

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- Coloured covers /  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /  
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion  
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut  
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la  
marge intérieure.
- Blank leaves added during restorations may  
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these  
have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que  
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une  
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,  
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas  
été filmées.

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary materials  
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips,  
tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the  
best possible image / Les pages totalement ou  
partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata,  
une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de  
façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- Opposing pages with varying colouration or  
discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best  
possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des  
colorations variables ou des décolorations sont  
filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image  
possible.

- Additional comments /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Pagination is as follows: [1], [2559]-3476, [i]-cxlv p.

Pages 2735-2736 are incorrectly numbered pages 2991-2992.

OFFICIAL REPORT  
OF THE  
DEBATES  
OF THE  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
OF THE  
DOMINION OF CANADA.

---

THIRD SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

48-49 VICTORIÆ, 1885.

VOL. XX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE TO THE  
TWENTIETH DAY OF JULY, 1885.



OTTAWA:  
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.  
1885.

# House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—48 VIC.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 16th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, What was the amount of the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank of Canada on April 30th, subject to payment on demand; and also the amount of deposits subject to notice of withdrawal, on the same date?

Mr. CARLING. The balance due to depositors payable on demand, on the 30th of April, was \$14,536,747. No portion of the amount due to depositors is payable on previous notice.

### WAYS AND MEANS—DISTURBANCES IN THE N. W.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the report of the Committee of Ways and Means (June 15), reporting a resolution granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,700,000, to defray certain expenses connected with the disturbances in the North-West Territories, be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Militia stated that he would give some further information.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no recollection of that. I understood the hon. Minister to say that he had no information that he could give other than he had given, but that he had received a very large package of receipts and vouchers for money expended in the North-West, which were then under the consideration of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. He said he hoped to be able to give the information to the House in a short time, and he stated it should be given at a subsequent stage of this Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will allow this motion to pass, so that I can introduce a Bill and take another stage, I will ask the Minister of Militia about the information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Militia is unwell to-day, and is confined to his house.

Resolution read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL introduced Bill (No. 149) to grant to her Majesty \$1,700,000 required to defray certain expenses now being incurred in the North-West Territories.

Bill read the first time.

### WASHINGTON TREATY.

Mr. MITCHELL. With the consent of the House, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the First Minister to a matter referred to in that very reliable paper called the *Montreal Gazette*, a paper that is characterised by a great deal of literary ability and truthfulness. In a letter to that paper I find this matter referred to, which is of great interest, certainly, to the people of the Maritime Provinces. The letter refers to the fact that correspondence has been had and an arrangement entered into between the Cabinet at Ottawa and the Government at Washington, in order to promote a settlement of the fishery question. The substance of the article is this, that an arrangement has been arrived at between the Cabinet at Washington and the Cabinet here, that no steps shall be taken to prevent American fishermen coming into our fisheries until Congress meets in December next, in the hope that in the meantime such arrangement will be arrived at to settle the question, not merely for a year or ten years, but for all time. Now, as this is a very important matter, one that is creating a good deal of interest in the Maritime Provinces, and to which, I am sure, the Government is giving a good deal of atten-

tion, and as the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty will expire in a couple of weeks, I would like to know what foundation there is, if any, for this article.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has asked the question. I think the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) asked a similar question some time ago, and I told him the subject had occupied the attention of the Government, and that the papers would be brought down before the end of the Session. At this moment we are applying to the Governor General for leave from the Colonial Office to lay certain papers before the House, and I have no doubt that consent will be given at once, unless the late change there will cause some little delay. I fancy, however, it will not, and we shall bring down very important documents to be laid before the House as soon as we have authority to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the right hon. gentleman feel himself at liberty to declare whether the tendency of the article, the declaration that arrangements are likely to be come to whereby our fisheries will be open to Americans during the present season, is correct or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say that is correct, but I do not think it well to be more specific in my statement. It is not correct, however, that there is any engagement by which the waters will be open to the Americans, but the papers speak for themselves. I may say, however, that the tendency of all this correspondence is to give strong hope that negotiations will take place, not only with regard to fisheries, but with regard to extended reciprocity.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman should state at once whether this statement in a Ministerial organ is correct or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, the Government has no organ.

Mr. MITCHELL. Except the *Herald*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the second place, I have not seen the article; in the third place, I do not think the Government can at all be forced, if they think it inexpedient, to make statements prematurely, and they cannot make a full statement now, or one full enough to be at all satisfactory to the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is certain some Minister has made the statement to the editor of the paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that is not the case. Any statement that has been made has come from Newfoundland, which is also interested in this matter. I have no doubt as to how the statement referred to has been made. Sir Ambrose Shea, who is not a member of the Newfoundland Government, and holds no official position whatever under the Government, went to Washington not long ago, on behalf of the St. John Board of Trade, on a matter relating to Customs, and had some communication with the American Government, and some unofficial communication with the British Ambassador, and I presume these rather imperfect statements have been made from the information he gathered when at Washington.

Mr. VAIL. I am sure I need not remind the hon. gentleman that this is a very important matter. As we are getting to the 1st of July I am quite sure he feels the necessity of taking early action, so as to arrive at some conclusion as early in July as possible. I presume any arrangements that may be come to to leave our fisheries open to American fishermen will enable our fishermen to send fish to the United States free of duty?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already stated that we merely wait for permission to bring down communications which have taken place between the Imperial Government and the Government of the United States.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. POPE. In moving that this House resolve itself into committee on the proposed resolutions for the Canadian Pacific Railway, it has been customary, on the part of my distinguished and

honorable predecessor (Sir Charles Tupper) to make a general statement as to the railway, giving, as nearly as he could, all the particulars, all the incidents that had transpired, and the prospects of the railway. I do not intend to follow this example by going over ground that has been gone over before, and so well gone over. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of former transactions, explained to this House time and again, but what I propose to make is a statement generally of what has transpired since the loan of last year, and perhaps in some particulars I may have to refer to former years. In the first place, let me say that the company have proceeded with their work during the last year, under the loan given by this House, with great vigor and energy, that not one particle of that energy we have seen in former years exhibited by the company has been lessened or decreased in the slightest degree. I do not believe that you could get any other men in this country who would have undertaken that work and pushed it to the extent these gentlemen have. Consequently, in starting, I may say that I think they are entitled to every consideration from this House and from the country, and that we may feel proud that we have found Canadians who could undertake this work and carry it through almost to completion as they have done. When I travelled through that country last fall I found that the line was a much better road than the contract they had entered into demanded, and I found that they must have expended large sums of money beyond what the contract required. I found that they had constructed the road, not only across the prairies, but into that sea of mountains going into British Columbia, which my hon. friend opposite has so graphically described. When you get into the Rocky Mountains you wonder that so few men could have performed this work, for there 100 or 1,000 or 5,000 men appear as nothing. I felt at that time that we owed a great deal to these men, and I feel now that we owe a great deal to them, and that they have done the work well, and have done a great deal more than they agreed to do by their contract. It is for that reason that I am here to-day to propose the resolutions that are now before the House. It is because they have expended large sums of money beyond what the contract required that I am forced to ask the House—I believe a willing House, a House that will appreciate the great work that has been done by these men, a work that could not have been done if they had adhered strictly to the contract—to agree to these resolutions. These gentlemen do not ask for one dollar to complete their contract. We all believe, they believe, and the chief engineer himself says, that the money provided for the completion of that contract is amply sufficient to carry it through and finish the road; but it was found necessary to do considerably more than that, in order to make the work one which would be in the interest of the country, according to its latest developments, and consequently they found that, while they could complete the work in the terms of the contract, they could not do that which must be done in a few years, in order to compete with other transcontinental railways, without the additional expenditure. Consequently, they found themselves involved in a large expenditure, and found it necessary to make an outlay which was unprovided for by the loan of last year. I think that was wise. I think I appeal to a House which will appreciate the wisdom of getting that road completed at once in a proper shape, rather than having to go over it a second time. The only thing the company are going to ask from this House in the shape of money is that they may be assisted temporarily to the extent of \$5,000,000, with ample security for repayment, and to be allowed to cancel stock of \$35,000,000 and issue bonds, in order to pay the loan and complete the road. This is the sum and substance of the resolutions as they stand. There is no money to be given for the completion of their contract—not one farthing—they do not ask it. The arrangement is to be made, if at all, not in the interest alone of the company, but of the country; that the road shall be, in all respects, superior to the contract, and as good as any of the other transcontinental railways between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and in every respect in a position to compete with the other roads. The company desire to get possession of their property in order that they may use it for the equipment and completion of the road. And, to put it in first-class position, they propose to pay off the indebtedness already incurred with the Government; to cancel \$35,000,000 unsold stock, issuing instead same amount of first preference bonds, \$20,000,000 of which will be held by the Government as security, the proceeds of which, when sold, to be appropriated to pay off \$20,000,000 of the loan of last year. The other \$15,000,000 of bonds will be deposited, or the proceeds when sold, first \$8,000,000, as security for a loan of \$5,000,000 to pay off their

Mr. POPE.

floating debt, which loan is to be repaid in July, 1886; the balance is for the purpose of equipping and completing the road in first class style—far above the standard contracted for, and as security we take the whole 21,000,000 acres. I think no hon. gentleman will say that the security we take is not ample, and does not secure us fully. My hon. friend may say, and probably will say, that we are releasing the security we had before, but the first mortgage bonds on that road of \$20,000,000 must be as good as the security we had before. The \$35,000,000 of stock in the hands of the Government was only to be sold, as explained by Sir Charles Tupper last year, for the purposes of the road or for the purpose of repaying the loan to Government. They are applying that now exactly, as was indicated by Sir Charles Tupper in his speech last year, towards the completion of the road, and eventually, also, towards paying back the loan—there can be no question about that matter. There can be no question about the point that he made in his speech last year when he indicated to the House, and when the House quite understood that whatever use was ever made of that it never could be used without the consent of the Government, and if used at all, it was either to be used in the completion of the road or in paying back the loan. Now, Sir, it is proposed to use it in both ways. The first \$20,000,000 is to be kept towards paying off the loan of last year. No one can doubt that these first mortgage bonds upon the road for \$35,000,000 only are good security, and that they are available security. The reason that they have come to us this year, and the reason that they came to us last year for a loan, was simply because their securities, which everybody in the country believed were available, and could be used for the completion of that road, had turned out not to be available; there was no market for them; the times had gone against them, and they are exactly in that position to-day; though I believe that in a short time the securities will become better in the market, and I have not the slightest doubt that the company will be able to avail themselves of the proceeds of those bonds and to pay back the \$20,000,000. I have no doubt, also, they will be able to avail themselves of the \$15,000,000 in bonds, in order to pay us back the temporary loan, which they will have to pay in July, 1886, and also to build the road, as I said before, and to put it in such a condition as that it will be able to compete with other roads. Sir, I travelled over that road last year, as far as they had gone, and I found it superior to any thing that I have travelled over on the prairie yet—in many instances much superior. There is no possibility of their being troubled with snow. The cuts are wide, and the slopes are taken to an extent of from 100 to 200 feet from the railway, involving an enormous expenditure on that account. The excess of expenditure has been brought about from that and various other ways. Of course, they have built iron bridges across the Saskatchewan and across the Bow River, and all these things, which are outside their contract, have cost them a great deal of money. Now, Sir, it was explained by my hon. friend and my distinguished predecessor, last year, that certain contracts were entered into by the Government, one north of Lake Superior and one at Port Moody. At the time he explained to the House he said there were certain amounts that must be paid hereafter upon these contracts, and there had been certain amounts then paid—I forget exactly the amount he fixed as having been paid north of Lake Superior, but a considerable amount was required to complete the work. I am happy to say now to the House that that work has been completed, with the exception of about \$60,000 worth. There is a little more filling to be done on that section, but \$60,000 is the estimated cost of completing that work. Now, Sir, when he spoke of the Port Moody section of 213 miles, if I remember rightly, he explained that there had been \$7,000,000 worth of work done on that section, and the estimated cost was \$9,000,000. That work has proceeded favorably, and will undoubtedly be completed within the contract time, which expires early in July, I think the 1st. But there remains to be done yet, stated in money, about \$350,000—I have not the odd figures exactly—to complete the whole line, which we expect will be by the 1st of July, when the road will be handed over to the Government. Sir, this is not all. There is a bad side to the case, which I must present to you, because I think, in explaining a question of this kind, my friends, as well as my opponents, expect a clear and frank statement which they can rely upon, and they want to know the unfavorable as well as the favorable side. Now, this is the position in which I find myself in respect to the section between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. The estimated cost of that work was \$28,000,000; I find it is going to cost us about \$29,500,000, an excess over the estimated cost of about \$1,500,000. This is partly accounted for

in this way : On the portions which were early built by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) when he was Premier of this country, trains had been run over that road and cars had been carrying supplies for the contracts beyond, without any section men being upon the road, and had been used—I presume my hon. friends would know the time better than I do—but I think the road had been used from six to eight years since it had been built. Nothing had been done to keep it in repair, except what those men pleased to do themselves; consequently, not only the roadbed had got very much out of repair, but many of the rails had got very much injured and bent, and the sleepers were invariably rotted away, because anyone that knows anything about a railway knows that the life of a sleeper only lasts from six to eight years, and everyone of those sleepers, without any exception, had to be taken out, and I believe the last of them was taken out this year. The wooden structures, the trestles on that section were about in the same proportion as they are on other sections of a like character.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman must not commit himself without looking at the figures. I assure him that I have looked at the figures, and these wooden structures are about in the same proportion as on other parts of the road of the same character.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. POPE. I say that all these structures have either been renewed, or must be renewed this year, because everybody knows very well that timber does not last very long. Most of this timber was spruce and the ties could not live more than six or eight years—six years would be about the life of a spruce tie, eight years, perhaps, of hemlock or tamarac; cedar would last longer. But those were largely spruce, as the hon. gentleman knows, and exactly the same thing took place. Now, Sir, in calculating \$28,000,000, account was not taken of the work that had got to be done to repair the rails that had been injured, to replace those ties, and to place this road in the shape in which it should be. Not only were the ties and rails worn out, but the road bed itself had gone very much to rack, as the hon. gentleman knows a road must go to rack where there is nobody to keep it in repair. All the materials, all the rails and supplies that were used upon that road beyond that point, went over this line without there being anybody to look after it. I presume something like \$300,000 of work had to be done on that part of the road, and it was done at the same cost that work is done elsewhere, for similar kind of work. Then there was another thing that was not taken into account in making this estimate. We believed that we had offered to Manning, McDonald & Co. a fair price, but found that the arbitrators, when it was referred to arbitration, brought in a sum of about \$400,000; that being the case, you can easily see how quite a hole was made in the one and a half million dollars, which is in excess of the estimate. Taking all matters into consideration, I am not disposed to blame any engineer, if on a heavy piece of work, representing millions and millions of dollars, there should be a million either one way or the other different from the estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask whether in what he has just stated he referred to the road north of Lake Superior or was it not to the road running for a distance of 400 miles between Port Arthur and Winnipeg?

Mr. POPE. I was referring to the road between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. Last year when my predecessor laid his figures before the House he told the House—I will not say to a mile—that something like 800 miles of road yet remained to be built. He explained that that was the heaviest work upon the whole line; that

it included the heavy work north of Lake Superior—and I am glad the hon. gentleman opposite corrected me just now—and to the very heavy work through the Rocky Mountains. I have said this distance was about 800 miles. At this moment I desire to refer to those portions of the road to which the loan applies, and which cover a distance of 800 miles. The section of the road from Sudbury to Nepigon is 487 miles; from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Savona Ferry, 295 miles, making a total of 782 miles. The line is completed so as to admit of the running of regular trains thereon for a distance of 568 miles. The amount expended on that mileage is \$19,483,369. The value of the work to be done thereon is \$918,000. The work executed upon this part of the road before was \$3,000,000; these items making the cost of these 568 miles \$23,401,000.

Mr. CASEY. Where is that?

Mr. POPE. On the incompleted 782 miles, part north of Lake Superior and part west of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. BLAKE. Part of the two sections?

Mr. POPE. Yes. Of the line yet to be completed so as to admit of the running of regular trains there remains 214 miles, the estimate for the completion of which is \$5,420,510. The value of the work executed is \$1,597,810, making \$7,018,320 as the cost of the work. I may say that at this moment there are about 150 miles to grade, about 200 miles on which to lay track, and that work is included in the sum mentioned. These 568 miles have cost \$23,410,469, equal to \$41,199.77 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Are you talking of the completed road?

Mr. POPE. Yes, of the 568 miles; 214 miles are estimated to cost \$7,018,320 or \$32,795.88 per mile. The rolling stock considered sufficient for the main line, is placed at \$286,000, making \$30,705,789, less 10 per cent. which is kept back on all work, \$3,070,578, or \$27,635,211. On the 568 miles to complete the road as estimated, there is a very heavy section north of Lake Superior and heavy work from the summit of the Kicking Horse Pass to within six miles of the summit of the Selkirk range. This completes what I have to say on that part of the road. I think it shows what has been done with the loan of last year. If I remember rightly, my friend and predecessor explained to the House that other companies and other people had taken very strong positions against this road, and the troubles of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were due to the action of those people and those companies. I am not disposed to blame other roads for any action they may take in this matter. I believe any road, no matter where it might be outside of Canada, is quite justified in any action it may take to protect itself. I quite understand that if they find their trade is slipping from their grasp, or trade which they otherwise would obtain is passing by them, they will be ready to do everything they can to embarrass what is likely to prove a serious competitor. And I am not inclined to quarrel with them for doing so. I had hoped, however, that our own roads and our own people would have taken a more decided stand in favor of this great national undertaking; this great work which in the future must become, and which now is becoming, such an essential part of Canada, that our credit and every interest Canada has is affected either by pushing forward and completing the road or by allowing it to stop where it is. I had a right to look, and I did look, to the people of this country and to the press to pursue a somewhat different course from what has been pursued, although I have been challenged and we all have been challenged to produce a single article or argument from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, or their organs in the press in which the road has been traduced. We have been so challenged, but the proof that such has been done is patent to everybody.

I could go to the *Hansard* of past years, I could go to the speeches made in the House by these gentlemen, and I could find their papers in this country stating that any man who went west of Moose Jaw would find a country unfit for civilisation, and that it could not produce enough to pay for the grease on the railway wheels. Do you suppose the people of this country and other countries have not been cognisant of those statements? Is it possible that such reports could go through interested men in this country—it would be invidious to mention any particular man—but, can any person suppose that when men were playing into the hands of the enemies of the road on the other side, and doing their utmost to injure the road, that it would not have an effect? I do not blame them, but I do blame the men of this country who should have had the interests of this country at heart. Every word they could have said, every act they could have done, should have been in the interest of building up this great transcontinental railway of Canada. Though there may have been some reason for others, there was no reason why our own people should have acted in that way. Before going into the floating debt of the company, I may say that I consider it of the utmost importance that the company should find their way as early as possible to the great summer seaport of Quebec. They feel it important that that connection should be made as soon as it prudently can be made; they hope to be able to do it before long, and I am glad that that is their hope. I cannot join with those who think that they should not find their way to secure the trade of the seaports of New England. I am certain that every man in this House knows that they must have the trade of the seaports of New England, but from whatever direction they get their trade, let us do all we can to look after our own ports. For my own part, I shall be glad in the future to give every encouragement I can in that direction, and therefore I hope that everything will be done that can be done to secure a road as far east as Louisburg, which will give the shortest line through to Liverpool. I am sorry that circumstances have been such that nothing has been done for that part of the country; that it has lain so long in abeyance, but I hope it will not be very long before hon. gentlemen from Cape Breton will have the advantage of railway communication, for it is a section of country which has never had the advantage of a dollar's outlay on railways, while the rest of the country has had very much. I hope it will not be very long before we will be able to assist those people in getting to the nearest port from which they could reach Great Britain, the port of Louisburg.

Mr. BLAKE. Could you not put some more bait on that hook?

Mr. POPE. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to laugh and to sneer, but he knows when I speak, I speak because I feel it; he knows that I never put any bait on my own.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what I say.

Mr. POPE. I wish to say to the House that while we propose to make these changes which are mentioned in the resolutions we believe that we have a perfect security in every shape. We believe that the penalties these gentlemen would have to pay, are so very great—so monstrous as the hon. gentleman said about the Franchise Bill—that they never would under any circumstances fail to meet these obligations. I know it is not probable, and I do not believe it is possible, that men in the position in which these men are placed, with a road in a position in which that road is placed—I say I do not believe that such a thing as their failing to meet their obligations is possible. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me when they remember that the penalty is that they would lose the whole road, the whole of the lands, and all of the money they have put into the road. If anybody can believe that men of their experience, energy

Mr. POPE.

and push would do such a thing, all I can say is it passes my comprehension. Hon. gentlemen know that in October, 1883, the Government became trustees for the payment of dividends of 3 per cent. per ten years upon \$65,000,000 of the company's stock, and the company deposited with the Government sufficient in cash and security for that purpose. In December, 1883, the company being financially embarrassed, applied to the Government for relief in the form of a loan of \$30,000,000. This is the loan we have been treating of to-day, and it is that loan which I have tried to explain to this House. The company were asked for an explanation how the sums already received from the Government were disposed of; and they replied by submitting the following statement of receipts and expenditures:—

*Statement of Expenditure and Receipts up to 31st December, 1883.*

<i>First—On the main line—</i>	
Construction of line comprising 112 miles completed.....	\$23,078,929
Equipment of main line, including \$495,567.88 for steamers.....	8,638,307
Expenditure of portion of line received from Government.....	353,606
Materials at different points on the main line.....	4,025,604
Callender to Port Moody.....	\$36,096,446
Extension to Montreal and Brockville.....	\$3,203,051
Real estate for termini, shops, &c. ....	390,790
	<u>3,593,841</u>
Montreal to Savona's and Brockville. \$39,690,287	
<i>Second—Branch lines—</i>	
Total expenditure on branches.....	3,827,093
<i>Third—On access to the seaboard—Expended out of company's funds on connections, &amp;c.—</i>	
Advances towards acquiring access to the seaboard.....	3,965,899
<i>Fourth—on interest on stock, &amp;c.—</i>	
Interest on capital stock.....	\$2,128,000
Interest on bonds and expenses of land grant.....	372,880
Deposited in advance of dividend.....	8,710,240
	<u>11,211,120</u>
Total.....	<u>\$58,695,389</u>

*Receipts.*

Amount received from cash and land subsidies, stock, and sale of town sites, and net revenue—	
Cash subsidy.....	\$12,289,212
Land grant bonds.....	9,029,012
From sale of town sites.....	477,775
	<u>21,795,999</u>
Net revenue.....	891,875
Net receipts—	
From stock.....	25,356,828
Advance on \$10,000,000 of stock....	4,950,000
	<u>30,306,828</u>
	<u>\$52,994,702</u>
Balance.....	<u>\$5,700,687</u>

The company offered to pledge as security for the repayment of the proposed loan (with 5 per cent. interest per annum, payable half-yearly) on the 1st day of May, 1891:—First, the trunk line between Montreal and Port Moody, with all the branches, aggregating 3,327 miles; second, the rolling stock, machinery, tools and plant; third, the company's three fine iron steamships; fourth, the unsold lands, amounting to 21,246,600 acres. The question of granting the loan was submitted to Parliament in the Session of 1883-84. when Sir Charles Tupper, in laying the case before the House, explained that if the company were to fail to fulfil the terms upon which it is proposed to grant the loan, the Government would be seized of possession of 21,246,600 acres of land, 3,327 miles of

railway, and three iron steamships, and for the following sums, viz. :—

3,753,400 acres of land (sold) say its value...	\$ 7,506,800
Advance on rails.....	339,235
Cash subsidy paid.....	12,289,212
Loan of.....	22,500,000
Loan for guarantee dividend on stock proposed.....	7,380,912
Lien on Canada Central and Q. M. O. and O. railways.....	5,333,333
Land grant bonds sold with no sales of land to reclaim them.....	1,123,500
Estimated cost of Government work.....	28,000,000
Balance of cash subsidy.....	12,710,788
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$97,183,780</b>

Or if the land be assumed to be worth \$2 per acre—which would amount, in the aggregate, to \$42,493,200—the cost of 3,327 miles of railway, equipped, and three steamships, would be \$54,690,580. Parliament, on the 5th of March, 1884, 47 Vic., chap. 1, granted the loan, to be applied as follows:—

To pay off floating debt of Dec. 31, 1883.....	\$ 7,500,000
To complete the contract.....	15,000,000
To complete the guarantee of 3 per cent on stock.....	7,380,912
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$29,880,912</b>

The work has continued to be vigorously prosecuted, and is rapidly drawing towards completion; there remaining on the 30th April, 1885, only 150 miles of grading, 206 miles of track-laying, and 640 miles of surfacing to be done. Up to which date (30th April, 1885) the following named sums have been paid to the company:—

Subsidy under the Act of 1881.....	\$12,289,212
Subsidy under the Act of 1884.....	9,126,205
<b>Total cost subsidy paid.....</b>	<b>\$21,415,417</b>
Loan under the Act of 1884.....	20,307,600
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$41,723,017</b>
Leaving a balance available for completing the contract of, on subsidy account.....	\$ 3,584,583
On loan account.....	2,192,400
<b>Total available for completing the contract</b>	<b>5,776,983</b>
Available for paying dividends on stock.....	7,390,912
<b>\$13,167,895</b>	

The Chief Engineer expresses a strong conviction that the balance above named of \$5,776,983, is amply sufficient to complete the contract, and he expresses his belief that the contract will be completed by the summer of 1886. The company have submitted a statement of expenditure up to the 31st December, 1884, similar in form to their statement of 31st December, 1883. And, in order that the position may be taken in at a glance, I have placed the two statements side by side :

THE COMPANY'S STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE.

	Up to 31st December, 1883.	Up to 31st December, 1884.	During the year 1884.
	\$	\$	\$
On Main line and branches.. ..	30,499,863	52,596,842	22,095,979
Equipment of main line.. ..	8,638,307	9,168,755	530,448
Improvement on Government lines.....	353,606	1,241,780	888,174
Materials on hand.....	4,025,604	3,687,729	337,875
Expended out of company's funds on connections, &c.....	3,966,889	5,857,223	1,890,334
<b>Paid interest on capital stock.....</b>	<b>47,484,269</b>	<b>72,552,329</b>	<b>25,068,960</b>
<b>Sum now in hand of Government to pay nine years interest.....</b>	<b>2,128,000</b>	<b>5,378,000</b>	<b>3,250,000</b>
<b>Interest on land grant bonds and expenses.....</b>	<b>8,710,240</b>	<b>14,288,288</b>	<b>5,578,048</b>
	<b>372,890</b>	<b>582,734</b>	<b>209,354</b>
	<b>58,695,399</b>	<b>92,801,351</b>	<b>34,105,962</b>

Less floating debt of 1883.....	7,500,000		
Plus do.....			7,500,000
	51,195,389	92,801,351	41,605,962
Received from cash and land subsidies and Government loans.....	21,318,214	55,532,651	34,214,437
	29,877,175	37,268,700	7,391,525
Less received from bonuses, net earnings, town sites, &c., after deducting payment of interest, exchange, &c., not included in above statement.....			496,063
			6,895,462

In order to make the thing as clear as we could, and if possible, give satisfaction to hon. gentlemen in this House and to the people, we thought it well to send an accountant to Montreal that he might examine the books of the company, and on his own responsibility be able to give the figures according to his examination. Now, I will state what those figures show :

STATEMENT prepared by Mr. Miall of the Expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to date, showing the floating debt contracted in 1884.

	DETAIL.	TOTAL.
West of Callander, including branches... Construction .....	\$48,382,084	
Improvements.....	1,241,780	
Material.....	3,687,729	
		\$53,311,593
East of Callander..... On main line.....		4,213,758
Equipment..... do do.....		9,168,755
Interest, &c..... On financial matters in connection with main line construction handling material, &c.....		1,389,474
		\$68,083,580
Received from Government..... Subsidy.....	\$20,240,317	
Loan.....	18,626,600	
Land proceeds.....	8,702,088	
		47,569,003
Expended on main line out of company's resources.....		\$20,514,577
Expended out of company's funds on connections.....		5,857,224
Dividends.....		5,378,000
Deposit with Government to guarantee dividends.....	\$ 8,710,240	
Less dividends paid.....	1,802,863	
		6,907,377
Expenditure made and liabilities incurred out of other than Government resources.....		\$38,657,178
How provided:—		
Capital (proceeds of stock).....	\$29,568,123	
Bonuses.....	232,600	
Town sites.....	504,675	
Earnings.....	\$1,626,063	
Less balance due.....	169,745	
	1,456,318	
Floating debt.....	6,895,462	
		\$38,657,178

Now, it will be interesting to the House to know what are the items of which this indebtedness is composed :

STATEMENT showing the services which occasioned the floating debt contracted by the company in 1884, as shown by their accounts, books, &c.

	DETAILS.	TOTAL.
Expenditure not covered by estimates—		
Callander to Port Arthur construction \$	918,917 26	
Red River to Savona's Ferry do	1,117,040 63	
Rolling stock.....	71,737 77	
		\$2,107,695 66
Port Arthur to Winnipeg construction.....		758,769 67
		\$2,866,465 33
Construction of branches west of Callander.....	\$ 705,772 28	
Improvements on Pembina Branch.....	130,435 80	
		\$ 836,208 08

Less bonus on South-Western Branch..	200,000 00	
Lake steamers.....		636,208 08
		145,118 24
Expenditure west of Callander.....		\$3,647,791 65
Montreal to Callander (main line).....	\$786,868 83	
Branch east of Callander.....	72,276 26	
		808,645 09
Expenditure on works, Montreal to Port Moody.....		\$4,456,436 74
Administering land grant.....	\$109,437 59	
Expenses of London office, handling stores, &c.....	230,096 63	
Fire insurance premium 3 years in advance.....	122,763 62	
	\$462,297 84	
Less receipts on land sales.....	305,569 00	
		156,728 84
		\$4,613,165 58
Interest and exchange.....	443,761 19	
do on land grant bonds.....	100,416 95	
Deposit on guarantee fund.....	147,136 87	
		691,315 01
Expended out of company's funds on connections, &c.....		1,890,334 00
		\$7,194,815 49
Less receipts from town sites, municipal bonuses, and net earnings.....		299,353 00
		\$6,895,462 49

In case, by any possibility, the company failed to fulfil the terms, what would be the position in which the Government of the country would stand? This is the position: The Government would have the possession of the following property:—Land, 21,246,600 acres; railway and branches, 3,327 miles; steel steamships, 3. This will cost us:

3,753,400 acres land (sold) say at \$2.....	\$ 7,506,800
Cash subsidy paid.....	\$21,415,417
do unearned.....	3,584,583
	25,000,000
Loan of 1883-4, paid.....	\$20,307,600
do unearned.....	2,192,400
	22,500,000
Proposed loan of 1884-85.....	5,000,000
Lien on Canada Central & Q.M.O. and O. Railway.....	5,333,333
Guarantee dividend on stock proposed.....	7,380,912
Land grant bonds, sold with no sales of land to redeem them.....	1,123,500
Estimated cost of Government work.....	29,500,000
	\$103,344,545
Assuming the lands to be worth \$2.00 per acre the following would be the position:—	
21,246,600 acres at \$2 00 per acre.....	\$42,193,200
Leaving the cost of 3,327 miles of railway at \$18,327 per mile.....	\$61,151,345

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman cheer me. I knew I should show him a statement which would be very satisfactory, and I am glad to see that he recognises it as such. The following is the statement of amount of cash subsidy and loan, showing the amount of each earned and paid to the company up to 30th April 1885:—

Cash subsidy.....	\$25,000,000
Loan to pay off floating debt.....	7,500,000
do complete contract.....	15,000,000
do do guarantee of 3 per cent.....	7,380,912
	\$54,880,912
Up to the 30th April, 1885, the following sums have been earned and paid to the Company:	
Cash subsidy.....	\$21,415,417
Loan to pay floating debt.....	7,500,000
do complete contract.....	12,807,600
do pay dividend.....	
	41,723,017
Balance available.....	\$13,157,895

Mr. POPE.

I think, from those figures, if I had not convinced the hon. gentleman already, and heard him say "hear, hear," in recognition of what I said, I still should have been certain that I had convinced him that it was a good transaction, one that he would like to go into, and that we ought to lay our shoulders to the wheel to complete this road. I have no doubt that he feels in his heart of hearts that every dollar of this loan has been properly expended, that a great deal of work has been done and a great deal more money expended upon it than he ever expected would be expended in the next ten years. I quite believe that it is a pleasure to the hon. gentleman, as is shown by his saying "hear, hear," when I explained these matters as frankly as I have. I must not occupy the time of the House much longer. I am sure I have tired you all with these explanations, but I wish for a few moments to call the attention of the House to a comparison between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other transcontinental railways in America. If you take the mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Northern Pacific, the Union Pacific, and the Southern Pacific Railways, and then take the expenditures upon them, I think you will find reason for congratulation so far as the cost of our own line is concerned.

	Canadian Pacific.	Northern Pacific.	Union Pacific.	Southern Pacific.
Mileage—Main line...	2,895	1,889	1,922	2,115
Branches....	432	578	1,128	1,936
Total....	3,327	2,467	3,050	4,051
Share capital.....	\$65,000,000	\$109,749,464	\$120,144,000	\$152,459,700
Funded debt.....	\$35,000,000	\$50,122,200	\$213,394,564	\$85,617,200
Cash subsidy from Government.....	\$25,000,000		\$61,395,192	
Acres of land grant....	25,000,000	43,756,800	33,401,600	56,862,384
Gross earnings.....	\$5,750,521	\$12,955,971	\$45,746,963	\$15,375,117
Net earnings.....	1,191,891	4,994,870	18,742,151	7,739,499
Working expenses.....	4,558,630	7,961,101	27,004,812	7,635,618
Maximum grade per mile.....	116	128	116	128
Minimum curve....	10°	12°	11°	14°

Now, Sir, I will not detain the House much longer, but I think the figures I have given here, the comparison that I have been able to make between the expenditure of this road and that of other roads, must be very satisfactory to the House. In most cases the cost per mile of the Canadian Pacific Railway is not more than one half the cost of other Pacific railroads. I am bound to say that I am certain there is no better road than the Canadian Pacific Railway. Though it has been built with great rapidity, and my hon. friend thinks it has been built a little too fast, I say it has cost but little more than half, and in some instances less than half, what these other roads have cost. In view of these facts I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will not complain; I am sure they have great reason for congratulation that this road has been built in four years, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, or will be built in about four years and a-half. Although we gave the company until 1891 to build the road, they have shortened the time by five or six years, and in the spring of next year we shall be able to travel from the Atlantic to the Pacific on our own line, when our immigrants will be able to go from the seaports of Canada to the North-West or to British Columbia without their being tampered with by American immigration agents. In all the experience I have had with immigration I never had so much difficulty and trouble as I have had during the present year in getting our immigrants through the United States, or even to get them into Manitoba, where they had to pass through American territory. Even when they have secured a passage from Germany to Manitoba on through tickets, we have had the greatest difficulty in keeping them from

being enticed away by American agents. And what is the course pursued by these agents? Two of them, perhaps, will come into a car filled with immigrants and begin to talk to one another. One of them says: "I was in Manitoba lately and they are having great trouble there; there is an Indian war going on, and the frosts and floods are so disastrous that I could not afford to stay there and I moved away." This is the kind of conversation that goes on. Only a short time ago about 50 families started from Roumania to Manitoba, what was my experience with reference to these people? I found that these land sharks from the United States came among them and enticed more than half of these people to go away to the United States, and I am sorry to say, that I learned afterwards that some of our own people, some of the German societies, co-operated with these American agents to get these families away. A gentleman of great ability, a man of world wide fame, Dr. Meyer, and an associate of his, arranged for the immigration of 200 Swiss families, and 50 of them sailed for Manitoba a little while ago. But we did not receive them, they did not get to Manitoba, and I determined to find out what the reason was, and I set a man to work for that purpose, because I looked with great favor upon what that gentleman and his associate were going to do in the North-West. I regarded this little band of immigrants as a nucleus for a large Swiss and German emigration in the future. Well, Sir, I sent a man to New York and he found that they had been enticed away to Kentucky. I never in my life have found so much opposition to our immigration on the part of the land and railway societies and others in the United States, as I have this and last year. They have not forgotten our Indian troubles, and they have been careful to spread the fact abroad that we had an Indian war, and I am afraid that my hon. friend's constituency in Manitoba is also pressing very hard upon people who reach Manitoba not to go any further west. But I say that when we have completed this road, when, next spring, or perhaps this autumn, we shall be able to bring immigrants from Liverpool to Manitoba for \$25, we shall be able to take them through our own country and thus prevent them falling into the hands of the American agents. But it is hard to bring German immigrants by Liverpool. In Germany the law does not allow you to send immigration agents among the people, and you must use the agents that have got certificates, and who have a right to act, not as immigration but as steamship agents. Well, Sir, all the steamships from Germany to America are plying to New York, and the consequence is that the steamship agents in Germany are all endeavoring to get immigration to New York. I found this year, at all events, that they had a great advantage over us from the fact of our Indian war. They talk about trials by field and flood, and no doubt, a great many of the people, the majority of the people, who came by New York destined for Manitoba have not reached their destination. By the end of next year this may be put an end to, so far as the English, Scotch and Irish immigration is concerned, and a good deal of the Belgian immigration—we must except the Germans—a large portion of which comes *via* Liverpool. Unless we enlist some of the great steamship companies having large agencies and entrust to them the German immigration, we shall never, I fear, have that immigration to the extent we desire to obtain it. But we shall obtain the old country immigration, if we can put our immigrants in the North-West. It remains with us to look forward with confidence as we ought to look forward with hope and confidence to the future of the country, remembering that it is not only for to-day we are legislating. It remains with those of us who have children at home to work out the future destinies of the country, to show that we are men enough to open up and occupy this vast country and see to it that we make the best use of the heritage we have obtained, so that we may hand it down to

our children unimpaired, and that we may build up in that country a healthy, prosperous British people, living under the British flag, under which they were born in the older Provinces and in the old land. I am sure you need not fear for the future of the country. In a few years more there will be no need for us to send volunteers there, if we develop its great natural resources. I am quite sure the future of the country is clear; that every man will be proud of what has been done towards its development; that every man who has given a vote for the Canadian Pacific Railway, every man who gave a vote to sustain it the second year, and every man who supports the resolution now submitted will have the satisfaction of knowing that his children and his children's children will declare, those were the men for the time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In seconding the motion before the Chair I wish to ask the indulgence of the House while I offer some remarks upon the wide question which the resolution covers. My remarks will cover pretty large ground, no less than the discussion which has taken place since the inauguration of this enterprise. I shall have to refer very often to discussions that have already taken place, and for this and other reasons I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House and the permission of hon. gentlemen if I make use, more than is ordinary, more even than is allowed by custom and rules of the House, of the notes which I have been obliged to take to try and grasp the vast subject and endeavor to do it justice. Within a few miles from Montreal, in the county represented by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, we find a parish and a small town with an allegorical name, a name bestowed by a man of true prophetic instinct, the noble de La Salle. He was indeed a prophet, that brave Cavalier de La Salle, when leaving Montreal in 1679, on his way to China, he christened by the name of Lachine the spot from which he started after having ascended the foaming rapids of that name. The dream of La Salle has taken two hundred years to be realised, but it has been realised, and the piercing whistle of the locomotive has awakened the silent wilderness of the Rocky Mountains, which were reached in 1732, after a thousand perils. Another Canadian, one of the great family that founded the native parish of my friend from Richelieu, the adventurous Gauthier de Varennes, sent across the mysterious continent by the Governor of La Nouvelle France, the Marquis of Beauharnois, whose name has been given to one of the finest counties of Lower Canada. Singular and happy coincidence is this! Three Canadian names, which have survived through two long centuries, are embodied in that grand idea that through Canadian territory was to be found the straightest, the shortest, the easiest, route between Europe and Asia. This recalls to my mind an utterance of Lord Carnarvon, the foresight of which must have struck all those who read it at the time. Before the Royal Society of Geography, in London, Lord Carnarvon said, in 1859:

"It is not unreasonable to look forward to the establishment of a regular system of transit, commencing from Nova Scotia and the shores of New Brunswick, passing through Canada, touching upon the Red River settlement, crossing the prairies to the Vermillion Pass, till it reaches the gold-bearing colony of British Columbia, creating fresh centres of civilization, and consolidating British interests and feelings."

Before Lord Carnarvon, a man of mark, Major Robert Carmichael Smyth, in 1849, if I am not mistaken, pictured, in the following glowing terms, the destinies of the British nation. I quote from a pamphlet on the subject of British colonial railway communications, dedicated to Haliburton, but really addressed to the Duke of Wellington:

"Did His Grace's imagination picture to his mind's eye swarms of human beings from Halifax, from New Brunswick, from Quebec, from Montreal, from Bytown, from Kingston, from Toronto, from Hamilton, from Red River settlement, rushing across the Rocky Mountains of Oregon with the produce of the west in exchange for the riches of the

east? Did His Grace imagine the Pacific Ocean alive with all description of vessels sailing and steaming from our magnificent colonies, New Zealand, Van Dieman's Land, New South Wales, New Holland, from Bornea and the west coast of China, from the Sandwich Islands and a thousand other places, all carrying the rich productions of the east, and landing them at the commencement of the west, to be forwarded and distributed throughout our Northern American Provinces, and to be delivered in thirty days at the ports of Great Britain? Did His Grace weigh and consider that to the inventive genius of her sons England owes the foundation of her commercial greatness? We will not go to the length of asserting that she retains her proud pre-eminence solely upon the condition of keeping twenty years ahead of other nations in the practice of mechanical arts?

Did His Grace, in short, look forward to a grand national railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific? If not, let His Grace do so now. Let the people of Great Britain do so! Let her colonial Ministers do so. No country can have all the blessings and advantages of England and have them for nothing! Nor can she retain them without great exertion. Her accumulated wealth cannot be allowed to remain idle, nor will it. But the undertaking proposed has a higher claim to our attention. It is the great link required to unite in one powerful chain the whole English race. Let, then, our railway kings and our iron kings, our princely merchants and lands millionaires, let stirring and active spirits of the age, the great reformers and the modern politicians, many of whom are now proclaiming through the land that economy alone can save the country, condescend, for a short time even, to consider the undertaking proposed."

We can to-day, from this House, address ourselves to England, and we can tell her: What was then asked of you, the mother country, to maintain your pre-eminence and to unite in one powerful chain your immense colonies, we have done ourselves, and we have done it alone. We have done it through our statesmen, through the princes of Canadian finance. They have asked, it is true, some assistance from that accumulated wealth which your genius had gathered, but even those advances have been secured by us in an indisputable manner. In taking up the question of the Canadian Pacific one must bear in mind that that railway project was the largest ever brought out in the world as a single enterprise. There may be found networks of railways more extensive, such as the Pennsylvania Railway, composed of several links, born of isolated enterprises, afterwards amalgamated; and it is not impossible that some European Governments may have, in the course of time, added to their systems of railways a greater number of miles on the whole surface of their country. France, for instance, has disbursed at this moment more than \$300,000,000 on 9,000 miles of railway; Austria has guaranteed a sum of \$250,000,000 on 3,694 miles; but in no country in the world was there undertaken, in one stretch, the construction of 3,000 miles of railway, five or six hundred miles of which traverses a mountainous region, presenting almost insuperable difficulties. That vast conception which raises our position amongst the nations of the world, which renders us the equals of our proud and powerful neighbors, should not be belittled nor discredited by those most interested in its success—the citizens of this Dominion. Unfortunately, party spirit is such that the desire to destroy is stronger than patriotism, hatred dominates intelligence, and, in certain quarters, people have come to this, that they regret that all the catastrophes which were predicted have not happened. The Canadian Pacific is the offspring of two great ideas: 1st. The necessity of uniting into one great empire the British colonies of North America as a barrier against the absorbing power of the neighboring republic. 2nd. The importance of opening to the coming millions of immigrants the vast area yet unexplored, and of finding for the commerce of Europe, and of America itself, the best, the shortest, the quickest route to the unbounded wealth of Asia. I shall not dwell here upon the wisdom of the policy that has won for Confederation that immense and fertile North-West, and that wonderful country, British Columbia. No one has any doubt to-day upon that question. I only wish to say that out of such a sudden development of forces, there have grown sacred obligations which no good citizen should think of ever evading. The page of our official record upon which is written the attempt to repudiate our engagements will always remain a

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

dark page in our history, whilst the most striking fact standing out in the present period of our national life, the event that has averted the stigma from us and the calamity from the nation, will be the return of the Conservative Government at the head of Canadian affairs. I know that to palliate their own shortcomings our adversaries have tried to ridicule, to bring into contempt, the Administration that had promised the construction of the Canadian Pacific within the period of ten years. Hundreds of times in this House, in their newspapers, on the hustings, they have denounced that promise as absurd, ridiculous, impossible of realisation, and men for whom I cannot help feeling great respect, on account of their high character and their intelligence have allowed themselves to be so carried away by the errors of their party as to make the most solemn declarations, the most gloomy prophecies, prophecies, however, which have been completely and loudly contradicted by what has happened since. Five years had elapsed since a solemn pledge had been given to British Columbia that the transcontinental route would be built in ten years, when the hon. member for East York, then Prime Minister, declared as follows, in this House:

"I have been an advocate of the construction of a railway across the continent, but I never believed that it was within our means to do it in anything like the period of time within which the hon. gentleman bound Parliament and the country. I believe the bargain was an act of madness, of utter insanity, and an evidence of political incapacity that has had no parallel in this or in any other country that I am aware of. After careful examination I found that while there was comparatively little difficulty in ascertaining the probable character of the prairie country, nay, from the Lake of the Woods westward to the Rocky Mountains, it must be a work of Herculean magnitude to ascertain the exact character of the country through British Columbia and from Lake of the Woods, eastward to Lake Nipissing."

Herculean magnitude! The word was well chosen, and I call attention to it when I fully accept it as a striking illustration of the immense success that has crowned the broad policy of the present leader of the Administration, and the intelligent confidence of the party supporting him. Yes, in 1871, the project of constructing the Pacific was a sublime audacity. It revealed the foresight of the men who had conceived and brought out that great scheme. But in 1876 there should have been no room for doubt. The Premier had then before him extensive and precise information. Elaborate surveys had been made, if we can judge by the following statements of their cost, as I find them in the Blue Books:

For the section east of the Rocky Mountains:—	
Surveys up to the 30th June, 1872.....	\$194,125 40
do do 1873.....	345,967 52
do do 1874.....	199,156 26
do do 1875.....	290,873 82
do 30th Dec., 1875.....	246,769 13
Making a total of.....	\$1,276,892 16

Section of the Rocky Mountains:—	
Surveys up to the 30th June, 1872.....	\$295,302 00
do do 1873.....	215,850 00
do do 1874.....	111,068 00
do do 1875.....	183,656 00
do 30th Dec., 1875.....	204,137 00
Making a total of.....	\$1,010,016 00

Giving for all these surveys an aggregate amount of \$2,286,907.54.

Shall I compare the policy, the confessions of incapacity, and the failure of the Liberal party in 1876, with the action of the Conservative party and its results, after a period of nine years? In 1876, the leader of the Government announced to the House that the works on the main line of the Pacific had reached the following points:—East of Fort William, 22 miles of grading; in the direction of Lake Shenandouan, 13 miles of grading; and east of Red River, 25 miles of grading. I say grading only; not a rail was laid, not a piece of iron work, only grading. Three years afterwards, in December, 1878, the following was the state-

ment of the work done on the main line:—From Fort William to English River, 60 miles with rails laid and 53 miles of grading; from Lacrosse to Selkirk, 75 miles with rails laid; from Keewatin to Lacrosse, 36 miles graded. In five years the Mackenzie Administration had succeeded in completing 135 miles of railway and 89 miles of grading, and the Dominion had already absorbed \$10,203,000 from its treasury towards the great work of the Pacific. I may add, Mr. Speaker, by way of comparison, that the present Administration has secured the constructed and completed 3,121 miles of the main line and branches of the Pacific within the period of six years. And to obtain that result the Government have not even benefited by the costly surveys of the preceding Government, whose plans and lines have been set aside from Callander to Fort William and from Selkirk to Port Moody. More than that, the company has been obliged to change nearly 100 miles of the 150 miles built on the line adopted by the last Government.

That undertaking, to build the railway in ten years, characterised as madness, as an act of insanity, the evidence of political incapacity—that project, condemned as an impossibility for the time fixed for its execution, which demanded an effort of the “Herculean magnitude” for its location alone—that project, I say, has been accomplished within six years, without any extraordinary effort, without danger, without commotion, without any burthen on the people of the country. At the rate they were going, the late Government—building 150 miles in five years—would have taken the greater part of the next century to cross the Rockies and reach the Pacific Ocean. One is led to ask the question, what would have become of the allegiance of that magnificent Province of British Columbia, to which the pledge of this Government with the solemn sanction of the Imperial authorities had been given in 1875? Stimulated by the marvelous development of the great Pacific State, California, the British Columbians, who knew that their country was as well situated, better gifted in certain respects, called by its resources to achieve high destinies, and to play on this continent as important a part as California, the British Columbians, I say, would not have consented to stagnate and sleep in the expectation of a railway ever promised and never done. They have the noble ambition of manly work, the great school of material progress is within reach of their hand across the Straits of Fuca. Having right on their side, they would not have failed to make us pay heavily for our breach of faith in the treaties made with them. Fortunately, and thanks to the intervention of Lord Carnarvon, further delay until 1890 was granted. But it did not appertain to the late Government to save the honor of the country, since, on different occasions, the then leader of the Cabinet, whilst accepting the obligation to complete the work within fifteen years fixed for the building of the road from Port Arthur to the Pacific Ocean, declared himself unable to build the section north of Lake Superior, and I believe that the present leader of the Opposition was more emphatic in the expression of his fears. He considered the enterprise such a gigantic one—such a fantastic one, I may say—that he even then raised the question of the disruption of Confederation. On the 15th of April, 1880, he expressed the following serious and sinister views:

“I had taken occasion in the fall of 1874 to declare my individual views on the subject of the Pacific Railway. I then stated that I thought the fulfilment of the agreement with British Columbia impossible; that unless she choose to be reasonable and to agree to a relaxation of the terms, I saw no hope of performing them; and that, if she insisted on secession as a consequence of the non-fulfilment of the terms of Union, I for one was ready to say: ‘Let her go rather than ruin the country in the attempt to perform the impossible.’ I have never changed that opinion, and each succeeding year has strengthened my view as to the wisdom and soundness of such a decision.”

I do not believe that any bolder words were ever uttered in this House. Nothing but the eminent position of the gen-

tleman who uttered them could have secured them from condemnation. An ordinary member would surely have been denounced, if he had ventured so far. It was in 1880 that the hon. member for Durham so expressed his views; it was after he had been willing to join a Cabinet by which all the Carnarvon conditions has been accepted, it was after he had belonged to a Cabinet whose chief had said, on the 31st of March, 1876:

“We have felt from the first, that while it was impossible to implement to the letter, the engagements entered into by our predecessors, the good faith of the country demanded that the Administration should do everything that was reasonable and in their power to carry out the pledges made to British Columbia, if not the entire obligation, at least such parts of it as seemed to be within their power, and most conducive to the welfare of the whole Dominion, as well as to satisfy all reasonable men in the Province of British Columbia, which Province had fancied itself entitled to complain of apparent want of good faith in carrying out these obligations.”

Not only that, but one year later, the Opposition, to better express the new views of their chief, proposed on the 26th January, 1881, the following amendment, which was supported by their leader and all his followers:—

“Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Rodgers, that all the words after ‘that’ to the end of the question be left out, and the words, ‘The present construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia is premature, and will involve the country in an expense beyond its reasonable capacity, and will result in the maintenance of too high a rate of taxation, while the postponement of that part of the undertaking till after the completion of the prairie section, will enable it to be constructed at much less cost and within a reasonable time.’”

And all those accusations of folly, all those “impossible enterprises,” that “probable dissolution of the Confederation” had no ground whatever, no figures, no arguments of any value to support them. The Opposition were aware of the engagements that bound the Dominion Government, but they had so little care for the honor of the country that they were ready to ignore those solemn engagements for a mere caprice. Well, Mr. Speaker, after all those fears, all those threats, I am able at this hour, from my place in Parliament, to say, repeating the celebrated words of Sir George Cartier: “All aboard for the west! All aboard for the Pacific!” Yes, all aboard for the Rockies, for Columbia River, for Yale, for Port Moody, Coal Harbor and Victoria! By the contract of 1881 with the Syndicate the road was divided into four sections, as follows:—

	Miles
Callander to Port Arthur (built by the Co.)	657
Port Arthur to Red River (“ by the Gov’t.)	428
Red River to Savona’s Ferry (“ by the Co.)	1,252
Savona’s Ferry to Pt. Moody (“ by the Gov’t.)	213
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,550</b>
Add Pembina branch	65
	<b>2,615</b>

On the 1st of May, 1885, we had the following result:—

	Miles.
Callander to Port Arthur (built by the Co.)	657
Port Arthur to Red River (“ by the Gov’t.)	428
Red River to Savona’s Ferry (“ by the Co.)	1,252
(Less 150 miles to be graded.)	
Savona’s Ferry to Port Moody	213
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,550</b>
Add Pembina branch	65
	<b>2,615</b>

So that out of 2,615 miles first intended to be the Canadian Pacific Railway, 2,470 miles are now built, if we include 56 miles all graded, but not ironed towards Savona’s Ferry. And here is the exact amount to be spent by the company to entirely complete the railway from one end to the other:

Callander to Port Arthur	\$ 773,279
Port Arthur to Red River	60,000
Winnipeg to Savona’s Ferry	5,004,704
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,836,983</b>

Up to the 30th of April, 1885, the following sums have been paid to the company:—

Subsidy under the Act of 1881.....	\$12,289,212
“ “ “ 1884 .....	9,126,205
Loan of 1884 .....	20,307,600
Total.....	\$41,723,017

Leaving a balance available for completing the contract of:

On subsidy account .....	\$3,585,583
“ loan “ .....	2,192,400
Total.....	\$5,776,983

That is to say only \$60,000 short of what is required to finish the road; so that we may now say that the road is completed inasmuch as the means to construct it are in the hands of the company. Going back to the opinion expressed by the late Government and their unwillingness to build the section north of Lake Superior, I confess I am unable to understand the persistence of the Liberal Government in opposing the construction of the section north of Lake Superior, whilst they were ready to spend \$20,000,000 for the portion of the road between Lake Superior and Winnipeg. During at last five months of the year that section to Winnipeg would have necessarily been closed, and if navigation was declared to be our only resource, we would not have been in a worse position in having to use, altogether, the American route to which we were thus forced, and in having to pass through Pembina to reach Duluth, at the other end of Lake Superior. The interest alone of the \$20,000,000 saved would have allowed the Government to give material assistance to its proposed navigation of Lake Superior. And if Fort William was not to be connected by rail with Lake Nipissing, why that persistence in building, at a cost of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000, the section of the Canada Central and Georgian Bay branch to reach at Lake Nipissing, a terminus that would not, in reality, be used as such unless connected with Fort William? Was it intended to receive the traffic that the navigation of the lake would bring there? But, then, a few more miles of navigation south of Georgian Bay would have brought that traffic to railways already built and nearer the ocean port of Montreal. It is a fact that whereas from French River to Montreal, *via* Mattawa, the distance is 424 miles, it is but 400 miles from Midland to Montreal. The opposition of the late Government to the construction of the section north of Lake Superior was in direct contradiction to the decision of Lord Carnarvon. The reasons for that opposition are found in the despatch of the 7th September, 1874:

“The fourth condition says the despatch, involves another precise engagement to have the whole of the railway communication finished in 1890. There are the strongest possible objections to again adopting a precise time for the completion of the lines. The eastern portion of the line, except so far as the mere letter of the conditions is concerned, affects only the Provinces east of Manitoba, and the Government have not been persuaded either of the wisdom or the necessity of immediately constructing that portion of the railway which traverses the country from the west end of Lake Superior to the proposed eastern terminus on Lake Nipissing near Georgian Bay, nor is it conceived that the people of British Columbia could, with any show of reason whatever, insist that this portion of the work should be completed within any definite time, inasmuch as if the people who are chiefly if not wholly affected by this branch of the undertaking are satisfied it is maintained that the people of British Columbia would practically have no right of speech in the matter.

“It is intended by the Government that the utmost diligence shall be manifested in obtaining a speedy line of communication by rail and water from Lake Superior westward, completing the various links of railway as fast as possible, consistent with that prudent course which a comparatively poor and sparsely settled country should adopt.

“There can be no doubt that it would be an extremely difficult task to obtain the sanction of the Canadian Parliament to any specific bargain as to time, considering the consequences which have already resulted from the unwise adoption of a limited period in the terms of Union for the completion of so vast an undertaking, the extent of which must necessarily be very imperfectly understood by people of a distance. The committee advise that Lord Carnarvon be informed that, while in no case could the Government undertake the completion of the whole line in the time mentioned, an extreme unwillingness exists to another limitation of time; but if it be found absolutely necessary to secure a present

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

settlement of the controversy by further concessions, a pledge may be given that the portion west of Lake Superior will be completed so as to afford connection by rail with existing lines of railway through a portion of the United States and by Canadian waters during the season of navigation by the year 1890 as suggested.”

And whilst that excuse of an excessive expenditure was put forward against the building of that important part of the main line, and the importance of that part has been fully demonstrated during this unfortunate revolt in the North-West, the Government was authorising a large expenditure, which, if not wholly useless, was, at least, unnecessary for the fulfilment of our engagements under the Carnarvon award—I refer to the building of the 85 miles of the Pembina Branch—\$1,600,000. There was also the famous Foster's contract of the Georgian Bay Branch, on the following conditions: \$850,000 in money, \$609,000 by a 4 per cent. guarantee, and \$3,400,000 in lands, say a total of \$4,859,000. That contract involved the necessity of spending another \$1,500,000 for the 30 miles remaining between the end of the Georgian Bay Branch and the terminus at Lake Nipissing. The route between Winnipeg and Lake Superior was lengthened by 40 miles by lot making it direct to Lake Nipigon, thus adding an expenditure of at least \$16,000,000. There was also the subsidy to the Canada Central, \$1,400,000. The Government was willing to spend \$6,000,000 on the Nanaimo line, on Vancouver's Island, a work which could easily have been delayed. So that at the moment when they declared the building of the section north of Lake Superior an impossibility, the Government of my hon. friend from East York, breaking in that respect a sacred engagement on the plea of too large an expenditure, undertook to the amount of \$16,959,000 works, the postponement of which would not have signified and would not have been a violation of our engagements. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the merits or the utility of those works; this is not the time to do so. I only want to state that the then Government was not unwilling to spend a sum of \$16,959,000 on works which were not included in our obligations, and that they refused to undertake the works which the Imperial arbitration had ordered us to complete. I want to state that the Government of the hon. gentlemen on the other side hesitated, pleaded, refused, and then unwillingly consented to build 1,900 miles of railway from Lake Superior to the Pacific coast in fifteen years, and as a contrast to show the present Government completing 2,400 miles of the main line and 701 miles of branches in six years, saving the good name and the pledge of the country, and opening, five years sooner, the door to that great commercial prosperity which must follow the completion of our great Canadian transcontinental railway. I know what answer our friends on the other side will give us. It is invariably the same answer, and it is an easy one, avoiding all effort in the direction of accuracy: “You have been extravagant with the money of the people; you have obtained the rapid execution of those immense works at the expense of the public chest.” Nothing is more unjust, Mr. Speaker, nothing is more untrue than that assertion thrown in our faces in the place of an answer. Who has forgotten that once the Mackenzie Government offered to any company willing to build and then become the sole proprietors of the 2,797 miles of the Canadian Pacific, the following terms: Subsidy in money per mile, \$10,000; 4 per cent. guarantee during 25 years per mile, on \$7,400; land subsidy, per mile, 20,000 acres. I say that the guarantee of 4 per cent. was on \$7,400 per mile, although the call for tenders did not mention the sum, but the Government could not give less, having themselves chosen that proportion in the Foster contract. That offer represented in round figures: in cash subsidy, \$27,970,000; by the net 4 per cent. guarantee, \$20,977,500; by 55,940,000 acres of land at \$2 an acre, \$111,880,000; or a total of \$160,827,500. That assistance was a complete gift for the building of the road, and we can compare it with similar items in the subsidy granted

to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the present Government which are as follows:—

Sections built by the Government and given to the company .....	\$29,500,000
Cash subsidy.....	25,000,000
25,000,000 acres of land, at \$2 an acre.....	50,000,000
	<u>\$104,500,000</u>
The surplus offered by the late Government being.....	56,327,500
	<u>\$160,827,500</u>

I need not add that the class of road we present to-day to the country is, to say the least, not inferior to the road which the late Government expected to get under the most favorable circumstances by their offer, and far superior to that road with regard to equipment, terminal facilities, connections and branches. And it is far superior to the expectations of the people, who had already been informed that the estimates for the road, as prepared by Mr. Sandford Fleming in 1879, were estimates for a cheap road, covering only \$1,300 per mile for rolling stock, and not allowing more than \$13,000 per mile for construction of the prairie sections. The present company has already a rolling stock of the value of more than \$3,000 per mile, and if we grant them the power of raising the \$15,000,000 additional contemplated by the measure proposed another \$1,000,000 is to be added at once to the value of the rolling stock of the company's road, so that instead of having a road equipped to the extent of \$5,100,000 on 2,550 miles of the main line if we take the calculations of the hon. member for Durham at \$2,000 for a mile, we shall have the same length of road 2,550 equipped to the extent of over \$9,000,000 not including the branches. On that single item we have a net gain, in favor of travelling accommodations and accommodations for traffic, of \$4,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I have taken his own figures for the estimates I am giving the House. Those figures of his, I may say, have varied immensely since the hon. gentleman first began to discuss this question in the House. If his political opinions had varied to the same extent he would, by this time, be sitting on this side of the House and perhaps be a colleague of the right hon. First Minister. His estimates have varied like his appeals and demands on the Government for a different construction of the railway, and it is in spite of the hon. gentleman that the road has been built at all. I might also remark that the company have largely exceeded the 2,797 miles to which the contractors by the late Government for main line and branches were limited. They have added 712 miles to their line of 2,550 of main line and 65 miles of branch, which is now 3,327 miles, not including 600 miles of leased lines. The terminus has been extended to Montreal by the purchase of 345 miles of road and the expenditure of over \$4,213,753. Another sum of \$4,000,000 has been expended to secure access to the Atlantic seaboard. The system of railways which the company now controls in Ontario has cost over \$5,000,000. There remains comparatively but little to do to reach Sault Ste. Marie and the American North-West, the Algoma Branch having already cost \$2,000,000. In one word, the company has expended, and wisely expended, over \$15,000,000 of its own resources to add to the earning capacity of its main line and to complete its vast and uninterrupted system of transcontinental transportation. My hon. friends on the other side would be the last to find fault with those changes, with those improvements. The gravest charge which the hon. gentleman brought against the Government in 1880 was that we were not building a road sufficiently solid and complete. The present leader of the Opposition, speaking on the 15th of April, 1880, said:

322

"But except by most seriously degrading the road, by altogether lowering the style of construction, by changing it from a good, through line to an inferior colonisation road, it will be necessary according to the estimates of the hon. member for Lambton, if they be correct, to expend a very much larger sum than the hon. Minister calculates to reach this result. On the other hand, we must look to the ultimate conversion of the road into a first-class road, a cheap carrying road, for the North-West, without which it will be useless for that long stretch of country towards Battleford and beyond, for the grain will have to come down along the Pacific Railway a great many miles before it reaches Selkirk or the Red River. The House must remember that, according to the theory on which the hon. Minister advocates the completion of the road, he is bound to give reasonable grades and curves to the prairies of the west \* \* \* Again, of course, the through traffic depends on the road being first-class, and we must remember that after we have spent all the hon. Minister proposes, we shall have not a Pacific but a colonisation road."

It is true that my hon. friend has travelled from one side to the other on that point. One would think, from his utterances at the beginning of this Session, that he is now making it a crime for the company to have given the country a first-class road. He seems to be afraid that the road is too well built to be able to carry freight at cheap rates. He is scandalised at the announcement that a first-class road has cost in the prairie section as much \$16,000 or \$17,000 a mile, and he charitably insinuates that dishonesty or incapacity must have presided at the building of that work. In 1880, the Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper gave instructions to the Chief Engineer to construct a cheap road. We see in his letter of the 15th of April, 1880, this passage:

"With regard to the location and character of the railway, I am aware that your own preference has been for a line with light easy gradients. The Government recognises the advantages of this feature between Lake Superior and Manitoba, but west of Red River we attach less importance to it than to the rapid settlement of the country and the immediate accommodation of settlers. The policy of the Government is to construct a cheap railway following or rather in advance of settlement with any workable gradients that can be had, incurring no expenditure beyond that absolutely necessary to effect the rapid colonisation of the country."

And in further evidence of what I want to demonstrate, I shall cite an extract of Mr. Fleming's report in answer to the above letter:

"OTTAWA, 15th April, 1880.

"SIR,—I have the honor to submit the following estimate of expenditure necessary to place the Canadian Pacific Railway in operation from Lake Superior to Port Moody, West of Red River, 100 miles have been placed under contract, and tenders have been received for a second 100 mile section. These two sections are designed to be constructed and equipped in the most economical manner, dispensing with all outlay except that necessary to render the railway immediately useful in the settlement of the country. It is contended that the line be partly ballasted to render it available for colonisation purposes, full ballasting being deferred until the traffic demands high speed. It is intended to provide sufficient rolling stock for immediate wants, postponing full equipment until the country becomes populated and the business calls for its increase.

"On this basis and on the other data furnished, the railway may be opened from Lake Superior to the Pacific coast within the following estimate:

Fort William to Selkirk (406 miles) with light gradients, including a fair allowance of rolling stock and engineering during construction.....	\$17,000,000
Selkirk to Jasper Valley (1,000 miles) with light equipment, etc.....	13,000,000
Jasper Valley to Port Moody (550 miles) with light equipments etc. :—	
Jasper to Lake Kamloops, 335 at \$43,660.....	\$15,500,000
Lake Kamloops to Yale, 125 at 80,000.....	10,000,000
Yale to Port Moody, 90 at 38,888.....	3,500,000
	<u>\$29,000,000</u>
Add.....	1,000,000
	<u>30,000,000</u>
Total miles, 1,956.....	\$80,000,000

"The above does not include cost of exploration and preliminary surveys throughout all parts of the country north of Lake Nipissing to James' Bay in the east, and from Equimault to Port Simpson in the west, between latitudes 49° and 56°, not properly chargeable to construction, \$3,119,618, or the cost of the Pembina Branch, \$1,750,000, or with other amounts with which the Pacific Railway account is charged."

Another report of the Engineer-in-Chief to the Minister of Railways, dated Ottawa, 16th April, 1880, says:

"In compliance with your directions, I have the honor to consider the cost of the eastern section of the Pacific Railway extending from Thunder Bay, Lake Superior, to the eastern terminus, Lake Nipissing.

"It is impossible to say what labor and materials may cost some years hence, when the period arrives for the eastern section to be undertaken. Taking the basis of present prices and present contracts, and adhering to the economic principles of construction set forth in the letters of yesterday, I feel warranted in stating that \$20,000,000 may be considered a fair estimate of the cost of opening the line from Fort William to the eastern terminus.

"In order that the estimates of the cost of the line from Fort William to the Pacific and from Fort William to the eastern terminus near Lake Nipissing, be clearly understood, I deem it proper to submit the following explanations:—

"I have in previous reports laid before Parliament, advocated a location for the railway with generally light gradients and other favorable engineering features. The policy of the Government, as stated in your letter, likewise the change of line by the abandonment of the old location west of Red River, render it necessary on my part to modify the views I have previously held.

"I have likewise estimated the amount of rolling stock as limited to the extent considered absolutely necessary for colonisation purposes, and I have not overlooked the fact that the transportation of rails and other materials, after our own line from Lake Superior to Manitoba shall have been completed, will be reduced to nominal charges to cover actual outlay, instead of the very high rates we have been compelled to pay by the railways in the United States.

"It must be borne in mind that if present defined policy with respect to the gradual progress of the work be modified, or if the extent of the work be different from that assumed, or if its general character be altered, the cost may be affected by the change. The same result may be looked for if a higher price has to be paid for materials, or for labor, and if through these or other causes the contractors failing to perform what they have undertaken, the work in consequence has to be ret at higher prices. Under these circumstances the cost of the whole line may be increased.

"The estimate submitted is based on the data set forth, and on that data the whole main line, from Port Moody, on the Pacific coast, to the eastern terminus, in the neighborhood of Lake Nipissing, may be constructed in the manner and under the circumstances referred to, for about \$80,000,000. But to meet any of the possible contingencies to which I have referred, I beg leave to recommend that in considering the subject of capital required for the undertaking, a liberal percentage be added."

My hon. friend from Durham was greatly scandalised when he read the documents I have just quoted, and he took the first opportunity that presented itself to lecture the Government upon that point. He laid special stress upon the fact that the prairie section would not be built for \$13,000 a mile. All that part of his speech in the Session of 1880 is worth quoting; I shall content myself by adding to my last quotation, the following:—

"It would be very easy to tell, if only it were convenient to let us know, what the estimated cost of the equipment is. It is included for example in the estimate of \$13,000 a mile for the prairie road. But the hon. Minister of Railways would not tell us how much he could squeeze out for equipment in dollars from the \$13,000 a mile, and I am not surprised because I daresay he would have to go into decimals to give it to us. When you recollect that an adequate rolling stock, according to the former estimates, costs \$2,000 a mile, that the steel rails, plates and fastenings, cost many thousands more per mile, you will find how very little remains of the \$13,000 a mile to construct the railway.

"At a point seventy miles north-west of the longitude of Edmonton, you get to the end of the prairie. \* \* \* I take, therefore, the longitude of Edmonton which is also the point of divergence, in case a northerly route should hereafter be adopted, as, for present purposes, the point of separation between the prairie and the British Columbia sections, and my hon. friend from Lambton, upon all the information which the official documents and the engineer's report give, added to his own knowledge (assuming the continuance of the same gradients and curves and the same style of construction and equipments, which were always intended up to the time he resigned) estimates that the 256 miles from Edmonton to the summit would cost \$9,400,000, which, added to Mr. Fleming's and Mr. Smith's estimates of over \$36,500,000 for the road from the summit to the Pacific, would give a total of over \$45,000,000, as the cost according to the old estimates.

"From Selkirk to Edmonton, according to the old grades and styles of construction, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at \$17,650,000. \* \* \* I do not think we can decide that \$13,000,000 will pay for the work according to the present plan of construction."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a most extraordinary fact, Mr. Sandford Fleming having said in his report: "Selkirk to Jasper Valley (1,000 miles) with equipment \$13,000,000." The hon. member for Durham comes up and, fortified with the opinions of the hon. member for East York, says: "Jasper Valley to Edmonton (256 miles) \$9,000,000; Edmonton to Selkirk (744 miles) \$17,000,000—\$26,000,000." Exactly double the chief engineer's estimate. The hon. gentleman was not afraid to put Mr. CHAPLEAU.

his reputation at stake and to declare from his seat, a place which allows its occupant to say only what he believes is true; "the section will cost \$26,000 a mile." And if we take his estimate for Selkirk to Edmonton, alone, that is to say 744 miles at \$17,000,000 it is \$22,850 a mile. And now, Mr. Speaker, what do we see? The hon. gentleman getting up in his seat and saying: "My calculations of 1880 were all wrong, the Minister of Railways whom I was then fighting was right; I now declare emphatically that dishonesty or incompetency alone can have absorbed \$16,000 a mile in that prairie region which I said, five years ago would cost \$22,000 a mile." The whole country must congratulate itself upon the happy result we have obtained to-day. Surely there must have been at times a great deal of uneasiness, not to say fear felt, in the community, if public opinion could have been affected by the declarations of my hon. friends opposite. It is within the recollection of everyone that the most fabulous statements were made as to the cost of the railway, and the hon. leader of the Opposition was far from reassuring the public mind, by his elaborate calculations upon the subject. He once informed us that the Pacific would cost the country no less than \$144,500,000 in cash. I am not exaggerating, Mr. Speaker. I quote from the hon. gentleman's speech at the sitting of this House on the 15th April, 1880:

"There are 550 miles of a very difficult road to build from Jasper House to Port Moody. For a part only of that road, for the 493 miles between the divide and Port Moody, Mr. Fleming's estimate was about \$36,000,000. The estimate of Mr. Smith was \$36,500,000, and the estimate of Mr. Cambie was, I think, \$31,000,000. But the average estimate of the Chief and Assistant Engineer may be said to be over \$36,000,000 for this 493 miles, which would run up the 550 miles to \$40,000,000. The Canada Central Railway subsidy reaches \$1,410,000; the surveys, including those location surveys, which, after all, come out of the pockets of the people, whether called exploratory surveys or location surveys, amount to \$4,000,000. The road from Fort William to Selkirk was estimated at \$17,000,000; the Pembina branch cost \$1,500,000, and, adding \$100,000 for the Red River bridge, we reach a little over \$15,000,000. From Selkirk to Edmonton, according to the old grades and style of construction, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at \$17,650,000, which, added to the \$25,000,000, makes a total of over \$42,500,000 as the amount, including what has been spent for surveys which it will have cost the country, irrespective of interest and construction to reach the point which I suggest as the reasonable terminus for the prairie section of the road.

"According to the old system of construction, that central section would cost including the other items, I have mentioned, altogether over \$42,500,000 leaving out entirely both ends. What are the ends to cost? \$45,000,000 as I have stated the cost from Edmonton to Burr's Inlet on the west; and from Fort William to Nipissing on the east, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at a length of about 650 miles and a cost of \$32,500,000. Thus the ends make up together \$77,000,000, the centre part expenditure \$42,500,000 making a total of \$120,000,000 and that wholly exclusive of the legitimate and necessary charges which must be added in all cases, the charge for construction. \* \* \*

"Taking the returns of ten days ago, if \$80,000,000 are expended in the next ten years, there will be a total of over \$24,500,000 for interest, calculating interest on future loans at 5 per cent., the lowest rate, as I believe, at which the money can be raised.

And even, during the last Session what did the hon. member say:

"It is quite true that I submitted to the House, as the result of the calculations of my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), based upon the estimates of the engineers up to that date, the probable cost of a first-class railway, from Callander to Port Moody, at the sum he mentions—\$120,000,000. That is perfectly true; I do not understand that the hon. gentleman now finds fault with that estimate. He did find fault with it—

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

"Mr. BLAKE. Yes, he said to-day that he could not controvert my argument about his estimate being too low, because my estimate was true. I venture to say that I heard a great deal of complaint against my argument when I used it. I was told that it was extravagant, and the hon. gentleman thought it was too much altogether; but neither my hon. friend from York, nor myself, was responsible for more than this, that the estimates were the fair results of the estimates of the engineers laid on the Table of the House and printed in the Sessional Papers. I believed them to be so, and that was all we said. I say that the estimates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company last year came exactly to that figure. They were to spend \$91,000,000 on the road from Callander to Port Moody. The Government sections were to cost \$28,000,000; and if you add \$28,000,000 to \$91,000,000, you get just about \$120,000,000, as nearly as possible; and if you allow a trifle—if

the hon. gentleman would be bending enough to night to allow a trifle or so for the \$5,000,000 for surveys—you will find that the estimate of the company last year does accord with the estimates of the engineers made so long before."

That road which was to cost us \$120,000,000, not counting the interest, we have to-day for \$53,000,000 in cash disbursed by us, with 712 miles of branch lines and 600 miles of leased lines in addition to the road upon which the hon. member for Durham made his calculations. And instead of being obliged to pay 5 per cent. on the money we want, we have borrowed at 4 per cent. and at 3½ per cent.

Mr. TROW. I rise to a point of order. I read a few extracts and was called to order by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is now reading his speech.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Let us see now what this Government will show us, next fall, when the road will be completed? What has been done, during these six years of power, for that gigantic work which my hon. friends from Durham and from East York declared an impossibility so far as execution was concerned and the conception of which they termed "an act of insanity?" We have before us two estimates for that work; Mr. Fleming's estimate, \$80,000,000; Mr. Blake's estimate, \$120,000,000, or an average of \$100,000,000, and this calculation is based on the main line alone, without reference to the branch lines. Mr. Fleming's estimate allows only \$1,300 per mile for rolling stock, I find that proportion of rolling stock repeated in Mr. Schreiber's estimates as published in 1884, page 211 of the 9th volume of the Sessional Papers. The \$80,000,000 estimated cost of the building of the road is thus reduced by \$3,387,800 leaving a balance of \$76,612,200. Let us compare that sum with the actual cost of construction of the road as it stands to-day:

Cash subsidy .....	\$25,000,000
Built by the Government.....	29,846,148
Loan of last year.....	29,880,912
New obligations of this year .....	15,000,000
Land grant bonds .....	8,702,086
Town sites.....	504,875
Paid on stock .....	29,568,123
Bonuses.....	232,660
Earnings.....	1,456,318
Surveys.....	3,263,482

\$143,254,344

Deducting from that sum:—

1. Balance of the deposit to pay dividends.....	\$ 14,288,287
2. Paid dividends.....	5,378,000
3. Interests paid by company.....	1,389,474
4. Equipment.....	7,359,930
5. Steamers .....	697,369
6. Advances to the South Western Railway.....	1,595,280
7. " " St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry..	227,155
8. " " Atlantic and North-West Ry..	202,837
9. " " Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Company.....	1,254,678
10. " " Ontario and Quebec and to the Credit Valley Railways.....	1,265,450
11. Acquired lines.....	8,981,955
12. Branch lines .....	4,605,172
13. Displacing 100 miles near Winnipeg.....	400,000
14. Renewing inferior material building.....	253,000
15. Indemnity to Manning, Macdonald & Co.....	395,000
16. Shops and machinery near Montreal.....	903,165
17. Construction plant, outfit and tools .....	208,291
18. Real estate at or near Montreal.....	408,207
19. Grounds and building at Winnipeg .....	1,040,701
(To be taken out of the \$15,000,000 now asked for.)	
20. For cars and material.....	1,000,000
21. For elevators, terminal facilities .....	1,500,000
22. For workshops on nine different points.....	600,000
23. To reach Coal Harbor.....	760,000
24. Snow sheds in mountains.....	450,000
25. Lake Superior.....	160,000
26. Terminal facilities at Quebec.....	200,000
27. Surveys .....	3,263,482

Total.....\$ 59,079,433

Total cost—Less amount outside of main line.....\$143,254,344

Cost of main line..... 59,079,433

\$ 84,174,911

The hon. member for Durham has estimated the rolling stock at \$2,000 a mile in his calculation of \$120,000,000, reducing it for construction to \$114,788,000. We have seen that Fleming's estimates were \$76,612,200, and we find that the real amount expended for construction is \$84,174,911, or not \$9,000,000 more than the *quasi* colonisation road for which estimates were asked of Mr. Fleming, and \$30,000,000, or more exactly \$25,000,000, less than the amount calculated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, if we deduct from his calculations the amount applied to branches. The specifications of Mr. Fleming, with light grading, heavy curves and high grades, have been set aside and the demands of the hon. member for Durham for a first class road have been complied with. If we had not, in that respect, the testimony of the most competent railway men who have inspected the road, I would cite the opinion of the Chief Engineer of the Government, in his report as far back as the 22nd September, 1883:

"It affords me much pleasure to be able to state that the Pacific Railway Company are doing their work in a manner which leaves nothing to be desired. The road is being most substantially built. The larger streams are being spanned by strong iron bridges, resting upon abutments and piers of massive masonry, and the small streams on the eastern section will be passed through solid cut stone culverts. On the central section, the streams are for the most part crossed by substantially built pile bridges.

"The work so far as it has been done, up to the present time, has been performed most faithfully and in a manner fully up to the requirements of the contract. I am enabled to speak with confidence upon this point, having made a personal inspection during the last two months of the work from a point east of Port Arthur (formerly Prince Arthur's Landing) to Port Moody."

The statement I have just given shows that the company has actually spent for branches and for the lengthening of the main line, \$15,330,823. Instead of blaming the company for that expenditure and raising the cry of extravagance, I say that nothing is better calculated to inspire confidence in the future of the enterprise than the energy which the company has shown in completing its railway system in view of future competition. It is now admitted that intelligently chosen branches are the strongest elements of success for a railway. I read some days ago, in an official report to the United States Government, at a chapter concerning the Internal Commerce of the United States for 1884, p. 37, the following remarks:—

"The work of constructing transcontinental railroads and their branches, and of equipping them and organising their agencies and methods for active participation in the world's commerce, has been an achievement unparalleled in the history of material enterprise. Soon after the completion of the main lines of the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railroads, those lines began to secure a large and remunerative local traffic, consequent upon the development of the resources of the country through which they ran. This was not at first expected. The growth of local traffic at once suggested the construction of branch roads, and this line of policy has been adopted by all the companies owning and operating transcontinental lines or parts thereof, and mainly with the object of thus promoting the financial interests of the main lines. The construction of such lines has also proved an important instrumentality in the development of the resources of that vast territory situated between the Pacific coast and the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, a region which but a few years ago was unhabited by civilised men. The State of Colorado, in all its material interests, is mainly a result of this development. The States of California, Oregon, Nebraska, and Kansas and Washington Territory and the Territories of Utah, Montana, Idaho also owe their present wealth and prosperity mainly to the contribution of the several transcontinental railroads and their branches."

There are to-day seven different railways working their way from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. Every one of them has a large proportion of branch lines. With the Union Pacific the number of miles in operation is larger for the branches than for the main line. The following mileage table of those roads speaks for itself:

	Main Line.	Branches.	Total.
Oregon Railway and Transportation Company.....	518	139	657
Northern Pacific.....	2,054	495	2,549
Union Pacific.....	1,695	2,815	4,510
Central and Southern.....	1,964	1,047	3,011
Denver and Rio Grande.....	897	420	1,317
Atcheson, Topeka and Santa Fe.....	1,692	1,064	2,756
Burlington and Missouri River	682	795	1,477
	9,502	6,775	16,277

All those lines show a large earning capacity, and the local traffic resulting from the branch lines constitutes a very large element in their success. On a total of 1,442,800 tons carried by the Northern, only 67,276 tons were through traffic; the balance, 1,375,525 tons, was local traffic. The Union Pacific had \$10,427,540 of local traffic, against \$2,512,507 of through traffic. The Central Pacific carried 844,793,100 lbs. of through freight and 3,888,308,510 lbs. of local freight. The Atcheson and Topeka had only 6 per cent. of through traffic, the Missouri Pacific only 3 per cent., and the Denver and Rio Grande shows \$500,000 of through traffic, as against \$7,361,545 of its total traffic. The Canadian Pacific Company has recognised these facts, and has shown itself worthy of the confidence we placed in it by making the fullest and the most intelligent preparations, in view of the great battle it will have to fight to secure a fair share of the American traffic against its formidable rivals. A railway man of high experience, largely interested in the Northern Pacific Railway, was obliged to admit that the general organisation of the Canadian company, with regard to its protection of the great channel of traffic which it will represent in North America, was admirable. Another remarked that the victory in the struggle for inter-oceanic trade must belong to the company that will not have to share with others the most remunerative part of its traffic, the through traffic to the point of destination, the Atlantic Ocean. Last year the hon. leader of the Opposition took exception to estimates of the company as to the reduced cost of the road, pretending that the company proved thereby that every shilling necessary to build that main road was drawn by them from the public chest. I suppose my hon. friends will adopt the same line of argument this year but with no more success, I am sure, an account of the unfairness of the argument. If the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House declare that they are satisfied to get a Pacific line merely connecting Callander and Port Moody, we must believe that the future of our commercial relations does not trouble their dreams much and I understand how it is that they have, at various times, endeavored to suppress the Lake Superior and the British Columbia sections, to endow the country with a mere local line the only object of which would be to develop the local resources of the North-West. I understand now the significance of what was said to the people of British Columbia: "You may go." I see why the efforts made by the Province of Quebec to secure the terminus of the Pacific, have been called ridiculous. But statesmen, business men, and men of judgment, or if you prefer the expression, "the enthusiasts" who have faith in the future of the country and who believe that the Pacific is a great national enterprise, attach as much importance to the connections as to the road itself. Without branches, without a considerable amount of rolling stock, and station accommodation, without elevators and important property at the terminal points, without the credit necessary to create business and traffic, the main line of the Pacific would be quite as useless as a body deprived of its limbs. It is not mere fancy or a thoughtless act on the part of the company, if they have invested alongside of the line proper, very near the value of a second road in the shape of lateral and supplementary enterprises. They have applied to their case the word of Archimedes: "Give me a point of

MR. CHAPLEAU.

resistance and I will raise the world." They had at their disposal a powerful lever in the shape of the road extending from Callander to Port Moody; they wanted, besides, a fulcrum to utilise their powerful means of action; each dollar judiciously spent to add to the facilities necessary to the traffic of the road will return one hundred per cent. A simple car costing \$300 will bring to the road an additional traffic of \$1,500 per annum. Good accommodation may have entailed an expenditure of a million, but it may be worth millions in lessening the cost of loading and unloading and in giving to the road the advantage over rival lines. Each branch line is an artery which brings to the body life and circulation, because everything brought by it to the main line is an additional source of profit. Instead of depreciating the efforts made by the company, we ought to thank its members for their broad and far-sighted views. Had the directors been common speculators, they could have dealt with their enterprise as with a simple contract; they could have endeavored to pocket as much of those millions as the circumstances would have permitted them; they could have pretended to finish the road, appropriate to themselves our subsidies and loans and then leave the contract. I am gratified to be in a position to declare, to the credit of Mr. Geo. Stephen and his colleagues, that the suspicion of such an attempt has never tainted their reputation. Mr. Stephen, during the construction of this railway, has proved himself to be more than a business man, more than an upright man, more than a man of ability; he has been an apostle of the progress of the country. He has turned the Pacific into a work of love, and, with a force, an energy I admire, he has succeeded in infusing his convictions and his enthusiasm through the whole country. We have seen him at work—this man who owns many millions, rich enough to dispense with labor and anxiety, and having no need to increase his income—we have seen him, I say, confine himself to unceasing labor, and risk his fortune in this gigantic undertaking. This I do not say as a matter of personal flattery to a man whom I know only in the official relations which I have had with him; but I think it is a duty I owe to pay this tribute to a gentleman who has not only undertaken this work, but has shown an enthusiasm in the work and faith in the progress and wealth and resources of the country that I wish had been shared by our friends on the other side of the House. I wish our hon. friends opposite, who are so often admiring and citing the great success of American enterprise, had shared a little of that enthusiasm which has been shown by the president of the company. I wish the hon. member who has been termed here—I believe erroneously, because in his heart he is not so—the champion of American supremacy on this continent, I wish he and other gentlemen on that side of the House had that good quality of American citizens—that is, never to cry down their own country, never to say that that enterprise, costly as it may be, is not worthy of the genius of the nation, and shall not be carried to success by them. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not all these gentlemen have done for this undertaking. I regard their work, their experience, their intelligence from a higher standpoint, by far, than that of their subscriptions. If the country had the largest share of money, the company had the largest share of labor. Men of the highest ability have superintended the execution of the work, and I am at a loss to know which we must admire the most, in the result we shall have before our eyes; the astonishing rapidity with which they have achieved a task declared impossible by the leaders of the Opposition, or the extreme economy with which they have been able to accompany such diligence. I am not afraid to proclaim it; the company has done more than the Government towards the construction of the Pacific, and it should reap the benefit. Our own title to credit, in the eyes of the country, will rest in the judicious choice we have made

of the men we intrusted with that enormous undertaking. Sir, that magnificent railway establishment must bear its fruit. From ocean to ocean it has the shortest, the most compact, the best equipped line of the continent; it has not and need not have for some years any competition over two-thirds of the continent; its bonded debt is by far smaller than that of any of the similar roads which are flourishing. With all these requirements combined it must succeed. In his speech of the 15th April, 1880, the hon. leader of the Opposition quoted the figures brought out by my hon. friend, the member for East York, as to the cost of operating the Canadian Pacific. The hon. gentleman accepted those figures as approximately correct. And what were they? The amount of the earnings of the road were fixed at \$6,750,000 a year to cover simply the working expenses of the line. Well, I am ready to accept those figures, Mr. Speaker, and I say that the most skeptical of the hon. gentlemen opposite will be convinced that the future has no disappointment in store for the warmest believers in the success of the Canadian Pacific. When the line and its accessories are completed the Canadian Pacific will have a mileage of over 4,000 miles, a large portion of it located in the best sections of old Canada, and possessed with the most convenient facilities for its ocean termini. Last year, with a mileage of about 3,000 miles of disconnected lines, its earnings reached \$6,084,345. The first months of the present year have shown an increase of \$782,741 over the same period last year. Surely this shows what the earning capacity of the line will be after its thorough completion, organization and equipment. It would be unfair to say that the heavy extra expenditure has been useless or unwise. The obligation entered into by the company is not limited to the mere construction of a road from its two terminal points. It includes the keeping of the road in operation. And if the company takes so much precaution to secure a profitable working of the line the country need not complain. It owes, on the contrary, a tribute of gratitude to the company for having largely increased the cost of the contract as a guarantee that the road is to be operated in a permanent and profitable manner. It is gratifying to the country to see that the company is confident that its profits will be derived from the working of the road rather than from the mere construction of it. The purpose of the company is a bold one but it is one commanding the praise of the whole community. I have demonstrated that, leaving aside the large difference in the land grant, if the present contract implies an increase in the cash subsidy of \$4,000,000 for the construction of the Pacific, it has secured to the Government a value of \$30,000,000 if you deduct from the \$54,254,293, the amounts for interests and dividends, over and above what the late Government expected and had exacted from its contractors in their proposed bargain with them, and I am in a position to show that amount should be doubled. And without putting a figure to the actual value of the lands one cannot deny that the policy of the present Administration has secured the keeping of 25,000,000 acres of land in the public domain. I admit that, after this Session, the \$54,600,000 in money already given to the company in cash and in work done, will be increased by the loan of \$35,000,000. But there is not a man, who has carefully looked into the whole matter, who would seriously pretend that the \$35,000,000 are to be reckoned as lost money. I care very little for those irresponsible prophets who predict that the Government will never make the demand and exact the payment of that well secured loan. We know what little risk those evil foretellers run if their predictions turn false. However that point needs no further reference as nobody knows what the Government of to-morrow will be. But if the country does not run a worse risk than to be long governed by the Administration of the day, I can solemnly assert

that every dollar of that \$35,000,000 may be considered as a safe and productive investment, as a sacred deposit not to be surrendered. We have not exceeded the prudent limits of official liberality; we have discerned between a useful and an excessive generosity. To go beyond what we have done, would have exposed the Government to the charge of extravagance. To have refused that assistance would have been courting a disaster for the country. And I feel I am not mistaken when I say that the strongest guarantee that these \$35,000,000 shall be considered and administered as part of the patrimony of the people, lies in the deep sense of the high responsibility which rests upon this Government as it will upon any future Government. There exists to-day this undeniable fact, that 3,327 miles of first-class road and 21,246,600 acres of cultivable lands is a safe and undisputable guarantee for a first mortgage loan of \$15,000,000. Everybody knows that the company has, during the last four years, realised \$8,702,086 out of its lands in spite of the difficulties that have been in the way. Last year, the receipts of the unfinished sections of the road gave the following results:—

	Receipts.	Expenditures.	Surplus.	Deficit.
January.....	\$274,645	\$401,915	.....	\$127,270
February.....	224,638	363,965	.....	139,328
March.....	278,575	359,275	.....	75,700
April.....	343,966	318,938	25,028	
May.....	424,556	349,739	74,816	
June.....	550,661	399,030	151,631	
July.....	549,367	394,673	154,694	
August.....	565,814	383,983	181,830	
September.....	639,839	407,628	232,211	
October.....	735,731	438,082	297,448	
November.....	640,573	395,160	245,213	
December.....	521,552	350,236	171,315	
	\$5,750,521	\$4,558,630		

or a total of nearly \$6,000,000 of receipts and a net revenue of \$1,191,891. We can easily make our estimates for the future when we consider that the above result has been obtained when there were not more than 2,000 miles of railway in good working order, or a proportion of \$3,000 a mile. Have we not before us the experience of the Northern Pacific. That road is less advantageously situated than our own Pacific, having no outlet of its own at Minneapolis or at Duluth, and still its traffic for the last ten months ending 30th May, 1885, hardly a year and a-half after its completion, was as follows:—

Gross earnings, for 10 months ending 30th May, 1885 (over \$5,000 per mile).....	\$10,218,941
Operating expenses.....	5,518,235
Total net profits for 10 months.....	\$ 4,700,706
The total mileage of the Northern Pacific, including branches and leased lines, is..	2,546 miles.
Its bonded debt, at 31st December (selling over par).....	\$69,536,221
Its preferred stock.....	38,255,565
Its common stock.....	49,000,000
	\$157,791,786
<i>Annual Charges.</i>	
Interest on bonds.....	\$4,050,648
Rents, leased lines.....	778,000
Other fixed charges.....	493,918
	5,320,566

Now, with the new engagements contemplated by the legislation before the House, the fiscal charges on the whole of the Canadian Pacific Railway are as follows:—

Bonds, \$20,000,000 at 4 per cent.....	\$800,000
do 15,000,000 at 5 per cent.....	750,000
Interest on purchase of C. M. O. & O.....	175,000
do do do Canada Central.....	58,400
do do do Land grant bonds.....	180,000
Rents on leased lines.....	778,000

On a total of.....\$2,741,400

The \$10,000,000 additional guaranteed by the lands will draw interest out of the annual sales of the lands. The

company will have next year the benefit of the earnings of nearly 4,000 miles of road in operation from ocean to ocean, without paying any tribute to other lines as is the case with the Northern Pacific. Allowing only \$3,000 per mile which is \$2,000 a mile less than the Northern Pacific, we find, for the year, a total of \$12,000,000 of gross earnings. Deducting 70 per cent. for working expenses (the Northern Pacific has reduced their tariff nearly 50 per cent.) there remains a sum of \$3,600,000 for the net earning of the road. I do not think any one will question the sufficiency of the guarantee of the lands for our \$10,000,000. Otherwise the boasted assistance given by the land grant would have been a delusion; the attempt to belittle the value of the lands would become a strong argument in favor of the increase of the cash subsidy (the necessity of the transcontinental line having been admitted by all sides in Parliament.) If our lands are worth any thing at all, they must be worth, at this moment, at least 50 cents an acre, and this is hardly the amount of our advance to the company as guaranteed by the lands. But I am sure I shall not be contradicted in saying that the lands are worth to-day \$1.50 an acre and will increase in value in the same ratio as the capital of their value would increase at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, taking into account a very moderate current of immigration in the North-West during the next 25 years. The results obtained by the other railway companies would warrant a higher figure than the one I have given. I do not think we shall have to wait for a year to be reimbursed the \$5,000,000 of the temporary loan, the \$8,000,000 of bonds of the company will soon find their place in the market when the returns of the road begin to show their security as an investment. We remain with \$20,000,000 of first mortgage of the company. The total bonded debt is \$35,000,000, so that we rank equally for \$20,000,000 with other bondholders to the amount of \$15,000,000 as the first creditors of the company. That total bonded debt of the company is the first lien on the following roads:—

	Miles.
Callander to Coal Harbor.....	2,565
Winnipeg to Stonewall.....	284
do to Manitou.....	102
do to St. Vincent.....	64
do to West Selkirk.....	22
do to Colville Landing.....	2
do to West Lynn.....	15
do to Maryland.....	51
Rosenfeld to Gretna.....	14
Total .....	2,864

Making a fixed charge of about \$12,237 a mile. But the debt is, in addition, secured by the lines from Callander to Ottawa, 225 miles, and from Carleton Place to Brockville, 46 miles, or a total of 271 miles. Considering that the amount due on these two last lines is only \$1,600,000 or \$5,900 a mile the fixed charge on the whole line remains but little over \$11,000. And when, added to that, we calculate the value of the rolling-stock of the company which will be not less than \$10,000,000; when we consider their vast property in Montreal, at Ottawa, at Winnipeg and all along the line up to Coal Harbour, property, which the natural development of the country increases in value every day; when we consider their immense and costly workshops, their steamers, we may safely scout the idea that the securities we have retained are not equal to the advances we have made. The Canadian Pacific Railway, after its completion, will have earning capacities superior to any transcontinental route in America, and inferior to none of the great railway systems of North America. Some may have larger traffic and a greater volume of business. None will be in a better position, comparing its actual value with its liabilities and the possibilities of its traffic. The Canadian Pacific will represent the following values;

MR. CHAPLEAU.

Portions built by Government .....	\$29,600,000
Cash subsidy .....	25,000,000
Loan of last year.....	30,000,000
Amount raised by present legislation .....	15,000,000
Paid for stock .....	29,568,123
Land grant bonds.....	8,702,086
Bonuses .....	236,600
City and town lots.....	504,675
Earnings.....	1,456,318
	\$140,067,800
Less deposited and paid for dividends and interests say.....	20,000,000
Total amount spent on the road.....	\$120,400,000

In other words our margin of guarantee is 350 per cent—and if we go to the extreme in any supposition of failure, so as to test in the most rigid manner the value of our securities; if we take the absurd hypothesis of the stoppage of the road by the withdrawal of all those interested in the enterprise, there would still remain the following assets respecting a commercial value, as follows:—

Rolling stock.....	\$10,000,000
Rails, &c., &c .....	10,000,000
Workshops.....	1,500,000
Steamers.....	500,000
City properties .....	1,000,000
New station and terminal facilities, elevators and other improvement contemplated by the present measure .....	2,900,000
Telegraph Lines.....	2,000,000
Amounts paid on lines from Callander Eastward.....	15,000,000
21,000,000 acres of land.....	21,000,000
Total.....	\$63,900,000

I have made that supposition of an impossible event to demonstrate the absurd pretensions of those who assert that we might be exposed to the loss of the capital of our loan; and to show at the same time the perfect safety of our investment. I had, therefore, good grounds for saying Mr. Speaker, that the loan of last year and the loan of the present year cannot be classed among the subsidies, that we do not lose a dollar of them and that they will not oblige us to disburse a single cent of interest. In return, we shall find that we have ensured the completion of the Canadian Pacific, five years before the time specified, and that in so doing, we have saved many millions to the railway. The dividends alone to be paid on the capital during the process of construction, represent a considerable amount, as the money furnished by private parties must always bear interest, and as a road during that process cannot give any profits, it had been agreed that the company should pay a dividend of 5 per cent. out of their capital, during the time of construction. A reserve amounting to 3 per cent. has been made for that purpose; but the company would have had to pay 2 per cent. on \$65,000,000, during a period of five years, or \$6,500,000 which we save; and it may happen that the railway may be such a successful enterprise as to be in a position to pay dividends immediately. We have, in another manner, protected the company against fruitless expenditure. They had only two modes of raising funds by themselves, that is: selling shares or floating bonds. The state of the money market shows that the shares could have hardly realised more than 50 per cent. The company, then, could only have realised \$17,500,000, by losing a like sum; so that it has not to be taken into account. As regards the bonds, it would have been impossible for the company to place them on the market last year (on account of the uncertainty which existed regarding the completion of the road, and also of that terrible "unknown" which always has so much influence on business men), at a rate exceeding 80 per cent., so that on a sum of \$45,000,000, the company would have lost at once \$9,000,000. They would have had to pay 5 per cent. on the whole amount, whilst they will have to pay only 4 per cent. on the \$30,000,000 of last year,

which saving of \$300,000 during six years represents \$1,800,000. There is then, a net gain of \$17,300,000 to the company without our being poorer by a dollar. Instead of passing into the hands of European capitalists, these \$17,000,000 will have been employed for our own benefit, and spent towards the construction of the numerous branch lines and other important improvements which the company has been in a position to undertake, thanks to that wise policy. All we enable the Pacific Railway to save is a "saving" for the country. Governments do not exist to speculate; their object is to manage the interests of the people so as to give the most fruitful results. Railways are more and more becoming national institutions; they take the place of former highways, and even of navigation. Although a railway belongs to shareholders nominally, it is not the less a national property; it ranks amongst its best assets; and the national wealth increases in proportion to the wealth and power of the railways. And if the result of the intervention of the Government has been to leave in the treasury of the Pacific Railway over \$17,000,000, the whole country can boast of this fact. The results will be visible everywhere: in the improvement of the roadway, the comfort afforded to passengers, the shipment of freight, the greater facilities of intercourse, and the reduced rates. The working of a railway in fact depends upon its financial standing. It is hardly possible for a railway crushed under heavy liabilities to show its full efficiency. This is why I am not afraid to declare that the Canadian Pacific will soon rank as the first of all trans-continental lines because not a cent of its liabilities will have been misapplied. Take, for instance, the most prosperous route of our neighbors, the Union Pacific Railways. The length of this route, to-day, is 3,050 miles, and the liabilities are as follows:—

1st mortgage bonds .....	\$138,131,132
United States Government bonds.....	75,263,232
Paid-up capital .....	120,144,000
	\$333,538,564
Debt, per mile .....	\$ 109,357
Debt, per mile, besides subscribed shares.	70,000
Debt, per mile, besides Government claim.	42,000

Supposing the portion of that debt due to the Government cancelled, and putting aside the interests of the shareholders, the Union and Central Pacific have still a debt of \$40,000 per mile, while, under the same circumstances, the Canadian Pacific is responsible for nothing but \$13,000 per mile. If we turn to the Northern Pacific, the total length of which is 2,549 miles, we find it encumbered with the following amounts:—

Bonds.....	\$ 50,122,200
Shares subscribed .....	109,749,464
	Total .....
	\$159,871,664
A debt per mile of .....	62,800
Bonds, per mile .....	19,700

The Southern Pacific which, with its branches is 4,051 miles in length has the following debt:—

Bonds, per mile .....	\$85,617,200
Shares, per mile .....	152,459,700
	Total, per mile .....
	58,785
Bonds only, per mile .....	21,140

If we take the total liabilities of the Canadian Pacific on 3,327 miles, we find them to be as follows:—

Bonds .....	\$35,000,000
Bonds Q. M. O. and O. and Canada Central...	5,500,000
Shares (less deposit of \$15,000,000) .....	50,000,000
	Total .....
	\$90,500,000
Total debt per mile .....	27,200
Total for bonds.....	12,000

So that we have the following result:—

	Total charges.	Bonds.
Canadian Pacific, per mile.....	\$ 27,200	12,000
Northern " " .....	62,800	19,700
Union " " .....	109,357	70,000
Southern " " .....	58,785	21,140

Should the state of things remain as it is, we could say that the Canadian Pacific will have a debt of \$12,000 only, per mile, on a line stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, while the American routes all terminate midway, and depend for an outlet on other roads, absorbing a part of their profit. But there is another contingency in favor of the Canadian Pacific; if the 21,246,600 acres of land are disposed of at, say, \$1.50 an acre, to have no dispute over figures, the company, after deducting 6,666,666 acres for the \$10,000,000 due to the Government, might receive \$21,869,851 for the remaining 14,579,934 acres, or more than one half of their bonds, which would reduce the real debt of the railway to less than \$6,000 per mile. And why should not the Pacific Company sell their land within the next ten years? They occupy the best situation, lying, as they do, alongside of the railway; they are very fertile; they suffer less from cold weather and snow than those of the Northern Pacific. Let us not forget that the snow fall is only 6 inches deep at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and that all along the prairie section generally it is only from 20 to 21 inches, when it is 50 inches in Toronto and 74 at Montreal. The agriculturists and cattle men have the market of the United Kingdom, which the Americans are partly deprived of, and this advantage is so striking that the inhabitants of Montana are sending their wheat through Canada to secure a better price, while ranchmen have already taken serious steps with a view to sending their cattle through the North-West. As the distance between Coal Harbor and Montreal is but 2,911 miles, while between Yacoma and New York it is 3,457, it is evident that wherever an immigrant settles, he will, on the Canadian route, always be nearer the Pacific or Atlantic shores in proportion to this saving of 546 miles on the distance. Take, as an example, two places on the same meridian, say Swift Current, on the Canadian Pacific, and Billings, on the Northern Pacific, towards the 109th degree. The distance from Billings to New York is 2,359 miles, while from Swift Current to Montreal it is but 1,940 miles, a difference of 419 miles in favor of the Canadian Pacific. On the Northern Pacific, the station corresponding to Winnipeg is Moorhead, and Moorhead is 1,660 miles from New York, while Winnipeg is only 1,430 miles from Montreal. And when the Northern Pacific can attend to its immigrants after submitting to the demands of several other companies between St. Paul and New York, having to make a choice between the Pennsylvania, Erie, New York Central and Baltimore and Ohio, from New York to Chicago, and between the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, Chicago and North-Western and Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific, from Chicago to St. Paul, the Canadian line has the sole control of its rates and accommodation, and gets the whole benefit of the receipts from the immigration traffic which it will have stimulated. Let us add that the fertile belt is longer alongside of the Canadian than on the American line. We have 839 miles between Winnipeg and Calgary, at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, when, on the Northern Pacific, we have the Rocky Mountains at Livingstone, 757 miles from Moorhead, and notwithstanding this excess of fertile lands, Calgary is only 2,269 miles from Montreal, while Livingstone is 2,419 miles from New York; and moreover Calgary is only 644 miles from Coal Harbor on the Pacific, while Livingstone is 1,036 miles from Seattle on the Pacific Ocean. But as we are speaking of these lands, and as the question is inseparable from the financial aspect of the case, since, we accept them as security, I may remark, by the way that the Opposition cannot accuse me of exaggeration if I

definitely fix the value of these lands at \$1.50 an acre, as on several occasions, they have expressed their opinion on this point, in the desire to compel the House to declare the Pacific Railway lands were worth over \$2 an acre. The leader of the Opposition himself has taken much trouble to prove that they ought to be valued at more than \$2 an acre. Here is what he said, on the 15th of December, 1880 :

"Then, what about these lands? These lands are to be within twenty-four miles of the railway. According to the estimate of the Government made by them in the recess before the last Session of Parliament, and which they published to the world as the terms of sale of railway land; confirmed by them during the last Session of Parliament, when they brought it down and declared it to be a moderate estimate; confirmed and re-confirmed by them when they asked Parliament to sanction their going on on those regulations and principles, and still further confirmed, in this sense, at any rate, when they announced, as they have repeatedly announced, that the prospects of selling lands in the North-West are infinitely brighter to-day, and that land is worth more to-day than it was a year ago. According to this view, which we may take as a minimum estimate established for lands there to be found within twenty-four miles of the railway, it gives an average price of \$4.04 an acre."

"I think, Sir, it may not be useless for me to prove, by a public document, something of the value of such a privilege. I have before me the prospectus of the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Railway Company, which is placing on the London market its bonds, and the statement it makes is :

"And the statement is there made that the length of this railway is 295 miles, of which the first section of 119 miles is under contract, and at least 50 miles are to be opened by the 1st of September, 1881. It is further stated that the Governor General has approved of a report of the Privy Council of Canada, recommending a grant to the company at the nominal rate—mark you, the nominal rate—of \$1 an acre, of an area of land equal to 840 acres per mile, commencing at the south-west of the boundary of the Province, so that it is outside of the Province of Manitoba that this land lies. The prospectus further states that it is estimated that a judicious realisation of the land would produce to the company the sum of £2,000,000 sterling, or \$ 0,000,000, and that the company has refused offers made to them for large portions of that lands at \$5 per acre. In another part it is stated that this line is to be constructed for £3,000 sterling or \$15,000 a mile, and the calculation is that the fortunate stockholders—and if there are members of Parliament among them, I hope they will share among us all—will have an admirable commercial railway constructed free of cost, and probably four or five millions besides from the sale of their lands."

"Well, Sir, you thus find that there are lands of very great value to be had, outside of Manitoba, beyond the range of twenty-four miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which can be opened up and made saleable at \$4 or more per acre, by railways which shall be, as this railway is declared to be, good paying commercial enterprises."

The Opposition, unreservedly accepted these views and calculations, and took advantage of them to stamp as extravagant the conditions of the contract of 1881 with the Syndicate of the Pacific. And the hon. member for South Huron, therefore, on the 26th of January 1881, proposed :

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway involves a total expenditure by the country in connexion with that work of about \$80,000,000 exclusive of interest, and the cession of 25,000,000 acres of choice lands, worth, at the estimate of the Government last year, at least \$79,500,000, making a total consideration of about \$140,000,000, while the railroad itself is estimated by Government to cost not more than \$84,000,000, and that the consideration proposed to be given is excessive, and that the contract is in the highest respect objectionable."

I need not say that all the hon. members forming Her Majesty's loyal Opposition voted in favor of this amendment. It will be claimed to-day that, by this speech as well as by this vote, the Opposition meant nothing but to offset the Government valuation; but such an attempt would be childish, since the opposition do not only quote it, but adopt it; and their hon. chief declares it, when he says :

"According to this estimate which we will take as the minimum value of these lands, we can fix their average value at \$4.04 an acre. There are lands, then, of very great value outside of Manitoba. And the amendment itself implies the assent of the Opposition to this valuation when it says 'exclusive of the cession of 25,000,000 acres of choice lands, worth at least, \$79,000,000.'"

The added words: at the estimate of the Government, are there only as an argument to strengthen the affirmation that the lands have a great value. Otherwise, why should the Opposition have declared that sum excessive, if they had not believed it was real? Why should their hon. chief

Mr. CHAPLEAU,

have declared that he was taking a minimum valuation if he had not believed this minimum well founded. It will be claimed that we have no use for these 21,000,000 acres of land, because we possess a territory of 300,000 square miles, or 200,000,000 acres. But when we have deducted from this the lakes, rivers and impracticable marshes, we are left with only 160,000,000 acres already, half of which is unfit for anything but cattle ranches. Not more than 80,000,000 will ever be under cultivation, and can yield a profitable return, and these figures soon lose their fantastic and embarrassing appearance, when we consider that 13,500 immigrants, taking yearly 320 acres each, would swallow up the whole of these lands in twenty years. The distance between Winnipeg and the foot of the Rocky Mountains is 900 miles. These 900 miles give, consequently, 45 sections of blocks of 20 miles on each side of the railway, or 90 sections in all. In other words, there are but 23,000,000 acres of land lying alongside of the railway in the prairie district; this gives at once quite a different aspect to the land question, and these lands acquire at once a value far superior to that of those lying elsewhere. The Pacific Company cannot receive more than 45 sections, although they have a right to 98 blocks of 256,000 acres. They will have, therefore, to take 13,568,000 acres, either outside of the prairie section or in a belt removed from the railway; and if they choose to raise the price of the land alongside of their road, in order to get rid of those less favorably situated, they can do so now. It was exactly one of the inconveniences felt at the time. But as the question was to give, not an apparent, but an efficient assistance to the company constructing the railway, the lands had to be given without restriction, or else money had to be substituted. To impose obligations in the disposal of the lands was to make it an impossibility, because no moneyed man would have advanced funds on a property held conditionally. The whole or nothing was wanted. I cannot do better than quote the 8th and 9th resolutions which the Government caused to be adopted on the 12th May, 1879 to show how well they understood the inconvenience of such a system. Here they are :

"8. Resolved, That the withdrawal for sale and settlement of the lands for twenty miles on each side of the located line of the Pacific Railway has, in part, had the effect of throwing settlement south and west of Lake Manitoba."

"9. Resolved, That in the existing state of things, it is desirable to combine the promotion of colonisation with railway construction on the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Red River."

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

### After Recess.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the House rose I was about to say that if necessity forced the Government, in 1881, to abandon this line of conduct, it is because it was not deemed prudent to engage deeper in money disbursements without knowing exactly what were the resources of the company, the means and disposition of the directors, and their ability to construct the railway; but the Government always watched for an opportunity to resume a policy more favorable to colonisation, and that is what we are doing in taking back the control of the sale of lands, and in forcing their sale under certain conditions. The Opposition must be unanimous in the approval of a plan which they unanimously proclaimed on the 27th of January, 1881, when Mr. Rinfret moved, in amendment :

"That the said resolutions be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway contains provision for ceding to the company 25,000,000 acres of choice lands in the North-West, but it does not, as it should, embrace any provision that such lands shall be open to sale to actual settlers at any maximum price; that the absence of such provision will enable the company to lock up the lands at their pleasure for a long time, and so be injurious to the progress of the country, and add to the labors and difficulties of the early settlers, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable."

This resolution was singularly ill-timed; for, as I have said, to have accepted this amendment of the Opposition at that time would have been to make such grant of lands illusory, because we would have made it impossible for the company to negotiate a single land grant bond. But now that the condition of the company is completely changed, and that experience has convinced business men that the financial assistance derived from these lands cannot be immediate, we have applied the principle enunciated by the Conservatives in 1879, and re-affirmed by the Liberals in 1881: that it is possible and necessary to reconcile the encouragement given to the Canadian Pacific Railway with the development of colonisation. We do not desire the company to make a fortune with these lands, by laying them aside to sell them in ten or twenty years; we intend that they aid immediately in the construction of the railway. It is not in our power to force capitalists to advance their money on that security, —the only alternative for us, who know the value of the property offered, would be to take their place. In doing this, we would not lose a cent; we risk nothing, and we would contribute to the development of the North-West. It is possible that my expectations will not be shared by several members of the other side of this House, and, amongst others, by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has already put on record in the *Hansard* his views upon the development on the North-West, and as these views have not been uniform, and that he may select those opinions which will best suit him, to oppose this plan, I will anticipate his wishes, by recalling them for the benefit of this House. On opening the *Hansard*, at page 1055, of the year 1880, I find, on 5th April, the following:—

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is believed from the best information we can get that 20,000 people went into the North-West last year.

"Hon. Mr. BLAKE. There was not more than one tenth of that number.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we are to judge from reports, we may rely upon it that 50,000 will go this year, but let us put the number at 25,000 (this year). I would ask the hon. member for Lambton if he does not really believe that sum—

"Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE. I will tell him that I do not believe so, nor do I believe that 20,000 went in last year. I think a large number will go, but not the number stated.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman is the first person that I have heard, say that 25,000 was not altogether too small an estimate. That number, of course, includes the baby as well as the adult. In ordinary cases the estimate is the average family number, five. If you take four to a family, we estimate that of the 25,000 or 24,000 that go there 5,000 will be heads of families, occupying homestead and pre-emption claims."

Subsequent events have proved that the leader of the Government was correct, and as I have already shown on another point, that the prophecies of the Opposition with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway were particularly unfortunate. I often wonder if there is ever a time when the Liberal party is sincere in regard to this question. Is it when it opposes, not the Government, but the Canadian Pacific policy itself? or when it pretends to defend the principle of the construction of the Pacific? For, in the same Session of 1880, only a month later, when the Government proposed to put aside 100,000,000 acres of land, and to build the Canadian Pacific with the proceeds of the sales, we find this motion in the journal of the House for the sitting of 5th May:

"The Hon. Mr. Blake proposed that the sales of railway lands shall be on condition of actual settlement."

According to the arrangement accepted by the Mackenzie Government, of which the present hon. leader of the Opposition was a member, Canada was committed to the construction of the Canadian Pacific, at any rate, from Port Arthur to Port Moody, by 1890. In the year 1880, therefore, there remained ten years for the completion of the work; and at the time that the House was deciding to complete the work only with the proceeds of the lands, the price of which was fixed at \$1 per acre, the hon. member

for Durham desired that the Government should stipulate that sales of these lands should be made only in favor of immigrants who would settle upon them at once. As it would have been necessary to sell nearly 80,000,000 acres of land at \$1, to realise the desired amount, it was consequently requisite that the North-West should receive not less the 50,000 families per annum, at the rate of 160 acres per head of families. I will not do the hon. leader of the Opposition the injustice of believing that he wished to break a solemn covenant entered into by the Dominion of Canada, or even to evade the law, which provided that the work should be carried on as vigorously as possible, in order to keep faith with British Columbia. He was, therefore, from his point of view, favorable to the construction of the Canadian Pacific, and if he wished that actual settlement alone should supply the source of revenue which the country would have at its disposal for the completion of that enterprise, it was because he was convinced that his plan was feasible, and that there would be an annual influx into the North-West of 50,000 families, paying cash for their pre-emption lots. Upon that particular occasion, I presume, he adopted the opinion expressed by him on the 5th March 1875, which is entirely at variance with that I mentioned a moment since. In 1875, I should have been of his opinion, when he said:

"You cannot hope to force immigration into a country beyond a certain point. You should look at the experience of the western States, at a recent date, where the railways had spread most rapidly, and with respect to the State nearest our North-West Territories, you will observe that, even with their wonderful progress, they have not made any such extraordinary progress as that which the hon. member for Northumberland has vaguely pictured as that which should take place in the North-West. I hope, Sir, that we shall see a degree of progress and settlement greater, in this country, than that which has been shown in the States at any recent period. I aim at surpassing the rapidity with which their territories were established."

Mr. Speaker, I will not go so far as the hon. member, when he takes the view that 50,000 families would be required yearly; I would content myself with a small proportion of those expectations. If it were found that in order to dispose of 21,000,000 acres of land in ten years, only 13,000 families would be needed, no one could find fault with our calculations. And if one-half of these families should take two lots each, 8,625 families per annum would be sufficient—say, about 35,000 souls to complete the sale of these lands, and to that we may assuredly look forward—in view of the figures I have given for past years. I have alluded to the sale of these lands at \$1 an acre; my own personal opinion would unhesitatingly be in favor of a regular sale at \$1.50 per acre. It is natural that these lands should be more sought for than others, on account of there being situated, for the most part, along the line of the railway. If the Canadian Pacific were obliged to sell these lands at a higher price, to cover any considerable deficit, as the American lines have to do, it would be necessary to submit to such a state of things, but settlement would be thereby retarded. Such a monopoly is not to be feared to-day. The Government takes back the control it gave up. If we sell these lands at \$1.50 per acre, without doing an injustice to the Pacific, let us do so. What is wanted is population. The day when there are 200,000 more whites in the North-West there will be no need to spend millions in protecting ourselves against the Indians. Immigration will be the safeguard of the Territory. When the construction of the Northern Pacific was undertaken the engineers were accompanied by regiments of the United States army. From the 20th of July to the 22nd of November, 1872, for instance, Mr. Hayden, one of the engineers, had to be protected by 400 soldiers, who were in constant conflict with the Indians in the Yellowstone valley. In 1873 it became necessary to increase that force to 1,700 men. In 1876 the Custer massacre occurred, on the meridian of Battleford, between Rosebud and Bighorn, on the Northern

Pacific. The warfare continued in 18.7, and, I may even say, up to the moment when the railway introduced an active civilisation. Who, now, minds the Indians in Montana? There is another reason why I wish for a rapid filling up of our North-West, viz, that it will give a market of consumers for our manufactures. When we consider what is taking place among our neighbors, we have a right to count upon the prompt development of our North-West and upon the sale of our lands. In the course of the past year the Union Pacific has placed 4,342,200 acres, at a price of \$8,000,000. There was sold, last year, in the Territories of the United States, a total of 18,300,000 acres of land. We have as much of lands as they; indeed, we have more, and ours are more fertile, nearer the seaboard and less costly. The average price of the American lands is \$3.40 per acre. The railway companies are so much involved that they cannot part with them for less than \$3. Our highest aim is to sell our land at \$2; and, if advisable, to dispose of them at \$1.50, the Canadian Pacific will not stand in our way. The Pacific possesses this advantage, this immense advantage, namely, that having but small interest to pay, the sale of each acre will give them more benefit. In the United States many companies have failed because the interest has swallowed up their capital, and because the sale of lands barely sufficed—or did not suffice—for the payment of coupons. We might have been less liberal, and possibly, at the same time, have effected a commencement of the iron band to connect the Atlantic with the Pacific, but I question whether we should not thereby have taken precisely the means of destroying the value of our subsidy, by forcing the company to expend, in interest, the money which we gave them to build the road. In going over this array of figures, my object is not limited to a mere calculation. There lies at the bottom of these facts a vast question of political economy. My pretension is less to solve than to submit to a class of thinking men in this country and outside of this country a problem which will soon impose itself to the general economy of modern nations, that is, cheap and, at the same time, rapid transportation. It is a common saying that water transportation is cheaper than steam transportation, and it is true. The maker of the universe, in his foreknowledge of the expansive power of civilisation, has made us the gratuitous gift of the great water highways in the interior as well as around the continent, whilst the genius of man has had to build his overland routes by dint of work and money. Independently of the cost of the road itself, if you compare the cost price of a locomotive and of the thirty cars composing a train to the cost price of a steamer, the railway will have the advantage. A first-class steamer, with a tonnage of 3,000 tons, representing, as a motive power, nine trains of thirty cars, of the capacity of eleven tons each, will cost from \$300,000 to \$500,000, nearer the latter figure than the first. Nine locomotives will cost \$72,000, and 270 freight cars about \$125,000: let us say, \$200,000 for both engines and cars. The advantage, as I have said, remains with the railway, each ton of merchandise representing in the steamer a capital of \$166 $\frac{2}{3}$ , and only \$66 $\frac{2}{3}$  in the railway. On the other hand, the steamer will cost only \$100 in operating expenses for each day of 300 miles voyage, whereas each train of the railway will cost an average of \$300 for each 300 miles run, or \$2,700 for the ten trains; so that each mile of railway transportation costs as much as three miles of water transportation. It is evident, therefore, that the greatest economy must be exercised in the operation of a railway, and that it is of the highest importance to bring to the lowest possible figure the first charge on the railway, that is, the first bonded debt on the road itself and its equipment. The less the railway is loaded with a bonded debt the better its position to compete with its neighbors. For instance, let us suppose a uniform volume of traffic on the following transcontinen-

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

tal roads; that traffic, exclusive of the working expenses, would have first to pay, on account of interest on the cost of those roads:

On the Union Pacific.....	\$5.47	per mile.
“ Northern Pacific.....	3.200	“
“ Southern Pacific.....	2.939	“
“ Canadian Pacific.....	1.400	“

In other words, each of these roads would have to charge, per mile, on its freight on 1,000 miles of road:

The Union Pacific.....	\$5.47	per ton.
The Northern Pacific.....	3.24	“
The Southern Pacific.....	2.94	“
The Canadian Pacific.....	1.45	“

A tariff of \$5.47 per ton on the Union Pacific would be equivalent to \$1.45 for the same quantity of freight on the Canadian Pacific. And take 1 cent as a basis of calculation, the charges in respect to payment of original cost price would be:

Union Pacific.....	\$1.00
Northern.....	0.57 $\frac{1}{2}$
Southern.....	0.53 $\frac{1}{2}$
Canadian Pacific.....	0.26 $\frac{1}{2}$

If our great national enterprise has not been the outspring of a caprice, if it has been built to develop the great resources of our country, and to create new industries and a great continental traffic, we know what our duty is towards that enterprise. I cannot say it too loudly or repeat it too often: Let us bring to its minimum the charge on construction, for fear of hampering the first efforts of the company with the cares and difficulties of pressing financial wants. I am sure this is the only means of obtaining the full measure of the earning capacity of the company, the only means to give it a chance of creating new fields of action for its activity and energy. I am aware that up to the present time none of the American transcontinental lines have succeeded in controlling a single ton of the commerce between Europe and Asia, with the exception of a special order of silk worm's eggs for France, and a small lot of furs for Great Britain. I know that even the wheat of California has not been exported overland to Europe, and that the 16,000 miles from San Francisco to Liverpool, around Cape Horn, have not frightened the exporters and driven them across the continent to New York and Liverpool. I have read the humble declarations of the proud Yankee, confessing his inability to solve that problem, having before his eyes the fiascos which have met his attempts in that direction. I have seen the declarations of Mr. Whittoy, the general freight agent of the Central Pacific, ridiculing our right hon. Premier in his attempts and his hopes of bringing the Anglo-Asiatic trade through the British North American continent, and calling those anticipations mere absurdities, and doing so with the approval of the United States Government, who are opening their official reports to those productions of Mr. Whittley's wisdom. Well, Sir, in spite of the experiments that have been made, in spite of the declarations of the railway scientists of the great Republic, in spite of the admiration that I have in the superior ability which our neighbors have shown in all their attempts in the direction of commercial success, nothing that has happened has yet shaken my firm belief in the future conditions of Asiatic commerce in relation to our country, to our great transcontinental route. In all those questions the question of cost is everything; and I confess I cannot see how the American routes could compete for that commerce, time and distance being the elements of cost. If we compare the respective distances, we find:

	Miles.
By Suez Canal, Yokohama to Liverpool.....	11,275
By way of New York.....	Yokohama to San Francisco... 4,650
	San Francisco to New York.... 3,320
	New York to Liverpool..... 3,040
A total of.....	11,010

Making a difference in favor of New York, over the Suez route, of only 265 miles, or a little more than 2 per cent. of the whole distance. The distance of 4,650 miles is the average between 4,500 miles to come to and 4,800 miles to go from San Francisco, as the course is necessarily different. The difference in favour of the Canadian route is shown by the following comparison:—

	Miles.
By way of Suez Canal.....	11,275
By way of { Yokohama to Coal Harbor.....	4,180
{ Coal Harbor to Montreal.....	2,911
Montreal. { Montreal to Liverpool.....	2,790
A total of.....	9,881
Making a difference in favor of Montreal of.....	1,394
(or more than 12 per cent. of the whole distance.)	

Let us take an average of 240 miles a day for a steamer making that trip. I know the great steamers average more than that; the Allan and Dominion lines have an average of 12 nautical miles; the grey hounds of the sea (as they are sometimes called) have a speed of 15 to 18 knots. But the Oriental trade is carried by steamers of less value. The fact that the Suez Canal is not safe for steamers drawing more than 20 feet or exceeding 350 feet in length, has prevented the use of very large steamers on that route. A steamer takes 45 days to go from Marseilles to Yokohama. It gives about 9 knots an hour for the 9,200 miles, taking three days for the passage through Suez Canal. For the whole voyage from Yokohama to Liverpool it takes 50 days, at about 10 miles an hour. From Yokohama to Liverpool *via* the Canadian Pacific, we have, taking the same average of steamers as those of the Suez Canal route:

Yokohama to Coal Harbor, 4,180 miles, at 10 knots an hour.....	17½ days
Coal Harbor to Montreal, 2,911 miles, at 30 miles an hour.....	4 "
Montreal to Liverpool.....	11½ "
	33 "
For freight trains (20 miles an hour) extra time.....	2 "
For transhipment of freight.....	4 "
	39 "

What do we find for the route *via* New York:

Yokohama to San Francisco, 4,470 miles	19½ days
San Francisco to New York, 3,320 "	5 "
New York to Liverpool, 3,040 "	12½ "
	36 "
For freight trains (20 miles an hour) extra time.....	2 "
Difference of grades, extra time.....	2 "
For transhipment of freight.....	4 "
	44 "

These figures will show clearly that whatever doubts might be raised about freight there can be none with regard to passengers, who will not only gain 17 days, but who will travel through a healthy and temperate zone. The difference of passenger rates by steamers or by rail is not marked. The average rate is about 3½ cents per mile for long distances. From Quebec to Liverpool, 2,630 miles, it varies from \$80 to \$100, or about 3 to 4 cents a mile; from New York to Liverpool, 3,040 miles, it is between \$90 to \$120, being also 3 or 4 cents a mile. From San Francisco to Yokohama, 4,470 miles, the fares are \$250, or about 5½ cents a mile. From Liverpool to Yokohama, by Suez, 11,275 miles, the price is £88—or \$428—or 3½ cents per mile. From Marseilles to Yokohama, 9,200 miles, the Messageries Maritimes are asking \$415, or 4½ cents per mile. From San Francisco to New York, the passenger rates are 3½ cents per mile—\$126 for the trip, exclusive of the cost of meals and sleeping car, which adds about ½ of a cent per mile. But very seldom does the charge of railway companies exceed 2½ cents per mile. Freight rates are altogether different; \$7 per ton of merchandise from Montreal to Liverpool is equal to ¼ of 1

cent per mile. From Marseilles to Yokohama the rates are \$40 per ton or 7/8 of 1 cent per mile. From Liverpool to Yokohama the ocean steamship company charges an average of ¼ of a cent per mile. Up to the last few years, freight rates for railways were 2 cents per ton per mile. Since then the rates have gone down considerably; the Union Pacific charges hardly 1 cent per ton. Between New York and Chicago the rates will soon reach ½ cent per ton per mile, grain being now carried between those two cities for \$48 per car load of 24,000 pounds, and I think I am safe in saying that those reduced rates are not likely to be increased in the future, every year adding to the experience already acquired in the methods of operating railways at a cheap rate. The following tabular statement gives us the average rates of all the freight of the last fifteen years on the railways mentioned, showing the gradual reduction on each road:—

	1868	1873	1883
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
New York Central.....	2.74	1.57	0.91
Pennsylvania.....	1.90	1.41	0.81
New York, Lake Erie & Western.....	1.81	1.45	0.78
Boston and Albany.....	2.81	1.95	1.19
Lake Shore & Michigan Southern.....	2.33	1.33	0.71
Michigan Central.....	2.45	1.89	0.83
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.....	3.24	1.92	1.42
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.....	2.50	2.50	1.39
Illinois Central.....	2.20	1.43	
Pittsburg, Fort Wayne & Chicago.....	0.79	0.79	

Or an average, in 1883 of..... 1.055

These statements run up to 1st January, 1884. Since then the tariff rates have been continuously decreasing, as is shown by the following return for the year ending 31st December, 1884:—

Name of Company.	Length of Line.	Operations.	Cost per ton per mile.
Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati & Indianapolis R'y.....	391 miles.	Rec. \$ 3,600,346 Exp. 2,768,749	Cts.
		Profit. 843,597	0.633
Pennsylvania and New York Canal and Railway.....		Rec. 2,151,338 Exp. 1,541,794	
		Profit. 609,544	0.86
Northern Central Railway.....	323 miles.	Rec. 5,528,876 Exp. 3,468,394	
		Profit. 2,053,483	0.825
Chicago, St. Louis and Pittsburg Railway.....	636 miles.	Rec. 4,398,840 Exp. 3,602,213	
		Profit. 794,627	0.6
New York, Lake Erie and Western Railway.....	1,900 miles	Rec. 21,637,435 Exp. 16,358,077	
		Profit. 5,279,358	0.685
Lake Shore and Michigan.....			0.652
Michigan Central.....			0.646
New York, Chicago and St. Louis (Nickel Plate).....	523 miles.	Rec. 3,207,591 Exp. 2,389,234	
		Profit. 818,357	
Pennsylvania Railway:			
Main line.....	1,470 miles		
Philadelphia and Erie.....	287 "	Rec. 48,566,917	
Lines east of Pittsburg and Erie.....	2,201 "	Exp. 30,527,016	
New Jersey and branches.....	443 "	Profit. 18,039,901	

These tariff rates have yielded profits, as shown by the net earnings above mentioned. The fact that the New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railway has, during the past few weeks, passed into the hands of a receiver, is not an argument against the lowering of the rates, but it merely demonstrates the necessity or not increasing the cost of

construction of a road. That road is responsible for \$70,000,000, or \$132,000 per mile. The Pennsylvania Railway Company shows, by the following return, taken from their report, that their rates are remunerative:—

	Receipts.	Expenses.	Net earnings.
Main line.....	0.740	0.441	0.299
Philadelphia and Erie	0.576	0.365	0.211
Line east of Pittsburg	0.804	0.518	0.286
New Jersey.....	1.365	1.081	0.284

I desire to dwell on a point which may appear of a purely technical nature, because the transport by rail, at a low cost, is the great problem of our time. Political economy must necessarily deal with this question as well as practical economy. It is impossible for railways to maintain themselves unless their working expenditure is very low. A good authority on those matters, Mr. Chanute, consulting engineer of the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railway Company, has given particular attention to that point; and after laborious research and study as to the composition of the various trains on the New York Central, he has come to the conclusion that the actual cost to a company for freight traffic on its line is as follows:—

Nature of Freight.	No. of tons per car.	Distance run in miles.	No. of cars in a train.	Running expenses per car.	Cost per ton per mile.
Cattle.....	10	440	30	16 13	0.344
Grain .....	12	298	35	8 77	0.245
Flour.....	11	448	35	13 18	0.268
Canned goods.....	10	298	35	8 77	0.294
Pork.....	10	440	35	12 95	0.292
Wool.....	5	440	35	12 95	0.588
Tobacco.....	11	440	35	12 95	0.027
Oil.....	10	440	35	12 95	0.292
Leather.....	8	142	35	4 18	0.003
Paper.....	10	114	26	4 15	0.004
Hay.....	10	73	26	2 66	0.364
Butter.....	10	42	26	1 53	0.364
Cheese.....	10	26	26	0 95	0.369
Iron.....	12	440	35	12 95	0.245
Hosiery.....	5	440	35	16 15	0.731
Boots.....	8½	440	35	18 13	0.461
Dry goods, carpets...	9	440	35	17 99	0.432
Sugar and liquors....	10	440	35	16 95	0.383
Coffee.....	10	440	35	18 05	0.433
Stockery.....	10	440	35	18 35	0.439
Toys.....	6	440	35	16 85	0.636

We must add to this, cost of loading and unloading about 50 cents per ton, altogether, which, for a distance of 3,000 miles, gives a merely nominal amount. But, in making those calculations, we must not forget that the proportion of cost bears upon the whole traffic of the railways mentioned, the local traffic as well as the through traffic. All economists, as well as practical railway men, agree in saying that the local rates must be calculated on a different scale from the through rates. In fact, the localities through which a railway line runs derive a direct benefit from the line, and must contribute towards its success in a manner proportionate to the value accruing to them from it. The through traffic must not be charged with the expenditure for the administration and maintenance of the road; so that the running cost of that traffic must not exceed a third of the running cost of the local traffic. Consequently, instead of saying that a freight train costs \$1 per mile, it ought not to cost, as regards through traffic, more than 50 or 60 cents at most; this being considered the exact proportion, the Canadian Pacific will then be enabled to carry, with profit, the freight of the east at a price of ½ or ¾ of a cent per ton per mile. When I say that ½ of a cent per ton per mile is the possible rate which could be fixed in the future, I know that I shall meet with some approval in this House. The hon. member for Durham said, on the 15th December, 1880, that it was possible for a railway to realise profits with a rate of ½ of a cent per ton per mile. Speaking of the St. Paul and Manitoba, the hon. gentleman said:

“A reasonable tariff should be 1½ cent per bushel per 100 miles, or 17½ cents for the 1,900 miles. In fact, I believe that the tariff from St. Paul  
**MR. CHAPLEAU.**

southward is much lower than 1½ cent per bushel, and, as a consequence, a much larger proportion than what that tariff would amount to is collected by the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway.”

Being 60 pounds per bushel, and 37½ bushels per gross ton, 1½ cent per bushel would give 49½ cents per ton, making, for 100 miles, within an insignificant fraction, exactly ½ of a cent. per ton per mile. My opinion, as I have said before, is that through traffic can be profitably carried for ½ a cent. per mile. That traffic should not be charged with the cost of administration, nor with office or station charges, which should be charged to local traffic; and if the actual wear and tear of rolling stock, the fuel and handling, be taken into account, a tariff of ⅓ of a cent. per mile per ton would leave a margin for profit, the cost price of haulage not exceeding ¼ of a cent per ton per mile. The laws of commerce are now being revolutionised. The tendency to sacrifice everything to celerity is growing constantly. Competition has necessitated rapidity. The costly steamers have driven away the sailing vessels. The desire to forestal one's neighbor in the acquirement of every new article is, to day, one of the mainsprings of trade and commercial life. When I said that the transhipment of freight would entail a disadvantage against the Canadian Pacific route from Asiatic ports, I should have added that the cost through Suez Canal is increased by the toll rates on the canal, viz.:

	Fr. Centimes.
Canal toll..... Per ton.....	9 50..... \$1 90
Anchorage.....	0 2..... 0 00½
Towage.....	2 0..... 0 40

Added to that is the disadvantage of being obliged to have comparatively small steamers for that trade. It has been established that a steamship drawing 23 feet of water touched bottom fifty times during the voyage. Then you have the increased rates of insurance, in consequence of the dangers of the canal and its approaches; that increased expenditure represents not less than 2 per cent. In one word, the whole question is reduced to this: The difference between the two routes, from Liverpool to Yokohama, is the difference which exists between 2,911 miles of railway transportation, from Coal Harbor to Montreal, and 4,305 miles of transportation by water, including the passage through the Suez Canal.

	Miles.
The distance run by steamer from Liverpool to Yokohama is.....	11,275
The distance between Yokohama to Coal Harbor, and from Montreal to Liverpool, being.....	6,970
There remains.....	4,305

of the Suez route to bring against the 2,911 miles of trans-continental railway remaining to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway route. The extra cost of transhipment by the Canadian route is compensated for by the canal tolls and other charges, with the additional rates of insurance on the Suez route, so that we remain with the difference of cost between 2,911 miles of rail and 4,305 miles of water transportation. I do not hesitate in saying that the gain in time and the gradual reduction of railway tariffs will inevitably turn the scales in favor of our Canadian route. If I am told that a difference of thirteen days in the voyage is not important to the merchant, which I deny, I say that sailing vessels employed from Yokohama to Coal Harbor would not lengthen the time of the voyage as compared with the Suez route, and would reduce the rates from Liverpool to Yokohama in the following proportion:—

From Liverpool to Yokohama the rates are, on the average, \$38 per ton, or about ⅓ of a cent per ton per mile.	
From Yokohama to Coal Harbor, by a sailing vessel, the freight would cost....	\$ 3.48 per ton.
From Coal Harbor to Montreal (¾ cents p. mile).....	21.83 “
From Montreal to Liverpool (¼ cent per mile).....	6.97 “
	<b>\$32.28</b>

Leaving, in favor of the Canadian route, a difference of.... **\$6.10 per ton.**

Another advantage, and this is perhaps the strongest point in favor of my belief in the future success of our Canadian route between Europe and Asia, is the fact the Asiatic trade is almost wholly in the hands of British merchants and capitalists, who will carry that trade through the channels of their own choice. In vain did the Americans struggle against that state of things; their efforts failed. It is impossible to find the confession of a defeat more plainly made than in the following extract from the reports of Commerce and Navigation of the United States, for 1884, page 104:—

"I will answer your question, says Mr. Atkinson of Boston, to the chief of the Bureau of U. S. Statistics, in respect of the export of our goods and ware. You will observe that it is a matter of necessity, and not of choice, for Europe to purchase grain, meat, oil and cotton in greatest measure from this country, paying for these supplies, as far as possible, in such goods and wares, commonly called manufactures, as we are accustomed to take, and passing to our credit the remainder of the sum due us in cash. Against this cash we draw bills in payment for sugar, tea, coffee, hides and other articles, which are furnished us by nations which are not yet 'manufacturing nations,' according to the common use of that term. This balance of cash due us for grain, meat, cotton, etc., is transferred in London to the credit of merchants in China, Java, Africa, South America and other countries, whom we owe for tea, coffee, wools, hides, etc., and is applied by them in payment of British manufactures, viz, cotton fabrics, woollen fabrics, worsted fabrics, metal work, and other commodities, commonly called manufactures. That is to say, Great Britain imports from the United States cotton, meat, oil and grain in greater amount than she sells manufactured goods to the United States. We import from China, Africa and South America, tea, coffee, sugar, hides, etc., in greater amount than we sell manufactured goods to them. Great Britain works up or converts our raw material into manufactured goods and sends those goods to China, Africa and South America, in payment for the raw material, or the tea, coffee and sugar we have purchased.

"Why should this three-cornered traffic continue. Why do we not convert our own raw material into manufactured goods and exchange directly with the non-machine using nations, of whose products we are large purchasers.

"Many of the goods of these several classes are made in the United States of better quality, sometimes at a less cost and sometimes at a slightly greater cost than in Great Britain. Why, then, is not this cash, which is at our credit in London, applied directly to the purchase of American goods rather than of British goods?

"For a long time this question puzzled me: I could not solve it, until I had studied the conditions of commerce in Great Britain on the spot.

"My conclusion was that while quality and price enter measurably into the conditions which control that exchange of products which constitutes commerce, yet modern science and modern instrumentalities for production have brought the quality and price of manufactured goods—such as textiles, hardware and the like—so nearly to the same standard that commerce is no longer controlled, in any great measure, by either quality or price in respect to such manufactured goods. But such differences in quality and in price as exists, being very small elements, are more than counterbalanced by facilities in respect to transportation, in respect to banking or exchange, in the technical sense, and more than all, in respect to the facilities for obtaining credit on the part of the middlemen who work the trade—this last being the greater factor. For instance, there is no doubt that buyers in South America would greatly prefer to buy American cottons at their relative quality and price rather than British cottons. Why don't they do so?

"We buy a great deal more from South America than we sell to her, and we pay cash in London for the difference.

"Why don't they take goods in place of cash, if they prefer the goods?

"Why has not a system of steamship communication been established, without any bounty or subsidy, between the United States and South America, as has been done between Great Britain and South America?

"The reason was far to seek; but I think I will give you the true one.

"All the traffic of South America in manufactured goods and wares is done on a very long credit. How is it done?

"The credit is not granted by the manufacturer of the goods, but it is worked in this way:

"The manufacturer of cotton goods, for instance, sells the cloth 'in the grey' to a warehouseman, so called. The warehouseman pays him the cash for it, substantially, on delivery. This warehouseman, middleman or merchant, causes these goods to be bleached, printed, or otherwise prepared for each particular district or market in South America, packs them, according to the exact section to which they are to be sent, in small packages, suitable for a mule-back (if they are to be carried into the heart of the Andes), makes his arrangements to ship them by one of the daily steamers to South America, then makes his bill of lading, ear-marked with the designating marks and number of the packages, with the invoice attached, to a banker, and gets his bill discounted on for four or six months, with the expectation of renewal for four or six months longer, if necessary, and the cash or proceeds of our wheat, cotton and oil which we have remitted for our South American purchases forms a part of the deposit of this very banker, on the basis of which he is enabled to grant this credit. But this would not suffice. These goods are carried to the interior of South America, to great fairs, to interior towns, and to various points of distribution, and are there

practically bartered for whatever the people, who have no money, but who have other commodities, desire to sell. These other commodities, whatever they may be—wool, hides, ores, nitrates, or anything else—being freely admitted into Great Britain, for the purpose of distribution, wherever they are needed, therefore come back to England to be sold, and out of their sale the warehouseman ultimately recovers his money, and pays up his credit granted by the banker in London. London being a great free port, has become, of necessity, the money centre or credit centre of the world.

"In other words, commerce is now carried on so small a margin, and on such a greater scale, that the profit or loss depends on the cost of transportation, the rate of exchange, and the facilities for credit."

In examining the causes which have prevented the traffic of Asia passing through the United States, Mr. Nimmo, the chief of the Board of Trade in the United States, says, in his last report, page 57:

"But a third, and perhaps the most important condition restraining a large and general exportation of products of American manufacture, is the fact that commercial enterprise in this country has shaped itself to the habits and requirements of our vastly larger and more profitable internal commerce, and that our merchants have, from the prompting of self-interest, left the more complex and less remunerative field of foreign commerce to be explored and cultivated by the merchants of countries whose internal resources and possibilities are incomparably less than are those of the United States."

In other words, the Americans, who have a genius for manufactures and railroads, have less aptitude for trade and navigation, and are as much behind in the latter as they are ahead in the former. Under all these circumstances, it is not unreasonable to believe that the Canadian Pacific will become the national route of England, and be preferred to the Suez Canal, a neutral route, which, besides, is controlled by a majority of French shareholders; and when the time comes, as it soon will come, when vessels of a larger class will be the only ones to plough the seas, Englishmen, forced to adopt the Canadian route, will do it the more easily that they will be induced to do so by all sympathies of race, of flag, and, if I am allowed to use the expression in its highest sense, by national prejudices, a most potent motive among all nations; and gradually one will reach from Yokohama to Shanghai, Manila, Yeddo, Saigoon, Hankow, Chefoo, Singapore, etc., and finally to all commercial centres in Asia. But whatever may happen with reference to through trade, it is undeniable that the Canadian Pacific Railway will change the route of a portion of our own trade. We import about 40,000,000 pounds of rice, tea and coffee, without mentioning large quantities of drugs, spices, essential and volatile oils, etc., the products of Asia. If we consider that last year, for instance, we used the Union Pacific for our importation of nearly 4,000,000 pounds of tea, we can well understand that the Canadian line will get the traffic. Last year the United States exported to China and Japan 45,000,000 yards of cotton cloth, over 1,000,000 pounds of fish, 30,000,000 gallons of lighting oil, etc. What is there to prevent us, with the advantage of a route shorter by 444 miles of railroad and 470 of navigation, competing for this trade? For instance, the freight rate on tea, from Shanghai to New York, is \$47.50 per ton. The distance being 5,515 miles by sea and 3,320 miles by railway, it may be said that the steamer receives \$13.89, or  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a cent, and the railway \$33.71, or 1 cent per ton per mile. The Canadian route would make the same profit exactly if asking \$42.16 for the same goods, that is to say,  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a cent for 5,135 miles of navigation and 1 cent for 2,911 miles of railway. Here is the way, then, for a reduction on the freight rate of \$5.34 per ton, or of 11 per cent. The Canadian Pacific will soon have the control of the Asiatic trade, if not for the whole of Europe immediately, at least, immediately for North America. But I will go further, Mr. Speaker; I claim that the Americans will use our route to reach both the Pacific and the Atlantic shores, and they do not make a secret of it themselves. In the official report on internal commerce for 1884, by Worthington, I find, on page 97, the following significant passage:

"The main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway will extend from Montreal, in the east, to a port in British Columbia.

"This new transcontinental rail line will, by virtue of the reciprocity of transportation facilities which exists with respect to traffic over railroads of the United States and of Canada, become essentially a part of the railroads of the United States. The proprietors and managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway can also acquire the ownership and control of railroads in this country, if they be inclined to do so, and they possess the energy, tact and financial ability requisite to the accomplishment of that object, just as such control of railroads in the United States has already been acquired by the management of the Grand Trunk Railway. By this means, or by means of traffic arrangements entered into with railroads of this country, the Canadian Pacific Railway, like the Grand Trunk Railway, may be enabled to compete sharply with the railroads of the United States in the conduct of our internal commerce."

It is a singular fact that the distance from Chicago to San Francisco is exactly the same as that from Chicago to Coal Harbor *via* Winnipeg, viz.:

	Miles.
From Chicago to San Francisco <i>via</i> Omaha.....	2,357
" Chicago to Winnipeg, miles.....	874
" Winnipeg to Coal Harbor, miles.....	1,483
	2,357

And Coal Harbor is nearer China and Japan by 470 miles. As to the trip towards the East, there is not, it appears, the least doubt in this House, since the Opposition have already recorded their opinion. We read in the Minutes of Parliament of the 26th of January, 1881:

"Mr. Laurier then moved, in amendment, that the said resolutions be not now read a second time, but that it be *Resolved*, That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway provides for the construction of between 600 and 700 miles of railway to the north of Lake Superior, between Lake Nipissing and the junction with the road from Thunder Bay, through a difficult and uninhabited country and at a vast expense; that a mere fraction of the cost of this road would, if applied as a basis of credit, secure the construction of those 63 miles common to the through line and to the Sault Ste. Marie Railway, and also of the remainder of the line to Sault Ste. Marie, within three years; that the line by Sault Ste. Marie would give Ontario, Quebec and the East railway connection with the North-West of nearly the same length and of better quality than the proposed North Shore line; that it would also give to Canada a great trade from an enormous area of the Western States, extending from the boundary to a point south of St Paul, and even now inhabited by about 1,200,000 souls; that it would secure a way traffic; that it would thus give, within three years, and at a fraction of the cost of the other line, greater benefit than can be secured by that line in ten years, which is the period stipulated for its construction; that it would bring both the Western States and the Canadian North-West into connection by rail with the ocean steamers at Montreal and Quebec on a route shorter, by about 300 miles, than the existing route to New York; that this advantage, together with the further gain of about 250 miles in the ocean voyage to Liverpool, would give this route a commanding position, and secure great benefit to the country at large; that the construction of the line to the Sault or Goulais Bay would also give a first-class rail and water route *via* Sault Ste Marie and Thunder Bay, within our own limits, by the shortest possible line, for the transport of emigrants, goods and produce; that the construction of the line from Sturgeon River to or beyond Thunder Bay to the north of Lake Superior is, under the circumstances, premature, and should not be now undertaken."

Let us take Brainerd, for instance, one of the stations on this end of the Northern Pacific Railway, and we find the following distances:—

	Miles.
From Brainerd to Pacific Junction .....	91
Pacific Junction to L'Anse.....	158
L'Anse to Marquette .....	26
Marquette to Sault Ste Marie .....	150
Sault Ste. Marie to Callander.....	244
Callander to Montreal .....	345
Total .....	1,014
From Brainerd to New York, <i>via</i> St. Paul and Chicago, the distance is .....	1,509

Here is, for the Northern Pacific, that is to say, for the whole North-West, from Portland, an outlet 500 miles shorter than by any other route. The distance between Montreal and New York being 382 miles, the Northern Pacific will, therefore, save 113 miles in reaching New York *via* Montreal, instead of passing through Chicago. I believe in the future of the North-West, because our geographical position gives us the advantage, because the climate of the Assiniboine and the Saskatchewan is better

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

than that of Montana, because British Columbia has advantages superior to those of Washington Territory, and because, intellectually, we are not inferior to our neighbors; and with the supply of labor which Great Britain is sending us, as well as with the market which she liberally opens to our agricultural products and to our cattle industry, we must inevitably follow the same ratio of development as was obtained by the construction of the Northern Pacific. That ascending march in the path of wealth and progress which that great American enterprise has opened is too interesting not to be examined. It is not difficult, in our day, to make a study of the philosophy of railways. The results obtained in the past clearly demonstrate that every dollar invested gives in return one hundred dollars. If we study the western part of the United States, we see that the two American Pacific railways, the Northern and the Central, had to cross tracts of wild and waste lands, as in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The regions more especially of this character were—for the Northern: Dakota, Montana and Washington; for the Central: Wyoming, Utah and Nevada. Let us follow the increase of those territories, in population and wealth, after the construction of the railways:

	Popula- tion.	Wealth. \$	No. of Miles of Railway.
1860.			
Dakota.....	4,837	.....	.....
Montana.....	.....	.....	.....
Washington.....	11,594	5,600,000	.....
Wyoming.....	.....	.....	.....
Utah.....	40,273	5,596,118	.....
Nevada.....	6,857	.....	.....
	63,561	11,186,118	.....
1870.			
Dakota.....	14,181	6,000,000	65
Montana.....	20,595	15,200,000	.....
Washington.....	23,955	13,580,000	25
Wyoming.....	9,118	7,000,000	447
Utah.....	86,786	16,160,000	257
Nevada.....	42,491	31,134,000	593
	197,126	89,054,000	1,387
1880.			
Dakota.....	135,177	118,000,000	1,265
Montana.....	39,159	40,000,000	48
Washington.....	75,116	62,000,000	274
Wyoming.....	20,789	54,000,000	472
Utah.....	143,963	114,000,000	770
Nevada.....	62,266	158,000,000	769
	476,470	544,000,000	3,598

Those territories, which contain 639,485 miles in superficies, had, in 1870, a value of \$89,000,000, viz., \$149 a mile. Ten years after the national wealth had increased by \$455,000,000, and the same area was valued at \$850 a mile, and an increased population of 279,344 inhabitants were contributing to the development of the national industries. The North-West Territory and British Columbia have a superficial area of 895,000 square miles, equal to the territory of the following States:—

	Miles.
Illinois.....	56,000
Michigan.....	57,030
Minnesota.....	78,205
Iowa.....	56,000
Dakota.....	149,100
Montana.....	149,060
Washington.....	69,180
Wyoming.....	97,890
Utah.....	84,970
Nevada.....	62,266
	858,121

In 1880 these eight States or Territories represented the following totals:

Population.....	5,970,000
Wealth.....	\$7,847,000,000
Number of miles of railways.....	23,827

The history of the development of the Western States is full of interest and of information. Let me give you the total increase, in the construction of railways, at each census, in the following States and Territories :—

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
Illinois.....	110	2,790	4,823	7,953
Michigan.....	342	779	1,638	3,931
Wisconsin.....	20	905	1,525	3,130
Minnesota.....			1,072	3,108
Iowa.....		655	2,683	5,235
Kansas.....			1,561	3,459
Nebraska.....			1,812	2,000
Missouri.....		817	2,000	4,011
California.....	23		703	2,320
Oregon.....			159	582
Nevada.....			593	769
Dakota.....			65	1,265
Arkansas.....			256	896
Colorado.....			157	1,581
Utah.....			254	770
Washington.....				274
Wyoming.....			429	472
Montana.....				48
<b>Total</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>5,969</b>	<b>19,075</b>	<b>41,426</b>
				<b>5,969</b>
				<b>35,457</b>

Average in twenty years..... 1,773

Let me now give you the increase in population and wealth :—

POPULATION.

	1860.	1870.	1880.
Illinois.....	1,711,000	2,539,000	3,077,000
Missouri.....	1,182,000	1,221,295	2,168,308
Wisconsin.....	775,000	1,054,000	1,315,497
Michigan.....	749,000	1,184,000	1,636,937
Iowa.....	674,913	1,194,000	1,624,615
California.....	378,994	560,000	864,000
Minnesota.....	122,000	439,000	780,000
Kansas.....	107,000	364,000	996,000
Oregon.....	52,000	90,000	174,000
Utah.....	40,000	86,700	144,000
Colorado.....	34,200	39,864	194,327
Nebraska.....	28,000	122,093	452,403
Washington.....	11,594	23,955	75,118
Nevada.....	6,857	42,480	62,266
Dakota.....	4,837	14,180	135,177
Idaho.....		15,000	32,610
Montana.....		20,595	39,159
Wyoming.....		9,118	20,784
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,828,395</b>	<b>9,519,790</b>	<b>13,692,198</b>
			<b>5,828,395</b>

Increase in population..... 7,863,803  
Average of yearly increase of population..... 393,190

WEALTH.

	1860.	1880.
Illinois.....	\$ 871,860,000	\$ 3,210,000,000
Missouri.....	501,214,000	1,582,000,000
Wisconsin.....	273,671,000	1,139,000,000
Michigan.....	257,163,000	1,580,000,000
Iowa.....	247,338,000	1,720,000,000
California.....	207,874,000	1,340,000,000
Minnesota.....	52,294,000	792,000,000
Kansas.....	32,327,000	760,000,000
Oregon.....	28,930,000	154,000,000
Utah.....	5,598,000	114,000,000
Colorado.....		240,000,000
Nebraska.....	9,131,000	385,000,000
Washington.....	5,601,000	62,000,000
Nevada.....		156,000,000
Dakota.....		118,000,000
Idaho.....		29,000,000
Montana.....		40,000,000
Wyoming.....		54,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,491,949,000</b>	<b>\$13,055,000,000</b>
		<b>2,491,949,000</b>

Increase of wealth..... \$10,563,051,000  
Average of yearly increase of wealth..... 528,000,000

The foregoing statements give the following totals :—

Average of yearly increase in Railways....	1,773 miles.
do do Population..	393,190 inhabitants.
do do Wealth.....	\$528,000,000.

This will prove that every mile of railway has caused, in twenty years, in those States or Territories, an increase of 222 inhabitants and of \$300,000 to the country. In the course of last year the exports of agricultural products from the ports of New York, Boston, Portland, Philadelphia and Baltimore, amounted to \$536,315,318. And it has been ascertained, by the statistics, that 95 per cent. of those products came from the States or Territories before mentioned. The same causes always bring identical results, and we find a proof of that in making a comparison with the Canadian North-West. Since 1873 the population of the North-West Territory has increased by 250,000, and the increase in the Customs and Excise is as follows :—

	Customs.	Excise.
1874.....	\$ 66,509	\$ 4,287
1875.....	179,377	8,176
1876.....	262,492	19,716
1877.....	235,314	24,018
1878.....	314,305	39,022
1879.....	294,591	53,741
1880.....	321,179	64,665
1881.....	471,845	97,878
1882.....	1,109,678	156,794
1883.....	1,833,655	183,872
1884.....	735,544	156,219
1885 (9 months).....	475,132	115,992

The quantity of lands sold is another proof of the development of the country. Excepting the sales made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Dominion Government has received the following amounts since 1877 :—

1877.....	\$ 3,799
1878.....	19,424
1879.....	23,828
1880.....	120,479
1881.....	131,124
1882.....	1,744,456
1883.....	1,009,019
1884.....	951,636
1885.....	400,165

There seems to have been a diminution in the last months. But we must not forget that the greatest amount of sales is generally made in the spring, and that the North-West troubles have this year stopped the influx of emigrants and the business in those regions. We must also consider the fact that immigration, here as well as in the United States, decreases at certain times. For instance, I may give you a statement of the yearly immigration in the United States :

1875.....	227,698
1876.....	169,986
1877.....	141,857
1878.....	188,769
1879.....	177,826
1880.....	457,257
1881.....	669,431
1882.....	788,992
1883.....	603,322
1884.....	518,592
1885 (1st December—6 months).....	243,413

But if there is a momentary lull in our immigration, there is still a great number of new settlers going to the North-West, as may be seen by the following statement :—

Sales from 1st July, 1884, to the 1st May, 1885—		
Homesteads—1,860, of 160 acres.....	297,600	
“ 520, of 80 “.....	41,600	
		<b>339,200</b>
Pre-emptions—1,016, of 160 “.....	162,560	
“ 520, of 80 “.....	41,600	
		<b>204,160</b>
Sales.....		<b>\$109,40</b>
Not including 153 McLean town lots sold...652,760 acres.		

It has been said, in this House and in the press : Why does not the Government exercise its right of taking possession of the road, if this company cannot finish it, rather than make a further advance of funds ? A poorer policy could

not have been adopted. We must not forget that private capital to the extent of \$29,000,000 is engaged in this enterprise, and that investors would not likely abandon their money, perhaps, their whole fortune, on the mere bidding of the Government. Private capital has the right to protect itself; it is its duty to do so; and in the present case, as there is still six years in which to deliver the road, they would do it. The Government has no interest in the ruin of individuals. The Northern Pacific has been the cause of two catastrophes of this kind, the shock of which has been felt in every part of the great Republic. The failures of Jay Cooke and of Willard have each produced a sharp financial crisis, even in such an immense market as New York, with the enormous business transacted there for the whole Union. If the shock has been so severe in the States, I wonder what would have become of our moneyed community under similar circumstances? I cannot imagine anything but a mass of ruins, under which our commercial institutions would have been buried and our banks shaken to their foundations. No Government would dare to take the property of the company without indemnifying it for disbursements already made. Governments cannot despoil individuals in such a way and take advantage of their difficulties and helplessness, to "grab" the fruit of their labor and savings. When the Government requires money it raises it through a tax borne by all equally; it cannot seize the pocketbook of any citizen and enrich itself at his expense. It is true that the law enacted last year seems to have established a contrary principle; but, in fact, it had no other object than to secure the control of negotiations, and to prevent, without our leave, the inconsiderate use of the railway resources. No serious man would venture to say that in taking the road the law has provided that the Government should not indemnify, at least partly, the shareholders who have, in good faith, invested their money in that enterprise. These words, I know, will be taken up by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, imbued with this elementary truth, said last year: "Why such rigor, why such a terrible clause, authorising you to take possession of the railway without legal proceedings? You would not bring yourselves to take back this railway without indemnifying the individuals who have invested their money in it?" Nobody, as far as I am aware, has specially contradicted the hon. member on this point. We needed this rigorous clause to watch the construction of the railway and the operations of the company, and to make the company and the people understand that in an extreme case we would go as far as propriety would allow. We never thought of using it as an excuse for spoliation. To take possession of the road the Government, then, would have to disburse a good portion of the \$29,000,000 of paid up shares, less the deposit already in their hands to secure the payment of the interest. Since the company requires \$15,000,000 because new necessities have arisen, we could not have avoided this responsibility, and therefore we would have had to begin by adding something like \$30,000,000 to our national debt, and this when we had an amount of \$25,000,000 of our bonds to redeem and \$30,000,000 to borrow. Who can say how much Canadian securities would have fallen under the immense temptation for stock-jobbing that such an important loan negotiation would have created? I do not hesitate to state that the result of such an operation would have been an enormous loss to the Treasury. What I say now is not a new argument. The hon. leader of the Opposition used that argument before me. It is true, he apparently used it in a sarcastic manner, but he felt, all the same, that the argument was a sound one, when he said:

"And in what position would the Government and Parliament be, if, at the end of these two years, default should be made? Are you going to sacrifice the interests of those shareholders—those poor people who have spent money on the road, who have done so much good to the country, who have built a road faster than ever a

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

road was built before and spent more money upon it than ever was spent before? Your charity and confidence and sympathy are immense: are you going to foreclose, hard hearted usurers that you are? You, who said yourselves that the security was worth two or three times the sum advanced, are you going to shut down and turn these people out of house and home, strip them of their palaces, take away their lordly equipages? Surely you will not behave so badly! That will be the appeal which will be made; that will be the appeal which will be listened to. The past tells us what the future will be."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we could not take possession of the road under circumstances which would have been so burthen-some for us and so unjust to the company. Naturally, the Opposition would seek to turn the argument against me as to another part of my remarks, when I demonstrated that this year's legislation leaves us all our guarantee. If we cannot touch the road now, how could we do so later? There is this difference in the two situations: It is, that the shareholders, who have willingly risked \$29,000,000 in this enterprise, should have the benefit of their venture. We should not take it away from them before they could see the results of their attempt. They would have the right to tell us: "Since we have had the pluck to risk \$29,000,000, give us the chance to see the end of our undertaking. We are now on the eve of success. A general crisis strikes us, as it has struck all institutions and all countries; give us time to tide it over. You shall lose nothing, as we are going to borrow ourselves what you yourselves would have to borrow should you take our place." The demand would have been a just and sensible one; but it will have no force when, once the road completed, the company shall have seen the result of its ventures; when, once the road is under full operation, it will have to derive from it the resources required to meet its obligations. If the road pays, nothing will remain to be said, since we will receive our interest; if it does not succeed as well as expected, then the Government will be in the position of business men looking to their own protection; I have no doubt that the \$15,000,000 of bonds will soon be taken by the public. When the company has placed itself in the hands of the public it will not have the same reasons to call upon us for assistance; the transaction will have reached another stage, and if, even then, we can protect ourselves in protecting the shareholders, it will become a duty for us to do it. But what I want to say is, that it will no longer be our bounden duty to incur any further risk, and that we will always have such a control of the situation that we can protect ourselves against any disaster, if the company is not prepared to ward off the blow. In other words, it is the duty of a Government to be patient in all transactions affecting the financial position of private persons, and to do its best to protect them; but when all is said, when nothing is left but to choose who will bear the loss, the Government or the private individual, then it is soon enough for the Government, if its titles are properly secured, to claim its due. We do not want to lose a cent of our advances to the Pacific, and we have taken the proper means not to lose them. I am not of those who believe that the Government ought to be anxious to take possession of a railway, because they cannot work a railway with the same advantage as private individuals. However great may be the integrity of the employees, the zeal and public spirit of the Ministers, it is impossible for any Government to compete with individuals when economy is concerned. They do not possess the same resources, and cannot give the same excuses. A step, shabby or mean, sometimes, that personal interest would justify in a company, would become a grievance, or leave a stain, if taken under the patronage of the Government. The outside pressure weighing on a Minister is irresistible, sometimes; and how can a Government be free enough in its action to compete with the marvellous activity of railroad men, who never back down before any obstacle. These great

organisations are generally profitable only because they stimulate trade themselves. They have their steamers, their warehouses, their commercial firms; they build up their own freight, when the public do not give them enough; they have to defend themselves against such cut-throat schemes as are organised against them, or to organise some such themselves. How can you expect a Government to become a trader, ship owner, manufacturer, miller, stock jobber, bull or bear on the money market, destroyer, if need be, and an implacable rival of the people under their jurisdiction? It would give rise to ceaseless accusations of favoritism or injustice. Should their tariff be regulated by those of other companies, a cry of monopoly would follow; if they reduced them, it would become a disloyal competition. Were they fixed permanently, the trade so delicately influenced by the supply and demand, by over-production or scarcity, would not really find its proper level. At times they would be too high, at others too low. In a word, you would have destroyed what is the greatest strength of a nation—the individual initiative; you would have subordinated the intelligence of the business man, so quick and so flexible, to the theories of the political man groping among experiments on economy, without knowing the value of audacity and a spirit of enterprise, which, for individuals, are worth dollars and cents. Traffic would be guided according to local instead of commercial views; no force in the world can counterbalance political laws, which are the same everywhere; therefore, English ideas do not favor the working of a railway by the Government. The Intercolonial is an exception imposed upon us by circumstances. But such a state of things cannot exist as far as the Canadian Pacific is concerned, this line being necessarily always fighting and competing with others for existence. At the time of the enquiry made by the English Parliament in Great Britain, in 1867, on the opportunity for the acquisition of the railways by the State, public opinion was unanimously against the scheme, and in quoting a few sentences of the report resuming the evidence, I establish, without any doubt, the theory I am now trying to develop. This report is found in the 38th and 39th volumes of the Sessional Papers of the House of Commons of 1867. We read:

"We have next to consider, if the State owned the railways, if it would be able to improve the system of management. None of the witnesses have recommended direct management by Government officers, but in the opinion of some, great advantage would be derived from the adoption of a plan of leasing the railways in groups." Pap. xxxv., Report 1867, vol. 38, p. 12.

"The practical result of any scheme for the national purchase and leasing of railways would be merely to substitute the lesser sense of responsibility of a lessee for a limited period, administering the property of others for the heavier and more durable responsibilities of owners managing their own property." Pap. xxxvi.

"In France, the absence, almost complete, up to the present time, of all competition amongst railways, discard that valuable equilibrium which is the safeguard of British industry." Pap. xxxvii.

"The plan of direct management by the Government itself seems to meet with condemnation on all sides, the chief objections raised being the want of a direct interest, the want of thorough knowledge or peculiar aptitude, the habit of costly management, and the danger of abuse in patronage." Page 112, same Report.

The country, on different occasions, has expressed its opinion, and its decision has never varied. The Act of 1872, authorising the construction of the railway, declared positively that it should be constructed by a private company, and in order that no doubt should remain about the unanimous disposition of the country, when the Mackenzie Government came into power, in 1874, it entered afresh in our statutes this universal preference in favor of private companies. And even were the weighty considerations which I have just pointed out not in existence, there still remains another, and the most important one, as it affects the relations of parties with politics. I ask what a storm would be let loose in this House if it were asked at this moment, Mr. Speaker, to invest us with the property of the

Pacific Railway and the millions of patronage which it implies. With what terror would we not see the Opposition contemplate the fact that all the resources of the Pacific would lay in our hands. It would be then that all the philippics, all the violent denunciations of past and present days, would wake all the echoes of this Chamber, and no eloquence would be found expressive enough to invoke upon us the wrath of electors. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if we had lived for the love of power, we could have armed ourselves with this invincible weapon; but before thinking of the sweets of power, we must consider the duties which devolve upon it, and we must not sow dissensions in the political world. We want a frank, open and loyal contest, free from the elements as well as the appearances of undue influence. Now, it is my duty to again ask this House to pardon me for having occupied its time so long in making the remarks I thought it my duty to make on this important question. It is not very often that I trespass upon the good will and patience of hon. members, and it is on this plea that I ask to be forgiven. I have, I think, proved that it was right for the Government to have done what they did last year; I think I have demonstrated by the facts I have put before this House that it was right for the Government to come to the assistance of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the manner provided for in these resolutions, not by giving the money but by assisting their credit in the money markets of the world. We have not to deal with a company who have proved they are a company of jobbers, of mere contractors, but with a company who, as the whole country knows, have shown that their intention is, not to make money out of the contract, but out of the returns to be obtained from the great railway they have built. I hope that we shall have the support of my hon. friends even on the other side. We anticipate criticism; we know we shall have criticism; it is right, perhaps, that there should be criticism; it is right that the acts of the Government should be scrutinised; but, in this matter, the Government has acted honestly, frankly, with the sole and the pure object, not of putting the finances of the country in a more difficult position than they were before, but of insuring the credit of the company to whose existence and success the credit of the whole country is so closely united. I know that fault will be found with our conduct, but there is one hope which I must express before taking my seat, and I shall, in this, for a moment, be a lecturer in favor of American institutions, of the American people, and of the sentiment which prevails in the United States. Let us unite at least in one sentiment, and that is, not to defame our country, not to decry our credit, not to try to put down our institutions or to pull down those things which we have built up, which are noble works, which are grand works, which, in the future, will redound to the credit, not only of Governments—because what have Governments to do with that?—but of the whole country. I do not object to the hon. gentlemen criticising our conduct. I would not object even to see the hon. gentlemen coming to this side of House and taking the places we occupy at this moment. I, for one, would be ready to give my place up to those hon. gentlemen. Those who have had experience know that it is not for the pleasure we have in being in the Ministry that we desire to remain here; it is certainly not worth as much as the people are led to believe; and I would give my seat up to my hon. friends, and my colleagues in the Cabinet, I am sure, would willingly give up their seats, if they could only think that the hon. gentlemen who would take our places would be imbued with a greater spirit of patriotism. If we are not to have our friends on the other side coming to the rescue, not of the Government—we do not want that—but of the credit of the country, if we are obliged to say that they are always trying to defame the good name of the country, instead of upholding its honor, they may rest assured that they will not, by

this means, destroy the good name of Canada, they will not destroy the good name and fame of the statesman who has presided over the destinies of the country for the last twenty-five years, they will not even destroy the Pacific Railway, the greatest of all the enterprises we have undertaken. Since I first entered political life I have been accustomed to see the persistency of my hon. friends on the other side in speaking of the bankruptcy of the nation. I heard it in 1854, when I was not fourteen years old, on the first occasion, when I heard two of the greatest orators of our Province, the great Morin and the great Papin; I then heard statements that the Grand Trunk Railway system had brought the country to ruin and bankruptcy. I heard the same thing years afterwards, and still I have seen the country growing more and more prosperous year after year. I heard the same thing in 1866, when the scheme of Confederation was before the country, when, from parish to parish and from county to county, I, though a young man, was fighting the battle of Confederation; I heard gentlemen saying that Confederation was to be the ruin of our Province, and was to result in the bankruptcy of the whole Dominion; that the vast stretch of country embracing seven Provinces, and extending from ocean to ocean, without any backbone, would result in disaster. But, Mr. Speaker, there was a backbone; there was the energy of British subjects, the energy of the men who had made this country; and that backbone has saved the country, in spite of all that defamation, in spite of all those who have been decrying our country. I heard the same thing again in 1870, and I remember, in 1872, when I was contesting one of the seats for this Parliament, that I heard one of the best champions of Liberal ideas in the Province of Quebec, my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), saying that the price paid by the Government of the day for the North-West, £300,000, was a loss to the country, and that those wild Provinces, where the buffalo still roamed, would be no profit to us. Since that, I have seen millions upon millions of capital invested in that country, and thousands and hundreds of thousands of people flocking to that region, which will become the granary of British North America, as the north-west of the United States became the granary of that country. I have witnessed the progress of our country, in spite of all that has been said to retard it. And, after that, when this great enterprise of the Pacific Railway came before the public, I heard a repetition of the same thing which I had previously heard in 1854, in 1866 and 1867, and in 1869 and 1870. I heard it in the beginning of that scheme, and still we have seen the result; we have seen the country growing more and more, and becoming the admiration of statesmen and men of business in the United States, and creating a feeling of jealousy on that side of the line. But there is one thing which I have not heard, and which I should wish to hear from my hon. friends. During my trip through the United States last year, the campaign for the Presidency was in progress. Never was there a campaign in which personalities were so freely indulged in as that; personalities were at the top of all discussions that took place. It was to be regretted, and good men regretted it; but I found what I regretted I did not find in my own country, that while every one who spoke on the platform referred to his opponent as the worst and the meanest of men, not one of them dared to cast the least shade upon one of the stars of the flag of the United States, but all united in upholding the credit of the country and of every State in which the campaign was conducted. Sir, the calumnies of those who want to villify the Government and who desire to destroy the credit of the country, of those who want to destroy the great work of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be of no avail. They will be like loose winds, blowing smoke and sand, and carrying dark things with them. Their dark ideas and their dark thoughts, everything that is dark in their

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

heart, and which is blown and breathed against us and against this enterprise, will not do more than those winds which cannot destroy the monuments of the old world. They may give a darker shade to the granite and the marble, but the solidity of the pyramids and of the great monuments of Europe remain, as the Pacific Railway will remain, as solid as if these winds had not passed over it.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, if the rest of the Cabinet do not desire to continue the discussion, I will trouble the House with some reference to the speeches we have heard, and the proposals on the table. I congratulate the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) upon the events of this day. I congratulate the High Commissioner upon the events of this day. Government brought him out before, and specially for the purpose of engineering the last Canadian Pacific Railway aid measure through. He came at their call and spoke, although not qualified to vote. He comes no more.

"Oh, for one blast of Roland's horn  
On Fontarabian echoes borne!  
Through the dark Ronces Valles pass."

As he came not, it was necessary to fill his place by a double performance. It was not exactly a duet. I can hardly call it a concerted piece, for there were some discords between several of the expressions and phrases. There was not that degree of harmony which I should like to have observed between the arguments of the hon. gentleman who moved and the hon. gentleman who seconded the resolution. We have had a speech, in at least two volumes, with this peculiarity about it, that the authors of the speech seemed to reverse the proper order of these volumes, because the modern history came in the first volume and the ancient history came in the second. We have had a joint composition. One was a speech composed of figures, and the other was composed of figures of speech. I will admit that there were a good many tropes in both. But, Sir, although I have, upon this occasion, to meet these two hon. gentlemen, who have taken a course unprecedented in my brief parliamentary experience, on the occasion of a Ministerial proposition, of pressing two speeches in support of their measure before a voice from the other side was heard; although I have got to meet them both, the same spirit which induced them to think it was necessary that there should be two opening speeches, may, I hope, serve to sustain me in this unequal contest, as I have been sustained in former contests against the eminent statesman whose place they have attempted to fill. This is a great day for Quebec. Her Ministers have opened the battle. Her Ministers have commenced the war—in the absence, it is true, of the Minister of War, who may have gone away by the *Grand Nord*, for aught I know; but they have commenced the war. But would not one of them have done? Was it absolutely necessary that they should both speak. Would no one hon. gentleman from Quebec have been adequate to open the Ministerial proposition? Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke last at some length, closed his speech somewhat in the tone of Sir Charles Tupper, and in a course and strain of exhortation which we have heard not unfrequently when from that side of the House, they invite us to discuss the question. They say that they invoke criticism, that they challenge it, that they are not at all afraid of it, that they rather relish it. If our observations indicate that their policy has been injurious to the country, and that the country has been injured by their policy, oh, they say, you are decrying the country, you are injuring the country. Criticise us as much as you like, but admit that we have caused the country to prosper, and that our policy has been all that it should be. These are the conditions under which the hon. gentleman invites us to discharge our duty. Now, Sir, we

have just as great a stake in the prosperity of the land in which we live as the hon. gentlemen opposite. Our fortunes are as much bound up in its prosperity as their fortunes—perhaps more. Our hearts beat as true to this country as theirs can. Why should they not? What interest have we to decry our country? Here we live; here the most of us were born; here our children, those we love, abide; here it is that we hope, when the day of rest shall come to us, to lay our bones; and why in the world should we desire to decry, or defame, or depreciate our country? But if we see that those who are entrusted with the reins of power have abused their trust, if we see that those who have had control of public affairs have mismanaged those affairs, if we find that their policy has been such as to injure the country, to interfere with its prosperity and lessen its chances of progress, I should like to know whether it be not true patriotism to point out those defects, to signalise those errors, to indicate those abuses, in order that they may be remedied. Therefore, Sir, no such language as the hon. gentleman has used, in which, under pretence of patriotism, he seeks to evade criticism of transactions which cannot stand a searching criticism—I say no such language as he has used to-night, any more than like language on former occasions, shall deter us, at all proper times and seasons, and upon all proper occasions, from explaining clearly what we think the condition of this country is, and to what cause that condition is due. Now, Sir, the Secretary of State, in the second volume of the joint speech, as I said, entered upon the ancient history of the question, and he pointed out that the mistakes of the Liberal party had begun at the beginning, that we were mistaken in objecting to the original contract that was made, and to the proposal to ratify that contract by the Parliament of this country in the years 1871-72. He declared that we did object, and that we ought not to have objected. How did the hon. gentleman himself describe that transaction? He said it was an audacious transaction. It was a thing unexampled in the history of the world, up to that time, that a contract and undertaking for the construction of so many miles of railway at one time should have been projected. He said: True it is that France has built large numbers of miles of railways; true it is that Austria has entered into large railway operations; but not even France, with her 40,000,000 of people, not even Austria with her power and strength and population, ever did that which was proposed to be done by Canada in the year 1871. We objected, not that we objected to a Canadian Pacific Railway being built, not that we did not desire that a Canadian Pacific Railway should be built; but we declared then, what events have verified most certainly, that it was not reasonable or prudent to agree that a Canadian Pacific Railway should be built by us within ten years, as prescribed by the obligations of that day. That was our declaration. We declared that it would take a very long time properly to ascertain the route, and that it would take a very long time, without imposing great burdens upon the country, to build the road. And mark you, Sir, at that time that happened which has often happened since. Hon. gentlemen met our declarations with promises of the impossible. They declared to Parliament, they declared to the people of Canada, that they were about to build that railway without increasing the then rate of taxation, and to build it within that time without increasing the then rate of taxation. They boldly stated that that was their policy, that that would be accomplished, and by that means, by a narrow majority of 10, they succeeded in inducing the Parliament of the country to agree to their proposal. I have said that that was the original statement. That was the statement made in the Act of Parliament itself: that the road should be built without any increase of taxation. The Liberal party declared that it was not prudent for Canada to agree

to build the Canadian Pacific Railway within ten years, as was then proposed. I want to know how many of the business men of Canada, if the question was put to them to-day, would not say the Liberal party was right in that declaration. The Liberal party declared it was not possible for Canada to build the road as proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it was not possible to implement the obligation without imposing heavily increased burdens on the country. I want to know how many of the business men of the country would answer that proposition in the negative, would dissent from it to-day. How many members of this House would dissent from it; would say to-day that although that promise has not been fulfilled, although the road has not been built within the time, although a longer time has been taken, yet our burdens of taxation and burdens of debt have not been heavily increased in order to secure the construction of this road. The Act of Parliament passed on 14th June, 1872, says:

“Whereas the House of Commons of Canada resolved during the said now last Session that the said railway should be constructed and worked as a private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government, and that the public aid to be given to such undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land and such subsidies in money or other aid, not increasing the present rate of taxation, as the Parliament of Canada should thereafter determine.”

That was the resolution brought in by the Government of the day; that was the resolution incorporated in the Act of Parliament, forming the preamble of the original Act for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Has the pledge been kept? Has the road been built within the time, and has it been built upon the terms? Have we not had the taxation enormously increased? Have we not had boasts from those benches opposite that \$20,000,000 have been paid into the coffers of the country by means of enormously increased taxation, and spent in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Do we not know that loan after loan has been brought down; that a loan was made last year largely for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that a Loan Bill passed through the other day, partly for the Canadian Pacific Railway; and that having raised the taxes to the highest point, and so dragged all we could out of the pockets of the people, and having borrowed all we could and given the cash to the company, we are now told that, having first taken all the taxes and given the amount to the company, and, in the second place, borrowed all we could and handed that too over to them—having come to the end of both those sources of revenue, we are now to give them our notes for the last advance. That is the position we occupy to-night. Under those circumstances, I say the prediction of the Liberal party that the policy of the Administration in 1872 would prove not a realisable policy, not a policy of which events would indicate the wisdom, has been proved by an accumulation of testimonies melancholy in their cogency, their force and their influence, on the future destinies of this country. Then the hon. gentleman has said that this general policy of 1872 was a policy which has conquered the North-West. This is the third conquest of the North-West which hon. gentlemen opposite have made. They made a conquest when they first took hold of the country—a military conquest. Then it seems there has been a peaceful conquest—I admit there is a domination by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway—and they have had another conquest since the Session opened. So, Sir, we find they are fond of conquest. They are a military form of Government; and now we find, not content with the conquests made under Wolseley and Middleton, they have conquered the North West with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and through the Canadian Pacific Railway they hold it in subjection. The hon. gentleman says that in 1876, at all events, whatever difficulties there had been before, however excusable might have been that short-sightedness,

that want of courage, that cravenness of spirit, which shrank from committing the people of Canada with three and a-half millions of people to undertaking within ten years to build this work, a work from which France or Austria would have shrunk, as I judge from the hon. gentleman's statement, that calculating spirit which induced us to come to the conclusion that it was impossible to realise the policy of hon. gentlemen of building it without an increase of taxation—whatever justification or palliation there might have been for those errors of judgment which the Secretary of State thinks we committed in 1872, but of which we are not at all ashamed to-day, and which we are quite prepared to reiterate to-day, and at all times, to which we point as proofs of our prescience and judgment, and as indicating our superiority in those ingredients of statesmanship to hon. gentlemen opposite—whatever palliation there might have been for errors of judgment and cravenness of spirit in 1872, there was none for our course in 1876, 1877 and 1878. In those years there was a confession of folly and incapacity, said the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), at the very commencement of his Administration, having come back to this House with a victory at the polls, upon a Canadian Pacific Railway policy which he had submitted to the people, which he had submitted in his speeches and Address, and in regard to which he had received the endorsement of the people, proposed his Canadian Pacific Railway Act. In that Act he proposed a re-enactment of the resolution and preamble of the former Bill, and repeated the declaration in these terms. I translate from the French :

"Considering that by the legislation of the present Session, with a view to fulfil the obligations of the Dominion, the Customs taxation has been raised to a figure much higher than that which existed at the period of the said resolution, and considering it is fitting to take measures for the execution of the said work as rapidly as it can be accomplished, without further raising the Customs taxation, etc."

His proposal then was to adhere to the view that the rate of taxation should not be raised, at all events, beyond the figure to which it had been raised by existing legislation, and that the road should be built after that fashion. An hon. member near, reminds me that the House was unanimous in sustaining those propositions. Then we were not wrong in 1874. I go further, namely, to the years of which the hon. gentleman has spoken. The hon. gentleman said—I took it down—that there was no room for doubt in 1876; and then he said, there was a confession of folly and incapacity because my hon. friend did not grapple with the work and did not do a great deal more than he did do, or propose a great deal more than he did propose. Sir, on the 7th April, 1876, the year in which the hon. gentleman says we demonstrated our incapacity to grapple with this subject, a motion was made to annex to the vote for the expenses of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the year these words :

"While granting this sum, this House desires to record its view that the arrangements for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be such as the resources of the country will permit, without increasing the existing rates of taxation."

So we find that once again, after all the negotiations which had taken place with British Columbia, after the discussions about the failure of the Carnarvon terms, when the question came clearly before Parliament, Parliament was called upon to decide whether they would adhere to the view that the arrangements, whatever they were, were to be limited by this condition, as to taxation, and Parliament did adhere to that view. It adhered to it, Sir, not by the ordinary party majority of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie)—he had 149 votes for that proposal. There were but ten who voted against it, and amongst those who voted for it, I will read a few names, for the edification of the Secretary of State, to whom this appears to be not merely ancient history, but history so ancient that he has but very obscurely learned it. Here are some of the names: Baby, shortly afterwards a member of

Mr. BLAKE.

the Government of the hon. gentleman, and since elevated to the bench; Costigan, shortly afterwards a member of the Government, and who with a slight interval of twenty-four hours, has ever since, continued a member of the Government and still graces the Cabinet by his presence; Desjardins—a well known and prominent supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite; Kirkpatrick—now Speaker of this House; Langevin—shortly afterwards and still a Minister; Masson—shortly afterwards a Minister, and now Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec; Mousseau—shortly afterwards a Minister, and now a judge—they seem to go up, these Ministers from Quebec; Ouimet—a firm and persistent supporter of hon. gentlemen, whether in or out of No. 8; Plumb, an ardent supporter of hon. gentlemen—rejected by the people, and elevated to the Senate; Robitaille—formerly a member of the Administration, and upon their regaining power, resuming his seat as a member of the Administration, and who having fitted, as so many of these Lower Canadian Ministers have done, became Lieutenant-Governor, and is now a member of the Senate; Rouleau—promoted to the Table. I will not go further, but I say, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman's colleague, the acting Minister of Railways, that he was amongst the ten who voted against the resolution.

Mr. McCALLUM. You raised the taxes afterwards; you did not carry that out.

Mr. BLAKE. The duties were raised, I think, to 17½ per cent. before that.

M. LANDERKIN. Two years.

Mr. BLAKE. At least a year before that time. We made no obligation that the duties should not be raised for any purpose; the resolution of the House of Commons was that the arrangements for the Canadian Pacific Railway should be such as that they should not interfere with the existing rates of taxation. Now, Sir, I think you will see that in the year 1876 there was a tolerably unanimous opinion in Parliament, and, at any rate, I hardly think that the successor of these many distinguished gentlemen from Quebec, who comes late from his Province, to fill the place of the worthy men who have gone up higher—I do not think that he is very well entitled to declare that the policy of my hon. friend from East York was a policy of confessed failure and incapacity, in the face of that resolution, assented to by all these gentlemen, which was its governing feature. He wanted, Sir, honestly to abide by the terms which hon. gentlemen opposite had professed to the country they would comply with, and he was determined to adhere to those terms, so far as he could. Then the Secretary of State, dealing with this ancient history still further, and, as it seemed to me, rather gleaming some of his information at second hand—in short, if I must say it, a good deal of what he gave us reminded me of some articles I formerly read in *La Minerve*—gleaning a good deal of this information at second hand, criticised severely the policy of my hon. friend from East York in building the railway from Fort William to Winnipeg, and not proceeding at that time with the construction of the line on the north shore of Lake Superior; and he also criticised our action in not proceeding vigorously in British Columbia. Why, Sir, I can point to another resolution during the time of my hon. friend's Premiership, moved by Mr. De Cosmos, formerly a member of this House, pressing for the construction in British Columbia, which was opposed, not merely by the vote, but by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, including the present First Minister, who thought that it was premature, that it was unreasonable pressure, that the circumstances had changed, and that construction was not to be hurried in that way. And with reference to the north shore of Lake Superior, I can point to the fact that when these gentlemen resumed office and propounded the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway policy in 1880, Sir Charles Tupper, acting as their spokesman in propounding that policy, himself declared in favor of the deferment of the line to the north shore of Lake Superior. He proposed to build into the prairie and to commence the construction in British Columbia, but he proposed nothing for the north shore of Lake Superior. On the contrary, he expressed the opinion that we could not undertake that construction at that time, and at that time the work of connecting Port Arthur with Winnipeg was approaching completion. Now, the hon. the Secretary of State passes very harsh criticisms on the conduct of my hon. friend in the matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He declares that he expended much money, that he expended it fruitlessly, and that very little had been done. I shall read you, Sir, a juster appreciation of my hon. friend's policy. I shall read an appreciation which, since the hon. gentleman seems to have been studying the literature of this subject, I am sorry he did not himself discover. The eminent man, whose utterances I am about to quote, said, in the year 1878:

"I will briefly refer to the amount of public money required in order to carry to completion works already undertaken, and contracts to which the country is now pledged. The amount of money required to complete the road from the shores of Lake Superior, at Kaministiquia or Thunder Bay, to Red River, is estimated, in round numbers, with a fair equipment, to cost about \$18,000,000. To that, of course, the country is committed."

He then refers to the subsidy to the Canada Central, to the Georgian Bay branch, to the Pembina branch, and the telegraph contracts, and so on, as making up the sum of \$23,456,000. Now, this eminent public man said:

"I have no hesitation in saying that the work I have referred to as involving an expenditure of over \$28,000,000 of public money has largely contributed to remove the difficulties and promote the progress of the entire undertaking. I believe, that as we originally looked to the development of the great North-West as the only basis upon which any Government or company could undertake the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so we cannot but regard the expenditure of \$28,000,000 of public money in permeating that difficult, almost inaccessible district of country, between Lake Superior and the Red River, as money expended in a way that is most likely to so develop, so improve and so people the great fertile country of the North-West, as to give us a substantial basis upon which we may hope to succeed in permeating the still more difficult and extensive region, from the Rocky Mountains down to the shores of the Pacific, and although the expenditure of public money has not been made within the Province of British Columbia I am free to say that that expenditure, in my judgment, has been made in a way much better calculated to secure the actual realization of this work than if every dollar had been expended in British Columbia, commencing at the shores of the Pacific, because no expenditure in British Columbia could materially contribute to the opening up of that great North-West region, upon the development and upon peopling of which must necessarily depend the successful prosecution of that gigantic undertaking, the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, I have stated that we have great advantages in the construction of such a work as this. There has been a great advance made within the past five years; not only have we accomplished an important work in providing for an early, rapid and easy communication to our own country, from the shores of Lake Superior to the Red River, but we have acquired information with reference to the North-West Territories which is invaluable in its character. High as was our estimate a few years ago, high as was the opinion we were warranted in entertaining as to the capabilities of the great North-West, we were comparatively ignorant of the vast extent of fertile lands of that country. The surveys which have been made, though attended with a large amount of expenditure, are cheap, compared with that which has really been accomplished, inasmuch as that we can only hope for the successful accomplishment of this great work by showing to the world the value and character of that country. I hold that the explorations that have been made and the increased knowledge that we possess of its resources place us in a position to appeal to capitalists much more confidently and successfully for this great work than would otherwise be the case."

Such, Sir, is the language of Sir Charles Tupper, speaking as the spokesman of the Government, in introducing their Canadian Pacific Railway policy of the year 1879, with reference to the administration by my hon. friend of matters connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway during the period of his Government. Such was the juster appreciation, such was the fairer view, such was the greater knowledge, which that hon. gentleman had of what had been done, and of the results of what had been done, than the Secretary of State, who comes late into this House and

seeks to fill his shoes, by making speeches diametrically opposite to those which Sir Charles Tupper made. Knowledge was fresher then; the Government had just come into power; they were just chosen, after fighting the battle for five years, which had terminated in their success at the polls; and fresh as they were from that combat, this was the measure of criticism of the policy of my hon. friend which the exponent of the Canadian Pacific Railway policy of the Government of the day gave on that occasion. I want no better vindication of the Liberal party or of my hon. friend, the member for East York, as its worthy representative, than the statement of the hon. gentleman who had been his political critic in Opposition for five years made, when he, himself, had assumed the responsibility of Administration. What, Sir, was the work my hon. friend was doing? Nothing? Were the survey moneys wasted? I have Sir Charles Tupper's word for that. Was the work between Port Arthur or Fort William and Winnipeg a waste of money, unless the line north of Lake Superior was completed? I have Sir Charles Tupper's word to the contrary, and I have the facts, too. We all know that the immigration to the great North-West takes place during the season of navigation, and that the moment we completed a road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, the season of navigation gave us a route for immigrants within our own territory, from the moment they touched the shores of the Atlantic to the time they were landed in the North-West. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite do not exaggerate the dangers to which the guileless immigrant is exposed in travelling on foreign soil; I express no opinion on that; but the step my hon. friend took was such as to provide us, during the whole season of navigation, with a safeguard against those dangers. What of the grain of the country? During those early years it would not be too great in quantity for shipment to come down by water from Port Arthur. So that that construction was, I believe, a wise construction, as part of a system largely taxing our resources, it is true, but still commensurate with our resources—a system which was to develop the great North-West and give us a means of communication with it. We felt, just as Sir Charles Tupper says, in the language I have quoted, that the North-West must inevitably be the backbone of any Canadian Pacific Railway; we felt that the development of the North-West was the prime condition on which the success of a Canadian Pacific Railway was possible; and the step my hon. friend was taking, though, perhaps, a bold step, in the circumstances of the country, was certainly an important step, as acknowledged by his adversaries, in that direction. Shall I go further? What charge was made in the contest of 1878 against my hon. friend, in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway? Why, Sir, the charge that was made was one I read the other day in this House. I read from a pamphlet of Sir David Macpherson, in which he attacked my hon. friend for going too fast and too far. His soul quavered at the idea of Canada having spent, from the time the project commenced up to the close of the financial year 1876, the heavy sum of \$6,250,000, but he has not blanched since, when the expense went to \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 a year. He pointed out that the proper course should have been to rely on the American roads, and not to attempt to obtain even the Port Arthur connection with the North-West by water and rail. That was his view, and when I read it the other day, I did not tell, for a minute or two, from whom I was reading; and from the usual corner arose the derisive cheers, because hon. gentlemen were sure it must be some Grit who said that.

Mr. McCALLUM, You did not read far enough.

Mr BLAKE. Well, the hon. gentleman, I dare say, will finish it some day; but I think he won't read that passage. I say, I heard the derisive cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they thought that was the sentiment of

some Grit, although we know it was the sentiment of an annexationist, who is fit to enter a Tory Ministry; but when I mentioned the name, hon. gentlemen ceased to cheer, and I thought they looked a little chop-fallen. Well, this was the criticism we met with; and I maintain that my hon. friend's policy in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the circumstances in which the country stood, was endorsed by the Parliament and the country. There was no issue on that subject, except the issue raised by Sir David Macpherson and his friends, through the circulation of this pamphlet. When hon. gentlemen opposite took office they did not depart so much at first from the policy of my hon. friend. In 1879 they proposed a policy of comparatively slow progress. They then thought British assistance was necessary; they thought we could not do this work alone, and they decided to apply for Imperial assistance. They declared that they would build a colonisation railway through the North-West, and they declared that they would make a commencement in British Columbia, but a commencement of a road in both cases of very inferior quality to that which had been before projected. To their proposition to build through the prairies, no dissent was offered; on the contrary, it was deemed a very good proposition. But, Sir, the eastern connection was at that time postponed. The hon. gentleman has shown the danger of getting out of one's depth. He has pointed out, amongst the evidences of incapacity shown by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), that there was 100 miles of railway which he had built and which the Canadian Pacific Railway was obliged to take up and remove. Now, I admit frankly that there was about 100 miles of railway built by the Government which the Canadian Pacific Railway found useless and removed, but it was not built by my hon. friend; it was built by this Government; it was built by hon. gentlemen opposite; it was built by Sir John A. Macdonald's Government; and therefore, if that be an evidence of incapacity, let the hon. gentleman take it to his own heart. The hon. gentleman then referred to my speech in 1880, and he read that portion of it which alludes to the view I expressed in 1874, with reference to these terms of building this railway within ten years. It is true that I entertained, rightly or wrongly—I thought then, in 1880, rightly, and I think now, in 1885, rightly—the view that it was not possible to comply with the terms of that bargain, and that it would be ruinous to this country to do so. I thought the country was deluded into that bargain, under the false pretence that it was possible to do it without creating an increase in taxation; whereas it was impossible to do it without increasing the rate of taxation; and I was disinclined to ruin my country, and British Columbia, as part of it, in the attempt to perform what I considered to be impossible. But I was not disposed, if British Columbia, after a frank, fair and loyal statement of that opinion, said: We insist upon the bargain being carried out; we will not relax the terms; we insist on the letter of the bond, and if you say you cannot do it, we wish to be released—I certainly was not disposed to hold British Columbia against her will; I was not disposed to say: Yes, we trapped you into a union with Canada upon a bargain we now find it impossible to fulfil, but we will not let you go, even if you want to; we will insist in holding you, though you wish to go. On the contrary, I was disposed to say to British Columbia: We are willing to go on and do our best to build this road as rapidly as the resources of the country, of which you form a part, will allow; if that will not suit you, if nothing but the letter of the bond will satisfy you, and if you wish to separate, we will not hold you against your will, on the terms of a bargain which we are unable to fulfil. I said that, and I do not think it was an unjust, a dishonorable thing to say. I think it was a fair, plain statement of what honesty and justice demanded of any man from the old Provinces of Canada to say to

Mr. BLAKE.

British Columbia. It was the least one could say to that Province, to tell it we would not hold it a slave and leave unperformed the terms of the bargain upon which it entered Confederation. Then the hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend made a proposal for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that it was a very expensive proposal, because, he said, my hon. friend, besides a subsidy in money and a subsidy in land, proposed a guarantee of 4 per cent. on a certain sum for twenty-five years. Now, a portion of this statement is true, but only a portion. It is not all founded on fact; for my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) did not state a sum; but the hon. gentleman himself stated a sum, the lowest he assumed it would be, and, therefore, he claims that the hon. member for East York made that offer. Now, what the hon. member for East York did was to advertise for offers to build the railway, stating, such a subsidy, in cash and in land, will be paid; if you want more, state for how much more of this guarantee of 4 per cent. will build the road. My hon. friend did not offer a particular sum; he did not say he would accept the tender; but he was determined to endeavor to secure an offer, to be submitted to Parliament with the advice of the Government, in accordance with the liberal policy which we insisted on while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. But the hon. gentleman, to make up a large sum of money, puts in this middle and unknown term. He assumes to be a tenderer, and he puts in a tender. I heard the words "bogus tenderer" applied a few days ago to a number of very respectable gentlemen; I will not insult the hon. gentleman by saying that he was a bogus tenderer, but certainly he comes late with his tender; and certainly, if he had come, in 1876 or 1877, and made that offer, he would have received the response that his proposal was too high. But there is another difficulty. The hon. gentleman names a sum, and he declares that a guarantee of 4 per cent. on that sum per annum for 25 years is equal to the capital. He declines the actuarial calculation. He declines to recognise the fact that a portion of this sum out-runs, in 25 years, a portion in 24 years, a portion in 23 years, and so on, and he actually multiplies 4 by 25, and says that is the proposal; and that is what he calls fair play and frank and loyal criticism. Then the hon. gentleman pointed out that there was a great difference in another point between this suggested offer of my hon. friend and the present position. He said the rolling stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway was nearly \$9,000,000, and would be \$10,000,000 very shortly. I do not so understand it. The term that is used in most communications that reach us upon the subject of that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's enterprise, is "equipment," and I do not understand the word "equipment," as they use it, signifies only rolling stock. I understand it to signify in part fixed equipment, and I base that understanding partly upon the report of the company, which appeared in yesterday's papers, under which, if I rightly recollect the figures, the company declared their rolling stock to be something like \$7,300,000, instead of \$9,000,000, so that the hon. gentleman, in that respect, also, has acted upon inaccurate information. The hon. gentleman then adverted to my speech in 1880, and pointed out the estimates that I had laid before the House of the cost of a first-rate road, which had been projected in former years, by the engineers, over the prairie country, and he declared that I had staked my reputation upon the fact that the cost of that road would be so much per mile, and that this was the same route as the Canadian Pacific Railway had followed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; the same route. Probably the hon. gentleman did not mean to say it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say it. I was very careful, and my hon. friend knows why, because the line was not on the same route.

Mr. BLAKE. I know it was not, and I want to know why the hon. gentleman, if he knew the line was not the same, ventured to attack me for having given an estimate that applied to the present line. He knows well that the present line is a cheaper line, that it has greater natural facilities than the line to Edmonton. If he will read the reports of the engineers carefully, he will find that the river crossings and the bridges are infinitely more expensive and the country, is much more broken, on the Edmonton route than on the southern route.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not the point. The hon. gentleman said I said the same line, and I never said so.

Mr. BLAKE. I so understood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You could not have so understood it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has no right to say I could not have so understood it. I say I did so understand it, and I will go further: I will say that a belief in the fair play of the hon. gentleman could have led me to no other conclusion than that he meant it, because, if he knew it was a different line, and if he knew that the comparison was useless, why did he state it? What is the use of comparing a line over one region of country with a line over another region of country, and saying that the particulars in regard to one region of country are applicable to a different region of country? What I stated upon that occasion I have more than once repeated in this House. My hon. friend, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), was familiar, from his experience and knowledge as a Minister, with the reports of the different engineers, given from time to time, as to the cost of the railway over the then located road. My hon. friend examined those reports and those estimates, and from them he brought out a statement of what the result of those estimates was. It was not my hon. friend's estimate; it was not my estimate; it was the estimate of the engineers. What my hon. friend, and what I, as the utterer of his statement, though I gave my authority, were responsible for, was taking reasonable care that we had correctly interpreted the estimates of the engineers, because that was what we proposed to lay before Parliament. That statement has never been controverted. No hon. gentleman has ever pointed to the reports of the engineers and shown that their estimates would lead to different conclusions than those which my hon. friend produced and put into my hands, and which, he sitting beside me, I gave upon his authority to that extent, and to that extent only. He made no estimate; I made no estimate; but we took the estimates of the permanent officers of the Government and laid before Parliament the result of that information. But we all know that this question is not to be decided upon the estimates of that day, and, in fact, these were estimates, not of that day, but of many years earlier. We know that railway construction in the year 1881-82 was very much cheaper than it was in the previous years. We know that railway construction in the year 1883 and in the earlier part—perhaps the whole—of 1884, was cheaper all around, steel rails and all, than it has ever been in the history of the country; and are you not to consider these circumstances when you deal with estimates? Are you not to consider the expense, the cost of labor, the cost of materials, the cost of rails, when you consider the question of the estimates which are given for a road? What we had to do with was the cost, at the time and under the circumstances under which construction took place. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that I gave the cost on that occasion as \$120,000,000, and the road will only cost—so he says—\$53,000,000. Now, what did the hon. gentleman mean by that statement? What did he mean

by putting in juxtaposition the two things? I gave the estimates of the engineers for the construction of the road by the Yellow Head Pass in earlier years at \$120,000,000, and no one has ever disputed that that was a correct statement of what the estimates were. The hon. gentleman says I estimated the cost of the road, and staked my reputation upon it, at \$120,000,000, and now it is costing the country only \$53,000,000. I will come to what it is costing the country presently; but, supposing it is costing the country only \$53,000,000, I want to know what was the meaning of his putting those two things in juxtaposition? Did I say it would cost the country \$120,000,000? I only stated what the road would cost, and if a company is to build it, paying a part of the cost, it is very different from the country building it and paying the whole cost; but the hon. gentleman puts the two in juxtaposition. Then, the hon. gentleman refers to the value of the railway lands. I will deal with the question of the value of railway lands a little further on. But, if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I will just touch it for a moment now. I was amazed to hear the hon. gentleman make his statement, and I had a mind, if he had not anticipated me, to have delivered, not in his admirable style, but with such humble approach to his histrionic powers as I could make, that lecture upon patriotism which he inflicted upon this side of the House. The hon. gentleman told us we need not be afraid of the cultivable lands in the North-West not being valuable, because there was not so much of them; it was a great mistake; half were rivers, and lakes, and marshes, and, of the other half, as I remember, one-half were ranching lands, and that left only eighty millions of cultivable lands. There is the statement of the hon. gentleman, depreciating this country, belittling our resources, minimising our assets, pulling us down to a poor, beggarly eighty millions of cultivable wheat lands in the North-West, when time and time again we have heard, in the thundering tones of the High Commissioner, the statement of the hundreds of millions of cultivable lands in the North-West. Only eighty millions! Only the small trifle of eighty millions, which will soon be taken up by—I forget how many families he said would take them up—and therefore you may expect your land to increase in value, because the supply will not exceed the demand. Well, that is a great source of congratulation. We will get the more for our land, because it will all be taken up, because it will soon come to an end. I have always believed, that after all said and done, the main dependence for Canada in regard to the lands of the North-West would be to put settlers upon them, who would be prosperous, and whose prosperity and the Customs duties they would pay would be the source of our wealth; that the main and ruling ingredient in our policy in the North-West, the ingredient to which all else should be subordinated, should be to keep the land for the settler and to give every facility for the settlement. But, if our estate is so small a farm, so comparatively small as the hon. gentleman has stated, perhaps the prospects are better of getting more out of the settler and making more money than we could when we supposed we had hundreds of millions of cultivable lands, since it appears that after all we have only this trifle of eighty millions. Then the hon. gentleman says that this side wants no road east of Callander, but only a local road. Where will he find that? He seems to think it is an absolute necessity, first of all, that the railway should be one railway, and secondly, that, if the railway is one railway, it should be made so by virtue of some great expenditure. Now, I have always believed that arrangements could have been made—and perhaps they were, in fact, made, for the mysteries of these transactions have not yet been revealed to us—whereby existing railways, when their availability and usefulness and value would be much enhanced by their being part of a trunk

line, could be made part of the trunk line by the proprietors becoming stockholders in the great trunk line, and putting in their property as part of the stock. But the hon. gentleman thinks it is only by paying hard cash, which the company is to pay out of its own resources, or of some resources, that this thing can be accomplished; and I dare say this thing will grow. I should not be surprised, since we see that the subsidy for the Short Line is to be nearly doubled this Session, that a proposal should be made to buy the line of the Acting Minister of Railways, to buy the Townships lines, to provide public money to buy these lines, which are to be parts of, and greatly enhanced in value by the construction of, a through line; that they are to be enhanced in value by the transaction, and then we are to pay more money because of the enhancement of the value. That seems to me to follow, from the hon. gentleman's line of argument; that seems to me pretty clear from the hon. gentleman's speech. Then, the hon. gentleman says: The company had given much more than this; that they brought a railway to Montreal, 345 miles. I was surprised that the hon. gentleman did not proceed to give us the benefit of all he knows in that direction. How in the world did the hon. gentleman come to forget the Laurentian Railway? I thought he knew all about it. I really did think that that was one phase of the transaction with which the hon. gentleman was perfectly familiar. But when he was stating the eastern acquisitions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he did not tell us one word about the acquisition of the Laurentian Railway, for about \$300,000. At the same time that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company bought from the Government of Quebec, of which the hon. gentleman was First Minister, the line from Ottawa to Montreal, they also effected the purchase, under an Act passed under his auspices, of the little Laurentian Railway, which they wanted, to use a vulgar illustration, just as much as a toad wants a tail; and it was very handsomely paid for to the hon. gentleman's particular friends. Then the hon. gentleman pointed out that there was a new policy adopted in 1881. I have pointed out that when the present Government took office, in 1878, their Canadian Pacific Railway policy was, relatively speaking, a cautious policy. I could read you large extracts from speeches, showing the necessity of going slow, and of caution in the view of the Ministers at that time; but in 1881 they took the great step and decided upon a contract policy, a policy of rapid progress and of completion of the line by 1891; a contract policy of enormous money grants, if we include the works the Government was to construct as cash—because, if the Government did not build them, the company would have to build them; therefore it is the same thing as cash—of money grants far in excess of anything that had ever been contemplated in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That which had been talked of was \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000, but at one fell swoop it was proposed to give \$25,000,000 in cash and \$28,000,000 in work, and to pay the surveys, at least \$3,500,000. We now find the Government works have cost \$29,500,000, so that you approach \$33,500,000 in money, or \$58,500,000 altogether. I say they then proposed that policy, and to that is to be added the Canada Central Railway subsidy, which had been already made, and which will give you \$60,000,000 as their cash proposals. I say that was an entire reversal of all former policies, because \$30,000,000 had been talked of as the extreme amount of cash we were to give, and here was a policy to give double that amount of cash and about the same quantity of land, here was a policy of comparatively rapid progress, of completion by 1891, of great grants, pecuniary and otherwise, and a policy of great monopolies. We opposed that proposition, and we declared there ought to be no monopolies. We declared that the country ought not to be bound for twenty

Mr. BLAKE.

years, as the hon. gentlemen opposite propose to bind it. We declared the future of the country ought not to be fettered, as they proposed to, and have, fettered it. We pointed out that the prairie country ought to be developed, and we were anxious to see it develop, but we said that many lines would be required for its proper development. We insisted that the ends of the road ought to be proceeded with more slowly, that more pains ought to be taken as to the route, that the progress ought to be slower than was proposed, that the grants should be less, and that the distribution of the grants should be such as to secure the completion of the work with those grants, instead of being made, in the way which was proposed, we insisted that the early and easy part of the work would be done first, and that we should be called on to fill up the gap afterwards. We insisted on these things. We said: There is no finality here, because we do not know how much the Government work will cost, because, in the mode in which you are locating these grants, there is no security for the road being built by means of the grants; you are not reserving enough for the heavy work. The Government promised finality. They declared that the aids were ample, were appropriately divided, for the thorough completion and adequate equipment of the railway, in the first place, while they declared that we would be entirely recouped out of the lands. They declared there would be no grievances whatever from the monopoly. They declared that the railway company itself would build plenty of branch lines. They declared that Manitoba could not and would not be checked, and that the proposed policy, therefore, would not apply to that Province. These were their statements in answer to our views. Now, Sir, as we have been called upon last year, and are called upon this year, to give further important aids, to alter seriously the position of the country, with reference to this railway, it becomes expedient to understand what the declarations and promises were upon which the original contract was entered into, so far as the hon. gentlemen are concerned. The First Minister declared that by the contractors taking up the enterprise "they relieved the country of immediate responsibility for building the road, in a great degree." But, I will prove that the contracted line has been built with our money, and that we have not been relieved from the responsibility of building the road in any sensible measure whatever. Sir Charles Tupper, estimating the amount of money for which Canada would get quit of its obligation to build and to work this railway, used these words:

"For the construction of the road from Lake Nipissing to Fort William, 650 miles, and from Selkirk to Kamloops, 1,350 miles—2,000 miles in all—the Government have agreed to pay, in addition to the \$28,000,000, \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres in land, making a total subsidy in cash of \$53,000,000, and in land—estimating the 25,000,000 acres at the same rate that I have estimated the land under the contract of 1873 and under the Act of 1874, \$1 an acre—of \$25,000,000; or a total sum to be expended by Canada for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway of \$78,000,000."

That was the declaration as to the terms upon which we were getting quit of our liability. Fifty-three millions in money is all that we were to spend, and twenty-five million acres of land was all we were to give. What we have in fact spent and what we are now asked to give I will investigate farther on. Then Sir Charles proceeds to say:

"We have reason to know that all that a command of capital can do they have the advantage of; we have reason to know that all that skill and energy and a knowledge of precisely such work will do, has been secured in order to make this a successful contract."

Then he makes a further unfavorable statement of what would happen if the English contractors, even of the greatest skill and capital, had undertaken the work. He points out that they probably would have failed, and predicts that horrible things would happen, many of which seem to have happened since. Then Sir Charles Tupper says, again:

"I have the satisfaction of knowing that throughout this intelligent country every man breathed more freely when he learned that the great, enormous undertaking of constructing and operating the railway was

to be lifted from the shoulders of the Government, and the liability the country were going to incur was to be brought within, not over, the limit which, in its present financial condition, it is prepared to meet; within such limits that the proceeds from the sale of the land to be granted by Parliament for the construction of the line would wipe out all liabilities at no distant day."

There was the pledge made when we were asked to make a contract. Our liabilities were \$53,000,000, and the proceeds of the land at no distant time were to wipe out every cent of that money and leave us free. Then the Minister of Public Works took up the cudgels, and he is generally rather cautious and precise in his statements. But influenced, I suppose, by that patriotic exuberance of spirit which his colleague, Sir Charles Tupper, sometimes showed signs, and with which, in his closing remarks, the Secretary of State also indicated he was occasionally afflicted, the Minister of Public Works made a very positive statement as to the result. He said:

"According to the contract the amount of money to be given to the Syndicate is \$25,000,000, and the amount of land 25,000,000 acres, worth, say, \$1 per acre. To these two sums you have to add the cost of the sections completed or now under construction, as far as Burrard Inlet, amounting to twenty-eight million dollars, so that the whole amount that will have to be expended by this country for completing the Pacific Railway is \$53,000,000, to which you must add the value of the land at a dollar an acre, making altogether \$78,000,000. Thus, according to our plan, we shall have the whole Pacific Railway completed for \$78,000,000, and with the guarantee that the company now to be inaugurated will work the road for all time to come."

At that time it was not deemed unpatriotic to insinuate a doubt that there might be difficulty about working the road. On the contrary, those hon. gentlemen who think it very unpatriotic that this matter should be questioned now, themselves took security in \$5,000,000 that the road would be operated. On the contrary, they told us that an enormous sum would have to be paid by the company during the earlier years to operate the road, and if we were paying large and liberal subsidies in money and land, it was to recompense the company and make them strong enough to operate the line. Then, the hon. gentleman, getting into that patriotic fervor to which I have referred, said:

"Does he (Blake) want to drive a hard bargain with these gentlemen? What reason could there be in attempting to cut them down to as small a figure as possible, in order to make the company a poor company? It is to our interest, and to the interest of the country, that the company should be able to construct the railway and work it afterwards, so that they shall not come back to us, year after year, and ask us for new terms. We want, once for all, to settle the whole question," etc.

Those were the opinions of the Minister of Public Works upon the question. Why should we cut the company down; let us deal with them liberally; let us not make them a poor company; let us make them a rich company, so strong that they will not come to us, year after year; that they will not come to us in 1884, for example, or in 1885, or in 1886; that they will not come to us, year after year, and ask for new terms. We want, once for all, to settle the whole question. Has the hon. gentleman, once for all, settled the whole question by the contract of 1881? Have they not come back, year after year; and who will say they will come back no more? Then the hon. gentleman said something which I thought was exceedingly sensible. I have heard something during the discussion to-day which was entirely opposed to the views of the hon. gentleman. I have heard it pointed out that we ought to regard ourselves as under a deep debt of gratitude to the contractors for and constructors of this road, and should deal with them in that spirit. What did the Minister of Public Works say:

"These men are not going to work that railway for the mere pleasure of doing so. They are not undertaking it for the sake of patriotism. They are undertaking it to make money, and they will make money, because they know that a railway through that beautiful country, settled with a large and thriving population, must give large returns."

That was the hon. gentleman's statement—a plain, business-like statement, such as the hon. gentleman knows how to make. We can see it all now. There is no longer a hazy atmosphere about it. It was the business, and not the patri-

otic motive; it was in order to make money out of the undertaking that the promoters undertook it; and the hon. gentleman said he was sorry if they did not make money. I hope they will make money; if they do not, it will not be for the fault of hesitating to come here. The hon. gentleman further said:

"The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has referred to the obligations and liabilities of Canada in connection with the railway. He says they are undetermined—that they have no finality."

How much are they nearer finality now?

"I generally find the hon. gentleman very logical, but I fail to see his logic in this case. I think our liabilities in the matter are as well determined as they could possibly be. Taking the land at \$1 per acre, we have a total of \$78,000,000 as the sum we have to pay. Surely there is sufficient determinativeness and finality in that calculation to suit hon. gentlemen."

The hon. gentleman was losing his temper; he ridiculed the idea of there being any want of finality and determinativeness in the calculation. What has happened since? We have altered the figures. We have given them \$29,500,000, or almost thirty millions since. We are to give them some more presently. The Secretary of State tells us to-day that although, when we gave them the loan, we took a mortgage, and were told we had absolute security under which we could get the road at figures appallingly small, dirt cheap, if they failed in fulfilling their bargain; still the Secretary of State tells us that was all a form, that we all understood it so; but the hon. gentleman was not here to understand it, and he did not hear the fervor and earnestness with which any such idea was repudiated by hon. gentlemen, his colleagues, or he would not have said what he did say. When that contingency was suggested, we were told that it was a fair and square bargain; that we were asked to advance money because it was clear we were going to get rid of paying so many millions if the company made default. The Secretary of State says we would have had to have bought up the stock. What is the use, then, of a mortgage, and of being on the top? The hon. gentleman makes a distinction, but it is entirely without a difference. He says it is an old loan; that it never was intended to deprive those people of their cottages; that, in fact, our bark was much worse than our bite. We took a very stringent mortgage, but we never intended to enforce it; it would not have been right to enforce it; it would have left a stain on the Government to enforce it; therefore, you are not to believe all you hear from us. That is the effect of the statement. For we certainly were told last year, when the bargain was made, that the mortgage was a good and valid mortgage, and was to be enforced. The Minister of Public Works said in 1881:

"I have shown, moreover, that not only will the railway be built by the Syndicate, but worked for all time to come; and that we have sufficient guarantees in our land to ensure both these objects."

That is quite true, if you make a little addition to it—if you pay the necessary further sum in order to accomplish that result. The Minister of Public Works further said:

"The leader of the Opposition asks why so monstrous a contract as this was brought down to Parliament. I tell him it was to secure our institutions, to increase our population, to enrich the country."

There was the object—it was to enrich the country. After another pause he goes on:

"Hon. gentlemen may or may not see that this is one of those great measures that a party, even in Opposition, should not hesitate to support. This is one of those rare opportunities that public men have to show how they can appreciate great measures and how they can foresee the future of their country. This is a measure which we, at all events, as public men, as the representatives of the people of this country, consider will be the crowning act of our lives."

Well, Sir, you may see that our appreciation of the results of the contract have been somewhat more accurate than that of hon. gentlemen. We declared that the bargain would not be observed; we declared that more concessions would be made, and these concessions have been made. They

declared that there was ample security, ample funds; that they did not want any further applications for aid. They wanted the matter settled then once and for all; but these suggestions have not been borne out. Then, during Christmas vacation, while the great debate was going on there was a meeting at Montreal, on the 9th of January, 1881, at which Sir Charles Tupper made a speech. He said:

"We must go on with the work, and now we are going to build the whole railway without costing the people a single dollar."

Then the Minister of Public Works, who could not attend the meeting, sent a letter, and *litera scripta manet* :

"By giving 25,000,000 acres and \$25,000,000 we will, by our scheme secure the building of the railway and its working for all time to come"

And persuaded by the assurances of the Minister of Public Works and the eloquence of Sir Charles Tupper, the meeting came to a resolution approving of the policy of the Government on this condition :

"While it limits our outlay and responsibility to a fixed annual sum."

That was the ground which had been pressed upon the meeting, and upon that ground these worthy citizens gave it their support. There followed, very shortly, a period of expansion, which we know and remember to our cost. There came the time of the boom, the season of the boasts of the Government—their boasts of progress; the time at which the company announced to them that they intended to complete the road in 1886, and great joy was uttered at that announcement. There came the time of inflated stock, the time of the changed policy about branches, of the outside schemes, the time of the inflated estimates of the results to the country itself; there came the good time for hon. gentlemen of 1882 and early 1883. There came the time, on the 4th May, 1883, when the Minister of Railways read a statement to the House, for its information, in making his annual Canadian Pacific Railway report—a statement from the Department of the Interior, declaring that, after a careful and exhaustive examination, they had come to the conclusion that the country would receive, within the nine years ending in 1891, \$58,000,000 in cash from the lands of the North-West. This statement was solemnly read, with grave face and measured tones, to prove to us that we were going to be recouped for our expenses. What were our expenses? We had heard nothing at that time of the loan of \$30,000,000, it was the original expenditure of \$28,000,000 or thirty-three and a half millions, just as you may count it, in Government works and subsidies, and \$25,000,000 subsidy. It was an expenditure practically to be covered by \$58,000,000. They had declared, in 1881, that they were going to pay this out of the lands of the country, and they brought proof to show it by an official document from the office of the Interior, running out the result with a critical, and, perhaps, I might say, an almost suspicious degree of accuracy, to a figure which neatly covered the required amount. The Minister of Finance, too, at the suggestion of the Minister of Railways, forecast the future and gave us estimates for several years. For the years 1882-83 he estimated that we should make out of public lands \$1,750,000; we made \$1,009,019. For 1883-84 he predicted a surplus from consolidated revenue of \$3,000,000; we got \$754,255. He estimated, as the proceeds of the lands for 1883-84, two millions and a quarter; we got \$951,636. He estimated a surplus from consolidated revenue for 1884-85 of one million dollars. Early in the Session, when he made his Budget Speech, he estimated \$350,000, apart from the lands, as the surplus for 1884-85, but I am sorry to say that even that modest surplus has long since disappeared, and has been replaced by appalling figures on the other side of the account. He estimated, as the proceeds of the lands for 1884-85, one million of dollars; in his Budget Speech for

Mr. BLAKE.

this year he estimates half a million. He estimated a surplus from consolidated revenue, for 1885-86, of one million dollars; in his Budget Speech of this year he estimated it at *nil*. He estimated the proceeds of the lands for 1885-86 at one million dollars; in his Budget Speech of this year he puts it at \$700,000, and I think, when the figures come to be revised, when the Supplementary Estimates come down, it will be found that that calculation will be largely cut down. He carried on these estimates down to 1891, estimating the comparatively neat round sum of \$1,000,000 from lands, and \$1,000,000 surplus from consolidated revenue each year, and he proved that we could pay for the Canadian Pacific Railway very handsomely in that and other ways. Well, the figures I have given you down to 1885-86, show 11,000,000 of an estimate, against the present estimate of \$4,164,000, or thereabouts, so that there is a large deficiency there. Meanwhile, while the boasts of hon. gentlemen were filling the land, while they were boasting of the great progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of the great progress of the country, of its wonderful development, of the great success of their schemes, of how everybody was going to be made rich, while they were calling on everybody to put on more sail, inviting prudent men to sink their hardly-made earnings in speculation, doing all they could to press on that inflation which we all remember—monopoly and disallowance were doing their work in the North-West, and the pressure for the main line construction overshadowed the earlier and wiser plans of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, to prosecute branch lines forthwith. That company brought forward a plan for the prosecution of branch lines of many hundreds of miles in length throughout the country. They were to be proceeded with soon—not when the main road was completed, as the First Minister said the other day, but almost immediately; but the moment that this project of completing the road from end to end in 1886 took shape, of course it was necessary that the company should strain every nerve and devote all its energies to the prosecution of a single long line, to the exclusion of the branches, and the people were worse off than if these promises had not been made, worse off than if these lines had not been projected. Large blocks of land had been reserved as railway lands; large territories had been pointed out to the country as to be permeated by railways; settlers went on these lands; other settlers were thwarted, and disappointment and distress prevailed through a wide extent of country, in consequence of unhappy alterations of plans. Then came the change of scene, in the fall of 1883, when hon. gentlemen opposite took the responsibility, executive, of agreeing to a thing in excess of their powers, namely, the arrangement to make the guarantee for the company. It was an arrangement the financial element in the success of which I have never been able to discern. The Minister of Railways declared that it ought to have succeeded, because all the most eminent financiers of Canada, New York and London had agreed it ought to succeed, and he could not make out why it had not succeeded. Well, I never could make out how it was expected to succeed, on the theory that money's worth was being given to the Government for the guarantee, and that money's worth was being extracted from the company to provide a dividend. How in the world that was going to increase the value of the stock to the holders I have never been able to see, and the public seem to have taken the same view, because the arrangement has been an entire failure. But the Government had committed themselves to the policy of agreeing that the company should appropriate enormous portions of its capital to the payment of dividends during construction and for years after construction; the Government sanctioned that policy and agreed to invoke the aid of Parliament, in which they were all-powerful, to make it lawful and to carry it out. The most injurious consequences flowed from that great

error of judgment on the part of the company and from that abuse of power and error of judgment on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, what followed? We met in the year 1884, and we were told that a loan was necessary, and a loan of \$22,500,000 was proposed, and a pledge of \$7,380,000 to meet the arrangements for the guarantee. We were told at that time that full investigation into all elements of the calculation was absolutely necessary, and that that full investigation had been made. Hon. gentlemen better their course with time. At that time they sent down two inspectors, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Miall, to the offices of the company, to inspect their books, to strike balances, and to make such a calculation as would be proper, in the event of a party being about to enter into partnership with, or to advance a large sum to, a respectable mercantile firm—I think that was the language of the late Minister of Railways. These gentlemen went down, and a few days before the final decision of Council was made, they sent in their report; I believe the decision had actually been made before the report was in. In point of form, only, hon. gentlemen opposite investigated the matter, but with reference to the engineering schemes of the company, with reference to the various sums they proposed to expend and the various purposes for which they proposed to expend them, there was the full report of the engineer on the letter of Mr. Stephen, in which he went into these matters, and staked his professional reputation as to the accuracy of the estimates and the propriety of the proposed expenditures. Then the proposal was brought up in Council; the Minister of Railways brought up these reports and laid them before the Council; the Council considered them, and they came to the conclusion to submit the matter to Parliament, and the Order in Council was brought down. Well, what is the action this time? The hon. gentleman lays a resolution on the Table, and about four days afterwards, speaking from memory, Mr. Miall makes the report. Did that inform the hon. gentleman's mind? He had decided his policy before Mr. Miall's report was made; everybody knew that he was going to lend the money, though not on the basis of Mr. Stephen's letter; the resolutions were laid on the Table, and after the Government had committed themselves to their policy, forsooth, they send down Mr. Miall to see whether they were right or not; and, strange to say, he finds they are quite right. Well, Mr. Miall sends down condensed balances—very condensed indeed. Twice I asked for the two large detailed balances from which Mr. Miall constructed his condensed balances, and hon. gentlemen have not thought proper to bring them down. They bring down the condensed balances, from which you cannot extract the true state of the question, and they decline to give up the detailed balances which would enable us to obtain some idea, even without the books, as to the state of the expenditure. Even as to the road, there are enormous expenditures proposed; there is a statement of a very large expenditure between Callander and Port Arthur; a large expenditure for snow sheds; \$910,000, or thereabouts, at Coal Harbor; in the works at Montreal, \$1,500,000, and large sums elsewhere; and on none of these has there been a single report. Neither the engineer nor the Minister has reported on one of them; and no evidence has been furnished to this House, even as to the propriety of one of these expenditures, at all. Even the form of an investigation has not been gone through, still less the substance. So far from that, when we met here, the Speech from the Throne contained no reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I called attention to this at once, and the First Minister said that the Speech contained no reference to the railway because it was not the intention of the Government to invite this House to legislate concerning the railway this Session. Another time I enquired whether he was going to bring down anything. He said it was not the present intention, and so forth. Then, had there been any

negotiations? There had been no correspondence—there had been verbal conversations, which he did not care to mention. Then comes the letter of Mr. Stephen, on the 18th of March; and then long negotiations with the company, stretching from that time till about the end of April, about six weeks; and then, at the end of April, come down these resolutions. Well, Sir, it is clear that if it was plain and obvious and reasonable, and in the public interest that these resolutions should be made, that the Government hesitated very much indeed about bringing them down. It is clear that the company were at their heels before Parliament met; it is clear that they have been dogging them ever since; it is clear that the Government having failed to come to any agreement to bring down any measure of relief, the company put their proposition on paper on the 18th of March; it is clear that the Government did not think that a proposition that they could reasonably ask Parliament to assent to. And they took six weeks more before they made up their minds to bring down any proposition at all. It is very clear, therefore, that in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite this was a matter involving very serious considerations. We met on the 29th of January, and it was not until the close of the normal period of the Session, when we ought to have been proroguing, that they brought down a measure for the Canadian Pacific Railway, although the subject had been under consideration from a time anterior to the commencement of the Session. Why this hesitation and difficulty about these negotiations? Why this pressure on one side and this resistance on the other, if the matter was so clear and straight and obvious—if hon. gentlemen opposite would have been so plainly recreant to their duty if they had neglected to bring down the measure at all? It is therefore very plain that hon. gentlemen opposite felt that they were in a painful position—a position of great difficulty and doubt as to whether they should bring down any measure at all. But other efforts were made to get information. I, myself, a little misdoubted the Government's power of resistance. I knew, of course, it would take a great deal of pressure, after what had happened in 1881, and after what had happened in 1884, before they came down, but I always was inclined to believe that the pressure would be applied, and that to it they would ultimately yield. I felt, it therefore, very important to attempt to be prepared and that this House should be prepared, with full information with reference to the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway, financially, and as to the earnings and working expenses of the road, and as to construction, and as to estimates from the period of the last loan; and very early in the Session I moved a series of motions on that subject, almost all of them being motions which were based on information given and thought proper to be given on the occasion of the last loan, or information given under Addresses granted by this House. The House unanimously adopted these motions; and by the unanimous consent of the Commons House of Parliament, it was indicated to His Excellency that it was in the public interest this information ought to be obtained. This information should be obtained. I shall not now, having a large area of ground to travel over, go over the several Addresses which, at a very early period of the Session, have been passed, asking for this information; but I will say this, that it was the duty of the Government to have pointed out to the Canadian Pacific Railway that if that company expected the Parliament of Canada to grant their application for aid they must comply with the demands of Parliament for information as to the operations of the company, and to have declined to bring forward measures for aid, unaccompanied by that information which Parliament unanimously decided it was in the public interest should be obtained. That information is a most important element. As to the working of

the road, as to what has been done with the public money and with the resources of the country, as to the results of operations, as to the expenditure and the fate of large sums of more or less questionable character which were in the accounts of last year—for example, the \$600,000 alleged to be due by the Northern American Contracting Company to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other sums—you find no information given at all, and a few of the less important papers are placed on the Table to-day, five minutes before this debate commences, by the Minister of Railways. Almost as a mockery, he says, I will give the papers just about when I am about to make the motion. I have not been able, of course, to investigate these papers; but, on glancing over them, I find they are not so full as they ought to be, and are not the papers of importance the House desires to possess. I ask, why should not these papers have been prepared by the company earlier, because they were asked for three or four months ago, many of them early in February last, why should they not have been brought down here in time for us to examine them in such a way that we might intelligently proceed to a discussion of the question. I say that the accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as they are submitted to Parliament and the public, are in a shape so condensed and contain figures that vary so that it is difficult in the slightest degree to analyse them. I think, that when information which would throw some light on this grant is asked for by Parliament, the company, which is demanding Parliament for further assistance, ought to comply with the demand of Parliament. Full information is a condition precedent to our acting. We are not, to use a vulgar phrase, to go it blind; we ought to get the information before being asked to vote the money. The Acting Minister of Railways, at an earlier period of the Session, also made a speech on this subject. He pointed out that he had visited the country, that he had gone over the railway, and he spoke in terms of enthusiasm of the railway itself, and of the Syndicate, and of the scenery of the Rocky Mountains. I was delighted to hear him, ordinarily some what unimpassioned, cool, and calculating, so exhilarated by that mountain air and those glorious prospects, that he indulged in these unwonted expressions of joy, and in such an appreciation of the picturesque. His railway journey reminded me a little of another railway journey that is memorialised in verse by Mr. Leland, and which I will take the liberty of paraphrasing:

"John Henry went to Shtephen;  
He drafel fast und far.  
He rided shoost drei thousand miles  
All in von rail-roat car.  
He knowed foost rate how far he goed—  
He gounted all de vile,  
Dere vash shoost von bottle of champagne,  
Dat bopped at efery mile."

I have no doubt, in the hon. gentleman's case, it was Apollinaris water and not champagne, but that would not suit the metre, and so I am obliged to use the ordinary liquor. The hon. gentleman went in a railway car, as several of his colleagues have done, without seeing very much of the railway, and he declares that the company has done more than they agreed; but after all what they have done and propose to do is what is necessary in order to have a good road. If there be one thing more than another which, at the time of the contract, and since, has been impressed upon our mind, it is that the road was to be a first-class road. We objected to the standard of the Union Pacific, as the Government put it in the contract, because it was a very imperfect standard. "Oh, well," they said, "there is no use to talk about that, because the company is certain to build a first-class road in every way; it is in their own interest to do so." "Why then," we asked, "put in any standard?" "We must," they said, "put in some standard." We urged that they should not put in a low standard, and they actually got a letter from the contractors to say that they

Mr. BLAKE.

consented to the standard of the Union Pacific, as it was at the time of the completion of the road in or about 1873, and not as it was at an earlier period; in fact, as it was when they had got it up to something like a first-class standard. Then, and every year since, whenever the Pacific Railway was touched, we were told that the road the company agreed to build was no mean, shabby, colonisation road, but a first-class railway; that the standard was a high standard, and that they were building a road as good or better than the standard. Now, the hon. gentleman says they have done more than they agreed to do; but what they have done it was necessary they should do in order to make the road a good one. Did they not agree to do all that was necessary in order to make the road a first-class one? Was it not to be a first-class road? If they are indulging in fancy expenditure more than is necessary for a good road, I do not see why we should furnish them with the money. By the agreement they are bound to do all that is necessary to have a first-class road. That was the interpretation of the contract forced upon us by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is what we have a right to expect. The hon. gentleman said we owed a great deal to the company. I thought, until he told us so, that it was the other way—that the company owed \$30,000,000 to us. But he said we owed them a great deal; and I suppose by these resolutions we are to pay them what we owe. His colleague joined, in a minor strain, in the same harmonious chorus. He said we owed a tribute to Mr. Stephen, and he proceeded to pay Mr. Stephen an oratorical tribute. I have no objection to his paying Mr. Stephen as many oratorical tributes as he pleases. No doubt Mr. Stephen deserves them, and I would be the last to say a word reflecting upon his title to the tribute; but while the hon. gentleman may pay his magnificent oratorical tributes to Mr. Stephen—and I am quite willing to give cordial assent to almost any tribute of that kind he may pay—I am opposed to the proposition to add to the oratorical tribute this other kind of tribute mentioned in the resolution. That is the sort of tribute people object to. They do not object to speeches lauding public men, but they do object to the hon. gentleman saying we owe the president a tribute, and moving a resolution declaring that we pay the company cash. We owe tribute to the president, therefore let us vote the money. It really becomes serious. I would like to know when we shall have done paying tribute to the company in the shape of money. I did suppose we had entered into a business transaction, in which we had given a particular price for the accomplishment of a particular object, and that there was no obligation on either side, except the obligation on our side to do our part as contracted, and on theirs to do theirs as contracted. Then the hon. gentleman said that they did a great deal more work than they were required to do, and they did this at this time, because they could do the work cheaper while the main work was going on; and he declared, in another part of his speech, or his colleague did, that the statements about extravagant expenditure due to haste were entirely erroneous. I can hardly think that either of these gentlemen have read the papers which have been laid upon the Table on this subject. Will you believe it, Sir, that these hon. gentlemen, who declare that it was cheaper to do more work than the company were doing at the time, while they were pressing on construction, these hon. gentleman who declare that no increased cost was produced by speed, have laid upon the Table of this House papers with reference to the work through the Kicking Horse Pass, which are to the following effect: Mr. Van Horne declares, on behalf of the company, that in the estimate which the company made, with reference to the sum required to complete the railway last year, on the occasion of the loan, he included a sum for a temporary line round a portion of the Kicking Horse Pass, as well as for a permanent line at that part. I will not pledge myself to absolute accuracy, but my recollection is that the figure for the per-

manent line was \$960,000, and the estimate for the temporary line a trifle over \$400,000. Mr. Van Horne declares that he made that double estimate because it had been his intention to build the temporary line first and then the permanent line almost immediately afterwards, within the period prescribed, by September, the temporary line to be built in order to get on with the operations beyond. He then proposes, in this letter to the Government, to get permission to postpone the construction, for some years, of the permanent line, for reasons to which I will allude a little further on, and he says: If you will allow me to do so, it will be a positive saving, because, by taking time and by using the ties and rails in the temporary line, I can build the permanent line for so much less that it will save actually the amount of the cost of the temporary line; the price of labor is so high, and it costs us so much more to do the work quickly within the specified time, that we will save the whole cost of the temporary line we are going to construct if you will allow us to postpone the permanent line; it will cost us 50 per cent. more to build that \$960,000 of work within this time we have stipulated for than it will if you allow us some further time to do it. The report of the chief engineer of the Government is that his opinion is, and that he himself estimated for that twelve or thirteen miles of permanent line, about \$960,000, and that in that estimate he added 50 per cent. to the cost, in consequence of the speed of construction, and that he believed it will cost no more than, I think, some \$630,000 or \$640,000—as I said, I will not profess to be accurate to a few thousand dollars—if time is given for the construction of this permanent line, being less by 33½ per cent. than he had estimated, when he added 50 per cent. to the cost of comparatively leisurely construction for expeditious construction. Now, there are the papers on the Table of this House proving how much extra it has cost to build this line at the speed at which it was built, and with these papers and the company's statement, and the Government engineer's statement, brought down by hon. gentlemen opposite, they ask us to vindicate this extra expenditure as a prudent expenditure, because it could be done cheaper now, while they were straining every nerve, hiring every available man, and raising the price of labor, than it could be done later on! How are we to take it? I have the statement of the vice-president of the company and of the Government engineer as to its costing 50 per cent. more in this particular part to build this railway with speed. I have the statement of the Acting Minister of Railways, that it is cheaper to do the work in a hurry than it is to do it with more time. Which am I to believe? Then the hon. gentleman said—and he came there to a very tender point—that we had no right to anticipate the necessity for these works last year. He said that was the difficulty, and there we get back to the allegations of last year. We find that last year the statement was made as to the plan upon which this company was to construct the road. We find last year that their plans were made for completion. We know that they were plans for a first-class road. We know that they were plans involving large expenditures. We know that they contemplated the construction of elevators and of great works, and we were told last year that the subsidy, the aid that we were giving was ample to complete the road. The contract is to complete the road. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the contract will be completed in September. I deny it. I say our contract will not be complete in September. Our contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to have a completed road. They will have the iron down by September, but they themselves say they are not going to open the road for business till the spring following. Why are they not? Why in the world are you not going to open the road and to reap all the profits which are to accrue the moment the road is opened? What means this insanity, of keeping a road some thousands of miles

Mr. BLACK.

long closed to traffic some months after it is completed? Open your doors, run your trains, take your freight trains across, from one side of the continent to the other, and reap your dividends. Oh, no, they say; we are not going to begin till the spring of 1886. And why? Because the road is not going to be completed till the spring of 1886, because all that is going to be done is to get a pair of rails from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Of course, there are parts of the road, and considerable parts of the road, which are completed; but according to the confession of the company, the entire road will not be completed till next year. They say, forsooth, that the contract is completed. They say that all they have agreed to do will be completed by September. I say our contract was to have a road quite complete, a road fit to carry traffic, a road in such a condition that the traffic could be carried over it, a road to be opened, and then, from the time of opening, the agreement as to maintenance went on. They say: We will have completed the contract in September, but the road will not be so far finished that we can open it up for traffic. No, it will not be completed; else, I presume, they would open it for traffic; but in many respects, even if it were open for traffic, it would not be complete, in the proper sense of the term. I observe that an eminent engineer, who was for many years connected with this road, and is now a director of it, Mr. Sandford Fleming, after passing over a portion of the road the other day, sent a telegram, in which he stated—I cannot remember the exact words—that either a large quantity or a considerable quantity of work remained to be done, but it was of the simplest character. Well, we know that a large quantity remains to be done between Callander and Port Arthur, because a great portion of the places that have to be crossed are crossed by trestles, not only small rivers, but ravines and depressions in the ground of various kinds, are crossed by trestles. Of course, these trestles are intended to be filled up with earth, and I presume the simple kind of work Mr. Fleming speaks of refers to that. Now, I do not care whether the work is simple or complicated; what is important to consider is, that there is a large quantity of work remaining to be done, and that is the statement in this very telegram. The circumstance to which I have just alluded, and the other circumstance, of the road not being intended to be opened for business to the Pacific until the spring of 1886, are sufficient indications that we are not getting a completed road. The hon. gentleman says we are getting all we really bargained for, because the road is completed within the meaning of the contract. But it is not completed so as to be fit for use; it is not completed so as to be serviceable for the purpose for which we wanted it; for that purpose you have got to pay more money. The statements which are made upon this subject, and also with reference to the effect and consequence of this loan, are material in considering our present condition. Sir Charles Tupper said:

“They are in a position to say to the Government, we can fall back upon our contract; we can disband our force of 9,000 men now operating near Lake Superior; we can draw in our engine, and by 1st May, 1891, we shall be able, to sell land enough to provide with the net revenue for operating all that we require.

“We shall have the means of completing our contract; but if you want that great work completed by the end of 1885, we ask you not to give us an additional dollar, but to advance to us, as the work proceeds, the amount of \$22,500,000 for that purpose. I have told the House, in the first place, that they do not ask an additional dollar of subvention for the purpose of completing the contract they have made with the Government.

“I have told the House the company have the strongest confidence in the value of the subvention already given; that with the amount that can be obtained from the outside public and that has been obtained from the outside public, they have the means of completing their contract. But while they do not ask the House to give them a single additional dollar, they ask us to use the credit of this country which, thanks to the management of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, never stood in a higher position, to obtain the means of accomplishing this great national work by the end of 1885, and that without imposing the slightest shadow of a shade of additional burden upon the Government or upon

the country for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract was to be completed, the 1st May, 1891."

First of all, then, Sir Charles Tupper declared that the contract was to be completed and the road was to be completed, and now we are told that the contract is completed but the road is not completed. Then, Sir Charles Tupper says: "You are to do this without imposing the slightest shade of a shadow of additional burden upon the Government or upon the country for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract is to be completed, the 1st of May, 1891." I wonder to what date the new loan, now under negotiation in London, is to run; I wonder for how many years the Minister of Finance is asking the public to loan us the \$30,000,000 which we authorised him to borrow the other day. Is it a short loan, to mature in 1891, so that he may not be embarrassed, as he stated a while ago he would be embarrassed, by the circumstance of getting so much money from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by 1891? I wonder whether it is a short loan of that kind that the Minister of Finance is now making, or whether he has abandoned those golden dreams which, so late as the Budget Speech, haunted him, of receiving from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company \$30,000,000 by 1891, and earlier. Perhaps some hon. gentleman—perhaps the Minister of Customs—who knows the date of that loan, would relieve our minds, and would tell us whether it is a short six years' loan, that the Government may use until they get the \$30,000,000 from the Canadian Pacific Railway, in 1891. I am afraid that they have abandoned that hope; I am afraid they have decided it will be a good many more years before they get back their money. I am afraid that there now exists more than the slightest shadow of a shade of an additional burden upon the Government or upon the country, for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract was to be completed, the 1st of May, 1891. You know that already, in consequence of this loan, we deferred negotiations for the exchange of 5 per cent's. for 4 per cent's. for six months, because the Minister, having to provide a large sum of money for the Canadian Pacific Railway, felt that he could not call in the old loan. You know that we lost the interest, being the difference between 5's and 4's for the half-year, and have been making various other short loans in order to pay this Canadian Pacific Railway; we have been making various other loans at some pretty fair rates of interest for them, too. The hon. the First Minister sometimes says that a little bird told him something. Well, Sir, a little bird told me something, it told me that 5½ per cent. has been paid for a portion of this money borrowed for a certain time from some of the banks. Well, when we are borrowing money from the banks in order to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when we have got to give our Exchequer bills for other money; when we are told now, as we are in effect told, by the silence of the Ministers, that the expectation of getting the loan in 1891 is abandoned, and that we have to make a long loan instead of a short loan, it is evident that the words of Sir Charles Tupper, which I have read, have hardly been verified. Then, says Sir Charles Tupper:

"I do not rest these resolutions for a single moment on the low ground of any claim that these gentlemen (the Canadian Pacific Railway Company) have. They have no claim. They made a contract, and they received, by the terms of that contract, a magnificent subvention for the work, great as it was, that they were undertaking to deal with; and they have, no doubt, prospective profits of a large character before them. I do not ask, for a moment, that these resolutions shall receive the consideration of this House on any such claim."

At that time, also, it was as a business operation this was treated, though now, it seems, there is an attempt to treat it on some other and so-called higher ground. Now, the Acting Minister of Railways declared that our security was actually improved by this operation—it was not a loan unimpaired; that would not satisfy the Minister; he wants to improve our position, and so he improves it by this

Mr. BLAKE,

operation. Why? Because the money had been put into the work. But it was contracted that the money should be put into the work. That was the security on which the old loan was made. It was upon the express agreement that the money should go into the work. It has gone there, and the money is going to stay in the work. To tell us that our position is improved by the money going into the work seems to be perfectly absurd. The hon. gentleman says that thirty-five millions of stock was to go into the work. I deny it. The whole theory of the arrangement of last year was that the stock was not saleable. The Government took it, and said: We take power to sell it, if we think it rises to a price at which it should be sold, and we take power to use the proceeds at our discretion, either in payment of the debt or for the purposes of the company. The company could not have disposed of the stock, because the Act of Parliament gave the Government the discretion to say when it should be sold, and whether the proceeds should be applied towards payment of the debt or not. The Minister of Railways, who was presiding over the measure, proclaimed that it was to be so applied; that the amount was to be used as a means of repaying the loan. But the hon. gentleman said, what are we doing? We are making another arrangement in respect of \$35,000,000. This new arrangement, about \$35,000,000, is an arrangement of an entirely different character. If the money had been realised from the stock and had gone into the work below our security, and the stockholders had no special claim, our mortgage would be improved by the value produced by the amount that went into the work. But if we gave power to the company to place, say, \$15,000,000 on a par with ourselves, and that sum goes into the work, we occupy a different position. Let the Minister of Railways, as a first mortgagee of a farm, consider a mortgage transaction, and see what is the situation supposing a second mortgage is put on after the first, for improvements on the mortgaged property. He then would be in a very good position, because he would be able to cut out the second mortgage, and his property would be made more valuable. But suppose the mortgagor came to the Acting Minister of Railways, his first mortgagee, and said: Mr. Pope, I want to improve the property, and for that purpose to put a mortgage on it, which will stand in the same position as your mortgage; in fact, I want to have a joint mortgage. I think the Minister of Railways would be acute enough to see that he would be placed in a different position; that his position, although the money went into the property, would not be quite so good as if it had been placed there under a second mortgage. So with respect to the stock. Then, the hon. gentleman declares that this arrangement will give satisfaction. He makes a statement with respect to the Government work, and admits an error in the calculation of a million and a-half. He excuses the error by saying it is due to the deterioration, the wear and tear, that resulted during the six or seven years since the road was constructed. Was that not known last winter? Did not the Government, which had charge of the road, know its condition? Were they not aware of what was necessary to put it into proper order? Is it only this Session that it is known that ties and rails wear out and the roadbed gets into a bad condition? Last winter we were told emphatically that twenty-eight millions was the cost of the Government work. It is strange, indeed, that they were not in a position, last Session, to say that this large sum would be required. I remember there were loud boasts made, when this Government came in, as to the savings on this section. They said they had cut down the amounts very low; but it has since turned out that they have increased the expenditure. The hon. gentlemen who have brought this measure forward have submitted a statement by Mr. Stephen, which is the foundation of the measure. Mr. Stephen's letter contained

a proposal on his part as to what the Government, in his opinion, ought to do for the company, and what the company would do if their wishes were complied with. The Government declined to accede to Mr. Stephen's proposal. I enquired whether, under the arrangements made for the altered proposals, the company had agreed to perform those things which they said in their letter they would perform, provided their own proposals were acceded to. And I could not get a satisfactory answer. I got it yesterday. It came in the report of the company, at their annual meeting. They think they have been rather hardly used by the Government. Mr. Stephen's letter will show the House that last Session the company remonstrated earnestly but ineffectually against the harshness of the Government, and pointed out the bad results that would flow from that harshness. The company says :

"The company, it will be remembered, at the time of the passage of the Act, earnestly, but ineffectually, remonstrated against the severity of the conditions on which the loan was granted, especially pointing out the damaging effect on the future credit of the company of the stringent and apparently inequitable character of the remedy taken by the Government, in the event of default by the company, and their apprehensions in these respects have been fully realised."

You will see, though we were not told it last year, that we were held to be harsh creditors, dealing with a reluctant debtor, and that we were going to injure the company by the severe terms imposed. They appear to be very good terms. The company, however, it seems, remonstrated against the Government lending them thirty millions, part at 5 and part at 4 per cent., and taking over the road if the company fail to pay back the money. We find now that the Government, on default being made, would not have taken over the road. We find that it was all a farce and a deception, and that it was useless to append that condition to the loan. I believe in making a bargain in plain terms, which will be carried out, and that a contract should express what is really intended. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told the House and the country that the arrangement with the company meant one thing, while they had a personal understanding with the company that it should mean something entirely different, something much less; that, if it became necessary to take over the road, the stockholders were to be dealt with on reasonable terms. Such is the statement of the Secretary of State, who then, as now, was a member of the Administration. If that be so, it is a most extraordinary commentary on the decision of Parliament, on the speeches made and the representations given to the country at that time. But we see the fatal effect. Mr. Stephen comes forward and says that if the Government grant the terms he asks the company will be enabled to complete the whole railway, to build the line to Coal Harbor, to construct the terminal works at the various points, to provide additional equipment, to build elevators and to pay off the floating debt, and so on; and then, after this is done, he says :

"It would then be in a position to proceed, 1st, with the much wanted extension of the Manitoba South-Western Railway; 2nd, with the completion of the line to Sault Ste. Marie; 3rd, to secure, in some way, a connection with the city and harbor of Quebec; 4th, with reasonable aid from the Government, to extend the Canadian Pacific system to the ocean-ports of the Maritime Provinces; 5th, it would also be in a position to aid indirectly in securing the early completion of its Ontario division to the Detroit River, and at the same time removing for ever all necessity for any further application to the Government for assistance on the part of the company."

These seven things he speaks of, showing that we have not removed that necessity by the last Act, though we were told so, and unless we grant this condition we do not remove that necessity, yet I find that in the report of the company, as it now stands, they say :

"This measure does not afford means for so complete and advantageous an arrangement of the company's affairs as would have been obtained under the conditions suggested in the president's letter of the 18th March last."

They go on to say :

"But the company is being pressed in several quarters for extensions and additional facilities beyond its main line, some of which it desires to provide; and although the directors hope that the measure proposed may also enable them to meet the more important of these requirements, it remains to be seen how far the Government measure, in reducing so largely the relief the company requested, may not restrict its power of providing for the extensions of its connections which the company and the public, and, it is believed, the Government, also, so desired to see carried out; any may not also interfere with the intention and wish of the company to anticipate the period of the repayment of the Government loan."

There you see, Sir, the direct statement, very pointed, that it is not expected to be within their power to carry out these various things which they proposed to carry out, which they pledged themselves to carry out, if they got their own terms. So we have not now the assurance that the conditions of Mr. Stephen's letter will be fulfilled; but, on the contrary, we have a fair and frank statement, which it does him credit to have made, that those terms are inadequate to produce such results. In that point of view, I think we have important considerations presented to us. It does seem to me that it is necessary for us to know what this arrangement will accomplish. Sir, we have been asked to assist this company once and again, and now for the third time—to make the contract first, to assist secondly, and now to assist again. And we want to know distinctly what is going to be accomplished. Is this to be the last time of calling? How much is the deficiency? What changes are to be made? What additional expenses incurred, in order that these things shall really be done; else this will not be the last time of asking, and we must expect to be called upon again? The hon. gentleman dealt, in this portion of his speech, with the question of the route of the road, and he gave us some statements as to the route, and some comparative statements with reference to this road, and the other Pacific roads which demand some attention at my hands. I did not intend to say much upon that topic, nor, indeed, had I intended to touch to any great extent upon the topics which have occupied me up to this time, but the unusual course which was pursued, in making two speeches, and dealing with all phases of this question, from the earliest period to the end, of course rendered it necessary that an answer should be made at the earliest practicable moment, and as fully as it could be by one individual, with such disadvantages as one individual labors under in speaking at this hour in the night, and after the House has been sitting nearly 12 hours. But those statements demand from me, and they shall receive, reply. I have not been able to agree to the wisdom of the change in the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have never been able to see that it was dictated by a wise appreciation of all the facts, properly collected, before the decision was arrived at. I maintain that the decision was arrived at and acted on by the company, long before they had found the route through the Kicking Horse Pass. I maintain that they, having determined to risk the Kicking Horse Pass route, have in the end, persuaded the Government, during the absence of Sir Charles Tupper, and while the hon. gentleman who is now acting was acting as Minister, to agree to a modification of his former policy. Mr. Speaker, it has just been intimated to me that the Government is willing to consent to an adjournment. I am sorry to ask it, but as I am answering two speeches late at night, it would be a convenience to me, as I have a good deal to say yet in reply to them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was intimated just now that the hon. gentleman was about one-half through his speech, and that he was desirous of an adjournment. Under these circumstances, perhaps he will move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BLAKE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:20 a.m., Wednesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 17th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) 'An Act further to amend 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' and 'The Liquor License Act, 1883,' be made the first Order for Thursday after Routine Proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Pope's proposed motion, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. When the House adjourned last night, I was adverting to the question of the route of the railway, upon which something requires to be said, not merely in consequence of the intrinsic importance of the question, but also because reference has been made to it by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the other important question of grades, curves and alignment of the road. I pointed out that I had not been able to assent to the views that it was a prudent thing to change the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State, declared—as I showed from the language of Sir Charles Tupper last night, erroneously—that the surveys which had been made under the auspices of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had been entirely useless. I admit a portion of these was less useful than it would have been had the route adopted by both Governments, that by the Yellow Head Pass, been fortunately retained. It is to be remembered that the present Government, as well as the Government of my hon. friend, formally adopted that route which these surveys led them to conclude was the proper route; and it was not until after the enterprise had been placed in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the present Government agreed to a change of route. That change was dictated by considerations which did not give due attention to the topographical features of the country through which the road was to pass. I make that statement without hesitation, because the public papers prove that there had been no ascertainment of a real practicable route when the company began to press upon the Government to accede to their determination to go south. I believe the company speculated on the possibility of a route being found through the Rockies, the Selkirk and the Gold ranges, and that they were anxious to secure a southern route through the prairies for two reasons. First, because it was known to be an easier line, one requiring no considerable bridges, requiring none, in fact, of importance except one across the Saskatchewan and a much less expensive one across the Assiniboine, thus being a better

Mr. BLAKE.

railway country, in that respect, than the other line, and therefore affording cheaper construction. Secondly, and perhaps a more important object to them, because they believed it would enable them more effectually to control and dominate the traffic of the North-West. The nearer they got the main line to the international boundary, the less danger there would be for them of pressure for the construction of a line south of their line. These were the points of view of the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway which led to this conclusion. They built their line through a country which is not equal to the territory of the central route. I point to the fact that the statement made by the First Minister is before the House, which shows that not a single homestead has been taken up between the 3rd and 4th meridian on the 48 mile belt, and between the 4th and 5th meridian only 23 homesteads have been taken up, thus giving a total of 23 homesteads on more than 400 miles of railway, stretching between a point close to Moose Jaw and a point close to Calgary. I point to that fact as one of great consequence and importance. I point also to the second fact, that between the 3rd and 4th meridian, the company has accepted 524,100 acres, while in that same area between the 3rd and 4th meridians it has assumed to reject 126,720 acres, or about one-fourth the area accepted. That figure is also of great consequence. I do not believe there is any serious dispute as to the proposition that the territory is in fact inferior. I observe that in the speech of Sir Richard Temple, made in Winnipeg, in September, 1884, he used these expressions on this subject:

"They were anxious to impress the consideration that the Canadian Pacific Railway was only the beginning of the vast railway system, nothing more or less than the main artery from which must branch out many veins, the backbone of the body politic, the limbs, arms, toes and fingers yet to come.

"The Canadian Pacific Railway runs through a rich country no doubt, but still not the richest, the richest country was far to the north, and to that country branches must extend. Critics said that the main line ought to have been taken farther north, but no doubt the wisest course has been followed, because the main trunk runs nearly as straight as an arrow from ocean to ocean.

"The remaining work of constructing branches was what ought to be called the crying want of the North-West.

"They had heard many remarks from many farmers to the effect that branch railways were wanting towards the south from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway so as to make connection with the railways advancing upwards from the United States.

"The great and pressing importance of these matters should receive consideration."

Now, this gentleman voiced, I suppose, the general information of those whom he had met in the extended tour which he and his confreres of the British Association took through the North-West, and gives them as the impression of the people of the country with reference to the relative quality of land on each route, and also as to the necessity of branch lines southward as well as northward. He also points to the wisdom, in his view, of building a straight line, but we know that, in railway construction, it is not always the straightest that is the shortest line. The question of curves and the question of grades tend materially to determine the practical shortness of a line of railway. There is also the question of the comparative character of the climatic conditions of the two passes. In the Yellow Head Pass, as is found by the reports of the engineers who visited that region for a long time, who traversed it frequently, and also by the reports of explorers and travellers for many years through that country, there are no traces of avalanches or snowslides. But, both on the Rockies and on the Selkirks, and perhaps on the Gold Range, at the crossings of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the case is entirely different. If you refer to the papers laid on the Table, you will find that Mr. Vice-President and General Manager Van Horne applies, I think in the month of September last, to be allowed to make permanent for some years the temporary line round a portion of the main proposed line in the Kicking Horse Pass, and the reason why he proposes to

make that line permanent for some years—a line with gradients of 237 feet to the mile and with very severe curvature—is, as he declares, that there are several boulder slides along the main located line, and there is one avalanche or snowslide moving from a glacier high up in Mount Stephen, that the engineers have been observing the movement of these boulder slides and this snowslide for a considerable time past, but that they have not been able to decide what would be the proper route in order to avoid the dangers and difficulties arising from them, and that several years, I think, is the phrase, but at any rate a very considerable time of observation will be necessary in order to establish the proper permanent route across the Kicking Horse Pass; and therefore, says Mr. Van Horne, I ask your approval of our opening the road and working it for some years to come with the temporary line we have built to facilitate construction. He proceeds to point out, rather in contrast to the glowing terms which we hear as to the great traffic that is to go over the road from China and Japan, and to China and Japan, that the severe grades to which I have referred, the grade of 237 to the mile, the severe combined grades and curves, are of less consequence there because the traffic will be comparatively light for some years to come, and will not compare at all with the traffic in the prairie country. So I find a complete proof, from the application of the president of the company and the assent of the Government to that application thus formally made, agreeing in the force and strength of his reasoning, and determining that for some years the temporary line is to be used, in order that they may see what the permanent location should be; that there are difficulties in the Kicking Horse Pass which do not exist in the Yellow Head. Then I come to the question of the Selkirks, close to the Illecillewaet Creek, which descends from a point close to the crossing of the Selkirks, going westwards towards the Pacific Ocean, and I find that, in answer to a question put by me early in the Session, the Minister of Railways declared that they had no reports upon the subject of snowslides in that region at all, but that the engineers had been ordered to observe. Later on, in answer to a question put by me, on information I had received from the west, he declared that the company had made an application to change the location they had already made at that point, and to make a new location, because the location which they had adopted was an impracticable location. Why? In consequence of the snowslides there. And the other day I applied to know whether the new location had been laid before the Government for approval, and the hon. gentleman said it had not yet been laid before the Government for approval. But in his former statement he had said the proposal was to adopt a location which would lengthen the line some  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles. The Government, then, has not yet got a practicable location across the Selkirk Range, the company has not yet got a practicable location across the Selkirk Range, because unquestionably, if the company was in a position to submit the profiles and plans and the requisite information for that practicable location, having long ago informed the hon. gentleman that they could not use the location which they had adopted and which he had approved, and would be obliged to resort to a new one and having given some general information upon it, they would have submitted the new location and the evidence. But the hon. gentleman has not yet submitted any evidence upon the subject of the snowslides. Now, this is a most material and important question. You find, at the two great crossings which are involved in the change of route, if there be not three, if the Gold Hills be not considered a third, the question of boulder slides and snowslides or avalanches assuming great and disagreeable prominence, and you find us actually to-day without information in the hands of the Government or in the hands of the House that there is a really safe, practic-

able location across these mountains. The hon. gentleman has received, or at any rate has brought before the House, no evidence as to what the condition of things has been in reference to the snowslides on the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Selkirks; but I have found some information which has been accessible to the public, and I read it to the House in order that we may understand if it is not possible to obtain some authentic official information upon a question so critical and important as this is; and I beg the House to observe that by the course which has been taken, in determining the location through the North-West before these important, crucial questions of the crossings of the Selkirks and the Rockies had been decided, by sufficient length of time in exploration, by sufficient length of time in observing the climatic difficulties, we were plunged into that particular route and pledged to that particular crossing. I say that was an act of great imprudence for which the Government is responsible. Long ago difficulties had been stated by the aboriginal inhabitants to exist in that part of the country. Of this very place, in 1865, Mr. Moberly, an engineer, said:

"I tried to induce the Indians to accompany me all the way across the Selkirk Range."

In another passage:

"All my efforts were unavailing, as they affirmed that, if we went in, we should be caught in the snow and never get out of the mountains."

In another passage:

"We soon found ourselves 500 feet below the summit. The adjoining mountains are steep, and tracks of avalanches are frequent."

The *Calgary Herald* of the 19th February last contains this statement:

"Corporal McDonald left the second crossing of the Columbia on February 8th, and rode for 30 miles east up the west slope of the Selkirk Range. Having gone thus far, he found himself 14 or 15 miles from the summit, and unable to proceed further unless on foot, and that with difficulty. The reason Corporal McDonald was unable to ride that stretch of mountain road was that from where he had dismounted, straight up to the summit, the pass was one mass of avalanches, and snowslides, and fallen glaciers. The snowslides were solid packs of ice, and were sometimes 50 feet in thickness. Muir's men, under the direction of Foreman Garner, were hard at work cleaning the Toro road, which had been a chief sufferer by the slides. On February 8th, the day McDonald left the second crossing, a slide had occurred six miles west of the summit, at McKenzie's camp, and a man named Robert Miller had been killed by it. Miller was the cook of the camp. On the same day another slide occurred four miles on the west of the summit, at Ross McDermott's camp. In this slide three men were buried alive, and have not since been seen. One of these men was known to be Dulac, a Frenchman. When the slide occurred the Frenchman and two others were known to have been overwhelmed by it, and none of the three were subsequently seen alive. A third slide occurred at the summit of the range where Hill's store was. There were a number of men in the store at the time. Luckily only the skirts of the avalanche swept the store, the consequence being that only the west corner was buried and the men succeeded in escaping through the windows east of the Selkirks. It took McDonald a day and a half to reach the summit of the Selkirks. Arrived there he got a horse from the detachment stationed there and rode to Beaver Creek, a distance of 28 miles or 30 miles. The eastern slope of the Selkirks was free from the slides, and was a more favorite resort for the workmen on the road than the western slope. In fact, the men at work on the west slope were quitting work on account of the dangers. They evidently had the same opinion as Mr. Moberly's Indian, "That if they went in they would be caught in the snow and never get out of the mountains, in fact the road from the summit of the Selkirks west beyond the second crossing in the Gold Range, was having a hard time of it. In the Gold Range the road had been overflowed by a slide and Wright's teams were all blocked out."

Then I find in the *Moosomin Courier*, of March 12th, 1885, this statement:

"Mr. Bowen found the chief topic of conversation at the Creek was the abnormal amount of snowslides obstructing work. The workmen on the road seem panic-stricken, and many of them are refusing to work on account of the danger, others are striking for higher wages, the demand being for \$3.50 per day. The slides seem to occur chiefly on the west slope of the Selkirks and on the east slope of the Gold Range. Some, however, have taken place on the east slope of the Selkirks, in one of which Holt, the contractor, had \$65,000 worth of supplies swept away about a fortnight ago. Monday it was recovered, however, the loss

amounting finally to about \$10,000. Hill's store at the summit of the Selkirks was also swept away. West of the summit the road is blocked with the snow, the slides occurring nearly every day. Wright, the contractor, whose men are working on the east slope of the Gold Range, is now getting his supplies from Beaver Creek, the road to Kamloops being completely blocked. So far there are six men known to have perished in these slides, but there are others whose names have not been ascertained, who also got buried in them. There was a rumor among the men that the line of route was being slightly changed on account of the dangers from avalanches. Instead of seeking the centre of the passes the road was being led along the mountain side, the rock being scooped out to afford more shelter to the passing trains."

Now, Sir, that is the statement of the newspapers as to the condition of things. I should have been glad if the hon. gentleman had given us an authentic statement from the reports of the Government's and the company's engineers and from the contractors, of what the state of things is. I think it was his duty to have done so. I think that Parliament has a right to be informed as to the results of the operations, as to what the results has been with reference to the climatic difficulties on the route which was chosen without those precautions and explorations, which should have been insisted on before the Government allowed themselves to be committed to it at the solicitation of the company. In the same connection I may advert to the circumstances that we now find in the papers on the Table an estimate for a further large sum of money for snowsheds, not merely on the north shore of Lake Superior, but the largest part in the Pacific region. Now this was either considered as an essential for this road originally or it was not. If it was considered as an essential originally and was included in the estimates of last year, it is embraced in the money that is voted to finish the road; but, if it was not considered a necessity then, it has become a necessity on account of these subsequent developments, and, therefore, you have additional proof from the company itself that there have been developments of a serious character with reference to the climatic difficulties in passing this way—how serious, what the drawbacks may be, what the difficulties may be, arising therefrom, it is of course impossible for me to tell. I have endeavored, before reading in this House what is notorious to the public through the medium of the newspapers, to obtain authentic information from hon. gentlemen opposite, and having so endeavored in vain, I have brought the subject once again before the House in the hope that we may even yet obtain that information to which we are entitled. Then passing the climatic question, which is a very serious difficulty, we come to the question of grades and curves. As I have said, it is not only a question of mileage with reference to a railway, it is a question of gradients and a question of curves. In the debate which took place last year, when the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) undertook the duty of sustaining, after I had spoken, the position of the Government, he, in a very elaborate speech, dealt with many topics, amongst others with that of grades and curves; and he stated, as you will find in the report of the *Debates*, that the utmost care had been taken to give easy grades and easy curves to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, by the Yellow Head, the maximum grade was 1 in 100, or 52·80 to the mile. The stiff grades there of 52·80 were all concentrated within 30 miles, and the longest stiff grade was but 3½ miles. That is the condition of the Yellow Head Pass. By the Kicking Horse Pass there are over 52 miles of 116 feet or 117 feet; there are over 52 miles of that grade, more than double the maximum of the Yellow Head Pass grade, and more than three times the mileage of that grade. Contrasting these things you have got in one case 16 miles of a grade of 52·80, and you have got in the other 52 miles of a grade of 116 or 117. This is altogether apart from the temporary line, which temporary line is to be the permanent line for several years to come, and to carry this immense traffic which is expected to go over the line from China to Europe, and back from

Mr. BLAKE.

Europe to China. On that line the grades are 4½ to the 100, or 237 to the mile. The grades are so steep that already serious accidents have occurred. In one case a construction train ran away and a large number of men were injured, and there are in the course of the grade two of what are called switch backs, arrangements by which, if you find the train is overpowering you, you can run it off the main track and run it up a little hill so as to stop it. That is the kind of track over which the traffic on the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be carried on for some years to come—237 feet to the mile, protected by switch backs. Taking the 119 miles west from the summit of the Rockies, there are only 11½ miles about as near as I can make out, of levels. Now with reference to curves. On the Yellow Head line, on the line of my hon. friend from East York, there was but one curve of 8 degrees, and there were several of 7 degrees, and those curves of 7 degrees were on levels, or very low grades, and I need hardly tell the House that that is a very important consideration, that the combination of a steep grade and a sharp curve intensifies the difficulty, and that therefore it is customary, wherever practicable, to compensate for the curvature by the grade. But, as I say, on the Yellow Head Pass, the maximum curve was one of 8 degrees, and there were several of 7 degrees. Now, what is the case in the 119 miles west of the summit of the located line? Why, Sir, there are no less than 103 10-degree curves, 37 9-degree curves, and 76 8-degree curves and under 9 degrees, making 216 curves of that very severe character. And this does not include all, because there are several very sharp curves on the line beyond the 119 miles. The investigation which I have made did not enable me to go through the whole of the line, and therefore I took this particular section of 119 miles, and from the imperfect information before us I gleaned such facts as I could. Now, Sir, the total number of curves on that 119 miles is 691. On one mile there is about 2,000 feet of tangent, as near as I can make out; on another of 1,500 feet; on several more about 2,000 feet. In one place, in about 2,200 feet of line, there are five curves, thus: 10 degree right; 10 degree left; 8 degree right; 8 degree left; and 6 degree right. They take as many and as sharp turns as this Administration does. In 12 consecutive miles there are 123 curves, 18 of 10 degrees, 9 of 9 degrees, 19 of 8 degrees, 15 of 7 degrees and under 8, 2 of 6 and under 7, or 63 curves over the minimum curve of the Union Pacific; and these are on grades which average about 116 feet. That is the condition of things. I say that the hon. gentleman authorised this location; authorised a location by way of Kicking Horse Pass, before he had before him plans and profiles, showing that there was a practicable road within the conditions of the contract, by the Kicking Horse Pass. They had realised that duty of theirs at an early stage. I can call your attention to the Order in Council, and the reports of Sir Charles Tupper, showing that he declined, on the advice of the engineer, to recommend the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the prairies of the North-West, beyond a particular point on those prairies, because they were pointing towards Calgary and Kicking Horse; and because he said beyond this point, which is a common point for both routes, the route by the Yellow Head and by Kicking Horse, I will not authorise the location until you show me a line within the contract by the Kicking Horse. That was his determination, and he declined to authorise a location beyond the common point I have mentioned. I can show subsequent Orders in Council passed under the rule of the Acting Minister of Railways in which, with the former Order in Council staring him in the face, and without information that there would be a practicable line within the contract by the Kicking Horse, the Acting Minister of Railways did authorise the location of the line to a point which was run-

ning southerly, and by which in effect he pledged the Government to agree to the Calgary and Kicking Horse route.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Let the hon. gentleman contrast the Order in Council and the reports of Mr. Schreiber and Sir Charles Tupper with his own Order in Council and reports, and he will be unable to say "no" without conflicting with those reports. Already the route was authorised towards the Kicking Horse before he had the proof that a line within the conditions and terms on the contract was practicable by that route. They adopted that route in excess of their powers. They were authorised to approve a location within the contract, and, in the earlier Orders in Council and reports approving the section of the location of the line, the grades and curves are shown to be within the standard of the Canadian Pacific contract, and upon those reports the Government approved of those locations. But on this occasion they have acted in excess of their powers, because they have approved of grades and curves which are in excess of the standard of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman declared the other day, with a view of escaping from that statement, that the maximum grade on the Union Pacific was 116 and the minimum curve 11 degrees. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in that statement. Some years ago I put the question to his predecessor, or the then Minister of Railways—because the hon. gentleman is not yet Minister of Railways—whether the maximum grade of the Union Pacific was 90, and he told me across the House that it was 90. But in anticipation of some questions arising on the subject, and being aware that sometimes grades and curves which occur not on the line of the Union Pacific but on some branches or extensions, are referred to as being those of the Union Pacific, I took occasion to get an official statement from the proper authorities of what the grades and curves on the Union Pacific were. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wrote at my request to the Commissioner of Railway at Washington a letter in March, and this is the reply to that letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
"OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS,  
"WASHINGTON, D. C., March 12th, 1885.

"HON. JOHN CHARLTON, Ottawa, Canada.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your enquiries about the grades, curvature and character of bridges upon the Union Pacific Railway, I have the honor to make the following statements:

"(a) As to maximum grades, number of miles of same, &c. The maximum grade is 89.76 feet per mile, and total length of same is 16.32 miles; the aggregate length of all lesser grades is 833.18 miles; the average grade is 24.33 feet per mile; length of level is 188.18 miles.

"(b) As to the curves upon the road, radius of each, &c. The total curvature is 22,508.43°, giving an average per mile of 119.37° or 2.26° per 100 feet chord, the shortest radius is 942 feet. There are no means in this office for ascertaining the length of curves that occur upon grades.

"The total length of curved line is 183.56 miles, being about 18 per cent. of the whole length of road.

"(c) As to material, class and character of bridges, &c. More than three-fourths of the whole length of trussed bridging is constructed of iron, of excellent design and abundant strength; all the other bridge structures are of wood, in excellent condition, and fully able to bear a heavy traffic.

"Yours very respectfully,  
"W. H. ARMSTRONG,  
"Commissioner."

You will find in numerous printed documents and in official reports to which I have had access, and I speak after having read them, confirmatory statements, although there is one report dealing not with the Union Pacific proper, but with some branches and extensions—

Mr. POPE. That was putting the Central with it.

Mr. BLAKE. We discussed both the Union and the Central when we had the Canadian Pacific Railway contract

before us; and we were told that it was the Union Pacific which was to be the standard, not the Central Pacific. The hon. gentleman takes the Union and the Central, and the whole system of those two lines, and joins them together for the purpose of his argument, because he finds on the Central a 10 or 11 degree curve and 117 feet grade, and he says that is the standard to which we agreed.

Mr. POPE. It is part of the Union.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not part of the Union Pacific. It was not part of the Union Pacific at the time the Canadian Pacific contract was made. Their standards are different, and it was the standard of the Union Pacific and not the standard of the Central we adopted. Compare the grades. You have a maximum grade on the Union Pacific of under 90, and there are only 16.32 miles of that maximum grade. On the Canadian Pacific there is a maximum grade on the intended permanent line of 116 or 117, and over 52 miles of that. But you have got also on the temporary line, to be used for a long time, a grade of 237. On the Union Pacific there is a minimum curve of 6 degrees, and on the intended permanent line of the Canadian Pacific Railway the curves are even in excess of 10 degrees, for there is one of 10.40 on the intended permanent line. But on the temporary line there is a curve of 11.30 degrees. What is the curvature of the Canadian line? On the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway there are, apart from the temporary line and leaving out the 11.30 curve, 142 curves of 10 degrees 62 of 9 degrees, 338 of 8 degrees, 114 of 7 degrees, 39 over 6 degrees, or 687 curves in excess of the minimum curve on the standard line. What as to the total number of curves? There are no less than 4,258 curves of 6 degrees and under, or no less than 4,945 curves in all. The total curvature of the line is 900 miles, or 35 per cent. of the whole length of the line. On the Union Pacific the total curvature is only equal to 18 per cent. of the length of the line. So you have about double the curve mileage on the Canadian Pacific Railway which there is on the standard line, and no less than 206 double curves, and I suppose everybody knows what a double curve means in railway works. This much was gleaned from answers to questions put to the Minister, and from imperfect information supplied by him. No proper table of grades and curves divided into mileage sections has ever been laid before this House, or has been prepared. When my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) was engaged in the task of finding a location for the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway he took the proper and usual precautions, and you will find in the Blue Books tables of the engineers divided into mileage sections, giving information in that form, and showing the grades and curves and the alignment of that line. When the hon. gentleman was bringing down his statements with reference to the comparative merits of the lines to form the short line from Montreal to Halifax, he brought down in his Blue Book these tables of grades and curves. He knew you could not tell what the line meant without them, and they are down here on the Table before you, forming an element in your decision. But, Sir, the Government has never caused the company to prepare, it has never itself prepared, it has not now in its possession—or had not the other day, for when I asked the question I was told that the tables were only in course of preparation—analogue tables with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has been under construction for four or five years, so that the essential, the usual preliminaries, even to a final location, have not been taken. Although the final location has passed, although construction is advanced and almost completed, although the country has paid for the road, the Government has not caused to be prepared those tables of grades and curves which were necessary to a proper determination to themselves, and necessary to the

proper information of the House and the country. But, Sir, from the general statements I have been able to glean, I have brought before you these results, and I maintain that the statement I have made indicates a very unfortunate condition of things for our great transcontinental highway, and a condition particularly unfortunate with reference to the change in the route. The reason why this route was changed, was that it was going to decrease the mileage length of the line by a certain number of miles—or rather, by an uncertain number; I cannot well make it out, as it seems to vary a good deal; sometimes 69 or 70—sometimes about 100, I know not what it was or what it will be, but something in that neighborhood. I say that any such shortening as that is far more than counterbalanced by the climatic difficulties to which I have referred and by the steep grades and the sharp curves to which I have referred in the statement I have made; and I believe that my hon. friend's wisdom in the choice of his route has been already demonstrated by what has already taken place, and I regret to say that I believe it will be more demonstrated hereafter as the road comes to be worked and the traffic upon it comes to be heavier. Now, Sir, looking at the two speeches of the hon. gentlemen, looking at the glowing prospects they held out to us as to this line, looking at the magnificent future which they depicted—the immediate future and the grand prospective future of the line, and considering its strength, its power, its capacity for competing with other lines, considering its unique advantages, considering its infinitesimal debt compared with other lines, I ask you whether these speeches did not lead rather to the conclusion that we should apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway to lend us some money than that the Canadian Pacific Railway should apply to us for a loan. If such be the strength and the magnitude of its resources, which have largely come from us, it does seem to me that while we are begging and borrowing, taking from the people inside and outside, from the banks in London and the banks in Canada, from the poor in the country and the rich in the country, while we have exhausted our cash and are signing our names for bills for which we cannot find the cash, it does seem to me that we should rather apply to this rich and powerful creation of ours for a moderate and temporary assistance from the temporary embarrassment in which we are placed, than that the situation should be reversed. They do seem to me most extraordinary speeches if you look at them as destined to support the conclusion to which they were directed, that we should lend the company some more money—no, we cannot do that any more, but that we should lend them our names, and put ourselves under discount at the banks, endorsed, no doubt, by the company; for after the statement of these hon. gentlemen no doubt the endorsement of the Canadian Pacific Railway would add much to the value of the Canadian Exchequer bills, and probably that is the reason that they are going to be financed more advantageously by them than if we borrowed the money ourselves and paid it over to the company. The company is so strong that it can do more with 4 per cent. Exchequer bills of Canada than we could, and thus we give them a great advantage, and they get this money on better terms. That seems a reasonable explanation, otherwise I do not see why we should not raise the money and hand over the hard cash to them instead of giving them our names. Now, I have always said, whenever I have addressed the House on this subject or spoken to the public, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had received enormous advantages. I think so still, and I think they had a great prospective future before them if prudence and not rashness, good management and not mistaken management, had guided them and the Government together. But I have also said, and I have signalled the fact for the last two Sessions at any rate, that great prudence was required in order to avoid danger and disaster,

Mr. BLAKE.

and certainly to avoid the marring of these fine prospects. I have never believed that the very early prospects of that road were such as hon. gentlemen depicted, but I believed that it had a future, and I believed that that future was bound up in a concentration of effort to construct the road not with extreme speed, but with moderate speed, at as low a rate of cost as was consistent with stability of execution. I knew that a low rate of cost was not consistent with extreme speed of construction; we all knew that. I knew also that its future was bound up in a comparatively moderate rate of speed, because we wanted the people to come into the country, that there might be something to feed the road with business when it was constructed, and I believed that its prospects were therefore marred to a considerable extent by the policy which it and the Government together had equally adopted of late years. I should not have entered on this subject at any length except for the statement of the hon. the Secretary of State. He predicted a great boom when the through line should be opened next year. He said they were opening the door of commercial prosperity for Canada, and he told us that the cry would then be echoed: "All aboard for the West." Now, I fail to see the ground of this prediction of a boom. The company itself in its report of the other day, does not say very much about the great through traffic, water-borne on each side from China and Japan to Europe, and *vice versa*, on which the hon. the Secretary of State dilated so eloquently. There are three classes of traffic upon which the road has to depend. There is the transcontinental water-borne traffic. Now, as to that, the hon. gentleman admitted that there had been none of it heretofore. There have been a few cargoes of silk worms carried from the East to Europe, under special circumstances, on Pacific lines, but up to this time the traffic of the world, so far as it is composed of traffic between the Orient and Europe, is water-borne traffic; and thus, although it cannot be done by other lines, although he says the almost irresistible Yankee has been obliged to admit that he fails to induce this traffic across the continent, yet he declares and predicts that the Canadian Pacific Railway will obtain it. Well, I am sure we all heartily hope they will obtain it. But I think it will be admitted by the House that that is a speculation, and I am not very sure that the learned prelection of the hon. Secretary of State has added very new or very valuable materials to the prospect of determining that speculation. The hon. gentleman declared that the rate of expense between land and water transport was about one to three, that is to say, one mile of rail to about three miles of water; and he declared that these proportions would be diminishing proportions, the land-borne traffic more approximating to the water. I will not enter into the calculations with which the hon. Secretary of State assumed to support that conclusion; but I will say this, that as far as I know the most learned practical men who deal with this subject believe that it is a varying quantity, from one mile by land to between three and eight by water, depending very largely on the size of the vessels and the length of the voyage. If you have a trade which you can carry in very large-sized vessels, which are known to be the most economical, and if you have a very long voyage, the cost of transport diminishes until the cost for eight miles by water is about equal to that of one mile by rail. An experiment on this question, interesting in its character, I perceive, is being tried or is about to be tried, with reference to one of the most southerly Pacific lines, under the auspices of Mr. C. P. Huntington, who, taking the traffic by land across the most narrow part of the continent to a southern port, intends to compete with the all-rail route to New York by putting the freight on a steamer at that port and bringing it to New York; and by calculations similar to those we have been

using, he expects to compete with the all-rail routes. So much with reference to the relative cost of rail-borne and water-borne traffic. There is another element, however. The cost of rail-borne through traffic itself varies very largely, being dependent not merely on climatic questions but also on the quantity of the local traffic. If you have a very large local traffic, which necessitates and makes profitable a very large equipment, a very large staff all along your line, and numbers of those things which are adjuncts to your total traffic, you can carry a through traffic and make money on it at very much lower rates than if you have not that large local traffic. A large local traffic is essential to low rates for through traffic. So that there are varying factors in both questions of great importance. The hon. Secretary of State declared that it was material to look at the capital account of other railways as contrasted with that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the theory apparently that the capital account controlled the rates. Sir, the capital account does not control the rates at all. Wherever there is competition, it is competition that controls the rates, and the road that can and does carry cheapest governs the rates for the rest. It is a question whether the rest will take the traffic at the rate of that road or not have it at all. As a rule they do take it at that rate even though they may obtain no compensation or an inadequate compensation for it. They charge no more upon the traffic because of enormous capital accounts. I admit that there is an aspect of this case in which the capital account is of vital importance. I admit that the capital account is a matter of great urgency with reference to the non-competitive traffic—that traffic which, either by law, as is the case in the Canadian Pacific, or in practice, which is more or less the case with reference to some traffic of all railroads, is monopoly traffic. By law a large amount of the traffic of the Canadian Pacific is non-competitive, because the people of the North-West are not allowed to get competition by connections with the south. The Canadian Pacific can fix its own rates, and therefore with reference to that traffic, it will have regard no doubt to the amount of its capital account, so as to be enabled, if possible, to pay fixed charges and dividends thereon. Even if there were power to make through connections, this would largely remain a monopoly traffic. It is more or less the case with every railway, that there is a kind of strictly local traffic in which there is no competition, on which the company fixes higher rates because it is master of the situation. In the case of any company which is master of the situation either by adventitious circumstances or by the law of the land, its capital account will tend to regulate its rates; but if the company is not master of the situation, its rates will be regulated by those who are masters of the situation, and they are masters of the situation who can carry the traffic the cheapest. With reference to the trade between China and Japan and America, and between Europe and America on the one hand, and with reference to the through transcontinental all land-borne traffic on the other, there are of course other considerations. In our country, even as to some of this traffic our great interior seaboard offers for a great distance means of effective competition. But putting that to one side, though it is a valuable regulator of rates—for without it the rates would sometimes be very different from what they are now—and dealing with the land competition alone, there is a very severe competition, whether you refer to the Atlantic or the Pacific with reference to this great transcontinental traffic. The facilities have been greatly increased both to the east and the west until at present they are fully, perhaps more than, adequate to the present demands of trade, though we hope, of course, that the demands of trade in a progressive country, such as the North American continent, will at no distant day overtake and tax to the utmost the facilities provided for this traffic. The amount of traffic on the trunk

lines, having 13 termini on the Atlantic, including Boston and New York, and 33 western termini, for the last few years, exclusive of beef, has been as follows—and these figures are very noticeable :

## EAST BOUND.

For 1880.....	\$7,500,000
“ 1881.....	8,250,000
“ 1882.....	5,500,000
“ 1883.....	5,400,000
“ 1884.....	5,300,000

That is a little more than two-thirds in 1884 of what it was in 1880. The decrease being principally in grain and provisions, as this traffic varies largely according to the crops and to the demand abroad.

## WEST BOUND.

For 1880.....	\$1,920,000
“ 1881.....	1,150,000
“ 1882.....	2,400,000
“ 1883.....	2,120,000
“ 1884.....	1,920,000

So that in 1884 it became about what it was in 1880. So, if you look to that portion of the traffic across the continent which is carried by the roads having their termini on the Atlantic, you find facilities proved to exist by the traffic carried in the year 1881 and 1882, far in excess of the facilities which were required as proved by the traffic carried in the years 1833-84; and you find in truth that railway construction has got quite abreast of, if not for the moment somewhat in excess of, the demands of the producer and the consumer. If you take the Pacific roads—I will not trouble the House with the figures—you will find they show a great increase in the last two years in the number of roads. It may be said, although some of the roads are common links for the transport of freight, that there are now somewhere about 6 Pacific roads, the result being a very considerable increase of traffic on these roads. It was inevitable from the increase of these roads that a large local traffic should be developed, but although there has been a very considerable increase of local, and even of through traffic, there has yet been an increase of the power of transport in excess of the increase in traffic. The consequence is that there is a very severe competition now for the transcontinental traffic both east and west. The old rates of freight can no longer be obtained for the same classes of goods, and I pointed the other day to an instance in which goods water-borne from Europe are being carried from Atlantic ports to Victoria, B.C., at \$2.10 per 100 lbs., even of the highest class, which tells you what transcontinental traffic means at this time. Another great difficulty we Canadians are involved in is the need of ocean ports with a very large number of seeking ships. For the purpose of that continental traffic, which is to be in part water-borne, you must always consider as one line your rail and your water communication. You must consider the question of transshipment and of freight rates on the ocean as well as the charges on land; and those of us who pay attention, as we must, to the difficulties which are besetting the shippers of the St. Lawrence at this moment, will all recognise, on looking at the figures the importance of these considerations. If they ascertain the cost that is involved in getting the stuff from a common point in the west to the port of Montreal and to the port of New York, and if they ascertain the cost from the port of Montreal to Europe and from New York to Europe, they will find how very important are the considerations of port charges, shipping charges, cost of transshipment, to freight. Now, the freight depends very largely upon the ocean port being an emporium of commerce. Take the case of the port of New York, to which immense numbers of seeking ships constantly go, which is an ocean tramp's resort. These ships go there because that port happens to have accumulated a very large amount of the traffic of the western

world, and therefore you find it is a low rate ocean port, through the free application of the principle of competition. These are considerations we have to grapple with, and we have also to grapple with our dependence for a cheap through rate upon the existence of a large local traffic to which I have alluded. All these things point to that to which the hon. the Secretary of State pointed, and in that part of his observations I entirely coincide, that is the great importance to this line of a large local trade. The Pacific roads which were for a long time inclined rather to ignore that, recognise it now. All roads recognise it more fully than they did before; it behooves us to recognise it too. It is a consideration upon which, I think, much will turn. Now take the thousand miles of this road west of Callander and the thousand miles east of Port Moody, in round figures, and I ask this House what the present development is and what the immediate future is for the local traffic on that 2,000 miles of the line. I do not need to put the question, certainly do not need to give the answer. There are capabilities in both ends of the line; there is a future for both ends of the line, but built as this road has been, rushed through as it has been, in the insane haste which has characterised the policy of the Government, what to-day are the prospects of a local traffic for the 1,000 miles from Callander and the 1,000 miles from Port Moody east, say 2,000 out of the 2,550? On this 2,000 miles, there are a few thousand souls of white population. From Callander to Port Moody, 2,500 or 2,600 miles, there is a population of perhaps 150,000, perhaps 200,000 white men. Therefore, when you look to those figures of a couple of hundred thousand white men, you find in a moment the vast importance of settlement to the future of the country and the future of the road. You cannot have a trade without having people to trade with; you cannot have traffic unless there be persons to traffic with; you cannot send goods unless there be those who will receive the goods; you cannot sell unless there be people to buy. What you have at present is about a couple of hundred thousand souls for your local traffic. Now, the hon. gentleman compared the immediate prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway with those of the Northern Pacific. The Northern Pacific has, over a large section of its road, owing to the adventitious circumstances to which I have referred—and which give to all railway companies, more or less, the command of the situation, and a practical monopoly, to a certain extent, within a certain range—the power of exacting very high and unreasonable rates for a very considerable part of its traffic; and to that circumstance are due the large profits, compared with the amount of tonnage moved, which you find the Northern Pacific realises. But the Northern Pacific has about 2,000,000 of people tributary more or less to its road, while, from Callander to Port Moody, the Canadian Pacific Railway has about 200,000 people tributary to its road. That is the difference, and we want to adjust that difference by an increase of population which will be tributary to the road, before we can expect results such as those to which the hon. gentleman has pointed. Thus the Canadian Pacific has a traffic, so far as its local population is concerned, of somewhere about 80 souls to the mile, while Minnesota has a railway population of about 300 to the mile, Dakota about 350, Montana 350, and Illinois 370 to the mile. Unless you lay down the proposition that you are going to take as much toll from 200,000 people as the Northern Pacific can take from 2,000,000, you cannot fairly compare at this time the traffic prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, as regards local traffic, with those of the Northern Pacific. The problem is, what is the price you can exact for the traffic you have to take? How far have the prospects for local traffic changed since 1833? Have they greatly improved since then? I deny it, and I will proceed to prove it conclusively and incontrovertibly when I come to deal with the question of the land.

**Mr. BLAKE.**

If that be so, I refer once again to the language of Sir Charles Tupper, delivered only two years ago, in which he said:

"I do not hesitate to say that the tariff which is now on the Table of the House cannot pay the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will not pay them for a considerable number of years."

There was the utterance of the Government two years ago. Now why?

"It would be impossible, until a large number of people go into that country, to construct a tariff which would pay them."

A very sensible observation, one in which I entirely concur, but which the hon. gentlemen opposite seem almost to repudiate—

"Because the climatic difficulties of the country are such that I have no hesitation in saying that the cost of hauling per ton per mile would be four or five times as great in the North-West, in the present sparsely settled condition of the country and the small amount of traffic, as it would be on the Grand Trunk railway with the enormous amount of traffic which I am glad to say it is carrying, and the milder climate in which it operates."

I do not think the climate of the North-West has changed much since Sir Charles Tupper made that speech two years ago. I do not think the settlement of the country has improved enormously since that time. I do not think its prospects of immediate settlement have very much brightened within the last few months. Therefore that speech as to climatic difficulties, as to the tariff of the railway company, however high, being not high enough to make the road pay, for how long? for a considerable number of years; until what? until that sparsely settled condition of the country was changed by a large population being brought in; that argument, that until then, you could not construct a tariff which would pay, why? because, if you constructed a tariff which would pay on the assumption that the goods would be carried, you would put it so high that you would prevent the goods being carried; you would kill the goose that laid the golden egg; and you would interfere with the settlement of the country. That speech and argument are true to-day. One must consider the prospects of settlement. The prospects of settlement, so far from the seaboard, where the farmer's produce has to pay so large a toll in any case in order to get to the market, depend upon low rates, and therefore you must have low railway rates if the country is to prosper. Therefore, Sir Charles Tupper was perfectly correct when he said we cannot construct a tariff which would enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay for some years to come, that we must have a large local traffic, the essential for which is a large population. I hope the respectable authority to which I have referred will cause me to be saved from charges of want of patriotism because I have told a few plain truths. I hope that I shall escape under the mantle of Sir Charles Tupper, who was speaking as the exponent of the views of the Government, who was speaking in his Ministerial position and upon his responsibility as a Minister, with his present colleagues, excepting the Secretary of State, sitting beside him; I hope his statements will not, now that he is in England, be altogether repudiated by hon. gentlemen opposite. They cheered them then, they affirmed them then, they confirmed them then, they assented to them then. Do they repudiate them now, and, if they do not, how do they accord with the statements given yesterday by the hon. gentleman the Secretary of State? Real progress required, then slower apparent progress than hon. gentlemen made. It required more branch lines in order to induce more people. It required a policy which would satisfy the people that were in the country. But, instead of attending to the settlers who were in, instead of recognising the great cardinal fact that the best advertisement you could give to the world for the North-West was so to handle the men who were in the country that they would send back word to the places from which they had come that this was the

land of promise, that this was the land of milk and honey, and advise their old neighbors to come out; instead of recognising that on the question of surveys, instead of recognising that on the question of land rates, instead of recognising that on the question of railway communication, instead of recognising that on the question of opening lands for settlement, instead of recognising that on the question of tariffs, instead of recognising that on twenty other administrative and legislative points, the contentment and facilities for the settler were the prime considerations. Hon. gentlemen opposite were so maddened by this notion of expansion that befell them in the years 1881, 1882 and 1883, that they went to work to survey sixty or seventy millions of acres of land, and had not a surveyor ready to survey the old settlements of the country, where the settlers were pining for surveys. The pioneers of the country were left without survey because the surveyors were surveying township after township where there is not a man to-day, and those who were there became discontented, and the worst results have come from that policy. And so you find in regard to the land companies, the bubble and expansion policy as to land companies; you find the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government together going into this policy, you find the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sustaining and supporting the North-West Land Company, which has done us more damage on the English market than any other company of late date, whose stock is now standing on the English market at 38, whose stock was largely bought by people in England on representations which have been very far from being realised; you find influential men, political men, men supporting and sitting behind hon. gentlemen opposite, creating colonisation companies, creating land companies, getting timber limits, getting ranches, getting coal lands, creating local railway companies in order to get large land grants, you find everything tending in the direction of expansion in the North-West, of undue and unhealthy speculation, of a boom, and you find a feeling pervading the eastern parts of the country, so far as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are concerned, that the North-West was a sort of reserve for the hon. gentleman's parasites and hacks, a great domain that they could cut up and utilise to promote their private fortunes. These vast promises of material gains and immediate gains which hon. gentlemen have made have resulted in scattered settlements, in enormous expenditure, in great engagements, in widespread dissatisfaction, in an enormously exaggerated expense of construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in necessarily increased rates of freight for that railway, in the embarrassment of the railway company, in the distress of Canada at large, and in the ruin of a great many of her citizens who were seduced to enter into these transactions by the course that hon. gentlemen proposed. With the great aids that we gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the enormous advantages which we gave it, had prudence marked the course of hon. gentlemen opposite and the course of the company its capital account ought to have been insignificant to-day, it ought to have been able to transact business at the lowest rates by far of any company at all similarly circumstanced geographically and climatically, and it ought to have transacted it more profitably, because, its capital account being so small, a very small margin of profit for handling would have realised a very large dividend. But, at present, you have an enormously inflated capital account, you have a road built so fast that even the centre is not developed so as to be able to sustain itself, so fast that the ends must depend wholly on the weak centre—for it is weak to-day—for their sustenance, and thus the great prospects which, had prudence reigned in the management of this business, would have been assured to the company, have been marred, those bright skies have been obscured, and we are face to face with a condition of things very different indeed from what we might once

have hoped. I showed awhile ago that the company did not now, under these resolutions which are before you, promise to accomplish those other objects which they had declared they would accomplish if the proposals of Mr. Stephen, which are on the Table, had been accepted by the Government. What are these other objects? The hon. the Secretary of State called out: "All aboard for the west." I doubt extremely that he is a very good conductor. From what point does the hon. gentleman call out: "All aboard for the west?" Is it from Quebec that he calls out: "All aboard for the west?" This good conductor sold the North Shore Railway to a private company and his sale has blocked the effective cry of "all aboard for the west" ever since. It blocks it to-day, and at what cost to this country we are to remove the obstacle in the way of the railway train, on which the hon. gentleman, duly decorated is to call out "all aboard for the west," we do not yet know. It is true we have some indications on the Table, we had indications last Session. They were indications only, though they were said to be finalities. We have more indications to-day, and perhaps to-morrow we shall have still further indications. The hon. gentleman, the Acting Minister of Railways, called out in effect—though he did not venture the oratorical flights in which the Secretary of State indulged—still in substance he did call out: "All aboard for the east." He is most anxious that the Canadian Pacific Railway should reach Quebec. He, too, duly decorated, would go a considerable distance to get to Quebec. I daresay he proposes to take the first train and call out to the passengers "All aboard for the east." To what east he did not say. He says: "I am most anxious, I do assure you"—and he looked around in a certain quarter which we used to call the nor-west corner—"I am most anxious, I do assure you, to give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company facilities for getting to Quebec. All in my power I will do;" and he spoke with a tone of such frantic earnestness that I almost believed him for half a moment, until he went on to say, after expressing his strong feelings on that subject, "and I think it ought to go to New England." And there the New Englander broke out; there the shrewd, calculating New Englander broke out. By what line? I suppose by the straight and narrow way. But I cannot call it straight, for I am afraid it is very crooked. It is a crooked way, like a great many of the ways of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They are to go by the crooked International line, and all the hon. gentleman promises is that the road shall reach both points. There shall be a pair of rails to the Atlantic coast in the New England States, and a pair of rails to Quebec. But he knows very well that it is not a pair of rails to Quebec that the people of Quebec want. It is the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And he says to them: "Gentlemen of Quebec, I will take care that you get a pair of rails to Quebec; but, gentlemen of the International Railway Company, I will take care that the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall go over the Megantic line." That was not all. The hon. gentleman felt that the proposals on the Table had supplied him with sufficient argument to dispense with some oratory, except as to Quebec. But there were some other ocean termini which he seems to have forgotten, which were not mentioned in his proposals. Do we not remember how the names of the old termini used to be rolled out by the Minister of Railways? Do we not remember now he used to call out: St. John, St. Andrews, Halifax, Louisburg, Sydney, Shippegan?—and I know not how many more. But now I hear nothing about Sydney from the Minister. But he says, turning towards my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron)—he says: "I assure the hon. gentleman that it is the dearest thing to my heart to secure at no distant date a connection with—which is it?"—he was obliged to be prompted as to the name, and he got the name "Louisburg"—"with Louisburg."

"Why," says he "the county of"—and again somebody prompted him with the name "Cape Breton"—"I know," says he, that the county of Cape Breton has no railways and it ought to have railways." Thus we found the deep interest and the intelligent information that the hon. gentleman has on this subject. It reminds me of the well known story of the Duke of Newcastle, who also was a Minister of the Crown in former days, when a public functionary, one of those busy permanent officers, came unto him one day at the time when they were engaged in struggles with North America and in struggles with France. He said to him: "My Lord, my Lord, Annapolis is in danger; it must be defended." "Good heavens!" says the Duke, "do you mean to say Annapolis is in danger? Certainly it must be defended. Where is Annapolis?" Another day, in discussing a subject pertaining also to the Maritime Provinces, he was informed by his permanent officer that Cape Breton was an Island. "Good gracious! Cape Breton an Island? Why this is very interesting. I must go and tell His Majesty that Cape Breton is an Island." And so the Acting Minister of Railways, in attempting to satisfy my hon. friend from Inverness, balked at the port he was to name, balked at the county he was to name, and was obliged to be prompted both as to the port and the county when he was telling how near to his heart was railway connection with those points. I do not wonder that he altogether forgot Sydney; in fact I do not think he ever knew of it. Well, Sir, these, it seems, are not to be provided for this Session. But this Session has seen a good many unexpected turns. Few of us expected to be here at the present time, and how much longer shall we be here? I do not know, I am sure, whether we may not see a subsidy for Cape Breton yet, if my hon. friend from Inverness stands to his guns, even this Session. I know that I was assured most positively two years ago—for I have always taken an interest in this Cape Breton Railway; I have always felt that the Island of Cape Breton had been hardly treated with respect to railway facilities—I heard the Minister of Railways propose a moderate subsidy for the purpose of that railway. I said that I was very glad to hear that the Island of Cape Breton was going to have a railway, and the terms were discussed, and I asked the Minister, being anxious to secure that railway, whether he was quite sure that he was going to get that railway for Cape Breton at that price, and the Minister, Sir Charles Tupper, assured me he was quite satisfied, that the arrangements were made, that the company was solvent, that the conditions were settled, and that Cape Breton would have a railway. My hon. friend from Inverness and myself, metaphorically speaking, shook hands over it, and some hon. members thanked me for having said a good word for Cape Breton. And so it happened that three years ago we were to have a railway for Cape Breton, and now the Acting Minister of Railways says the best thing he can say to Cape Breton is, when he remembers the name, that at some time or other in the future, he proposes to make some further provision for a railway in Cape Breton; and that in the face of a direct statement made, I believe, by the hon. member for Inverness, that if that thing was not done before the federal elections, Cape Breton would return six members hostile to the Administration—and he could not say anything fairer than that. Now, Sir, we were promised last Session that all these objects should be obtained for the price, which was stated. The subject was discussed, the short line was discussed, the various connections with the Atlantic ports were discussed; and we were told the financial proposals of the hon. gentlemen opposite were made after full consideration, were made after full enquiry, were made after having counted the cost, and with the certainty that the results expected would be reached by that proposed investment, and upon the faith of that promise the House

Mr. BLAKE,

assented to the policy and agreed to the vote. And this Session votes of \$2,200,000 more are brought down to accomplish the same results which we were told would be accomplished by the votes of last Session. Now we are told that the Administration was out by that amount of money, that it is a comparatively small amount; and we know not at all, as yet, how much farther we may have to go to accomplish this object. Sir, I maintain that it is a disgraceful thing to have to say of a Government, that they bring forward proposals committing the country to very large financial expenditures upon such incomplete and inaccurate information as to render it utterly impossible for the Government to carry out those objects upon the terms on which we were assured they could be carried out. They come down Session after Session and say: We find we were mistaken and we want more money. Is it on purpose, is it by design? Is it intended to get the people and Parliament accustomed to these expenditures by degrees; is it intended that the country shall get accustomed to the notion of an expenditure of one or two millions and then the Government shall come down the following Session and say they require three or four millions for the work, and the people will be disappointed if the additional amount is not given and the work carried to completion? Is that the reason? Or is it simply incompetency and incapacity. What is the reason why hon. gentlemen commit the country to proposals on terms which turn out afterwards to be totally incapable of execution? The information given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government upon which to base this very large proposal now before us is altogether scanty and inadequate. I am not going to discuss at this moment the information given by Mr. Stephen in his letter and the statements given from the opposite benches. I say no man can examine that information without feeling that it requires more thorough investigation and more full reports from engineers and experts and others before we can come to any reasonable conclusion upon it. We have before us no evidence whatever of the necessity or propriety or even of the character of many of the proposed expenditures, or of the necessity or propriety of many of the expenditures in the past. It is in the absence of such evidence and information as business men would require that we are called upon to act. How are we called upon to act? We are called upon to act in this way. Our interest is to be reduced to 4 per cent., although, as I pointed out last night, for the last six months we have been paying 5 per cent. on a loan which might in January last have been reduced to 4 per cent., and we are paying it because our Canadian Pacific commitments rendered it inconvenient for the country in the opinion of the Finance Minister to take the course of effecting the conversion, and we have been paying high rates of interest to the banks in the meantime as well. This company cannot borrow money anywhere else at 4 per cent.; I do not know whether it can at 5 per cent. I find that last fall it proposed a loan on the Ontario and Quebec system with its own guarantee for 5 per cent. at 92½, and it is said there were no takers or very few takers. They could not borrow at over 5 per cent. on what they say is a very profitable part of their system, with the guarantee of the whole Canadian Pacific Railway. It required a higher rate to tempt investors. Last year hon. gentlemen opposite, when they wished to induce the House to agree to the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway told us that the country should get 5 per cent., and that it was a reasonable rate for such a company to pay and for the country to obtain; that the country was engaged in borrowing transactions and 5 per cent. would be a fair rate. Having so declared, they induced the House to agree to the loan. It was the boast of hon. gentlemen opposite that we were making

a good commercial transaction because we were getting 5 per cent. Only one Session passes, and the Government come down and say: Let us reduce the interest to 4 per cent., which for the five or six years the loan has to run will amount to a loss of something like \$1,350,000 compared with our position last year. I want to know why? Do you tell me: I am shabby, that it is mean to ask 5 per cent. from the company. It is you that are shabby and mean. It was your bargain. No; it was the company's offer. The company offered to give 5 per cent. for the money. The Government thought it was right, and fair, and reasonable to exact that rate, and that rate was given as an inducement for making the loan. They induced the House to make the loan, because the rate was at 5 per cent., and now it is proposed to throw off 1 per cent. and thus save the company \$1,350,000. Were you shabby and mean last Session? If you say you were, let us discuss it. If not, if it was not a shabby and mean act then; it was the company's own proposal; in fact, it was that which induced the House to assent to the loan then; it is not shabby and mean now; and any such assertion would be absurd, particularly when we are dealing with a company so powerful and with such brilliant prospects as hon. gentlemen opposite have indicated. Then the Government impair our security. As to the \$20,000,000 of our loan, we are to be placed in partnership with the public which is to have \$15,000,000. I put to one side the temporary loan; I assume it may be repaid out of the sale of bonds at some price or other, and the whole \$15,000,000 of bonds will then get into the hands of the public. These being in the hands of the public, the Dominion will be holders of \$20,000,000 first mortgage bonds of the railway, the public having \$15,000,000 ranking equally with the securities held by the Dominion. That is nearly halving our security. While we will obtain only 4 per cent. for six years, the public will get 5 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it does not impair our security to put other \$15,000,000 alongside of our \$20,000,000. Such a statement is perfectly absurd. Reasonable men would not make such a statement. It is an attempt to gull the House and the public to say that you do not impair the security if you place \$15,000,000 on equal terms with our \$20,000,000. We do not go in even on equal terms. While I do not admit the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite that we would be bound as first mortgagees to pay off the stockholders if there was default, still it follows from that proposition, and it follows even without that proposition, that if there be default in this new arrangement, Canada will have to pay those \$15,000,000. The Dominion cannot take over the road without doing so. It is interested as a partner in the concern. If default is made, is the Dominion going to work the concern with the other bondholders of the company, they having \$15,000,000 in the partnership and the Dominion \$20,000,000? No. If there is default, the Government are going to pay the \$15,000,000 to the bondholders and take the road. That is the practical result. We are making ourselves in effect second mortgagees, because we are bound to pay off the \$15,000,000 if there is default in order to get the road. That is an unsatisfactory state of things. There can be no doubt that instead of being partners, we are practically, I say, second mortgagees, considering our relation to this enterprise in the present and in the future. It is a bad arrangement anyway. It is a bad thing to have a partnership between the Government and the public; it is an unfortunate arrangement which is sure to lead to complication. As to the price of the securities, the public may not take them up at par. They would not take them at par, if the interest were at 4 per cent. for six years, as we have done. We have taken our bonds for \$20,000,000 at par. It is true we have taken them as securities, but we have substantially taken them at par, irrespective of the price that the public is offering for them. The *Montreal Gazette* and other organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, when the proposal was first sug-

gested, stated this was an objection; that if the Government took those securities, they should take them at the same price they brought in the market. Now, it is said we should take them at par, and no doubt we shall have hon. gentlemen saying that it is all right. The time for payment is indefinitely extended. For what time are the bonds to run? I do not know. The resolution does not indicate it. The company may issue mortgage bonds for 40 or 50 years. If for 50 years, our loan becomes a long loan. We see what we are doing, and although Sir Charles Tupper told us last year that there was not the slightest shadow of a shade of doubt but that we would get our principal and 5 per cent. interest by 1891, we find now that we are throwing off an extra 1 per cent. interest, reducing it to 4 per cent. interest up to 1891, and giving the company a practical option of postponing the debt for the whole expected currency of the bonds, which may be 50 years. Then for the \$9,810,000 we take the land as security, and in effect if not in form, release the railway, because we take a third charge on the railway, after paying off \$35,000,000 and all the fixed charges, which include the interest and rentals upon the leased and acquired lines. And more than that, this is a fourth charge, because there are several millions of land grant bonds outstanding, not cancelled, and \$5,000,000 in the hands of the Government as security for the operation of the line—outstanding in this sense that they are our security. Is it intended to release them impliedly, and to say that there shall be no security for the working of the line? Is that term of the contract to be departed from? It is not said so here, and it surely is not intended to do so without saying it. Then there are \$5,000,000 of bonds in the hands of the Government for security, and those bonds and the portion in the hands of the public are charges, of course, over our charge for the \$10,000,000. So you have first of all the expenses of administering the lands; then you have the cost of the interest upon the loan, you have outstanding land grant bonds—those in the hands of the public; then you have the security for the operation of the line of \$5,000,000 of land grant bonds, and lastly you have our own \$9,810,000, or say, in round numbers, \$10,000,000. These are the charges, and this is the order of the charges upon the land of the company. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to my valuation of the North-West lands, as he called it, in 1880-81. I pointed out what the Government valuation had been in the preceding year. I was not, therefore, measuring their corn in my bushel, but in their own, and I think that is a fair way. They had valued the lands at such and such prices, and the following Session, within a few months, with no variation of circumstances except one of improvement having occurred, they brought up a proposal to hand over the picked lands—nothing which was not cultivable—lands fairly fit for settlement—that was the character of the lands; they were proposing to hand them over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I said: Now you are bringing forward this as a bargain. You told us the lands were worth on the average so much money last year. Are the circumstances worse now? No; they told us they were better. Then the lands must be worth as much? Yes, that could not be denied. Well, if you are giving so much lands to this railway, and if, according to your conception, they are worth so much money, then of course you are giving them the equivalent of so much money. That was my argument. But I have never said that the price of the North-West lands was a fixed figure. On the contrary, I have pointed out that under different circumstances, in varying years, under varying influences, the price of the lands in the North-West, as in other new countries, would rise and fall, and that we have to deal with the facts as they were presented to us at the time at which we were called upon to deal. I cannot say what the North-West lands will bring in the near or the distant future, but I can refer to some tests of the value of

those lands at the present time, and that I will venture to do. I say that their value in the future is speculative; on the average, no doubt, in the long run, the value will improve, the country will improve, but what you should deem them worth to-day, or in the near future, is a question which passes my poor head to answer, although hon. gentlemen answer it in various ways according to the exigencies of the situation. I pointed out last Session that they could not be relied on as present sources of revenue, to meet the interest on the loan, and now after the collapse which occurred during and since last Session, and after the outbreak of this Session, what are we to say is their value? Now, I will give you some tests. Take the North-West Land Company which obtained a share of the choicest lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in part along its line of railway, and in part the best lands of Southern Manitoba, which besides obtained a half interest in all the town sites of the Canadian Pacific Railway west of a certain point—I think it was Brandon—which obtained these advantages, and which bought its lands at a price of \$2.23 net per acre with the sites thrown in. The stock is \$7,500,000 paid. That stock is worth in the market 38 per cent, or \$2,850,000. Now how much will you allow for the town sites? Will you allow \$650,000 for them? If you do, there will remain \$2,200,000 for agricultural lands, and as there are 2,200,000 acres of those land the price will be \$1 an acre. If you allow only \$400,000 for the town sites you increase the price of the lands to \$1.10 cents per acre as the estimate placed by the public, of the agricultural lands. There is a company whose whole property consists of 2,200,000 acres of the best agricultural lands in the North-West, and half the town sites on a large section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The stock is valued by the public at \$2,850,000, and dividing that between town sites and agricultural lands, and deducting the value of the town sites, the residue being agricultural lands—that gives you the public's value of those choice lands so situated. Well, then take the colonisation companies. We do not know of course what the Government measure is; they have promised to bring one down and they admit that they are about to bring a proposal to relieve the colonisation companies whose bargains made with them by the Government are too hard and cannot be performed. Take again the calculation of the Government itself. On the 4th of May 1883, they brought down calculations that they would realise \$58,000,000 in cash for the lands in the North-West by the year 1891. How many millions will they dare say they will realise now? Will any man amongst them say they will realise \$58,000,000? Will any man say that they will realise one half of \$58,000,000? If they will not, will they say that circumstances have not changed, or that their calculations have been verified? Take their action in June, 1883, when they passed an Order in Council declaring that in future they would give no lands to railway companies in the North-West at a price which would net the Government less than \$1.50 per acre. They were afraid that the former price gave too large a margin of profit to the railway companies, and so all railway companies which had not been fortunate enough to secure land at \$1 per acre, were to pay at least \$1.50. In the year 1884, the Minister of Railways stated that there were some 23,000,000 of acres applied for by colonisation companies, that \$10,000,000 were already provided for, and that the rest would be provided for very soon, because they would go on selling an increased acreage and enlarging the price. Now, we had this condition of things, that while in June, 1883, the Government declared that future sales to railways should be at a price which would net the Government \$1.50 per acre, the companies making their profit beyond, in September, 1884, they decided upon the policy of giving lands free to the railways, and why? Because they found that the railways could

Mr. BLAKE.

not sell the lands at one dollar even and make money on them, and in order to make that money which they intended the railways should make, it was necessary to give them free. Does not that show a change of situation as to the lands of the North-West? Surely there is but one answer to that. When you find the Government declaring in June, 1883, that it would be sufficiently profitable to the railway companies to get lands at \$1.50, and in September, 1884, saying, we must give them free to the railway companies in order that they may make some profit on them, who will deny that there is a change—I do not know how long it will last—with reference to the North-West lands? And what more? Why, Mr. Van Horne, in September, 1884, declared that he was not sanguine, with a gift of practically 9,600 acres a mile for 100 miles of the Manitoba South-Western Railway, passing through the best part of Southern Manitoba and long settled, that he would be able to build that line, although he started out with a basis of credit of 50 miles of completed line, for which the company charges something like \$25,000 a mile. That is the statement of a gentleman who in his other capacity as Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway is certainly deeply interested in not depreciating the value of the lands of the North-West. Does not that show a change? Take the dealings of the Bell Farm Company with the Government, by which their agreement is modified very materially. Take the fact that there are only 23 homesteaders on a 400 mile stretch of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the prairies. Taking all these facts, I ask you, whether there is any immediate prospect of realising considerable sums from the sale of lands in the North-West. Now, these gentlemen do not like this, because they told us when they asked us to assent to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in 1881, and again when they asked us to assent to the loan of 1884, that they were going shortly to pay off the railway obligations which the people of Canada were incurring out of the lands of the North-West; they told us they would all be recouped out of the lands; and having told us that they do not like to hear these statements which convict them out of their own mouths of gross miscalculations. How are we to get at the facts? I have more than once pointed out how inadequate are the accounts which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company render to the public—how impossible it is to find out anything with regard to their traffic returns from the different sections, so that we may judge of the prudence and the wisdom of those acquisitions and leases by the test of their result in profit. We know now something we did not know a little while ago. We find among the expenditures made a sum of over \$1,200,000 on these leased lines. We were told they were going to help the company on; but at a time when the company are straining every nerve in order to carry out their contract, we find them obliged to pay this large sum of money, we do not know for what—whether for working expenses, for rolling stock, or for something else—in connection with the leased lines. Are we to have no account or audit such as in the United States is provided for the subsidised lines of that country? By Act of Congress it is provided that there shall be a railway auditor, who shall have access to all the books and accounts of railway companies which are subsidised by the public. Are we to have nothing of the kind? Is that to be refused this year, as it was refused last year? Are we to have no opening of Manitoba to the south, closed as it has been by virtue of the exercise of the power of disallowance, contrary to the spirit of the constitution and to the declaration made by the First Minister and re-echoed by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) when the contract itself was made? Are we, I say, to have no opening of Manitoba to local lines? Is the power of disallowance to be continuously exercised?—Last Session, when we were asked to vote the loan, the

Minister of Railways told us that they would desist from exercising the power of disallowance when the main line was opened over the North Shore, and that it was expected to be opened this year. It is open now in a sense; trains have passed over it with traffic. There are railway companies waiting to know whether the power of disallowance is to be exercised or not; they are afraid to go on with their work, because they remember that one company spent a considerable sum of money in grading their line, and that it was swept out of existence by disallowance; and they want to know whether the pledge of the First Minister and of the Minister of Railways is to be fulfilled, and whether that which I regard as an unconstitutional exercise of the power of disallowance is to prevent any longer that Province from building railways as freely as other Provinces in this Dominion. Is it to be all give and no get? Is it to be nothing on one side and all on the other? If we had to take over this line after all these arrangements are made, what would we have paid and have to pay? The \$25,000,000 of subsidy; \$11,000,000 which have been received by the company from lands, land grant bonds, and so forth; \$20,000,000 on our railway mortgage; \$10,000,000 on our land mortgage; \$30,000,000 on our works; \$3,500,000 on our surveys; \$15,000,000 for the public bondholders, making a total of \$114,500,000; and there would be besides \$14,000,000, which is the sum of the proposals now on the Table and those which have been voted by Parliament before for eastern and western arrangements in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but not included in the original contracted line. That makes a total of \$128,500,000 in cash, besides the defaulted interest, which we would not of course get,—\$128,500,000 which, under the present proposals, this country would have to pay before it could get control of this railway. Now, the Acting Minister of Railways made a statement the other day, of the most extraordinary character. He summed up the expenditure in case of default at \$104,500,000. In that he included the lands sold, calculating them at \$2 an acre, a price below what they brought to the company, and he included the \$5,000,000 for the new loan; but he omitted the interest account, and the \$15,000,000 of bonds, altogether, and in that way made up the \$104,500,000. That is bad enough; but he then went to work to deduct, and he said, there are 21,500,000 or more acres of land, worth \$2 an acre, which we will get back, and they are worth \$43,350,000. Deducting these the road will cost us \$61,150,000 only. The land which we gave over for the construction of the road is not charged in the expense when he sums up its cost to us, but he credits it when we get the road back. He puts it down on one side, and not on the other; and that is the principle on which the hon. gentleman deals with the railway company. I wonder if that is the way he dealt with the affairs of the International line—whether he handled its contractors in that manner—whether he agreed that what was paid should not be accounted in the payment, but should be credited when the road was got back. Let us simplify this transaction. Instead of mixing together acres and dollars, let us talk only of acres or only of dollars. Is it fair or reasonable to put in the account of expenditure \$104,500,000 and say nothing about the twenty one millions of acres, and when you go to the account of what you will get back, to say: I will get back 21,000,000 acres? If you say you will get it back, you must acknowledge that you gave it away in the first instance. Take it in dollars, take the 21,000,000 acres as represented by \$43,000,000, then is it fair and reasonable to say: I did not count in what I gave that 43,000,000, but I am getting that back, and I will give credit for it, and yet that is what the Minister has done, and by that sort of book-keeping does he reduce the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the country to \$61,150,000.

Mr. ORTON. The value of the lands is created by the construction of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh dear, Oh dear! Is the grant of land of no value? I hope that I will hear the Minister of Railways give that reason, and I will wait to answer it until then. Is it decent that a deliberate statement, a revised statement, a written statement, a statement carefully made up and calculated, should be laid before this country by this Administration, based upon such principles as that, and that they should strive so to persuade the people that the road will cost the country only that sum? A very unhappy reference was made by the Secretary of State to the aids to the American roads and to the cost of those roads. No road in the United States, not one of the Pacific roads, was given a money gift; not a single Pacific road was given a money subsidy. Two of those roads were loaned bonds; the bonds were not given to them; it was a loan of the credit of the country to the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific, and it aggregated somewhere about \$60,000,000 of bonds, for which a first mortgage was taken, which mortgage was afterwards made a second mortgage to ease the financial operations of the company. So that I say no road was given a present of money. Our road has been given a present of money and of works, which were built by the Government and are therefore equivalent to money, according to my calculation, amounting to something like \$58,500,000. As I have said, no American road received any grant of money, and only two received loans of money—the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific. They were built—we know when, we know how, we know at what era of railway building, in what condition of the country, and under what circumstances they were built. Why, to read the account of the construction of the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific, at the time they were constructed, and to compare it with the work of railway building to-day, or when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, will show you the difference; and as to the question of cost, why some of the iron rails, and those of a character which were not very good and did not last very long, cost the Union Pacific more than \$100 a ton. The iron rails on a large portion of the road cost alone \$17,000 a mile. They cost more per mile than the entire construction of the 615 miles west of Winnipeg, which cost, supplied with steel rails, \$16,800 a mile, against \$17,000 a mile for iron rails alone on the Union Pacific. Then the stated combined mileage of the Union Pacific and Central Pacific, because in some of the statistics this system is now combined—their branches and main line together—is 3,554 miles. Their land grants, as I believe is the case with all the land grants in all the American States, were of the land as it came. There was no provision whatever for bad sections, whether rivers, marshes, or unfertile lands. They took their chances with the country, each taking one-half, and it was a question, in fact, of lot. It was good and bad. That is an enormous difference. Again, they took it only out of the sections that happened to be unallotted when they were entitled to claim their grant, and they were not entitled until every particular section had been constructed and accepted. In the meantime the United States were entitled to sell or settle the lands, and whatever the United States had sold and settled came out of the railway company's grant, and the railway company did not receive the money or any allowance. Many millions, fives and tens of millions, were lost in this way from the different land grants of several of the Pacific roads. Since the first two roads were built circumstances have wholly changed, and since that time not one dollar of money has been given or lent by the United States to an American Pacific railway. All that has been done is to give land grants, great quantities of

which are desert, and of the great quantities which are not wholly desert, but are mixed up, good, bad and indifferent, they of course come under the operation of deduction to which I have referred. The Central and Union Pacific systems received about 32,000,000 acres. The Atlantic and Pacific, whose intended mileage is 2,500, of which but a small portion is constructed, is to have only 17,000,000 acres. The Southern Pacific, 929 miles, has 10,445,000 acres; the Texas Pacific, 1,901 miles, 12,000,000 acres; the Northern Pacific, 2,700 miles, may get, but it is disputed, 42,500,000 acres, of which 15,000,000 is all that is vested, and it is claimed the company has forfeited its right to the whole or to a very great portion of the remainder, and of that which may not be forfeited, a large portion is hilly country. Comparing these in every aspect you please, whether in the figures, in the quality of the land, or in the cost of railway building, you find no comparison whatever between the American lines and the Canadian line. The Acting Minister of Railways was imprudent enough to refer to the cost of these roads, when he compared them to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I quite admit the nominal cost was enormous. They were constructed on the good old-fashioned plan, the plan which has caused American railway investments to stink in the nostrils of Europeans, and even of the American investor of late years. They were constructed on the old plan of watered stock, of enormous bond issues, of *crédits mobiliers* and construction company contracts, of which we saw a specimen on this Table a little while ago in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. They were constructed according to these principles, and by these principles was this enormous apparent capital account created. The apparent cost of the Union and Central Pacific systems was \$91,150 a mile or \$324,000,000. The real cost was estimated to be about \$30,000 a mile, as estimated when the road was just about completed, by the engineer of the Government. In the year 1881 again the Government officer estimated that the road would cost, laid with good steel rails, \$25,642 a mile or \$91,150,000, instead of \$324,000,000. Between one-third and one-fourth the nominal cost of the road. Let this be a lesson to us how we permit the system of stock watering to invade our subsidised roads, how we permit the system of *crédit mobiliers* and construction companies to invade our Legislative halls, as well as our companies' headquarters. Then of the Atlantic and Pacific, the nominal cost was \$35,526 per mile or \$88,816,000; the real cost of that road, as estimated in 1881 by the Government, was \$20,000 a mile or \$50,000,000. The Southern Pacific, nominal cost \$81,020 a mile, or \$75,250,000; the real cost, estimated in 1881, was \$25,000 a mile or \$23,225,000. The Texas Pacific, \$37,416 per mile nominal, or \$71,130,000; the real cost, estimated in 1881, was \$20,000 a mile, or \$33,020,000. Look at what was fictitious on the one hand, and on the other look at what was real. Look at the nominal amount, the enormous amount of fictitious capital which has been palmed off upon a credulous public of investors, and under which so far as the law of competition has not admitted of relief, the public tributary to the railways is obliged to stagger, because, as I said, I entirely admit that, so far as your road is a monopoly road, the capital account will be regarded in considering the tariffs; and therefore I am glad that hon. gentlemen opposite referred to these American roads and to their system of finance, because they furnish lessons to us, to which I have alluded formerly in this House, which were not heeded by the majority at that time, and the melancholy results of which we are now to reckon with. The hon. the Secretary of State said, and I quite agree with him, that it was of prime importance to keep down the cost of construction; but it is also of great importance to keep down the nominal cost; because you already find this company rating its stock at \$65,000,000, as if a dollar had been

Mr. BLAKE.

paid for every dollar of that \$65,000,000. You find it estimating the cost of the main line at a sum including the aggregate of that nominal stock; you find it already trying to persuade the public that there is value there for all the stock it issued at a discount of 60, or whatever it may be; you already find it trying to pile up a capital account under which it may ask this House a little later on to sanction tolls upon that portion of the road which, under the monopoly provision is subject to and tributary to the company. It was a sound and prudent proposal of the Secretary of State that we should keep down the cost of construction, and it is also a sound and prudent proposal which I have made that we should keep down the issue of fictitious capital. I turn now to the nature and extent of our own Pacific Railway aids, and one cannot but be amazed and confounded at the nature and extent of those aids. What are they? There were 1,909 miles of road to be built by this corporation, and 2,550 miles to equip. That is what they had to do. What is done for them? The Government builds and hands over to them 641 miles of the main line, besides the Pembina branch, the probable cost of which I estimated, before the hon. acting Minister of Railways made his statement, at \$30,000,000. He says now \$29,500,000. I dare say we shall entirely agree by next Session, but I will leave it now at \$30,000,000, because, I am sorry to say, half a million more or less in the figures I am about to deal with is of very little consequence. The Government surveys cost \$3,500,000 about, really, I believe, \$3,440,000. The Government subsidy in cash was \$25,000,000. The Government provision of lands and powers has already realised to the company about \$11,000,000 in cash, under the operation of the land grant bonds system, the sales of town sites, and so on. That makes a total of cash or its equivalent of \$69,500,000, besides which there are 20,000,000 acres of land, because I throw off 1,400,000 acres with the \$2,060,000 now due for land sales, to meet the outstanding \$3,600,000, of land grant bonds in the hands of the public. Throwing this off—the proceeds of land sales yet to be collected and this fourteen hundred thousand acres of land to which I refer gives you a net 20,000,000 acres of free lands. So there were \$69,500,000 in cash aids, and 20,000,000 acres of land. If you value that at a dollar, you get public aids, not loans but gifts, of \$89,500,000. If you value that at \$2, which hon. gentlemen opposite and the company in their report of the day before yesterday value it at, you get public aids of \$109,500,000. There is the condition of things. Remember these are not loans, these are gifts. Besides that, there were those monopolies, those exemptions and those privileges to which I have referred more than once, which are of enormous value to the company and are of still greater disadvantage to the country. The sternness with which they are clung to shows their value to the company and shows their injury to the country. Throw them in at what you please, you find the aids in cash or its equivalent and in land, according as you value the latter at \$1 or \$2 an acre, amount to either \$82,500,000 or \$109,500,000 given to the company. Now add the loans of 1884. They amount to \$29,810,000. Then you have gifts, as before, \$69,500,000; loans, \$29,810,000, or a total of cash aids of \$99,310,000. Then add the 20,000,000 of acres and, if you value the lands at \$1, you have \$119,310,000, or if you value them at \$2, it gives you a total of gifts and loans, a total of aids of \$139,310,000. And the cost of the whole line, the Government and the company's sections, according to their own estimate was \$83,500,000, and the equipment \$8,000,000, making a total of \$91,500,000; and it is to be the property of the company, and the company and the Government both declare that it is going to pay from the day it is opened. Not merely does the Government declare that the whole line is going to pay from its opening, but the First Minister has declared in this House that the ends of that line are

going to be the most profitable parts of the line, that the British Columbia end and the North Shore of Lake Superior end are going to be more profitable than the middle. We have all agreed that the middle would be profitable; the hon. gentleman says the two ends are to be more profitable still; so the prospects of the company as a paying road are of the brightest description, and, as I have shown, we have given them the means, and far more than the means, to build that paying road. Well, then, the hon. First Minister gave a reason for the faith that was in him the other day, for he told us the road could carry freight at one-fourth the cost of other roads; and a road that can do that will certainly be a highly paying road. It is quite true that the late Minister of Railways said that it would cost the Canadian Pacific, for some years, four or five times as much to carry traffic to the Grand Trunk Railway which, in its through traffic, is burdened by all the disadvantages of making connection with other lines from which the Canadian Pacific Railway is free; but the First Minister's statement is that by which, I suppose, the Government is bound; and it contrasts curiously with the statement of Sir Charles Tupper who said the road would cost four or five times as much to carry traffic as other roads, while the First Minister says it will cost only one-fourth as much. But if we take the statements of the First Minister as the real determination of the Government upon this question, it will certainly be a most profitable enterprise. We build, and they are to own, they are to enjoy; and, besides owning and enjoying the railway, by virtue of the monopoly they are to own and enjoy the country as well. The company themselves have declared, in the report the other day, and the Secretary of State has practically declared that they are going to make a profit from the opening. Now, then, that is the position of this company, and what is our position at this moment, when we are asked to impair our securities and to make this new arrangement? I have pointed out that for the last six months, just in consequence of our financial embarrassments in connection with the Pacific, we have been paying 1 per cent. extra upon twenty-five millions of money. We borrowed \$25,000,000; we have borrowed temporarily \$15,800,000 from the banks, and we are to make new loans, chiefly to pay off these borrowings and in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of \$40,000,000, which makes a total of fresh obligations of \$65,000,000. We have a war debt on hand and we are in danger of a deficit, despite the monstrous taxation from which we are suffering. We have to pay increased permanent charges in the North-West, along with diminishing receipts from that country, and we have demands from various Provinces which claim railway aid and governmental aid of various kinds, at the peril of discontent, dissatisfaction, and some people even say—threatening only, I hope—disruption. We have depression and difficulty. We have a statement now made from those benches, and from the financial institutions, and from the company's reports, of unexampled depression. We even heard the word "crisis" used yesterday, a word we thought had disappeared from the dictionary with the incoming of a Conservative Administration. That is the condition in which we are, when we are called upon to make this new arrangement between the Government and the company, after we were told that the arrangement of last year was ample, ample and final—that there was an end to all. It behoves us to be cautious. The proposal, apart from the danger of the old loan, increases the aids by \$5,000,000, irrespective of the \$1,350,000 for interest; and this increases the total amount of the aids to the Canadian Pacific Railway in this wise: assuming the 20,000,000 acres to be unvalued, the gifts are to be \$69,500,000, loans \$34,810,000, or an aggregate of \$104,310,000 of aids, besides the 20,000,000 acres of land.

Assuming the land at \$1 per acre, and gifts become \$39,500,000, loan \$34,810,000, or a total of aids of \$124,310,000. Assuming the land at \$2 an acre, and you get a total of \$144,310,000. Nor is that the sum of our Canadian Pacific Railway engagements. I alluded a little while ago to our present and prospective Pacific Railway engagements outside the contract, which sum up to about \$14,000,000, apart altogether from the value. I know not what value the hon. member for Inverness attaches to them, or at what rate he would discount those several promises the Minister of Railways made to him yesterday; but apart altogether from that, there is about \$14,000,000. First of all, in British Columbia, aid to the Island Railway and the dry dock arrangement, both made in compensation for the Pacific Railway, \$1,000,000. In the Province of Ontario, the Canada Central, \$1,440,000; Gravenhurst and Callander, \$1,320,000; total, \$2,760,000. In Quebec, New Brunswick and Maine—Ottawa to Quebec, \$3,350,000; the Junction, \$200,000; proposed addition of this year, \$360,000; in that connection, \$3,910,000. Rivière du Loup or Rivière Ouelle to Edmundston, \$240,000; proposed addition of this year, \$258,000; total \$498,000. The Short Line proposal, which, as I understand, applies to Quebec, New Brunswick and Maine, is this: value of the grant of \$170,000 for 15 years, \$1,890,000; the present value added this year by making the grant \$250,000 for 20 years, or \$1,510,000, make a total of \$3,400,000. I will slip in here, as low a voice as I can, for fear it should reach the ear of the Acting Minister of Railways—the International, \$158,000, making a total of \$3,558,000, and a grand total for Quebec, New Brunswick and Maine of \$7,966,000. In Nova Scotia, Canso to Louisburg, \$256,000; Oxford to New Glasgow, \$224,000; Eastern Extension, bought to carry out that arrangement, \$1,236,000; Oxford and Sydney, \$30,000 for 15 years capitalised, \$333,600, or \$2,100,000 in Nova Scotia; making a total of \$13,827,000 as the aggregate of the proposals of the previous and the present Session, outside the Canadian Pacific Railway, but in connection with the scheme of a grand trans continental railway. So that you are about to add that sum. Then, if you do not value the lands, your total aids, including the proposed loan, to the whole scheme, inside and outside the contract, will be \$118,310,000, and 20,000,000 acres of land. If you value the land at \$1, your total aid will be \$138,310,000. With the land at \$2 an acre, the total aids will be \$158,310,000. But, Sir, let us revert to the contracted line and omit any reference to these outside engagements, which yet belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway policy: there is another way of viewing the case. Apply the means which are provided by the country as a basis of resources to build 1,909 miles of railway, and to equip 2,550 miles of railway, which was the company's obligation, the result is as follows, on the mileage basis of 1,909 miles: cash subsidy, \$25,000,000; cash realised from land grant bonds and powers of that kind, \$11,000,000; summing up, \$36,000,000, or making cash gifts in this way of \$18,858 per mile, available now, or in September, when the line is completed. Government works and surveys, \$33,500,000, making a gift at the rate of \$17,548 per mile on the 1,909 miles; thus making an aggregate of gifts in cash or its equivalent of \$36,406 per mile, with 20,000,000 acres of land, or a balance of 10,470 acres per mile by the original contract. And if you value the lands at \$1, the original gifts are equal to \$46,877 per mile; or if you value them at \$2, they are equal to \$57,348 per mile. Then, if you add the loans of 1884 these loans are equal to \$15,091 per mile on the 1,909 miles of contracted line. That makes gifts, cash and works of \$36,406 per mile, and a loan of \$15,091 per mile, or a total of cash, gifts and loans of \$51,497 per mile, besides the 10,471 acres per mile; if you value the land at \$1 per acre it gives gifts \$46,877 per mile; loans \$15,091 per mile, or a total of \$61,968 per mile. If you value the lands at \$2 per acre the amount of gifts is \$57,348 per mile; loans \$15,091 per mile, or a total of \$72,439 per mile. Now,

if you add the proposed loan of \$5,000,000, that makes the total loans equal to \$17,710 per mile—the old loan and the new loan; and that makes the aids of cash gifts and loans \$54,110 per mile and 10,471 acres per mile. Valuing the land at \$1 per acre makes the amount, of the gifts and loans, \$64,487 per mile; and valuing the land at \$2 per acre the amount is \$75,058 per mile for the 1,909 miles which the company are to build. Now, of course, I am not prepared to say, without going into further calculations, that this is too much; one has to consider what was to be done in order to find out whether this was too much or too little. I propose now to proceed to enquire what was to be done for those aids. One year ago, when the loan of 1884 was asked for, the official statement as to the cost of the contracted line was as follows: expenditure already made, \$23,078,950; materials on hand, \$4,028,604; total amount required to complete the contract, \$27,000,000, from which I deduct, for the moment, \$1,700,000, being the amount out of that estimate attributed to equipment, because I am dealing with the construction, and have for the moment no reference to equipment. That is to say that \$25,300,000 were required to complete the road; and thus the total cost of construction would be \$52,407,500. That is a plain and clear statement of the case given to the country by the Government and the company last year, namely that \$52,407,500 was to be the cost of building that line, in accordance with the contract, apart from the equipment. Mr. Van Horne, in a paper on the Table, says this estimated cost includes the permanent road round that part of Kicking Horse Pass which is now arranged for by a temporary line; that the cost of both the permanent and the temporary line was estimated at about \$1,360,000, of which \$960,000 was estimated for the permanent line. He has obtained permission to use the temporary line for some years to come, and therefore the permanent expenditure will not be incurred. I deduct, therefore, from the estimate of last year, \$960,000, since we are not to have the permanent line built, and that reduces the cost to \$51,440,000. But Mr. Van Horne also says that \$4,000,000 have been saved in British Columbia since the estimate of last year. Mr. Stephen, however, in his letter of 18th March, says that the saving in British Columbia has been off set by extra expenditure on the North Shore. Now, when you come to the brief, condensed and unsatisfactory statement placed before us, unverified and unsupported by the statement of any engineer, you find that the extra expenditure on the North Shore is stated by Mr. Stephen at \$2,500,000, and that only. I deduct that sum of \$2,500,000, unsatisfactory though the statement is, from the \$4,000,000 which Mr. Van Horne said was saved at the other end, and I find a net saving of \$1,500,000 in that respect, as estimated last year. That being deducted from \$51,440,000 reduces the cost of the line, by the estimates and statements which are before us, to a trifle under \$50,000,000. Now, as to the cost of equipment. When the loan was asked for, we were told that \$1,700,000, which was included in the loan, was quite adequate, in addition to the existing equipment. The existing equipment of all lines and branches was said, at that time, to be of the value of \$3,638,000; and the amount added, which was put into the loan for equipment, was \$1,700,000 and it gave, as necessary for all the lines and branches, according to the estimate, \$10,328,000. There is the required equipment for the main line and branches. I will make another calculation, by which to ascertain the cost of the equipment. I take Mr. Stephen's own letter of the 18th March, in which he states the expenditure for equipment up to 31st December, at \$9,168,755; and that there will be required \$1,000,000, making a total of \$10,168,750 for the main line and branches. That is on average within a fraction of the result of the former calculation. I take the larger of the two figures, so as to err on the safe side, and taking \$10,338,000 as the cost of equip-

Mr. BLAIR.

ment of all lines and branches, and observing that there are 2,550 miles from Callander to Port Moody, \$8,000,000 would be the proper proportion for equipment. This accords, so far as I can see, with the figures given on the last occasion. I have thus arrived at the cost of the construction of the contracted line and the cost of equipment for the Government and contracted lines: \$50,000,000 for the one, \$8,000,000 for the other, total \$58,000,000. That is the result of the information which was given in January, 1884, as modified by the information we have since received. I ask, next, having arrived at what the cost of the work for the company to do was—a work which they say is to be completed a few weeks from this hour—what are the cash resources available to meet that work? They are easily ascertained. There are, subsidies, \$25,000,000; the loan of \$22,500,000, the land grant bonds, which realized, in 1883, \$9,200,000, and in 1884 the company received more than \$1,000,000 more of land grant bonds, which have always been saleable at something approaching par, from 97 to par. I put in \$1,000,000 for that. Then there are bonuses and town site sales \$800,000. These three figures give you \$11,000,000 of cash resources actually available to the company, in addition to the subsidy and the loan. Then I come to another point, and that is the net profits of working. The company state the profits from all the lines to be \$1,626,000. There I am in the region of conjecture, because we have not got a statement of what the net profits were from working the leased and acquired lines, and therefore it is impossible for me to declare what proportion of profit is due to the main line, the line from Callander to Port Moody. But my belief is, that I overstate the case when I assume \$66,000 to be the amount of net profit derivable from the acquired and leased lines, in excess of the fixed charges to the company, and charges for interest on purchase money which the company have already paid. If you take the purchase money paid for the Canada Central and for the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and the Laurentian Railway, and other lines, and calculate the interest on the purchase money; and if you take the interest on the unpaid purchase money of the Canada Central, and Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental, and the interest on hypothecated bonds and for stock, for the other line, the Ontario and Quebec proper, if you take the charges on the Credit Valley arrangement, the rent of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and deduct them from what are called the net earnings, which are the gross earnings, less the actual expenses, I think you will find it very probable that I erred in assuming that \$1,626,000 were the earnings in excess of those sums. I do not know whether that sum is the result of the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway, after deducting those charges. It ought to be, because if those charges are not deducted, then the main line has been charged with the cost of buying and leasing lines and branches. I did assume that those charges were deducted and that the result of \$1,626,000 was after the deduction of those charges. Assuming that, and assuming that \$66,000 would be the surplus upon the leased and acquired lines, after their bearing the cost of their acquisition, I take \$1,560,000 as the net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line from Callander to Port Moody, and I add that to the resources I have already stated, which gives \$60,060,000 cash resources—or, say sixty millions. Now, I have shown you the cost of construction, and equipment, to be \$58,000,000, and I have shown you the cash resources provided altogether outside of the company, provided, in fact, by the public, to be \$60,000,000, or \$2,000,000 more than the whole cost of construction and equipment, and that without touching the company's original stock. Now, that stock was to be touched; it was part of the contract that the company should subscribe that stock and pay it up in full; it was part of the contract that that should be done; that the money should go into

the fulfilment of the contract. They did subscribe it, and they did pay it up and put it in the contract, and therefore that \$5,000,000 is to be added, which gives you the total available assets of the company—of which the company provided only \$5,000,000—\$65,000,000, to meet the expenses due under the contract of \$58,000,000, or a surplus of \$7,000,000. Then, Sir, you may make certain deductions and additions, and I am about to state those for which there is more or less plausibility. You may say now: You have charged us with the whole amount which has been realised for land grant bonds, but we had to pay interest on them, and that should be deducted. I admit the fairness of the statement, but I do not admit the fairness of the whole deduction, because, if they deducted \$582,000 for interest on land grant bonds, while the money received from them was deposited with the Government, of course the interest they receive on the money goes against the interest they pay for the money, and so, deducting the \$192,000 which they received in that way, we have a net charge of \$390,000 for interest on the land grant bonds. They have also paid interest on the Government 5 per cent. loan, which was one of the assets, and I have credited that interest to the amount of \$265,000 to date. That gives a total interest of \$655,000, which is a fair deduction from the surplus of \$7,000,000. Then, do you dispute my deduction of \$960,000 for the permanent line? I do not see upon what ground you can dispute it, but if you do, let us throw it off. Do you dispute my deduction for savings of one and a half million? I do not see upon what grounds you can dispute it, but throw it off. Then, you still have \$3,115,000 against the surplus of about \$7,000,000, you still find about \$4,000,000 remaining. If you even ask me to include what the company says is a betterment to the Government lines, it is only some \$1,200,000, and still there is left a balance of \$2,700,000, out of these resources all provided by the public, excepting the original \$5,000,000 provided by the company. Now, I invite your consideration to those figures, and I invite those who challenge them to show in what respect they are substantially inaccurate, and if accurate, how it is that ample provision in cash has not been made for every dollar which was required to be expended to complete this contract, upon the contract itself. But, Sir, I have entirely omitted, up to this moment, enormous additional resources of the company. There is the Government 4 per cent. loan on securities. These securities were available; they were securities which might be used in order to get cash or credit; they were used in order to get credit, in order to get the Government deposit of \$7,380,000, and therefore there is that available asset created by this work of \$7,380,000, and in respect of which the company obtained from the Government a loan to that amount. Then, as to unsold lands: after settling for the land grant bonds, as I explained a little while ago, there remains a balance of twenty millions on that account, and that, also, was an additional asset. Then the Government works and surveys were an additional asset of thirty-three and a half millions. And the company actually realised, in cash, for the sixty millions of stock which they issued and sold, subsequently, under the new scheme of finance, to which I will presently allude, \$24,493,000, or, say twenty-four and a-half millions. So, outside altogether of the line of assets which I have given to you before, I show you enormous additional assets and resources which were available towards the completion of this contract. And you cannot overlook the consideration of those assets when you come to consider the proposal to grant additional aid and to impair the existing securities to Canada for the aid already given. Now, Sir, so far I have been dealing with the figures as of the 1st September next, when it is said this contract will be completed, and the loan and the subsidy will be actually realised to the last dollar. That is the proper date to handle. We are now within a few weeks of the 1st of September,

and all of our calculations may be fairly directed towards the condition of things on that day, and on that day, therefore, you find the results such as I have indicated. But I will turn back, and I will deal with the figures which were given—deal with the figures of Mr. Stephen's letter as of the 31st of December, 1884, and I will enquire what were the expenditures and what were the assets up to that time. There were, in the shape of assets, cash receipts on account of subsidy, up to 31st December, \$19,773,027; loan up to that date, \$17,970,720; land grant bonds, etc., of which I have explained the details, \$11,000,000; working profits, \$1,560,000; original paid up stock, \$5,000,000; making an aggregate of \$55,640,000 received up to the 31st of December last. Now, I cannot make out in the same satisfactory manner the expenditure on the contracted line up to that time, because the statements of Mr. Miall and Mr. Stephen are short, obscure, vague, condensed, and give no reasonable practical information upon which one can make it out. But I give you my deductions from figures the accuracy of which I do not admit, which I am unable to reconcile with the statements made in January last and the statements made since; but such as they are, assuming them to be correct, these are the figures. Mr. Stephen says the expenditure on the main line and branches up to the 31st of December was \$52,595,842, and for the material on hand \$3,687,729; making a total of \$56,283,571. From that I deduct, according to Mr. Stephen's own figures, the company's expenditures on the acquisition of lines east of Callander, \$4,213,758; their expenditure on branches—the Algoma branch, \$2,269,798, and on the western branches of 176 miles, \$2,335,374, or a total for branches of \$4,605,172; those deductions aggregating \$8,818,930, which, deducted from the principal sum, leaves, according to Mr. Stephen's statement—which is inexplicable to me—\$47,464,671 as the expenditure on the construction of the contracted line up to the 31st of December last. My opinion is that that may include a large sum for interest or dividends; I think that is the negro in the fence corner. But I only conjecture it. Then, as to the equipment up to the 31st of December, Mr. Stephen's statement is that it is \$9,168,750 for all lines. Deduct for the line east of Callander and the branches, say 670 miles, their proportion, \$1,890,000, leaving the expenditure for equipment on the 2,550 miles \$7,178,750. That gives me an aggregate of \$54,641,000 for construction and equipment on the contract, as against the receipts to that date of \$55,643,000, leaving an apparent surplus of \$1,000,000. But that surplus is properly subject to the deduction of \$655,000 on interest account, so far as I can judge. I do not know, of course, whether this \$47,464,671 may not include some interest. If it does, then the deduction I suggest should not be made; but, if it does not include the interest I have referred to, then that deduction should be made; and that would still leave a surplus. And, even if you add the improvements on Government sections to the amount of \$1,240,000, you only get a deficit of under \$1,000,000, after paying up to the handle for everything that was expended on the contract up to the 31st of December. The assets which produced that result being entirely public assets, except the \$5,000,000 of the original stock of the company, that deficit of under \$1,000,000 is, at any rate, not embarrassing, because a floating debt of \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 is customary in such operations; they said it only became abnormal when it reached \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000. All they required to do was to carry this \$1,000,000 as a floating debt, and of course the drawback which was kept on the Government subsidy, and which obviously rendered plain the cause of the narrow circumstances, would pay for that, practically, under the contract. So that on 31st December there was no ground for embarrassment, irrespective altogether of those other enormous resources to which I have referred. I have pointed out that these enormous resources had netted on the

new stock of sixty millions, \$24,493,000; the Government 4 per cent. loan was \$7,380,000; and their credit enabled them to owe \$6,895,000, of which you can strike off \$1,000,000 as due on the contracted line, which would leave owing on other accounts than the contracted line \$5,900,000; so that their other resources had actually produced, up to the same date, the 31st December, applicable to other purposes than the contracted line, an aggregate of \$37,780,000. Now, the next question to which I address myself is what has become of this \$37,780,000; because I have shown you enough assets to accomplish all they were bound to under the contract, without having reference to that sum at all. They obtained it and the 20,000,000 acres of land besides. Well, what became of it? The explanations of that are not absolutely clear; but they are sufficiently clear for our purpose, dealing, as we are, with sums so enormous, that an inaccuracy of even half a million or so is of little consequence. I divide this \$37,780,000 into two grand heads; the first of these is outside expenditure in one way or another, and I will give you the items which I find in the company's various statements:

Main line and branches east of Oallander.....	\$4,658,622
Algoma branch.....	2,269,798
Western branches.....	2,335,374
Steamers.....	897,369
Real estate at Montreal.....	408,207
South-Western Railway.....	1,593,280
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway.....	227,155
Atlantic and North-Western Railway.....	202,837
Manitoba and South-Western Railway.....	1,254,678
Ontario leased lines.....	1,265,450
Proportion of equipment for these Outside lines.....	1,890,000
Interest on financial matters, &c., &c., &c.	1,399,484

Total..... \$18,195,264

The sum of \$1,399,484 is stated by Mr. Miall to be interest on financial matters and other charges, some of which I have very probably included in my estimate of interest already charged against the other receipts, and therefore should not now be included; but still I include it all, for I have not the details, though the Government have them; and all these sums give me the aggregate of \$18,195,264 spent by the company on outside matters out of the \$37,780,000. Well, that leaves the larger half to be yet accounted for. I have found for you where \$18,200,000 have gone; I have to find for you where \$19,600,000 have gone. And that comes under the second grand head of the two grand heads of expenditure by this company of its resources—dividends, dividends, dividends. The statement of Mr. Stephen on the subject of dividends is not, according to my judgment, absolutely accurate, but I will use it, in the first instance, so as to state the amount from his own lips. He states that there were paid by funds provided by the company, partly paid by the company itself and partly by the Government, out of the funds provided by the company, \$5,378,000 in dividends up to the 31st December last; and that the sum remaining in the hands of the Government for future dividends was, on the 31st December last, \$14,288,000, making an aggregate for dividends of \$19,666,288. My task was to account for \$19,600,000. I have got you the \$19,600,000, and I think I have practically squared the account. I think I have practically shown you where this \$38,800,000 has gone—that the smaller half of it has gone in outside enterprises and that the larger half of it has gone in dividends, past, present and to come. This shows where the money has gone and to what the trouble is due. There were extravagant expenditures, according to my belief; my belief is that this road cost more than it need have cost. There was haste and waste. There is proof in Mr. Schreiber's statement and Mr. Van Horne's also, to which I referred yesterday, of the necessary cost involved in the speed; there was inordinate expense on outside objects, on the Laurentian Railway line, on the South-Eastern line, the St. Lawrence

Mr. BLAKE.

and Ottawa Company, the North American Contracting Company, the North-West Lands Company, the leased lines and other objects. There were on these various heads, grounds for saying that more money had been expended than ought wisely to have been expended. With reference to the whole of this outside expenditure questions arise, various questions, differing questions, questions which may make some of the expenditure prudent, and some of it very rash—but granting all, wiping out all the extravagance and assuming there was no extravagance; wiping out all the imprudence and assuming that there was no imprudence; saying that it was right and wise for the company, assisted and egged on by the Government, to spend the sum of over \$18,000,000 on outside enterprises, while they were, or ought to have been, straining every nerve to build the contracted line—admitting all that, for the moment, yet with the resources they had and have in hand there was a margin up to the 31st December last of \$20,000,000 to keep them out of embarrassment: \$20,000,000 is absorbed in repayments to subscribers. Now, let us examine this question of repayment to subscribers, this question of dividends. The law allows a railway company during construction to pay not exceeding 6 per cent., if they please, on the amount actually paid up in cash, in hard cash, on the stock that has been subscribed for construction. That is all which the wisdom of Parliament has provided that railway companies should be allowed to pay. No watered stock payments, no payments on anything that was not solid cash, but you might, if you pleased, having got in hard cash, which had gone into the works, say \$1,000,000, pay the subscribers of that amount 6 per cent. a year on that or \$60,000. That, in the wisdom of Parliament, was the sound rule established. Let us consider this company. Did it occupy an exceptional position? It did. What was the exceptional character and position of this company? It was this, that it was subsidised by the Government on the understanding that it was not going to make an early dividend, but that it was to be recouped out of the sale of the lands for its actual losses in the early working of the road. The proposal was, not that we should furnish money to the company to give subscribers who had stock 6, 10, 12 or 20 per cent. on their money, but that we were to give the company, in addition to cash, land, the ultimate result of which would repay them for the loss of interest or dividends in the early working of the road. That was the position of the company, a position against the paying of dividends out of capital instead of in favor of it; a position in which the impropriety of paying dividends out of capital was recognised, and in which the source of recoupment for losses was to be the great resources the Government were giving the company. Now, the stock was fixed at \$5,000,000, to be all paid up, in actual cash, within a short delay, with the power of increasing it to \$25,000,000; but I need not say that when the \$5,000,000 was paid up in full in cash it would be impossible to put out the other \$20,000,000 at a discount, or on any other basis than par, without creating an entire revolution in the scheme of finances of the company. The principle recognised by Parliament was that every dollar of the stock first subscribed should be paid up in cash; \$5,000,000 was paid up in cash, and if the company were to issue the rest at 50, the subscribers at 50 would get the stock at half the price of those who had subscribed the first \$5,000,000. No one thought of more capital being issued, at any rate, beyond the \$20,000,000 additional; \$25,000,000 was the extreme capital talked of. We were anxious the capital should be kept down, because the great object was that there should be a small dividend to be paid, since the burden on the commerce of the country was to be measured, first of all, by the cost of carriage, and secondly by the dividend; and it was vital to

us that the dividend-bearing capital should be kept down to the lowest possible figure, so that the burden on the commerce of the country might be kept down to the lowest possible figure. That being the principle, and these being the expectations of Parliament, I now address myself to the question: What has actually been done? I leave out of consideration, for the moment, the original \$5,000,000, because that was contemplated, that was arranged, that was subscribed, that was paid in full, that went into the fund; but, besides that, the company has issued \$60,000,000 more, and in connection with its stock operations it has raised \$7,380,000 from the Government. Now, I want to know, having stated the millions of stock that it has issued, \$60,000,000 of new stock and \$7,380,000 raised from Government in connection with stock operations: what has that produced? The original stock of \$5,000,000 would have reaped its whole profit out of the working earnings; \$1,000,000 would have paid a fair and reasonable dividend during construction on the \$5,000,000 of capital, and that would have been paid out of the working earnings of the road; but that abominable system of stock watering to which I have referred, which, I have pointed out, in two years resulted, in the United States, in the increase by two thousand millions of interest and dividend-bearing stocks and bonds, or presumably interest and dividend-bearing stocks and bonds, while the betterments represented by that two thousand millions only cost one thousand and fifty millions, or, practically, \$2 of obligations for every \$1 of real value was to be introduced. That abominable system which has destroyed the credit of the American railways, which has rendered it impossible for the ordinary mind, with ordinary acquaintance with things, to judge of the real value of an enterprise at all, which even induces an Acting Minister of Railways to talk of the cost of a railway system as \$323,000,000 when it has cost only a trifle compared with that amount; that system which renders everything vague and speculative, which gives every opportunity to the dishonest man to deceive and gull the simple investor, was to be carried out. The principle of an honest paid up stock was to be given up, and the first thing that was done was to commence the creation of this load of fictitious capital. They issued to the original proprietors of \$5,000,000 of paid up stock \$20,000,000 more, realising only \$5,000,000 in cash, or 25 per cent. of the nominal value. They got \$5,000,000 in cash, and they issued \$20,000,000 in stock. Having done that, they sold \$30,000,000 more at prices which netted the company only \$15,281,754, or under 51 per cent. of the nominal value. They then proceeded to borrow on, and ultimately to sell, \$10,000,000 more, selling at a price which netted the company \$4,211,294, or 42 per cent. of the nominal value. They thus produced from the \$60,000,000 of nominal capital \$24,493,000 in cash, or, on the whole average, under 41 per cent. of the nominal value. And, if you choose to throw in the honest \$5,000,000, and to put it together with these tainted matters, you find that an issue of \$65,000,000 nominal realised \$29,493,000, or 45½ per cent. of the nominal value. And if you choose to average the holdings of the original proprietors, the \$5,000,000 honest and the \$20,000,000 at 25, their special holdings cost them 40 per cent. of the nominal value. Now, remember, if you please, when you hear talk of a ruinous price for Canadian Pacific Railway stock, when you hear talk of risks, when you hear talk of difficulties, when you hear talk of embarrassments, that the whole of this stock, the first five millions paid up and all, was issued by the company at prices which realised only 45½ of the nominal value. Remember that the original proprietors put their estimate of value upon their whole holding by taking the \$20,000,000 at 25, thus averaging for their holding 40, and remember that the stock has fluctuated from 37 and 38 for a little while, up to 64 and 65. Now, what is 50 on a stock, the real value of which, as

represented by the money given for it, is 40? Why, of course, when you pay 50 for a stock of which the real value is 40, it is an advance of 10, it is a premium of 25 per cent.; if you pay 60, it is an advance of 50 per cent.; and, if you pay 80, the price to which Mr. Stephen said he expected the stock to advance, it is an advance of 100 per cent. on the 40 which was paid, and at which he could have sold, if his expectations had been realised. The original proprietors, if the glorious visions in which they indulged, and which they expected the House to help them to realise, had been realised, having paid \$10,000,000 for \$25,000,000 of stock, would have realised 80, and thus taken \$10,000,000 clean profit, apart altogether from the question of interest or dividend. I am going to deal with the question of interest and dividend presently, by itself, because it is too large a question to mix up with capital. But I am dealing now with the new finance. The \$60,000,000 of the new finance netted \$24,500,000. The Government loan in connection with the stock was \$7,380,000, or a total of \$31,880,000. I enquire, now, what has become of the proceeds of the new scheme of finance? What has become of that \$31,880,000? There is what the company realised by the issue of stock and by a mortgage, in connection with its stock operations, of its assets, irrespective of the sales of the public lands, the grant of the public moneys, and the grant of the public loan. Now, Mr. Stephen states that the company itself paid, not out of the Government moneys, not by virtue of the moneys placed in the hands of the Government at all, but itself paid, in dividends, up to the 31st December, 1884, the sum of \$3,428,000. The company itself paid, on the 17th February, 1885, a further dividend of \$650,000, or 1 per cent. To these sums which the company itself paid, not through the medium of the Government, I add the company's deposit with the Government and the company's loan from and deposit with the Government to meet dividends, which amounted to \$15,942,645; and I add also the interest which was paid and allowed on that item up to 17th February, 1885. That interest amounted to \$318,852.96 for one half-year, \$305,729.56 for the second half-year, and \$292,344.56 for the third half-year, making an aggregate of \$916,927, which was produced by the means of the deposit of \$15,942,645. These sums make a grand aggregate of \$20,937,572, or, in round numbers, twenty-one millions of dollars already devoted by this company to the purposes of dividends. Now, what is the short result? They raise by the new finance on stock twenty-four millions and a-half of money, and they have devoted by the new finance to dividends twenty-one millions of money, making \$3,500,000 to go on the work, and \$21,000,000 to go into their own pockets. What is the amount they actually paid on dividends up to the 17th February last? On the first \$5,000,000 of cash stock they have paid about \$1,000,000; on the \$20,000,000, which represents \$5,000,000 cash, they have paid \$2,610,000; on the \$30,000,000, representing \$15,281,000, they have paid \$2,640,000, and on the \$10,000,000, representing \$4,212,000, they have paid \$750,000, or a total of \$7,000,000 already paid in cash to its shareholders by this embarrassed company, which has to come to us for help in its urgent need. And having paid \$7,000,000 in cash they have deposited with the Government now, at interest at 4 per cent., \$13,934,572.42, which with interest, at 4 per cent., would sum up to about \$14,100,000 at this moment in the hands of the Government. Now, Sir, there is the finance. A portion of that \$15,942,645 was paid in by the company itself, how was it raised? It was raised by the sale of this stock at a price which makes the dividends on that stock between 12 and 13 per cent., and it was deposited with the Government at 4 per cent. interest to secure the dividends at 12½ per cent. interest on that very stock and the other stock. They sell the stock, agreeing to give it at a price which is to net 12½ per cent., and they take the money and put

it into the hands of the Government at 4 per cent. and they say: Keep this to secure the 12½ per cent. dividends—I ask you what is to be expected from finance like that? Now, Sir, the original proprietors who took the additional \$20,000,000, have on their \$5,000,000 of cash, for which they received \$20,000,000 of stock, already received 52 per cent. on their capital investment. They got for part of the time 24 per cent. per annum on their investment, and for the rest 20 per cent. They promised themselves a continuation of this same dividend until the completion of the road, and honorable men, fulfilling their promise, they kept it, Sir, in the dire distress of the company in last September, they kept it in the still more dire distress of the company on the 17th of February last. What mattered it that the contractors were unpaid? What mattered it that the section men on the line, the employés, were unpaid? What mattered it that their credit was being destroyed? What mattered it that they were embarrassed in every way? Their promises to themselves must be observed. They took out the money and they put that money into the extra dividend producing these enormous profits, and left the contractors and section men, honest debts and everything else, unpaid, and destroyed the credit of the company. We could not collect our interest in May. We gave them time to pay it in May, because we did not want to interfere with their use of the money in the prosecution of the work; but they took care to pay their dividends, although they would not pay us our interest. There is one thing that must be done: the dividend must be paid, no matter who is left out. Having got this 24 per cent. for part of the time, and this 20 per cent. for the rest of the time, they have secured themselves, by this arrangement, 12 per cent. for eight and a-half years to come upon this investment. Blow high, blow low, do ill or do well, give up the road, if you like, to-morrow, still there will be 12 per cent. up to the end of eight and a-half years. By the end of ten years, for which this arrangement is made, they will have taken on that \$5,000,000 the sum of \$7,810,000, apart altogether from the future earnings of the road, on which the company declared, just the other day, they expected to make a profit in the first year; so that, leaving the earnings out, it will repay them their whole \$5,000,000, with 10½ per cent. interest, until repaid. They are absolutely secure to get back every shilling of that \$5,000,000 and 10½ per cent. interest on it under this arrangement, and to own besides in respect of that investment twenty-sixty-fifths or nearly one-third of the whole enterprise, land and all. But they say you ought to average their investment; that it is very unfair to deal separately with the second \$5,000,000. I deny that, but I shall go into the account on the average investment, too. Now, taking the average on the \$10,000,000 cash they put in, \$5,000,000 of honest cash, \$5,000,000 for which they get twenty millions. They have got \$3,610,000 in dividends already, and they get, in eight years and a-half, \$6,875,000 more, or \$10,485,000 of dividends, apart altogether from the road and the land and the future earnings of the road, on \$10,000,000 capital.

Mr. HAGGART. Why don't you buy some of the stock?

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's interest in the company is.

Mr. HAGGART. I have none, but you say it is a good investment.

Mr. BLAKE. But the law forbids any member of Parliament to be an owner of stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, these are figures in respect to which I challenge contradiction. If you put to one side the question of a return of the capital, and assume that the capital will be represented by twenty-five sixty-fifths or more than one-third of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its lands, at the

Mr. BLAKE.

end of ten years then their dividends have been in the earlier stages from 15 to 12½ per cent. on their whole ten millions, and they are to have 7½ per cent. for the rest of the term, after the completion of the road, with the chance of dividends from earnings to be added. So that they will have more than one-third of the enterprise, with dividends already secured, varying from 15 to 7½ per cent., during the ten years after its inception. Now, as to the other stock. That stock realised \$19,500,000 cash for \$40,000,000 of stock, and it has obtained, and will obtain, in secured dividends, \$14,390,000, an enormous interest; and, besides that, forty sixty-fifths, or nearly to two-thirds of the whole enterprise. Now, Sir, take the average date of the payments of the \$29,500,000. I have averaged the dates of the payments at which those men put in their money, and I find the average date of the whole, including the original \$5,000,000, was the 16th January, 1883, and by the 17th February, 1885, or in two years and one month, they had received \$7,000,000, or 11½ per cent. per annum profit on the whole \$29,500,000. And the future secured dividends, allowing the September 1 per cent., which they have promised themselves—and I have shown the desperate fidelity with which they have adhered to those promises of the past—will give for the future 8 per cent. per annum of profit, apart from earnings, up to 1st September, 1885. In all, if you include the September, 1885, and February, 1886, extra dividends, there will have been paid and provided for dividends \$24,875,000; or a sum equal to the whole amount realised from stock by the new finance. They will have paid \$24,500,000, and there will have been paid and provided for dividends, even including only the September payment, just about \$24,500,000. So far from these resources of the company being invested in inside or outside operations, the net result of the transaction has been to invest money with one hand for the purpose of taking it out with the other. In substance the proceeds of the stock are divided among the stockholders; we are to raise money to build the road; and the country is to pay tolls for all time to meet the stock so divided. The company are seeking to secure \$15,000,000 of additional capital to use, although they have \$14,100,000 available in the hands of the Government. The Government are asking the permission of the country to reduce interest on the public debt and to create an interest charge on the new capital, while the company are saying that whatever happens we must take care of ourselves and the Government must take care of us, and we must lay by a nest-egg for ourselves. I maintain that the proper place for the company's money is the company's road. I maintain that we have no right to connive at transactions like this, to approve or to endorse them. We never contemplated such an act as this, that millions upon millions would be emitted, representing a nominal capital of \$60,000,000 and an actual capital of \$24,500,000, and then that we should be called upon to lend about \$29,500,000 and then be asked for \$5,000,000 more, and to impair our security and lower our rate of interest, in order that those gentlemen may run no risk at all, but ensure to themselves large interest in the meanwhile and a magnificent enterprise subsequently. They say it will pay a dividend from the start. It is just about to start. Let them take their dividend out of the earnings, and use their money to complete the road which is to produce the earnings. Do not let them do like the man of old, put their money in a napkin and bury it in the ground; but let them put it where it will do the most good for the country, put it where it is destined to go, put it where it belongs. For what purpose was the stock issued—the stock of \$60,000,000? To make dividends for the stockholders? Was it not that the money might be got to build the road? Use the money then to build the road. The company have already taken \$7,000,000 out of the nominal capital and put it in their pockets. Let the company take the \$14,000,000 in the hands of the Government and put it into the road. That money will pay off the floating debt; it

will give the required new money; it will keep our securities just as they are, and it will prevent the necessity of reducing our rate of interest. If the shareholders want \$14,000,000 more let them ask us for that money of theirs which the Government now holds. My view is that the company ought to apply to Parliament for what Parliament would, no doubt, willingly give them; that these shareholders should say: Gentlemen, we find that we miscalculated, that we took too much of our money as profits on our stock. We find that we want some of that money for the object to which it should be devoted, namely, to put it into the road which we were to build, and from the earnings of which we were to receive dividends; will you please hand it back to us, this \$14,000,000, so that we may put it into the road, that it may go to its proper destination and earn its appropriate dividend. Let the shareholders make that statement to us, and we will willingly comply with their request. We will say: That is where the money should always have gone, certainly where it ought to go now. I believe no ground whatever has been made out for granting the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the proposal of the Government, which is calculated to impose for all time to come a further charge of fifteen millions of dollars on the commerce and trade of this country, to exaggerate to that extent the rates and tolls required to make the Canadian Pacific Railway remunerative; and all this is to be done because the stockholders in this enterprise, having realised from \$60,000,000 of stock \$24,500,000, have chosen to appropriate \$24,500,000 to pay dividends upon their stock. I say they ought to be told: Gentlemen, you can have the \$14,000,000 when you desire to obtain it. Assemble in general meeting, and if you want that money, come and ask us for it, and it will be handed over; it is your money, deposited as a fund for you; but while it is there, it is nothing less than impudent for you to come to us and ask us for more money, ask us to impair our security, and ask us to allow you to make further permanent charges on the road, simply in order that your dividends may be assured beyond peradventure. Holding these views, I oppose and I protest against the passage of these resolutions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has succeeded, after the years that have elapsed since 1878, in getting up what might be called a rather hearty cheer.

Mr. DAVIES. The occasion called for it.

Mr. IVES. Yes, the occasion called for it, because it is the first time the leader of the Opposition ever announced a policy upon any subject, and having announced a policy on this subject, the occasion called for a cheer, which the hon. gentlemen gave him. I congratulate those hon. gentlemen upon having got up a hearty cheer, and it was a proper return for seven weeks of arduous labor on the part of the leader of the Opposition, and of eight hours labored speaking in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. IVES. You are showing your natural tendency by grunts, but you will not disturb me. There was a time, a few weeks ago, when Conservative papers intimated that the leader of the Opposition was not exactly in accord with those of his followers in this House who were obstructing the business of the country, week after week, in the discussion of the Franchise Bill; and it was said, as a reason why the leader of the Opposition was not in the House, that he was not in accord with the course which hon. gentlemen were taking. But after the evidences of labor which he has now given us, I think he deserves to be acquitted of that charge. I think it is a quite satisfactory explanation that during the

last seven weeks he has been preparing this long array of figures, which we have heard a dozen different times before, and which are served up to us in as many different forms as the hon. gentleman has made speeches. As it is nearly six o'clock, I propose, for the few moments remaining before that time, to deal with one of the matters which the hon. gentleman referred to, for the purpose of inspiring a joke, occasionally, in the somewhat dry details of his speech. The hon. gentleman referred to a number of matters beside the question, for the purpose of amusing us, but he only made one really successful hit and that was the reference to the Secretary of State crying "All aboard for the West." He asked at what point would the hon. the Secretary of State embark; would he embark at Montreal or at Quebec? He also referred to the Acting Minister of Railways as the conductor of that train, and he said the only difference between him, as conductor, and the Secretary of State, was that he would say, from Montreal: "All aboard for the East," and *sotto voce*—so low, in fact, that I could hardly hear him—he made a subsequent reference to the Acting Minister of Railways in connection with the proposed short line subsidy from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. I would ask the hon. gentleman what sort of conductor he would make for this train? Where would he get aboard? Would he get on board at Callander or in the prairie region? If he only built the prairie section of the road, as he has always advocated, I fancy he would have to use some of the water stretches of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to get there, and then taking his prairie road, he could not go to British Columbia. He could not get on board at Port Moody, at Calgary, or even at Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. McCALLUM. He would get on at the Fort Francis locks.

Mr. IVES. If he were there he would have a fine place to start from, as he would spend the night in the Neebing Hotel. I quite understood why the hon. gentleman spoke *sotto voce* about going away from Montreal, because I observe that it is necessary for the hon. gentleman in order that he may avoid wounding the feelings of some of his own supporters, to speak very delicately on that tender subject of the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Maritime Provinces; so delicately, in fact, that although so many days have elapsed since the resolutions were brought down, the *Globe* newspaper has not had a word to say with regard to building a railway from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. It was necessary for the hon. gentleman to speak low, more particularly on account of his hon. friend on his left (Mr. Laurier), who certainly must be pleased with the prospect of extending the railway from Montreal to his own constituency at the port of Quebec.

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

### After Recess.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MACMASTER. I rise to ask the permission of the House to bring up a matter by way of privilege—to make an explanation personal to myself. In the *Montreal Witness* of the 16th of June there occurs the following article, under the heading of "Tampering with the *Hansard*:"

"After recess, Mr. Blake, on a question of privilege, pointed out an interpolation which had been inserted in the revised or permanent form of the *Hansard*, in a way which leaves little doubt that some one has been tampering with the official debates. The alteration is made in the debate in the *Hansard* of 8th June, in which Mr. Macmaster made his unfortunate statement that the Highlanders of 150 years ago were practically savages. In the first draft of the *Hansard*, which appeared on the day following the debate, there is no break in Mr. Macmaster's remarks, but in the permanent edition of the *Hansard*, after members have had an opportunity of correcting their speeches, there appears, just at this point, an interruption by Mr. Blake, to the effect that the ancient High-

landers stole cattle. The rule with regard to correcting the *Hansard* is that a member may make any necessary corrections in his own speech, but no member is allowed to insert remarks and attribute them to another member, as was here done. Besides, no such words were ever uttered by Mr. Blake, and one—”

I suppose it should be “no one”

“had any reasonable pretext for making the alterations.

“Mr. Bowell, Minister of Customs, substantiated Mr. Blake's denial of having used the obnoxious words, but said they were certainly used by some one in the House. It appears the interpolation was inserted in a correction of Mr. Macmaster's speech, handed in by himself, and without the knowledge of the *Hansard* management, and it appears, further, that Mr. Macmaster has caused a large edition of his speech thus corrected to be issued for circulation amongst his constituents in Glengarry. Mr. Macmaster was not in his place in the House yesterday to make any explanation of the affair, which, in the meantime, looks decidedly colorable.”

I understand that an editorial article appeared in the *Toronto Globe* to the same effect. I was not in the House when the leader of the Opposition referred to this question, a few days ago, and this is the first opportunity I have had of bringing it to the attention of the House. Now, the charges contained in this article are substantially these: First, that I attributed my own words to another; secondly, that I inserted those words in the official report of the debate without the knowledge of the *Hansard* management, and thirdly that I had ordered a large issue of the *Hansard*, containing the corrected or revised edition of my speech, with a view of sending an erroneous copy to my constituents. Now, Mr. Speaker, the whole of this article, in so far as it relates to me, is either directly or indirectly false. It is necessary for me to explain the circumstances under which the occurrence took place. I was speaking in the franchise debate on the extension of the franchise to the Indians. I was pointing out the progress the world had made since 1642. An hon. member of the House cited the condition of the Indians at that period, and argued against the admission of the Indians to the franchise, upon the ground, to some extent, if not entirely, of the uncivilised condition of the Indians in 1642. I was pointing out the progress that had been made throughout the world since that date, and the inapplicability of an argument of that kind; I was referring to the progress of my own countrymen, the Highlanders of Scotland, in comparatively recent years. At that stage the hon. leader of the Opposition made an interruption; and the statement I now make with regard to that is in accordance with the statement he himself made to the House. I did not hear distinctly the words of the hon. gentleman's interruption; I was anxious to hear them, and I at once said: “I beg your pardon.” The hon. leader of the Opposition did not answer; he seemed to have turned to engage in a conversation or to exchange a smile with the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I then turned about, being anxious to ascertain what words he had used, and said: “What did he say?” When an hon. member answered: “He said they stole cattle.” The hon. gentleman now smiles.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not smiling in the slightest degree with the view of casting any doubt on the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MACMASTER. I am glad to hear that. I am stating the matter exactly as it occurred—

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt whatever.

Mr. MACMASTER. And I hope to satisfy the hon. gentleman that I am incapable of committing the act I am here charged with in the press.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with making a false statement.

Mr. MACMASTER. The answer was: “He stated they stole cattle.” There had been previously no reference whatever

Mr. MAOMASTER.

in my remarks to the stealing of cattle. I assumed that the information I received was correct, and that the hon. leader of the Opposition had made that statement. I never had the slightest doubt at all until I saw his statement yesterday morning in *Montreal*, that he denied it. Assuming that he had made that statement, I proceeded with this remark:

“I have no doubt my noble ancestors stole cattle and proved their prowess in war by going down to the southern country; and no doubt they crossed the Channel to where my hon. friend's ancestors were.”

Thus plainly showing, from the words of the original copy of *Hansard*, that I supposed I was replying in good faith to a remark made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. On the following day, Mr. Boyce, the revisor of the *Hansard* debates, came to me and delivered, as he is in the habit of doing, in the case of other hon. gentlemen, the first print of my speech. It was in the afternoon, I think, of Thursday last. I was to leave town on the following morning. A few hours afterwards he came to me and asked me if I thought I would be able to have the revise of my speech by that evening. I told him I would endeavor to do so, although I was very much hurried. I had in the meantime read my speech through, and when I came to the passage about which this controversy has arisen, I saw that the remark which I supposed the hon. leader of the Opposition had made was entirely omitted from the first print of *Hansard*; and hence it would appear that the words:

“I have no doubt my noble ancestors stole cattle, and proved their prowess in war, by going down to the Southern country, and no doubt they crossed the Channel, to where my hon. friend's ancestors were”—

were volunteered by me, whereas, in fact, they were uttered by me on the supposition that the hon. gentleman had made the remark: “They stole cattle.” Mr. Boyce came to my desk where I am now standing, and my friend, the hon. member for Ottawa city (Mr. Mackintosh), was also present; and I pointed out to Mr. Boyce, in presence of my hon. friend, that there was an omission in the first print of the *Debates*—that the statement of the hon. gentleman was not inserted, and that without that statement my remark was perfectly meaningless, and did not indicate to what hon. gentleman's ancestors I referred; and I said that in order to have a true record and to show my meaning and the reason I used these words, the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition should be inserted in the report. He said: “Very well, Mr. Macmaster; if it is correct, insert it.” I said: “I shall do so, and I assure you it is correct.” I inserted it myself, and if there be any blame in connection with it, the *Hansard* revisor, Mr. Boyce, is entirely free from blame, and so is everybody else, except myself, if blame there is. I asked Mr. Boyce if it would be necessary for him to call the attention of any one else in connection with the *Hansard* staff to it, and he said: “No; if it is correct it is not necessary.” I inserted the words, delivered to Mr. Boyce the copy of *Hansard* so revised, just as I always did on former occasions, and he took it, I presume, to the *Hansard* office; and the copy so revised was printed with the statement I have indicated attributed to the hon. leader of the Opposition. A copy of it was forwarded to me in *Montreal*, where I received it. Yesterday morning I read in the morning papers that the hon. leader of the Opposition had stood up in his place in this House and had said that these words were not uttered by him. He did not accuse me, it is true, of wrongfully inserting them. He made another remark, that was not germane to the matter, that the only responsibility he attached to my noble ancestors was that they had produced me. I do not think that remark was essential to the correction the hon. gentleman intended to make, because I trust, before I die, if my life is spared, that I may not be entirely unworthy of my noble ancestors; and I am very certain that I have nothing to be ashamed of in the record of

my ancestors. I do not make these remarks, as hon. gentlemen will see, in any acrimonious spirit, and I would not interject into the statement I am now making the slightest circumstance that might tend to encumber it or give anyone reason to suppose that I make any attack on the hon. gentleman for using those words, or do anything to divert the attention of the House and the public from the plain, honest statement I am now making. Immediately I saw yesterday morning in the public press the statement the hon. leader of the Opposition had made, I telegraphed to my trusted personal friends in this House, the hon. member for Ottawa City (Mr. Mackintosh) and the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) calling their attention to the statement the hon. leader of the Opposition had made, and requested them at once to proceed to the *Hansard* office and see that the necessary correction was made in the official reports of the debates. That was all that I could have done, under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman will perceive that the charge of altering the speech of the hon. gentleman opposite is entirely unfounded. The only thing I did was to attribute to him a remark which I supposed in perfect good faith he had made. The hon. gentleman will also perceive that the second charge made in this article against me, that this change was made in *Hansard* without the knowledge of the *Hansard* management, is entirely false, because I made the statement clearly and distinctly to the reviser of *Hansard* of all the circumstances connected with it. There remains, therefore, only the explanation with regard to my ordering copies of *Hansard* to be distributed among my constituents. I found, whether it be that I spoke very quickly on the occasion, or that my sentences were long, or whether it be that I am difficult to report, or through not having obtruded myself very frequently on the House, the *Hansard* men are unfamiliar with my style of delivery, or whether there may be other imperfections in my style of rapid delivery, I know not—that there were many errors in the first printed copies of my speech, and I desired a correct copy, to go to my constituents. I desired it, in the first place, because I wished the plain, honest truth to be put before them, and, in the second place, because I had precise information that certain gentlemen, in sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite—I will not say any member of this House, because, I do not know the fact with regard to that—had intended, and were actually taking steps to have printed and circulated in my constituency many more than a thousand copies of the first print of my speech, in order to convey to my constituents an erroneous impression of what I had said. I, therefore, thought it was due to myself and my constituents that a true version of what I had said should go to them, and I therefore ordered copies of the correct version of what I had said. But I never dreamed or contemplated for a moment, when I was ordering the copies, that there was any improper statement attributed to the leader of the Opposition, or to any other hon. gentleman in this House; and when I found that the hon. gentleman stated distinctly—and when he makes a statement I believe him—that there was an error in the revised copy, I took all the steps I could, by wire and through the double medium of two gentlemen who I knew would spare no effort to serve me in the right way, to have the correction made, and I am now able to say that through the diligence of my hon. friends not a single copy of the speech of which the hon. the leader of the Opposition has made complaint has been distributed among my constituents. I believe one or two copies were sent out for examination, but not one single copy, either of that or of the speech as it is now properly corrected, with the amendment the hon. gentleman has suggested, has been sent to my constituents. If there is a mistake on my part, an unwitting mistake, in attributing a remark to the leader of the Opposition which he did not make, I trust, by the course I have taken—and I have taken,

I think, every step I could to repair the mistake—that he will be able to say to this House, as I think he ought, in justice to a public man, occupying the humble position I do in this House and the country, that upon the full and, I trust clear and explicit, or, whether clear and explicit, the truthful statement I have made, that there was no intentional wrong-doing on my part, and not for a moment the slightest intention to do him an injustice or to save myself from any consequence that might result from the remarks I had made.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman misinterpreted my smile. I repeat the statement which I made, that I had not the slightest idea of indicating, by a smile, any degree of incredulity whatever as to the perfect accuracy of the statement the hon. gentleman has made. I accept his statement as the statement of a gentleman, literally and absolutely accurate. I did not charge the hon. gentleman; I would not have charged him, in his absence, with having done a fraudulent or improper thing in that sense at all. I felt it essential to state, at the earliest moment—and it is fortunate I did so, from what the hon. gentleman has said—simply the facts as they were—and I was sorry the hon. gentleman was absent, the facts that I had not used the language which was attributed to me in the report, and that it had not been submitted to me for correction in any way. The hon. gentleman has now stated how he derived the information upon which he took the responsibility of inserting that interpolation. I am sorry I did not notice, in the course of the debate, that the hon. gentleman indicated that he had not caught my remark. I learn now, for the first time, that he did indicate that, or I would have repeated my remark at the time.

Mr. MACMASTER. It is so indicated by *Hansard* itself.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not indicated that the hon. gentleman said: "I beg your pardon." I am sorry I did not happen to hear his "I beg your pardon," and when he answered, as I supposed, the observation I had made, I could not be supposed to discern that he was answering some remark I had not made. I supposed he was making a jocose answer to my jocose observation. I was endeavoring to congratulate the hon. gentleman on the progress of development since that period, 150 years ago, when he said his ancestors were savages. He had pointed out: "the Indian will advance by the progress of development" go on and progress; and I said: "The progress of development." I thought he was a striking instance of the progress of development, a proof of the hon. gentleman's theory. That was the whole of my remark, and when the hon. gentleman answered, I was not paying much attention to the response. I did not think it very appropriate, but it did not lead me to the idea that he had misunderstood what I had said. I may express the regret which, I think, the hon. gentleman shares, that when the interpolation was inserted no suggestion should have been made, either by the official reporters or by anybody else, to enquire of myself whether the words attributed to me were correct; but I assume, with the utmost confidence, that the hon. gentleman absolutely believed the statement which was made to him by his friend, that he was quite convinced, from the statement he had heard from his friend, and that he took the responsibility which he and I regret he took, entirely innocent of the slightest desire or design of imputing to me words I did not utter or which he thought I did not utter.

Mr. MACMASTER. I was not familiar with the way in which the *Hansard* reporters submit these corrections, or whether it was customary to submit amendments of that kind to hon. gentlemen. I see that some of my own interruptions during the debate were not entered, interruptions

made during the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. IVES. Until the House met this afternoon, and you had taken the Chair, Sir, I had not expected to take part in this debate at this stage, and I can only express my regret that the gentleman whom I expected to have seen taking part in the debate at this stage, and who is, I regret to say, obliged to be absent, is not here to perform the task much more ably than I can expect to perform it. I regret it all the more because I was not able to be present during the debate of yesterday, and did not have the opportunity of hearing the hon. gentleman during that part of his speech which was delivered yesterday, and I shall therefore be obliged to confine myself, in whatever notice I take of his remarks, to that portion of his speech which was delivered this afternoon. The hon. gentleman, in the first part of his speech delivered this afternoon, I presume, in order to show that the anticipations of the railway company, of being able to pay their fixed charges, are not likely to be realised, stated that the company, unfortunately, had selected the wrong route, that it would have been very much better, for a variety of reasons which he gave, if they had adopted the route through the Yellow Head Pass, which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had approved of before his retirement from office, and that, as several of the results of this change of route from the Yellow Head Pass to the Kicking Horse Pass, the land through which the road passed was much inferior in quality to what it was further north, the grades and curves were much less favorable, and he then gave us a most harrowing account of snow slides and avalanches that had occurred, and are likely again, at any moment, to occur along the route of the existing line. I am sure the first travellers—and they must be the most courageous of our population—who undertake to travel through upon the first train that goes to the Pacific Ocean, will have occasion to tremble, and probably will not enjoy their ride, more particularly if they read the somewhat lengthened remarks of the hon. gentleman, in order to appreciate his opinion of the danger which results from snow slides and avalanches in the Kicking Horse Pass. He then told us that it could not be expected that this railway company could obtain anything at all worth considering, in the way of China and Japan trade, that is to say, through trade from Asia to Europe. He told us they could not expect it, because, up to the present moment, the trade which had been done by the American railways, of that character, had been very small indeed. Next, he told us that the company must expect a very small local business throughout the extent of their line, because the population at the present time is not over 200,000, and it was not worth our while to compare the prospects of the Canadian Pacific with the prospects of the Northern Pacific, because the population more or less tributary to the Northern Pacific amounted, not to 200,000, but to about two millions of people. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to minimise the earnings of the road, and in order to minimise the earnings of the road, he laid down, what I think railway men, with all due deference to him, would declare to be something entirely new in the matter of net earnings.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no.

Mr. IVES. He objects to the company's taking from the gross earnings the operating expenses, and calling that net earnings.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I did not.

Mr. IVES. I beg pardon; I so understood the hon. gentleman. I understood him to object to that, and to say that from that result should be deducted the fixed charges, the

Mr. MACMASTER.

rentals and the interest payable on the purchase of the Canada Central and the Quebec, Montreal and Occidental Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. What I pointed out was, that if I was endeavoring to ascertain what the net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, the contracted line, were it would be essential not to charge those net earnings with a portion of the interest, expenses and fixed charges connected with the acquired and leased lines. I do not at all object to the usual mode of ascertaining the net earnings of a railway, which is to take the working expenses and the gross earnings, and then deduct the working expenses from the gross earnings, to show the net earnings, but I said that the earnings of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ought not to be charged with the fixed charges of the leased lines and the acquired lines.

Mr. IVES. I certainly misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I understood him to mention \$60,000 as what he considered the proper net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway to be, rather than what they returned.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. I estimated \$1,560,000.

Mr. IVES. Then he refers to the excessive cost, by reason of its rapid construction, and goes on to say that the grades are much greater and the curves much worse than those on the Union Pacific, which he insists, without the Central Pacific, which is part of the Union Pacific, is the standard fixed by the contract. He then proceeds to tell us that the price of land is very much less in the market than it was; that it can hardly be expected that any more revenue can be derived from the sales of land very soon. I fail to understand why it was necessary for the hon. gentleman on this occasion, *quoad* the purpose of his argument and the conclusion to which he finally arrived, to repeat the line of argument which he has almost invariably used whenever he has addressed the House upon this particular subject. It was necessary for the company, and it was necessary for the Acting Minister of Railway, in laying his statement before the House and suggesting the changes which he does suggest by these resolutions, to induce the House and the county, if possible, to believe that the prospects of the road were such that the company would be able to repay to the country the loan as it would stand after the proposed arrangement is effected; but how it could serve the purposes of the hon. gentleman, how it could strengthen his position or his argument, or could assist him to arrive at the conclusion at which he finally arrived, in the peroration of his speech, I have not been able yet to understand; and it is to be all the more regretted that the hon. gentleman found it necessary to take this line of argument, because I am afraid that its tendency will be to defeat, so far as it has any effect at all, the purpose which the Government have in view in asking the House to approve of the resolutions now before the Chair. What is the purpose of the Government? The proposition is to so change the arrangements now existing under the Loan Act of last Session as to enable the company to use \$15,000,000 of bonds, first \$7,000,000 and afterwards \$8,000,000, and to sell them in the markets of the world, in order to obtain money with which to repay the temporary loan of \$5,000,000 and to complete this great undertaking. But, Sir, certainly the tendency of the hon. gentleman's arguments in this part of his speech would be to persuade the investing public not to invest in these bonds, but, on the contrary, to treat them as they did the \$35,000,000 stock, when it was in the market for sale. The hon. gentleman says: You have taken the wrong route; you have got bad land, whereas you might have got good land; you have got heavy grades and sharp curves, and, on account of the operating expenses, your road cannot be successful. You have snow slides, which will endanger the lives of your passengers, and

may sweep away your track. You cannot expect to receive any advantage from the trade with China and Japan. You cannot expect any great local traffic from 200,000 people—although I admit, as he must have admitted, that the amount of produce awaiting transshipment in that country now is considerable, and would go a long way towards furnishing traffic for the railway. He says: You cannot expect very much from that small population, when the Northern Pacific, with a tributary population of 2,000,000, has yet hardly attained a sound financial position. He further minimises, as I understood him, the earnings of the road, and pointedly called attention to the fact that the lands are practically unsaleable. If the hon. gentleman has no particular object in decrying this land, it is unfortunate that he should have done so, as the tendency is to defeat the object the Government had in view in introducing the resolutions, and to defeat the successful floating of the scheme which the company have asked the Government to sanction. Now, if a wrong route was taken, as the hon. gentleman says, it may not be too late to make a change. He did not propose to make a change. The grades and curves may be amended and, as I shall show, they have been amended in the case of another railway. Does he propose that the grades and curves should be ameliorated? Not at all. Does he propose any change in location which shall avoid the risk of snow slides? Not at all. Does he propose to take any steps to increase the possible trade that may be derived from China and Japan? Not at all. Does he propose to assist in securing a large number of emigrants? Not that I heard. Nor does he propose, by anything I heard him say, to assist in enhancing the value of the land which the company has to sell. *Cui bono* then this old and much abused reference to the disadvantages under which it is said this company labor? It certainly did no good for the purposes of the hon. gentleman's argument; it was outside the general scope of his argument, and so far as it has any effect, it will be disastrous upon the financial standing of the company. But, Sir, what is the fact with regard to this matter? Was the wrong route taken? It would be admitted at once that at least 100 miles in distance was saved by the route adopted, over the route by the Yellow Head Pass. That of itself is a very important matter. As to the land, the hon. gentleman would admit, I presume, that considering the climate the farther south the road goes, everything else being equal, the more valuable would be the land; and we have the testimony of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that, far from the land on the route of the existing railway being poor, it is good land; and I had supposed for the past few months that that testimony had settled the pretensions of the hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the land along this railway. Then I have already mentioned that small as the population in the North-West is, the quantity of grain raised there last year, and which has been and is being shipped, is very considerable, and is so great that it goes far towards furnishing business to the railway, and certainly gives promise, at an early day, of a traffic so large as to make the railway profitable. But the hon. gentleman says, that the Northern Pacific has a tributary population of 2,000,000, and I noticed that he included in that population the State of Minnesota. Now, Sir, I beg to inform you that the State of Minnesota is not in any appreciable degree tributary to the business of the Northern Pacific. The State of Minnesota furnishes business to the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway, and to those several lines of railway which, starting from Chicago, centre in St. Paul, Minneapolis and other cities of Minnesota. But with respect of the line to Duluth, the Northern Pacific, does not derive any considerable part of its business from the State of Minnesota. These remarks would apply with almost equal force to a considerable portion of the State of Dakota. After you go west of Dakota the popula-

tion is very sparse, nearly as sparse as the population of our own North-West, and it is a population which, man for man, furnishes less railway traffic than the population of our own North-West. Then I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that so large an extent of country as to contain 2,000,000 of a population is tributary to the Northern Pacific. Why, Sir, in the same sense in which this large extent of country which he mentioned is tributary to the Northern Pacific, the Saskatchewan country, the country about Edmonton, Prince Albert and Battleford, and the southern portion of Manitoba, would be equally tributary to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is tributary in the sense that branches leading from those more distant portions of the country will eventually bring the traffic to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, with reference to the earnings of the road, it is only necessary to refer to the fact that in the last full year of the operations of the company, as established by their own books, and as set forth in Mr. Miall's statement, the net earnings were \$1,191,891. Then there is the point of rapid construction having involved excessive cost, which is a favorite point with the hon. gentleman, and that is one of the reasons he always gives why it has taken so much money to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. Upon that point I, for a moment, propose to take issue. I will admit that under ordinary circumstances excessive haste means excessive cost, but under the circumstances in which that railway has been constructed, considering the remarkably cheap rails that have been used, the saving of interest that has been effected, and the saving in engineering and other expenses, I believe these savings will amount to more than the increased cost from the increased wages that have to be paid, as a rule, where large numbers of men are required on short notice. Then, with reference to the matter of grades and curves, the hon. gentleman says that the Union Pacific is to be the standard. Well, that was never my understanding, except in the sense that the Central Pacific formed part of the Union Pacific. Why, Sir, there is no such road as the Central Pacific except as a portion of the consolidated road. The whole road is known as the Union Pacific, and is so understood among the people of all the western towns and cities. If you were to say to a man: By what route are you going to San Francisco? he would tell you, by the Union Pacific; not by the Central Pacific and Union Pacific, or by the Northern Pacific and the Southern Pacific. What would be the sense of taking for our Canadian Pacific Railway the standard of a line which does not pass through a mountainous country at all, which does not pass through a country in any respect analogous to that the hon. gentleman has characterised as a sea of mountains.

Mr. BLAKE. By the Yellow Head Pass.

Mr. IVES. I do not mean to say there are no mountains within sight of any portion of the Union Pacific line; but I mean to say that, comparatively speaking, as compared with the sea of mountains which the hon. gentleman delights to refer to, as compared with British Columbia, whether by the Yellow Head Pass or the Kicking Horse Pass, the Union Pacific—what was formerly known as the Union Pacific—is a comparatively level and easy road. The Central Pacific, however, passes over a difficult country, and has a maximum grade of 116 feet to the mile and a maximum curve of 11 degrees. I am sorry for the hon. gentleman's authority that he read to-day from Washington, on account of the trouble which he and the member for North Norfolk took to obtain it, that a change should have been made in the grades of the Union Pacific since the contract was entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. All railway men know, and the hon. gentleman can get the information without going so far as Washington, that mouths since the Union Pacific was selected by the Govern-

ment as the standard, a very considerable change was made, which reduced its maximum grade, which was formerly 116 feet, to about 90 feet, or a trifle less. The hon. gentleman, in order to give us one of those breathing spells, to which I referred before the adjournment, asked—and it certainly was very amusing—if the statement of the Secretary of State was a correct one, why the company applied to the Government for a loan, and said he could more readily understand the matter if the Government were applying to the company for a loan. I will retort on the hon. gentleman, and ask what objection there can be, after the dismal picture he has drawn with respect to the line, the land, the earnings, the grades, the curves and the prospects of business of this road. Certainly, after his dismal picture, there is as much propriety in asking him if there is any more objection to the road asking further assistance? The hon. gentleman, in the second part of his speech, referred to the proposed new arrangement, the resolutions before the Chair, and said, as near as I could understand him, that he was opposed to them because of certain objections. He said there was a reduction in the rate of interest from 5 to 4 per cent., which he complained of; and he said the arrangement would impair the security which we now hold. So far as this change from 5 to 4 per cent. is concerned, the hon. gentleman himself will admit, I presume, that the Government can afford to make the reduction without any, or, at most, a very trifling loss to the country. There is this much further to be said. This company comes to the country and says: We must have some modification of the terms established by the arrangement of last Session. We want such a change as will, in part, release the main line of our road, so that we can put a bond upon it, that a portion of that bond may be disposed of to the public. The object which we have in view in seeking to adopt these resolutions is to place the company in a position to obtain from the public the additional capital necessary to complete the undertaking in all its entirety and completeness, in accordance with their plans and desires. If we can, without a loss to the country, reduce the fixed charges, so as to enable the company to show that their earnings now are, or are soon likely to be, sufficient to meet their fixed charges, then we are in a position to give a value to the bond, and the company will be enabled to go into the market and secure the sale of that bond, which could not be done if we insisted on the rigorous terms and the rate per cent. of interest that would augment the fixed charges beyond what the company could show they could pay by their earnings. If we have in view the special object, without loss to the country, of changing the arrangement of last Session, so as to enable the company to obtain from the public the additional capital which all admit is necessary, then I say let us frame our present arrangement so as not to defeat the object we have in view; let us, if we can, do it without loss to the country, as we certainly can in this particular instance, and assist in convincing the public that the fixed charges of the road will not be beyond what may be considered to be the net earnings from its operation. Then, the hon. gentleman said this proposition would impair our security. What is our security under the Act of last Session? Our security is a statutory lien or mortgage. How could you dispose of it? You cannot sell it, or even foreclose it, until 1891. Suppose the railway company were not to move another shovel full of earth, I would ask members of the Opposition to state what course the Government could take in order to enforce the loan of last Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Take possession.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman ought to be too good a lawyer to suppose that by our own act, by our own will and volition, without legal proceedings or taking steps to show we have a right, we could take possession, and take the road out of the hands of the contractors, until 1891, which is the

Mr. IVES.

time by which the contract has to be completed. I do not see very well how we could take the road out of their hands. That is the hon. gentleman's security, which, he says, is going to be impaired. What do we get instead of it? A marketable bond, something we can dispose of for what it is worth.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. If you please, yes; and I trust it is worth more than par. I do not think that would please you. We get something which is marketable, something which can be disposed of and realised upon. The hon. gentleman, during the debate of last Session, when it was proposed to make the loan, argued, and it was what had most effect with the people, that while this was made as a loan it would eventually amount to a gift. The hon. gentleman said: "You will do with this company precisely what you have done with the Grand Trunk; you will waive the claim of the country in favor of somebody else's claim, and move it down in the scale of values, until it will be valueless, and it will thus become a gift." That was the argument of the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches. That cannot come, under the arrangement now proposed. Under the arrangement now proposed, that marketable commodity can be disposed of. The public may be asked to take this twenty millions, as well as the fifteen millions which is to be handed over to the company, and instead of this arrangement impairing the security, I undertake to say that it makes a better security, that at least it is as safe a security, and it puts it in a position where it may be realised on or disposed of. But the hon. gentleman says we are taking in partners to the extent of fifteen millions, and that in case of default by the company we would be obliged to buy up this fifteen millions dollars worth of bonds, and that that will be a needless expenditure. I cannot concur in that view. If there is a default there may be a foreclosure by a holder of any of these bonds; there may be a sale of the railway, but the Government will only have to take care of themselves, and will have no obligation to take care of the purchasers of those \$15,000,000 of bonds. More than that; in the case of default we would have embarked and interested in this enterprise capitalists to the extent of fifteen millions, who would be interested in preventing default, in assisting the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry out their obligations, and who, in case of default, would certainly not be a disadvantage to the Government of the country. Then, the hon. gentleman says that the 21,000,000 acres of land would be insufficient security for the ten millions of last years' loan, for which we do not take bonds, considering the present depreciated value of land, because, he says, the five millions of land grant bonds which the Government holds as security for the operation of the road, together with the \$1,123,500 of land grant bonds which are in the hands of the public, will stand before our claim of ten millions of dollars. I ask the hon. gentleman if those amounts do not stand before it now to the same extent as they will afterwards? Certainly they do; and it does not change the position at all in that respect. Even at 80 cents per acre, which is a less amount than the hon. gentleman has dared to mention even *sotto voce*, the land would be sufficient to redeem the whole three amounts he stated. In the third part of his speech the hon. gentleman attempted to show what the road will cost the country, in case of default, under the present arrangement. Of course, Sir, it is impossible for me, without seeing his voluminous statements presented in *Hansard*, to attempt a criticism of the tables and figures which he gave in the course of his speech this afternoon. It was impossible for me to take down those figures, or to grasp them during their delivery, and it will only be possible for some other gentleman who will look over those figures to attempt to answer them. One thing, however, struck me, in connection

with what the road will cost the country in case of default. He reckons, amongst the items of cost to the country, not his valuation or anyone else's valuation of the land which has been sold, and which we are necessarily deprived of, but \$11,000,000, which he says they have derived from the lands. Now, I could understand that as being fair if he were figuring what the road will cost the company; but when he is figuring what the road will cost the country, I should say that it would be more proper for him, seeing that he was very critical with the Acting Minister of Railways in his statement, to give us an estimate of the value of the lands sold rather than to charge in that statement the gross amount, making no allowance for administering the lands—the gross amount of what was received from the sale of these lands, namely, \$11,000,000. Then, the hon. gentleman makes even a more questionable entry than that in his statement. He charges \$15,000,000 in that statement as the cost of the road in case of default—the amount of the bonds which are to be given to the company to float. Now, that is on the assumption, as he stated, that the country will be obliged to buy these bonds and pay for them, an assumption with which I certainly do not agree. The hon. gentleman did not find any fault with the statement of the Acting Minister of Railways as to the cost of the road to the country, in case of default, if there should be default. He only found fault with the credit entry of the 21,000,000 acres of land at \$2 an acre. Now, what is this statement of cost which the hon. the Acting Minister of Railways gave, and which, as I take it, the leader of the Opposition admits to be practically correct. That statement certainly includes everything which can possibly be charged as the cost of the railway, in case the worst comes to the worst, and there should be default. At the risk of seeming prolix, I shall give you this statement, which is not a very lengthy one. We have 3,753,400 acres of land sold at the value of \$2 an acre, amounting to \$7,506,800; cash subsidy paid and to be paid, \$25,000,000; the loan of the last Session paid and to be paid, supposing it is all paid, \$25,500,000; proposed loan of this Session, \$5,000,000; debt on the Canada Central, \$5,333,333, and guaranteed dividend, \$7,383,912; land grant bonds sold, with no sales of land to redeem them, \$1,123,500; and cost of Government work, \$29,500,000; making a total of everything that can be fairly included in connection with the cost of this railway, \$103,344,545, an amount that is within the hon. gentleman's estimate in his former speeches of what would be the cost of this railway. The hon. gentleman, as I said before, made a large number of statements as to the cost of the road, as to the amount the company had received, and as to the disposition they had made of it; but I do not gather, from all his speeches, that he thought any of the money had been stolen by the company or anybody else. On the contrary, his explanation of the money which he claimed had not gone into the main line was that it had been invested in outside enterprises and appropriated in paying dividends. I would ask you, Sir, to note especially what the hon. gentleman said as to the effect of a large local traffic upon a road with regard to through business. The hon. gentleman truly said that if we can give to the Canadian Pacific Railway a large local traffic we will make it possible for that railway to carry through business at a low rate, but that, on the contrary, if it has not a large local traffic, the charges upon through business must necessarily be large and excessive. Well, Sir, the company took that same view of the matter. How would you obtain local business if you did not find it within the reach of your main line? Manifestly, by building branches, by extending your connections, by reaching out in different directions to tap business centres. Well, Sir, that the company have done. You certainly would not object to the extension from Callander to Montreal. What position would the Canadian Pacific Railway be in if, on

reaching Callander, it were obliged to hand over all its traffic to some independent company, to charge what they saw fit from Callander to Montreal? Why, Sir, if the people of the city of Quebec complain, and justly complain, of the charges made at the present time by the Grand Trunk Railway, between Montreal and Quebec, how much more would they, as well as the people of all this part of the Dominion, including the people of the great Province of Ontario, complain if the Canadian Pacific Railway, on reaching Callander were entirely dependent, in distributing its traffic at that point, on what other and independent lines of railway saw fit to charge? Then, Sir, you cannot object to the extension from Ottawa to Brockville, which gives you connection with the American line of railway at Morristown, N.Y.; you cannot object to the extension from Ottawa to Prescott, which gives you connection with the Rome and Watertown road, at Ogdensburg; you cannot object to the Algoma branch, which, in my opinion, when completed, together with the road from St. Paul to Sault Ste. Marie, will furnish a much larger volume of traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway than will be given by any other branch of that line. I look forward to the day as being not very distant when a very large portion of that traffic which now centres in Chicago will not go by Chicago at all, but by the proposed new line from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Sault Ste. Marie, and over our own Canadian Pacific Railway system. Then, the Manitoba South Western Railway, in which a considerable amount of money has been placed, the hon. gentleman himself declared the other night, was an enterprise that should be completed, and completed without delay; and, so far as I was able to understand, his objection was that construction had not been proceeded with more rapidly. So that, with regard to investments made by this company in outside enterprises, when we come to consider these enterprises it must be admitted that they are as important to the general scheme as the construction of the main line itself. But the hon. gentleman, in the fourth part of his speech, complained that the company have paid dividends, and he kept this sweetest morsel of his speech, in his opinion, apparently, to the very last; he kept the best of the wine, in his estimation, until the last of the feast; and he drew a very eloquent and harrowing picture of the wrongs which have been suffered by the navvies and the section men of this railway, who have been going without their pay while these bloated stockholders have been drawing their dividends. The hon. gentleman, I presume, was quite right, from a political point of view, in giving great prominence to that part of his speech; and if his statement, which was certainly very plausible and very forcible, was the only statement that could be made, it would be very effective, and taking in the country. But what are the circumstances of the present case, and what has led to the state of things he mentions? The circumstances are these: Canada, in 1881, had a great deal more knowledge of this enterprise, and of what it would cost than it had had in previous years; but we did not know half as much about it as we know to-day. The Government have been learning, the country have been learning, and the Opposition have been learning, ever since the contract has been let to the Pacific Railway Syndicate—

Some hon. MEMBERS. • Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. Yes, you have a good deal to learn yet. When this scheme was first set on foot, as the hon. gentleman truly said, it was proposed that the capital stock should be \$5,000,000, and it was understood that the gentlemen who composed the syndicate, and who afterwards became stockholders in the company, should, either themselves or by others, pay into the Treasury that sum. It was expected at that time—so little did we know what this enterprise would really cost, and so little did we know of its great magnitude and the necessity of branches, exten-

sions and connections—that the \$5,000,000 put into the road by the original company, with the \$25,000,000 of subsidy, and what would be received from the sale of lands, would be sufficient to complete the undertaking. I take it that the hon. gentleman will not dispute that position.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no; we agreed to increase that stock to \$25,000,000.

Mr. IVES. If necessary; but I am speaking of the original idea of the Government, who took the responsibility of the measure, and of the hon. gentleman who took the responsibility of criticising it. It must be admitted that there was not much attention paid at that time to such matters as building elevators or providing for the extension from Callander to Montreal; no provision was made for that at all. Well, Sir, if it was thought that \$5,000,000 would be sufficient, what was it expected that the company, as a company, would do? Their original undertaking was to risk \$5,000,000 of their own money in the enterprise for \$5,000,000 of stock; that is all they ever undertook to risk. The hon. gentleman himself admitted, after some two hours of most elaborate figuring, that the company had invested in equipment and construction of the main line—independent of the branches, independent of the extension from Callander, and independent of all outside investments and of all provision for dividends—the sum of \$6,800,000. Then, Sir, if the company only undertook to put \$5,000,000 into the main line and equipment, while they have put in \$6,800,000; what point is there in the hon. gentleman's saying that the company have failed to risk their money, but, on the contrary, are only making provision for themselves? In other words, he would lead us and the country to suppose that the object of these gentlemen was to invest their money at a high rate of interest. What were the circumstances that led to the change of the original plan? The company very soon found that they could not stop at Callander. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), years before, saw that this line must be extended south of Callander, and he subsidised the Canada Central Railway to make the extension; but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, soon after that arrangement was made, foresaw that provision must be made for the extension from Callander. They foresaw that they must get access to these boards in one, two or three or more directions. They foresaw that branches must be built to Algoma, and in Manitoba itself. There were no funds to do this. It was understood that \$5,000,000 would be required to build and to equip the main line, and it was found that amount would be required. They ran into debt; they must have these connections, these extensions. What did they do? They came to the Government and asked for power to increase the capital stock, and the capital stock was increased to \$100,000,000. Now, what three courses were open to the company at this stage? They must have money; they must have these connections and extensions. The three courses open to them were these: The company might apply to the Government for an increased subsidy; that would not have suited the hon. gentlemen. They might have applied for power to issue bonds, but if they had taken power to bond the road, some new arrangements would have to be made, with reference to the stock they themselves had taken. That stock would have to be converted into bonds if the road was permitted to be bonded.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Mr. IVES. These men were not making a present to the country of \$5,000,000 for the honor of being connected with this contract. They proposed, under this first arrangement, to be the owners of the road, subject to what it owed. Nobody understood anything else. It was supposed they would be the owners of the road, subject to what it owed, free from bonds; and if the second course were

Mr. IVES.

adopted, of putting bonds on the road, manifestly some arrangement would have to be made with reference to their purchase at par of the capital stock of the company. That course was, in many respects, more objectionable than the course of increasing the capital stock. But the increase of the capital stock meant the sale of that stock below par, and its sale below par, when the original members of the syndicate had paid par for their \$5,000,000 of stock, would have been manifestly unjust to the members of the syndicate, the original promoters of the company. Therefore, although they took \$5,000,000 stock at par, the hon. gentleman tells us they took the other \$20,000,000 at 25 cents on the dollar. Supposing his statement to be correct, and I am not prepared to dispute or admit it, they paid, according to his statement, for \$25,000,000 of stock \$10,000,000, or 40 cents in the dollar, which is more than its market price to-day, or at any time within the last three or four months; so, there was not so very great advantage obtained by the original members of the syndicate in the purchase of this \$25,000,000 of stock at 40 cents in the dollar. But that course was taken. It was taken with the consent of the country, without objection from anybody, as the most feasible plan of meeting the necessity of increased capital, for the purpose of making extensions and connections, which it was at that time considered necessary for the success of the undertaking to make; \$30,000,000 of stock was disposed of to outsiders, I understood the hon. gentleman to say, at an average of 51 cents in the dollar. Then it was found that the balance could not be sold. There remained \$15,000,000 unsold, which the company depended upon for raising the money to complete the undertaking; and owing to the course of hon. gentlemen opposite, about which I will have more to say later on, it became impossible for the company to dispose of this stock, and they were obliged to come to the Government for a new arrangement. Now, what was that new arrangement? It was this: The company represented that if the public could be assured that at least 3 per cent. would be paid annually for ten years, as a dividend on that stock, the stock would become marketable. I admit I should myself have considered such would have been the case, but I remember very well what the hon. gentleman said, with reference to that matter, last Session, when this same subject was being discussed. What course did he take last Session? Did he move against the course of the Government in permitting this arrangement to be made? Not that I am aware of. Did he ever move a vote of censure on the Government with reference to that arrangement? Not that I am aware of. What was the complaint made last Session, with reference to this matter? Was it that it was placing all that the stockholders had given for the stock in the hands of the Government to secure repayment to themselves? No; the hon. gentleman's objections, last Session, were that it was perfectly useless as a financial scheme, that any fool would have seen it was useless, that the merest tyro in finance would see that taking the resources of the company out of one pocket and putting them into another could not possibly enhance the value of the stock. That was what he said. If this money was taken out of the pocket of the company on the one side, and put into its pocket on the other, it was as valuable on the one side of the leg as on the other, and the objection the hon. gentleman raises to it is entirely a new objection. But the Government consented to that arrangement. They consented to receive a sufficient sum of money to guarantee 3 per cent. dividend for ten years; an Act of Parliament was passed, ratifying that arrangement, and under that arrangement stock has since been sold—\$40,000,000 being held in Europe, \$10,000,000 in the United States, \$15,000,000 in Canada. But still the arrangement did not succeed, owing to the same causes which prevented the sale of the \$45,000,000 of stock. This stock, with a guarantee of 3 per cent., which the hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose was a bonanza,

was not marketable, and the company, instead, found themselves in the position of having stripped themselves of all their available cash capital, which they had placed in the hands of the Government, and which had not enhanced the stock one dollar. Under those circumstances, they were obliged to come to the Government again, and say: "Under the circumstances of the company, under the course which hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have adopted, with reference to us and our undertaking, your guarantee is useless to us, and we must stop, or you must make us a loan." Under these circumstances, the loan of last Session was made. The company's available cash had been deposited with the Government. It was placed there, not for the purposes of speculation, not to enable these gentlemen to draw a large rate of interest, but because it was supposed that it would render it possible to sell the remaining block of stock, and that the company would thereby obtain the funds necessary for the completion of the undertaking, and the Government of the country would have, in this way, avoided the necessity of making the loan which they afterwards made. But the hon. gentleman says that only applies to 3 per cent. dividend on your stock; what about the other 3 per cent., which was paid for three several half years? Why was that paid? I can only say that under the original prospectus issued by the original promoters of the company when they sold the \$30,000,000 of stock, they promised that during the construction of the railway 6 per cent. would be paid on the stock. That was published in the prospectus, and the promoters of the enterprise could not, during the construction, refuse to pay it, without being guilty of a breach of good faith. The hon. gentleman has said that the terms made at that time were illegal, that it was paying a higher rate of dividend than the law admitted; but I have reason to know that when the directors asked for subscriptions to that stock they expected that the stock, with the guarantee, with the promise of 6 per cent., would bring an average of 75 or 80 cents on the dollar. If it had, the financing of the company would have been easy. It was under these circumstances that these dividends have been paid. The 3 per cent. paid by the company was paid under a promise put out in their prospectus. They have kept that promise, and continued to pay it until the current half year, when I noticed that the directors have asked the stockholders to forego that dividend. The other was paid under Act of Parliament, under a solemn arrangement made between the country and the company, and the people who took stock, and it cannot be avoided. And the hon. gentleman's policy, for which he was so loudly cheered, is repudiation and spoliation. After seven or eight weeks' study and after eight hours' speaking, the hon. gentleman arrives at a conclusion, and he says: I cannot support this proposition, but if you will ask the gentlemen who hold the \$40,000,000 of stock in Europe, and the gentlemen who hold the \$10,000,000 of stock in the United States, to consent to the Government handing over to the company the money thus deposited to secure the dividend, and will ask them to pay back the moneys that they have already received as dividends—

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. IVES.—I will approve of that proposition.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. IVES. And in the face of the House of Commons, in the face of this country, upon a solemn occasion of this kind, when an enterprise in which this country has invested millions of dollars comes before us, and says it needs our assistance, when we are solemnly proposing to assist it, that is the policy which the hon. gentleman proposes as an alternative for the resolutions before the Chair. He says these gentlemen, under Act of Parliament, promising a 3 per cent. dividend by the Government of this country, took

this stock and paid for it, in faith that the Government of Canada would implement its promise; but the Government of Canada has got hard up, says he; the company have got hard up, says he; they want more money, and you, widows and orphans, and others who have purchased this stock in the expectation of receiving that 3 per cent. interest, should come here and lay your money that you have already received upon the Table of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. IVES. You should consent to the repeal of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. IVES. You should change all you looked to when you purchased this stock, and should thus help us out of the difficulty.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. IVES. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to an expression of regret that the Government had made the arrangement, and of regret that he had not objected to it, and of regret that he had not proposed some resolution condemning it, when it would have been useful to have done it, if the hon. gentleman had said: I am sorry that you will not consent, at this late day, to give up your rights under Act of Parliament, I could have understood it; but, when this company, upon which we all look for the success and development of the North-West, comes before us for assistance, all he has to suggest, all he has to offer, all he has to declare as a policy, is that if the stockholders will return their dividends and consent to no longer claim the 3 per cent. interest promised them by Act of Parliament, he will support that, and he gravely suggests that, until such time comes round, the Parliament of Canada should take no action in the matter at all. I can only repeat the congratulation which I offered to the hon. gentlemen who sit behind that hon. gentleman for having very loudly cheered him when he resumed his seat, because that approaches more nearly to a pronouncement of a policy upon some question that interests the people than any statement that they have had the opportunity before of hearing from him. As I have said, it may be regrettable that this arrangement did not succeed, that it did not answer the purpose for which it was intended, that it did not afford the capital which was necessary. It may be regretted that it was afterwards necessary for the company to apply for the loan of last Session, but these facts exist, and we have to meet them as facts, and it seems to me perfectly childish that we should act in the hope that people who have purchased their stock upon the fact that the Government of Canada, sanctioned by the Parliament of Canada, had entered into an arrangement, would give up their rights and return the money they have received as dividends.

The hon. gentleman made one remark to-day which I heartily approve of. He said he was willing to be measured by the measure with which he measured others. I think, perhaps, it would be worth the attention of the House for a few moments to refer to a most remarkable extract from a most remarkable speech delivered by the hon. gentleman upon an important occasion. The speech which the hon. gentleman made on the occasion I refer to was made before he had been long in public life. I think it was made during the first Session that he had the honor of a seat in this House. It was made before he had become spoiled, I will suppose, by struggling and assisting others to struggle for power. It was made at a time when he was more accustomed to the practice of the legal profession, and when his opinions were certainly more judicial than, I am afraid, they have been on the occasion of the present debate. On the 1st April, 1871, the hon. gentleman made a very important

and a very able speech in this House, upon the resolution for admitting British Columbia into the Union and constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway; and at that time, when he was more judge than politician, when his mind was judicial, when he had not become contaminated with the struggle for power or demoralised by it, he made a declaration as to the obligation which rested upon Canada and upon the statesmen and people of Canada by the arrangement with British Columbia. He said:

"The man who would vote for this proposition with the secret intention, not to sink the last dollar, if necessary, to fulfil the obligations thus contracted, was a dishonest man. If the obligation be now incurred, then we will be bound by the highest sense of honor to fulfil it at whatever sacrifice. If we were not prepared to do that, then we were not worthy to have national existence, and national existence would be not worth having. This was not a mere measure for the construction of a railway, which could be repealed at any time if necessary, but, if once passed, is irrevocable."

I had not the honor of a seat in Parliament at that time, but I well remember reading the hon. gentleman's speech and the principles laid down in the extract I have read, and thinking then, as I do now, that they correctly and fairly stated the obligation which rested upon the Government and the people of Canada, under the arrangement which was made with British Columbia to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, I believe that the hon. gentleman was right when he said that the man who voted for that proposition, with the secret intention not to sink the last dollar, if necessary, to fulfil the obligation thus contracted, was a dishonest man, and that if the obligation was once incurred, as it was incurred, then the country would be bound by the highest sense of honor to fulfil it. Well, Sir, the Bill was passed, the obligation was incurred and the Dominion of Canada, its public men on both sides, whether they voted for or against it, were bound to fulfil that obligation which the hon. gentlemen then described. And moreover, as he very truly and ably said, the obligation was irrevocable, and was binding upon all political parties. Sir, with reference to a great national obligation of this kind, an obligation which is not merely a measure to build a railway, as the hon. gentleman says, the respective duties of the Government and the Opposition in one respect are precisely the same. The Administration, it is true, has to take the responsibility of proposing the ways and means by which to fulfil the great national obligation, but the leader and the members of the Opposition are bound, by the same obligation, to give assistance to those ways and means, unless they can show sufficient and tangible reasons to the contrary. They are certainly bound not to offer factious opposition. I look upon the obligation the hon. gentleman described in much the same light that I would look upon the obligation of the Opposition and their leader in the case of an invasion of the country by a foreign enemy, or in the case of a war like that in our North-West. If I am right, if the obligation and duties of the hon. gentleman who leads this Opposition, with respect to this railway, are analogous to his duties in the case of an invasion of Canada by a foreign enemy, what would be said of the political party or of its leader, that had advised a surrender to the enemy, that discouraged enlistment, that had extolled the bravery of the enemy, that had magnified the strength of the enemy, that had encouraged him by reports that we were starving, poor and without resources, unable to pay our debts, much less any future loan; who refused to assist, and, in every case, opposed everything the Government proposed? Sir, I undertake to say that in the case of an invasion by a foreign enemy the leader of an Opposition who would advise surrender, and who would give aid in every possible way to the enemy, would be called unpatriotic, and could not be said to be assisting in the fulfilment of an obligation to which the country was bound by the highest sense of honor. Sir, I undertake to say that the hon. member has advised a

Mr. IVES.

surrender to the enemy. He advised a surrender to the enemy in the matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by endeavoring, with all his power, with all his influence and eloquence, in the House, on the platform, in the press and in the country, to prevent the construction of anything that could be called a Canadian Pacific Railway. I undertake to say, and the experience of the last few months has proved it, that a railway which began in Chicago and ended at Calgary would not be a Canadian Pacific Railway. I undertake to say that the scheme which the hon. gentleman still owns—though somewhat timidly, more timidly this Session than ever before—which he still calls his policy, and which was to build the prairie section, leaving the ends unbuilt—I say that scheme was not a Canadian Pacific Railway. By advising that course, I contend he advised a surrender to the enemy. He has not only done all he could to prevent the fulfilment of an obligation to which, in his own language, he was bound by the highest sense of honor, but he has discouraged enlistment—to continue the analogy. And how? By depreciating the value of the lands in the North-West and along the line of railway, by saying that it is bad land, and that you could have got better land by going somewhere else, by depreciating the country generally, and the character of the railway, by exaggerating the cost, by minimising the business to be done, by exaggerating the operating expenses, by discouraging immigration, by encouraging emigration, by understating the amount of immigration and overstating the exodus—in all these particulars the hon. gentleman has discouraged enlistment. And, Sir, he has extolled the bravery of the enemy, he has magnified his strength, by praising the United States, by praising their lands, their climate, their land regulations, their railway facilities, their trade policy, their land policy—in every possible way giving the impression to intending immigrants that the States of the Union were preferable to our own North-West. He has encouraged the enemy further, by declaring that Canada is poor, that our people are discontented, that they are leaving the country; that taxation is enormous and burdensome; that our debt is enormous; that we are unable to borrow further; that our credit will be ruined, and that the obligations we were assuming were far beyond our capacity. Sir, I undertake to say, on my responsibility as a member of this House, that so far as I have been able to gather from his speeches on this subject, he has, in every possible way, hindered, and in no way assisted, the fulfilment of an obligation which he, in common with all other Canadians, was bound by the highest sense of honor to fulfil. Sir, it may be said that a parliamentary Opposition may, in time of war, fairly criticise the methods of defence adopted by the Administration; and that the leader of an Opposition has a right to criticise the means taken by the Administration to fulfil a national obligation to complete a Canadian Pacific Railway. I admit that; but it seems strange to me that the Government of the right hon. Premier, if it were as bad and incompetent as the hon. gentleman thinks, should by any chance have been always wrong. And yet, unless the leader of the Government has been always wrong with reference to this enterprise, then the leader of the Opposition has sometimes been guilty of factious opposition, because, Sir, without any exception that I have been able to discover, he has always opposed everything that has been proposed with reference to this railway, its construction or completion. He opposed the construction of a railway altogether; he has opposed it by depreciating the value of the land; by depreciating the value of the country; by exaggerating the cost of the road; by minimising the business that would be done; by exaggerating the operating expenses; by discouraging immigration and by encouraging emigration; by praising Dakota, Texas and Kansas, and by exaggerating the depression in trade. These are not honest criticisms of the means taken by the Administration; but these are per-

sistent efforts to ensure failure. Sir, let me review the course the hon. gentleman has taken with reference to the proposals of the Government to secure the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1880, if I mistake not, the Minister of Railways introduced a resolution setting aside 100,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of forming a fund to construct a Canadian Pacific Railway. What was the course of the hon. gentleman when that proposition came before the House? Sir, was the land worth \$2 an acre then? was it worth \$3 an acre then? was it worth \$4 an acre then? No, Sir; it was absolutely valueless for the purpose of constructing a Canadian Pacific Railway. Not the hon. gentleman, but his former leader, in my hearing stated that you could just as well expect to build the Canadian Pacific Railway with one acre of the North-West as you could with 100,000,000 of acres. That statement was made in my hearing and in the hearing of the hon. gentleman, and it was not rebuked by him. His cue then was to depreciate the value of the land. That was in 1880. In 1881, just one year afterwards, the Government came down with a proposition to take 25,000,000 of acres of those 100,000,000, which were set apart in 1880, and \$25,000,000, and give them to this company, which undertook to build the railway—mark you, a work, the cost of which the hon. gentleman had estimated as high as \$120,000,000. What did the hon. gentleman then do? Was the land worthless then? It had grown in value with extreme rapidity during that short year, from 1880 to 1881. He gave full play to his imagination, and it seemed as if he could not imagine a sum large enough to represent the value of 25,000,000 of acres of land, added to the enormous advantages which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, according to his view, received under that contract. The hon. gentleman then opposed the Government, not because the land was worthless as an asset for constructing a railway, but because they were giving too much, an unnecessary quantity, towards the construction of that road. That was the course of the hon. gentleman in 1881. What was his course next? The moment the contract had been signed, sealed and delivered, the moment the company went on the markets of the world to raise money on the land, and offer their capital stock for sale, there was another change. There was a relapse to the feelings of 1880. The land then became very greatly depreciated in value. The enormous advantages which the company had formerly possessed under the contract began to fade away. The operating expenses began to look very formidable. It began to be ascertained that it would be impossible to operate the road for anything like the gross earnings for years to come, and everything possible was said that could dissuade the public from purchasing the lands and investing in the stock of the company. That relapse was an unfortunate one for the hon. gentleman's sake, for the credit of assisting in any possible way in the performance of an obligation to which he says he, in common with all other Canadians, is bound by the highest sense of honor. The policy of the hon. gentleman has been too retrogressive, indefinite and halting for a live and enterprising young country, stimulated by and competing with the push and energy of our great neighbors to the south. The intelligent and progressive portion have decided that life is too short to wait for the hon. gentleman to decide upon a policy, and they have constantly preferred to entrust the destinies of their country to those who believe in its resources and its capabilities, and who have the courage of their convictions. The hon. gentleman shines as a Liberal when, in a prepared and set oration, redundant with long-drawn-out and well-rounded sentences, he deals with questions outside of living issues; but he is a veritable Bourbon when the progress and advancement of the country is proposed by the measures of his political opponents. His theatrical Liberalism and Bourbonism is

well described by language long ago used of another distinguished lawyer—Thurlow :

“ He saw nothing clear but the obstacles to any course ; was fertile only of doubts and expedients to escape deciding, and appeared never prompt to act, but ever ready to oppose whoever had anything to recommend.”

Nothing in the history of this country or of any country ever showed in a stronger light the evils of political partisanship and the evils of struggles for office than the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the connection of the Parliament of Canada with it. If it had not been for political partisanship, if it had not been for factious opposition in this House, in the press and in the country, if we, as Canadians, had worked shoulder to shoulder, as patriots should do, in the performance of a national obligation, we should have been spared the necessity of the loan of last Session, and of the application which is before us for an additional loan. As has been very well said, in matters of this kind, in which the interests of the country are bound up, we should take a leaf out of the book of the friends of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If we could forget party and think only of country when it came to questions of railway construction, of immigration and of the settlement and development of the country, it would not have been necessary for this application to be made or for the application which was made last Session. But, fortunately, the Government have been strong in the House and in the country. Fortunately, they have not only been strong, but they have been courageous. They have realised that the people have decided that this road shall be built and completed, and that the country shall be settled and developed, and their policy has been a settled and consistent one from first to last, and I trust, before the fall of the Administration, they will have the pleasure of seeing a completed enterprise. I remember last Session the hon. gentleman taunted the Government with being partners, sleeping partners, he said, with the Canadian Pacific Company. He never said a truer thing.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. You are entitled to all the pleasure you can get out of that statement. The Dominion of Canada is a partner with the Canadian Pacific Railway in this respect: they are jointly interested in the settlement and development of the North-West; they are jointly interested in the flow of immigration and the development of the wealth of the country. In that sense, in that most important sense, the people of the country at large are partners of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am very sorry to say they have received no assistance from members of the Opposition. Fortunately, in this discussion there are some objections upon which the hon. gentleman formerly consumed a great deal of time, but which are no longer heard. We hear nothing now about the people of the North-West being ground under the heel of a soulless monopoly. The experience of the people of Manitoba in the disposal of their wheat last fall, when the poor, down-trodden, ground-down people of Minnesota were obliged to haul their wheat over the international boundary and pay a duty on it, in order to bring it over the Canadian Pacific Railway, that put an end to the well-rounded phrases which the hon. gentleman on several occasions was wont to indulge in, that the people of Canada were being ground down under the heel of a soulless monopoly. The hon. gentleman used to doubt whether the road would be completed in its entirety. He believed that the prairie section only would be built; but we hear no more of that. He used to tell us that if the road was completed, it never would be completed in the time fixed by the contract, and it would be depreciated in character. We hear no more about the railway having depreciated below the character fixed in the contract. Everybody admits, the hon. gentleman himself does not dare

to deny, that in the construction of the railway the company have built a road of a character far above the character fixed by the contract. Sir, the Acting Minister of Railways yesterday gave a table showing the capital stock and other particulars with respect to the Northern Pacific, the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific Railways. I have drawn some important facts from that tabular statement, which I take to be accurate, important as bearing upon the charge that the Canadian Pacific railway has cost too much money. Sir, the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway is only 52 per cent. per mile of the cost of the Northern Pacific, 21 per cent. of the cost per mile of the Union Pacific, and 69 per cent. of the cost per mile of the Southern Pacific. As to the bearing of these facts upon the charge that the stock was sold too cheaply—and the hon. gentleman says that it yielded 46½ per cent.—just compare it in that respect with these other Pacific roads, and you will find that in the case of the Southern Pacific, if you call the land grant \$2 per acre, which appears to be the favorite price to-night, and add the land grant to the funded debt, and subtract the total from the total cost of the road and rolling stock, only \$10,000,000 remains as derived from share capital, or 6 cents on the dollar. In the case of the Union Pacific, the funded debt added to the cash subsidy paid by the United States Government makes an amount forty-two and a-half millions larger than the total cost of the road—and that reminds me that the hon. gentleman said to-day that none of these roads received a cash subsidy; but they received what amounted to that; they received a guarantee of bonds which the United States Government long since paid.

Mr. BLAKE. They owe the money.

Mr. IVES. So does the Canadian Pacific Railway owe us the money, but you are not satisfied. I say it makes that amount larger by \$42,500,000 than the total cost of the road and rolling stock, and if you add the land grant at \$2, there would be \$109,000,000 over and above the total cost of the road and rolling stock. The share capital was all water, and besides there was a steal of many millions of dollars.

Mr. BLAKE. A big steal for a big country.

Mr. IVES. I want the hon. member for Norfolk, who, on other occasions, has found our southern neighbors to be perfect in wind, limb, and every particular, to note that in this case, at least, they made a big steal. By the same process of reckoning, I find that the Northern Pacific share capital yielded thirty cents on the dollar, so that the Canadian Pacific, which yielded forty-six and one-half cents on the dollar, stands out in favorable comparison with these other Pacific roads.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Another big steal.

Mr. IVES. I challenge the hon. gentleman to-night, or at any other time to suit his convenience, to show where even one single dollar has been stolen or misappropriated out of the funds of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What did they do with it?

Mr. IVES. Your leader told you to-night. He said that \$19,000,000 had been invested in outside enterprises, and \$19,000,000 laid up to pay dividends.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Which they steal.

Mr. IVES. That is stolen, is it?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Part of it is stolen.

Mr. IVES. You will have your chance to deal with that by-and-bye. This statement shows what are the comparative chances of the Canadian Pacific Railway to earn dividends upon its share capital. The share capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway is only 59 per cent. of that of the

Mr. IVES.

Northern Pacific, 54 per cent. of that of the Union Pacific and 31 per cent. of that of the Southern Pacific. The funded debt is 69 per cent. of that of the Northern Pacific, 10 per cent. of that of the Union Pacific and 40 per cent. of that of the Southern Pacific. I say, Sir, that under these circumstances the outlook for this company is of the brightest character. Taking the leased lines with the branch lines, when, by connections at Detroit River, it is enabled to compete with other trunk lines for the transport of the product and imports of the western States; when, through connections at the Sault Ste. Marie, the products of the north-western States are transported over the eastern section of the trunk line to the seaboard; when, through the settlement of our fertile prairies, there is a large movement of cereals from our own great west; when the surplus stock of the numerous herds grazing upon the foothills of the mountains is transported eastward; when there exists that immense local traffic necessitated by the settlement of the country traversed by the railway; and when, at its ocean termini, lines of steamers are feeding it with the wealth and products of Asia and Europe—who will say that it will not be as valuable railway property as can be found upon this continent. The company has already revolutionised railway travel in Eastern Canada; it has stirred up the dry bones of antiquated management and given us the comforts and improvements of modern times. Through its stimulus, there is being provided at Montreal the necessary terminal facilities for the economic and expeditious shipment of grain—something which the Grand Trunk has never accomplished, and owing to the lack of which, this trade has seriously declined, and been diverted from the St. Lawrence route. We are thus assisting a road controlled by Canadians, operated in the interest of Canada, and for its material development and prosperity, a road that will prosper as we prosper and develop. True, the cost has been large, and the obligations we have incurred are heavy. But it is a consolation to reflect that our nationality has not been founded in bloodshed, nor our debt created by the ravages and destruction of war. It has been founded in peace, and the debt occasioned by the construction of national public works, which have excited the admiration of both continents and placed us in the van of nascent powers. In the years to come, when over the myriad fields of waving wheat the autumnal glow throws a golden splendor; when, from town, hamlet and farm-house resounds the din and hum of a contented and peaceful people, where now is a noiseless and uninhabited solitude, then shall the people of older Canada reap the meed of their public spirit and enterprise, and then shall be related, not the deeds of war, through which national debts have arisen, but how each man, from the bronzed fisherman who braves the dangers of the Atlantic gale for food for wife and children, to the farmer by the great lakes, who fells the tree and tills the soil—each contributed his share to provide happy homes for his children and the expatriated of other climes, upon these boundless prairies, and to set hard and fast the lines of a great nationality.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have listened with very great attention to the speeches of the two members of the Government, and the speech of one prospective member of the Government. We had the Acting Minister of Railways and the able speech of the Secretary of State yesterday, and to-night we had the address of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who commenced before dinner by promising to tell us a story, by way of introduction. The hon. gentleman called it a joke. I did not hear the joke. The only joke I heard was the hon. gentleman venturing to answer the able speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. gentleman's advocacy of the resolutions before the House, granting the

Canadian Pacific Railway \$5,000,000 and a change in the security, and the expectation of a grant to the International line of \$250,000 a year for 20 years to come, were the huge jokes of the Session, but these were no jokes for the people of this country. Now, the hon. gentleman did to-night as he has done on former occasions. A good part of his speech was devoted to my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), and he adopted the old role of charging my hon. friend with depreciating the Great North-West, and thereby, as the hon. gentleman said, interfering with and hampering the financial operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman told us that my hon. friend minimised the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Where did the hon. gentleman get that valuable information? He did not get it from the speech of the hon. member for West Durham, and I challenge him now to state where he got it? When the hon. gentleman made that statement in the early part of his speech, my hon. friend called him to task for it, and he partially apologised. I excused the hon. gentleman, because it was part of his peroration, and could not well be left out, in the way the hon. gentleman, following the illustrious example of the hon. Secretary of State, delivered the closing part of his speech. He charged the hon. member for West Durham with exaggerating the cost of constructing the railway. Why, Sir, no man in Parliament or out of Parliament can exaggerate the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway; it is not possible to do so. He charged the hon. member for West Durham with, by his actions and his speeches, discouraging immigration into that country; he charged the hon. member for West Durham with minimising the ordinary advantage of settlement in the North-West and lauding to the skies the policy adopted by our friends on the other side of the line, and with praising Dakota and Kansas. I challenge the hon. gentleman again on that subject. It is very well for hon. gentlemen, time and again, in the House and out of the House, to make these vague and general charges; but let the hon. gentleman come down to particulars; let him state the occasion when and the place where the hon. member for West Durham, or any other hon. gentleman on this side of the House, said or did anything that would tend to depreciate the character of the soil or climate of the North-West Territories. I know that has been done; but it has not been done by gentlemen on this side of the House. I challenged the hon. First Minister the other night on that subject; but the challenge has not been accepted yet, although I observe that the *Mail* newspaper of yesterday says that the challenge will be accepted, and will be answered. I say again that if the character of the North-West has been aspersed it has not been done by the Liberal party, but by the Tory party. I do not know the politics of the *Sherbrooke Gazette*, but I read the following extract from it:

"As Mr. Riley has gone to the sunny South, you may not hear that the inhabitants of the North-West are having the severest winter known to the oldest settler. Sixty degrees below zero is nothing here this winter. Stock are having a hard time, especially pilgrim cattle. I fear Senator Cochrane's thirty-seven thousand head at Hillhurst, on the Belly River, will look small in numbers next spring."

Who do you think signs that letter? It is signed by Mr. G. C. Ives. I do not know him, but I am told he is a strong friend of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). He publishes, in a Conservative paper, scattered abroad throughout the country, what would do more injury to the reputation and credit of that country than all the Liberal members of Parliament have said for the last ten years. We have unbounded confidence in the future progress and prosperity of the North-West Territories; and we believe that that progress and prosperity will commence just as soon as hon. gentlemen opposite cease to occupy the Treasury benches. So much do we believe in

the progress and prosperity of that country, that any of us who have a dollar to invest invests it there. Do the Tory members of this House invest their money in the North-West Territories? Do they invest it under the British flag?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, Sir; they invest it in Dakota and Kansas. It was not very long ago that I received a circular which was sent to me, in which Conservative members of this House laud in the highest possible language the soil and climate of Dakota and Kansas for stock-raising purposes. It was the circular of a company in which several hon. gentlemen, members of this House and members of the Senate, were large stockholders.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No; do not ask me. It is stated in the circular that they had 36,978 head of cattle, valued at \$932,712; that the assets of the company were \$1,105,220; that they had under fence 40,000 acres of land; that they had under lease 234,000 acres of land, at 2 cents an acre, and that they paid a dividend of 20 per cent. This circular was scattered all over this country. And who do you think the manager of that company was? Why, my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. IVES. It was only less profitable than your enterprise in southern Manitoba.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yet this man poses as a patriot, who never does anything, except in the interest of the country, who charges hon. members, in season and out of season, with saying everything they possibly can to depreciate this country at home and abroad. Yet he has not the confidence of his expressed convictions in the North-West; he won't invest \$1 in the North-West Territories, but he invests a fortune in stock-raising in the State of Kansas. The hon. gentleman has his thousand herds roving over the valleys and hills of Kansas, and yet he lectures us in this House because occasionally, in the course of our duty, we undertake to point out that hon. gentlemen opposite, by their wicked and criminal policy, have done more to retard the progress of that country for the last 10 years than 25 years of the best Government Canada ever had could undo. The hon. gentleman went further; he blamed my hon. friend from West Durham for speaking of this railway as being subject to snow slides and avalanches, as having heavy grades and sharp curves. Well, who did that? Was it my hon. friend from West Durham? No, Sir; it was this Tory Government, who, in their Blue Books, have published it abroad to the country, as the First Minister, in his Blue Books, has told the world that north of the Canadian Pacific Railway and along the line of that railway they cannot grow wheat, on account of the July and August frosts. He complains of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) for blaming the Government for having changed the route of the railway, and he blames my hon. friend for not insisting on the construction of a new railway. He says it is a simple matter that we can have a new railway. No, Sir; one Pacific Railway is enough for us, especially under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not want any more Canadian Pacific Railways, while the hon. gentleman's friends have seats on the Treasury benches.

Mr. HACKETT. We would have none if you were here.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman says that the security we propose to take is not a security which we shall hold in common with the holders of \$15,000,000 of bonds. The hon. gentleman did not pledge his reputation as a lawyer on that point; he was careful not to do that. As I understood it, this company by these resolutions get the power of issuing \$35,000,000 of first mortgage bonds, secured

by a first mortgage upon their estate, \$20,000,000 of which are to be handed to the Government and \$15,000,000 to the company. The hon. gentleman says that in case of default in paying the Government bonds there will be no difficulty in the Government taking possession of the road; that the holders of the \$15,000,000 bonds cannot interfere with the Government in taking possession of the road. The holders of these bonds are not precisely in the same position as the Government of the country, but the First Minister knows that the Government cannot take possession of the road without paying the \$15,000,000 of bonds which are held by outside parties. The hon. gentleman further says: Why, you cannot complain of the expenditure of this company; you cannot object; you ought not to object to the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to Brockville and to Montreal; you cannot object to the construction by the Canadian Pacific Railway of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway; you cannot object to the acquisition by the Canadian Pacific Railway of other lines leading to the seaboard. We do not, we never did object to that, but we do object to the enormous subventions placed at the disposal of the company by the Government of this country for the construction of the main line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, being misappropriated and applied for the purpose of the acquisition and leasing of other lines. It is the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway to find the means for extensions where they will; our business was to find the funds for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) charges my hon. friend with not having complained during the last Session that this company had deposited with the Government \$20,000,000 to secure dividends to themselves upon their own stock, and he thinks my hon. friend, now, is not in a position to complain of this application of money because he did not complain of it last year. Last year the company obtained from Parliament \$30,000,000 of money. It was not our business to complain. The Government were not then asking for this \$5,000,000. I do not know that Parliament was then aware that the company had \$20,000,000 of money deposited with the Government to secure these dividends. I do not believe we were aware of all the facts; but even if we were, that is not any reason why we should not now point out that the money the company has in the hands of the Government ought to be applied towards building this road, and therefore, in the interests of the people and the Parliament of Canada, the company ought to take this money, part of the capital of the company deposited in the hands of the Government to pay these dividends, and devote that money to the building of this road. The hon. gentleman says this is a solemn, a grave, a serious matter; that thirteen years ago we entered into a solemn contract with British Columbia to build the Canadian Pacific Railway; that we are under obligations, as honorable men and a free and independent Parliament, to build this road. We have taken every step required by the terms of union to implement to the letter every term of that contract. We have given this contract to a company to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway; we were assured by the First Minister and the Minister of Public Works, and their colleagues, when this contract was ratified by the Parliament of Canada, that we were giving it to men of undoubted ability and of unlimited means, who would complete the work by the 1st May, 1891, from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. That day has not yet arrived. We were assured last Session, by the ex-Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) that, on the subvention granted in 1880 by Parliament to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway would be constructed, beyond peradventure, from Callander to the Pacific Ocean by the 1st May, 1891, and it was only with

Mr. CAMEBON (Huron).

the view of hastening the completion of the road that he ventured to ask this Parliament in 1884 to loan the Canadian Pacific Railway the sum of \$30,000,000. We are as anxious as the hon. gentleman is to implement this contract, but he must recollect that those are not the only terms upon which Canada agreed with British Columbia to construct the railway. One of the terms was, and this was declared by Parliament over and over again, that by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway the burden of taxation should not be increased, and throughout the whole of our legislation, with respect to the construction of the railway, that was always considered as a fundamental consideration. The hon. gentleman told us a good many things in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but he failed to tell us a good many other things in this connection that would have been of interest to this side of the House, and to the people of Canada. My hon. friend from West Durham, in his statement to the House, gave the figures to show that this company obtained from the people of this country in cash and other assets the sum of \$119,000,000, apart from the unsold land, to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was only to cost, according to the estimates of the Government engineer \$53,000,000, apart from the Government works. It would be interesting to know exactly what became of the difference between the \$119,000,000 and the \$53,000,000. The president of the company, on the 13th June last, while addressing the shareholders in Montreal, declared that the assets of this company, when the road would be completed and available for any purpose, would amount to the sum of \$177,000,000, without any charge against that sum, except the \$65,000,000 of stock. If this company has unencumbered assets valued at \$177,000,000, I would like the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe to tell us why it is now knocking at the doors of Parliament, asking for a loan of \$5,000,000 and a change in the securities. The papers submitted to Parliament by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company show that on the 1st of January last this company had in hand over \$7,000,000 of the money placed by the people of Canada at their disposal, more than they expended in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what became of this \$7,000,000, or why the Canadian Pacific Railway does not appropriate that sum towards the completion of this road. It was stated by the hon. member for West Durham, and it is capable of proof, from the documents submitted by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to Parliament, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has now in hand, of the moneys placed at their disposal by the people of Canada, after having charged every dollar that they have expended on the construction of the main line, the amount of \$7,000,000, excluding the proceeds of sales of stock. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposed to do with this sum of money, or why they do not, out of this sum of money thus under their control, appropriate \$5,000,000 to complete the railway. Further, it is capable of proof, the documents submitted to Parliament by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company prove it, and the statement of my hon. friend from West Durham cannot be contradicted, that out of the moneys that ought to have gone to the completion of this railway the shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have drawn out of the capital of the company \$7,000,000 by way of dividends, some of those dividends ranging from 12 to 24 per cent. This company, now begging at the door of Parliament for an additional grant of \$5,000,000, ought to pay back to the treasury of this company enough, at all events, to complete this road out of the \$7,000,000 they have improperly extracted from the capital to pay these extravagant dividends. But my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) says how unfair and unjust this would be, because a large portion of this money has passed into the

hands of the widows and orphans of England and Canada, and it would not be right or fair, after these people had taken their stock upon the faith of an Act of Parliament, to refund this to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to enable the company complete their road. Well, that is a matter between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government and the holders of this stock. It is no concern of the people of this country. That money was placed in the hands of this Government as part of the capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Government had no right to permit these men to draw extortionate dividends upon that capital, until, at all events, the final completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. We know, further, that according to the letter of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, transmitted to this Government during the sitting of this Parliament, bearing date 18th March, 1885, that this company had, on the 1st January, 1885, in the hands of the Government, \$14,288,288 to pay additional dividends upon their stock. The proposition of my hon. friend from West Durham is to appropriate a portion of that money to the completion of this road. They report to the Parliament of Canada that \$5,000,000 will complete and equip this road; they say they have \$14,288,000 in the hands of the Government to pay dividends to themselves. If this is so, why not appropriate this money, says my hon. friend, to the completion of this road? That proposition is wholly unanswerable; there has been no attempt to answer it by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and it cannot be answered successfully. It is no answer to say that many of these stockholders are in England. We know that in Canada there are enough stockholders to obtain from the Government upon their own stock enough to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. So much for the observations of my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe. I have only this further to say in respect to them. The hon. gentleman discussed a great many things, but he did not discuss the real question. He gave no reasons, that I am aware of, why the Parliament of Canada should come to the assistance of the Canadian Pacific Railway on this the third time of their demands. The hon. member, when discussing the proposition of 1884, stated that my hon. friend from West Durham, whose objections were strong and powerful then as they have been to-night, had not pointed out any alternative proposition. He said: The Canadian Pacific Railway Company say that they cannot build this road without disposing of and realising on their assets, and to do that now would be practically to sacrifice all their valuable assets; they say they cannot complete the road unless you lend them \$30,000,000, and if you are not willing to give this money, submit some alternative proposition, and, if it is reasonable, it will receive my assent. Well, my hon. friend from West Durham has to-night submitted an alternative proposition. He has said: Instead of saddling this country with an additional \$5,000,000 to be loaned to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company take out of the hands of the Government, the monies deposited there to secure them enormous, outrageous, extortionate dividends, the \$5,000,000 required, and apply that towards the completion of this railway. What will the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe do? Will he accept the alternative proposition? Verily, no. He will vote with the Government, and if my hon. friend from West Durham had submitted even a more plausible and reasonable proposition than that—and he could not well do it—my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, and other hon. gentlemen in this House, who are the unwavering supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, would not adopt any alternative proposition. We had a speech from my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and a speech from the hon. the Secretary of State. The Sec-

retary of State occupied five hours in the delivery of his speech. He discussed everything beneath the sun, except the proposition before the House. He steered clear of that. He told us something of the French Canadian voyageurs, of their indomitable energy and wonderful perseverance in exploring the great North-West; he quoted a little poetry and read a good deal of prose—he gave us what the First Minister would call a microscopical history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Adam down; he gave us a sketch of the Union Pacific Railway, the Central Pacific Railway, the Northern Pacific Railway, and all their branches, their bonded and other debts, and their exact financial position. The hon. gentleman approached dangerously near the resolution before the House, but he kept prudently clear of it in the five hours speech that he delivered to the House, and he assigned no reason whatever why the Parliament of Canada should give to the Canadian Pacific Railway—because I look upon it as giving this sum—an additional \$5,000,000, and change, in the most material parts, the security the country holds. The Acting Minister of Railways gave us a plain and business-like statement of the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from his own standpoint, but he had to admit the fact that on the 30th of April last the company had in its hands the sum of \$5,776,983 with which to complete this railway. If the company had this sum in their hands then, why are they here asking for five millions more? The Minister told us, further, that they had in the hands of the Government the sum of \$7,390,312 that might be used for the same purpose, or in all, the sum of \$13,167,295 which they then had at their disposal for the purpose of completing this railway. Sir, I ask again if they had that sum of money in their hands for the purpose of completing this railway why are they asking this Parliament to grant an additional sum of five millions and a change in the security? Now, Sir, I say that the whole course of the Government in relation to this railway is of the most extraordinary character, and it is worth while spending a few minutes in briefly reviewing the dealings of the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—not for the last fifteen or twenty years, but since the 1st of January, 1881, when the contract to build the Canadian Pacific Railway was ratified by this Parliament, and pointing out the shuffling and vacillating conduct of the Government; their unreliable and untruthful assurances given to the Parliament of this country when this contract was ratified; the misrepresentations that were made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the false pretences under which that contract was ratified by the Parliament of Canada, and the consistent attitude the Liberal party have occupied for the last ten years, with respect to the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the propositions of the then Minister of Railways, for the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway under the contract, were submitted to Parliament on the 13th December, 1880, on that day, Sir Charles Tupper moved that on the following Tuesday the House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient to grant and appropriate \$25,000,000, according to the terms of the contract relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, transmitted to this House by His Excellency the Governor General, by his Message, dated the 10th December, 1880.

“2 That it is expedient to grant and appropriate 5,000,000 acres of land in the North-West Territory, according to the terms of the contract so transmitted as aforesaid.”

The propositions then submitted by the Minister of Railways to Parliament were of the gravest possible consequence to the people of this country. They involved a grant of 25,000,000 acres of land to this company; they involved the grant of \$25,000,000 in money; they involved the grant of such portions of the railway as the Government of this country had constructed or had undertaken to construct under the terms of that contract; they involved, as we pointed out, a large increase in the national debt of this

country, and they involved, as we contended, a direct violation of the terms upon which British Columbia became a part of this Confederation, and about which the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has spoken so much. Those terms were that the railway should be commenced within two years after the compact between British Columbia and Canada was assented to; that the road should be completed within ten years thereafter, that the burdens of the people of this country should not be increased; that the rate of taxation then existing should not be increased for the purpose of the construction of this railway. I say, further, Sir, that the circumstances under which this contract was submitted to Parliament were of the most suspicious character. We know that the First Minister of this Dominion and some of his colleagues went to England, in the year 1880, with the view of enlisting the support of the capitalists of England in the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway, and assurances were given to us from time to time in the Conservative press that the mission of the First Minister had been successful, that, in fact, he had accomplished the crowning achievement of his life and had been able to obtain the assistance of capitalists in England, France and Germany, in the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the people of this country would not have to spend a single dollar for that purpose. We had the most solemn assurances from hon. gentlemen opposite that this contract was signed, sealed and delivered in England before the First Minister left the shores of England that the hon. gentleman had succeeded in obtaining the assistance of English, German and French capitalists in the construction of the road, that the construction of it had passed from the Canadian Government to the control of monied men, men whom we were told were men of immense resources, of unlimited means, and that the people of this country would not be called upon to pay a single dollar for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the hon. gentleman, on his arrival in Canada from England, was feasted in many parts of the country, and among other places in the city of Montreal; and for the purpose of completing my review of the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to this railway, I shall read to you a few remarks made by the First Minister on the 27th of September, 1880, in the city of Montreal, about the success of his mission:

"I have great pleasure in telling you, gentlemen—though I cannot go into the matter fully, because I am merely the agent of the Governor in Council, sent to Great Britain along with two of my colleagues, and must submit the arrangements we have made for the approval or rejection of the Parliament of the country—that we have made a good arrangement with a number of capitalists, not alone in England, but in Germany, France, the United States and Manitoba; we have made a combination of forces which will not only be quite sufficient to build the road, but will have additional influence to turn the great current of German emigration from the United States to Canada. We have received security—satisfactory security—for the proper construction and running of the road for ten years after its completion, which will be twenty years hence. We have made an arrangement, not that the road shall be built through a fertile district and left untouched in the wilder parts, but that it shall be constructed, whether through a wild or a fertile district. We have made an arrangement by which the land will be put upon the market and sold at once, by which means there will be a continuance of systematic emigration to the North-West. We have secured the running of it for ten years after it is built, and when I tell you that when the road is finished it will not cost the country a bit more than the arrangements would that I made with Sir Hugh Allan in 1873, you will, I am certain, rejoice with me. \* \* \* We have made an arrangement by which the road is to be built; we have caused a desire on the part of a settler to emigrate to Canada, and the road will be built without costing one cent to the people of Canada. We have made the arrangement 'a contract firm.' The contract will be carried out, the railway will go, on whether Parliament meets in November or February. The railway will go on all the same, and we will trust to Parliament and the country to sustain us in our course. The contractors are men of means, millionaires, capable of building a dozen railways. They are quite willing to take the risk of going on at once, and they will do so."

At that very time, when the First Minister was deceiving and misleading the people of Canada by these boastful utterances, the hon. gentleman had accom-

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

plished nothing. The hon. gentleman had no contract. The hon. gentleman had not a scrap of paper binding anybody in Canada, England, France, Germany or elsewhere, to construct a single foot of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The contract subsequently submitted to Parliament bears date 21st October, a month after the hon. gentleman had delivered that boasting speech to his admirers in Montreal. The contract itself, when submitted to Parliament, was of the most extraordinary nature. It involved such extraordinary concessions, grants in money and in land, such extravagant privileges, such extensive franchises, such extensive exemptions, such great monopolies, that the representatives of the people in Parliament, even the friends of the hon. gentleman, were surprised and astounded at the magnitude of these subventions. What were the subventions? I wish to direct the attention of the people of this country to a short historical sketch, which I propose to give, of the connection between this Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the terms upon which this Government purposed to give the contract to the company. By the terms of this contract the syndicate agreed to construct such portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, extending from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, as the Government of Canada had not constructed or agreed to construct, by 1st May, 1891. The Government of this country agree to hand over to this company, completed: 1. The Lake Superior section of the Canadian Pacific Railway; 2. The road from Kamloops to Yale; 3. The road from Yale to Port Moody; 4. Suitable station buildings and water service on the portions so constructed by Government or to be constructed; 5. The road from Emerson to Winnipeg; 6. 25,000,000 acres of land; 7. \$25,000,000 in cash; 8. All land required for the road bed, stations, station grounds, workshops, dock ground and water frontage at the termini on navigable rivers, buildings, yards, and other appurtenances required for the convenient and effectual working of the railway; 9. Government agreed to admit free of duty all steel rails, fish-plates and other fastenings, spikes, bolts and nuts, wire, timber and all material for bridges to be used in construction of the railway and telegraph line; 10. Also, all telegraph apparatus; 11. Government agreed to convey to the company, at cost price, and without interest, all rails and fastenings bought by it since 1879; 12. The Government agreed to extinguish the Indian title to the lands so to be conveyed to the company; 13. The Government gave the company the right of locating the line of railway as the company might see fit; 14. Government gave the company the unlimited right, the monopoly, of constructing branch lines; 15. And the monopoly of constructing all lines south of the Canada Pacific Railway; 16. The Government gave the company the right to prevent the construction of any line to within 15 miles of international boundary; 17. Government agreed to the exemption of railway stations, station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards, and other property, rolling stock appurtenances and capital stock of the company, from taxation for all time; 18. The Government agreed to exemption of lands from taxation until sold or occupied. Those conditions, concessions, grants, privileges, monopolies, were so different from what the First Minister led the people to believe they were in his speech delivered on 27th December, 1880, in Montreal, that the people were astounded at the nature of the propositions. The hon. gentleman submitted the proposals to Parliament on 10th December, 1880, and on the following Monday the Minister of Railways moved the House into committee to consider the resolutions. Up to that time no information had been given to the people or Parliament as to the nature and extent of the concessions made and the grants given under the contract. No information was given as to the steps taken by the Government to call for tenders and invite competition for the construction of the railway. No information was given as to the

circumstances that led up to the signing of the contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Information was asked by the leader of the Opposition, and by other members, on this subject, information was persistently and consistently refused. In order that the people might be informed upon the subject, that members of this House might be able to discuss the propositions intelligently, fairly and understandingly, in order that they might know something of these extraordinary subventions, and as to whether the terms by which British Columbia became part and parcel of the Dominion had been violated and as to whether the contract, necessarily involving an increased rate of taxation, information was asked for and refused. The leader of the Opposition moved a resolution, in order to obtain time and to secure that full and ample consideration which the question demanded. He moved:

"That in view of the magnitude and gravity of the proposition, this House resolve itself into committee, on Monday, 5th January, 1881."

That amendment, which was a reasonable proposition, was voted down by the majority. Even two weeks were refused the Opposition in Parliament to consider the obligations to which the Government of Canada, in their mad folly, were committing the people of Canada. The discussion proceeded and the leader of the Opposition and other hon. members on this side clearly pointed out the enormous subventions, grants and concessions proposed to be given under the resolutions. We pointed out that in the work completed and to be completed, in the land grant, estimating the land to be worth \$2 per acre, and in other subventions, the Government were placing at the disposal of the company a sum equal to \$111,800,000. We pointed out further that the Government were giving the company enormous concessions, franchises and monopolies which were worth no less than \$40,000,000. We pointed out that in money, lands, railways completed and to be completed, concessions, franchise exemptions and monopolies, the company received no less than \$161,800,000. We pointed out, in addition, that we gave the company the Canadian Pacific Railway finally completed, for all time to come. We pointed out that this road, which, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, was to cost this country this enormous sum of money, would not cost for construction, according to the estimates of the Government engineers, made in 1880, more than \$84,000,000. We pointed out in the strongest possible language to Parliament that those concessions, grants and subventions should not have been given; that the people of this country should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon the terms of this contract. Sir, the Liberal party were not satisfied with mere protests in Parliament. We adopted the most solemn and formal way known to Parliament of recording our opinions upon this question. Every vulnerable point of the contract was challenged by amendments submitted by gentlemen on this side; our protests were crystallised into amendments against the obnoxious features of the contract, and the votes of the representatives of the people in Parliament were challenged on this question. Our protests were unheeded; our warnings were in vain. The First Minister, by the majority he had in Parliament, succeeded in forcing those resolutions through the House, and this country, in 1881, became saddled with these gigantic obligations, which, I fear will rest upon it for many years to come. We pointed out that an undertaking of this kind, involving such gigantic obligations and enormous concessions, should not have been entered upon by the Government in a private contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway; that tenders ought to have been called for and competition invited, and that it was unwise and unsound policy for the Parliament of Canada to ratify a contract without calling for tenders and allowing fair and reasonable competition. How were we answered? We were assured by the First

Minister and by the then Minister of Railways that this was an admirable contract; that the Government had succeeded in removing the responsibility for the construction of the road from the shoulders of the people to the shoulders of the company, and that for the construction of this railway the people of Canada would not be required to pay another dollar. The Ministers of Railways, who was in charge of the resolutions in 1880, as he was in charge of the resolutions of 1884. The Minister of Railways, who was always daring, bold and defiant, declared, in his place in Parliament, with reference to this contract:

"Hon. gentlemen do not like the company, but one would suppose that their ideas had undergone a revolution on that subject. The gentlemen who have undertaken this work stand before the people of this country to-day in the strongest position that it is possible for gentlemen to occupy in relation to a great enterprise such as this is. The Canadians engaged in the enterprise are men who are second to none in respect to commercial standing and capacity, and by their success in carrying out other great railway enterprises they have afforded us the best possible guarantee for the manner in which they will fulfil their engagements with the Government and Parliament of Canada."

He proceeded:

"I say that this company embraces capitalists, both your own and other countries, who are men of the highest character, men whose names are the best guarantees that could be offered the people of Canada, that any enterprise they may undertake will be successful."

Sir, unfortunately for this country, the assurances of hon. gentlemen opposite, in 1880, when Parliament proposed to ratify this contract, have been scattered to the winds, and to-night we have not a particle of reliable security upon which this country can fall back for the completion and running of the road for the ten years for which the hon. gentleman declared he had a money security. Sir, we protested further against the vague, uncertain and indefinite terms of the contract. We knew we were pledging the credit of this country to an enormous extent, that we were placing in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company an enormous amount of money and assets for the completion of this road, and we pointed out to hon. gentlemen opposite that we had no security, that the end had then been reached. The element of finality was wanting, and we had no security, but that we might be called upon to pay additional sums to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of this road. How were we answered on that occasion by hon. gentlemen opposite? By providing that ample security which the First Minister declared he had obtained, when addressing his friends in Montreal on the 27th of December, 1880? No, Sir; the only guarantee we had was the statement of the Minister of Railways, in the following language:—

"We will not only have the proud satisfaction of seeing Canada assume an advanced and triumphant position, but that she will be relieved from the expenditure of a single dollar in connection with the construction or operation of this railway."

Now, in the face of the declarations of the Minister of Railways and the First Minister, three years afterwards we had this same Canadian Pacific Railway Company, whose members, we were told, were men of unlimited means, men of great fortunes, men whose character and standing were such that they would carry out the contract—we had these men knocking at the doors of Parliament, asking Parliament to aid them to the tune of \$30,000,000. And what have we now? We have these same wonderful moneyed men, men of such great ability in the completion of such enterprises as these, men of such unlimited means, knocking for the third time at the door of Parliament, asking for additional aid, and the abandonment of the security we took in 1884 for the repayment of the loan of that year. Sir, in 1880, when we protested against the ratification of this contract, the First Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Railways, assured his followers that they had ample security, that the road would be constructed from end to end, without costing the people of this country one dollar. The hon. gentleman's followers believed him, and they

cheered him lustily. In 1884 we had the Minister of Railways coming to Parliament and practically admitting that the calculations made in 1880 were not reliable. We had him coming to Parliament and practically admitting that the Canadian Pacific Railway was then in financial difficulties; that they were practically on the eve of bankruptcy, and that the work would stop unless the public purse came to their relief. Hon. gentlemen opposite received the same assurances and they ratified the resolutions of 1884, amid uproarious cheers; and now, in 1885, just twelve short months after we had the solemn assurances of the hon. First Minister, of the Minister of Railways, of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), that the loan of 1884 was more than ample to complete the railway from end to end and thoroughly equip it, this same Canadian Pacific Railway Company come knocking at the doors of this Parliament and boldly demands, as a matter of right, that they shall get \$5,000,000 additional, and that the security we obtained for the repayment of the loan of 1884 shall be materially changed; and I have no doubt, from what I see to-night and from what I heard this afternoon, that these resolutions will be affirmed amid the cheers of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. We further pointed out, in 1880, that in money grants, in completed and to be completed works, in land at the Government valuation, and in franchises exemptions and monopolies, this company got \$161,800,000, although this road was only estimated to cost the contractors \$84,000,000; and, therefore, the country was asked to pay for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway a sum enormously in excess of the real cost. Sir, those objections were of the first possible importance; they impressed themselves on hon. gentlemen opposite; they required to be met and answered, and they were met and answered by hon. gentlemen opposite; but how? In order to strengthen the wavering faith of the supporters of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, in order to give them courage to vote for the resolutions then submitted to Parliament, assurances had to be given. The assurance of the Minister of Railways was given. "But they had not faith in that. His reputation as a stretcher of facts, especially in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, was too well known. Other solemn assurances had to be given. They were given; the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who is known, if not in reality, at all events in appearance, to be the honestest man on the Treasury benches, took the stand and stated:

"We want a good and great railway, and also to put it on a proper footing, so as to prevent its owners coming back to us and saying, 'you starve us to death, and we want more money.'

"Mr. CASGRAIN. We have the guarantee.

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have the guarantee, no doubt; but perhaps the hon. gentleman would prefer to have them come to ask for better terms. I am not of that opinion, nor is the Government."

Again, he says:

"I have shown, moreover, that not only will the railway be built by the syndicate, but worked for all time to come, and that we have sufficient guarantees in our hands to insure both these objects."

Now, it is perfectly clear that when hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches gave those assurances they misled and deceived their followers; because it turned out, in 1884, that there was no such security. It turns out to-night that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are entirely at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and are bound, whether the country's interest requires it or not, that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall get exactly what they require. Sir, the Opposition were thoroughly impressed, in 1880, with the recklessness of hon. gentlemen opposite. We knew perfectly well that they would stick at nothing to gain a point; we knew that they would not hesitate to violate an Act of Parliament and the solemn declaration of Parliament,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

that the burdens of the people of this country should not be increased by the construction of this railway; we knew that they proposed to create and when created to utilize this great corporation, and so we protested that no contract should be made and no obligation entered into by the Government or Parliament of Canada, that would be a violation of the terms on which British Columbia became part of this country, namely, that the national debt and the rate of taxation should not be increased. How were we answered? We were answered as follows, by the Minister of Railways:

"We would relieve Canada of all additional responsibility in the further construction of the railway. And just when we are lifting from our shoulders to the shoulders of a private company all responsibility, I ask this House, in candor, to tell me whether they do not think that, as far as we could, we ought to post those gentlemen in as favorable a position for the construction of the road as we occupied ourselves."

Did the hon. gentleman succeed? No, Sir; what was the result of the course he took? The result was an application within three years for an additional grant of \$30,000,000, and an application this year for \$5,000,000 more. We pointed out, further, that the mountain sections of this railway should not be constructed until the prairie sections were completed; we knew that to do so would press heavily on the people of this country and would not be in the interest of the country; but we protested in vain. What are the consequences to-day? There is no intelligent man in Manitoba or the North-West Territories but will admit that it was a huge mistake to construct the mountain sections before the prairie sections and branch lines, extending both north and south of the line, were constructed, thus securing the filling up of the prairies of the North-West with an active and thriving people. I say it was a huge mistake, to encourage such settlements along the line of railway surrounded by a fierce, untamed and uncivilised barbarians. In 1880 we protested against giving this company the monopoly of constructing all railways south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We were told by the First Minister that our fears on that subject were groundless—that we could not check Manitoba. What has been the result? The result of that monopoly has been to create dissatisfaction and discontent from one end of Manitoba and the North-West Territories to the other. The existence of that monopoly is one of the grievances that have been presented to the Government by the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The result has also been to check the tide of immigration that would otherwise have flowed into that country, to stunt the growth and to check the prosperity of the country. It is utterly useless for us to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to encourage immigrants to leave their homes in the old country, to settle in the North-West, when we cannot give them railway facilities after they reach there. The Premier of Manitoba, discussing the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite declared:

"At present we are on the verge of a crisis from which we must emerge in a better or a worse condition. Not, however, until the masses were made aware of their condition, would they stand up and maintain their rights? The time has come when Manitoba must be placed on a level with the other Provinces of the Dominion. Not one new arrival had been in the Province three months before he, who before was loud in its denunciations, was equally loud in demanding its right. The eyes of the farmers had been opened and they were alarmed at the prospect. These matters should strictly engross the attention, not only of the Provincial but of the Dominion Parliament."

Such are some of the circumstances under which the contract of 1880 was ratified. Some of the protests made. Some of the answers given and some of the consequences that followed. I have drawn the attention of the House to the circumstances under which the contract of 1880 was ratified; I have shown that the assent of Parliament was obtained by promises, pledges and assurances from hon. gentlemen opposite, every one of which has proved to be baseless. I have shown that the grants, the privileges, the monopolies

and the exemptions were simply enormous, more than double what was sufficient to construct the railway. I say again that the resources placed at the disposal of the Canada Pacific Railway by the people were out of all proportion to the cost of construction of the Canada Pacific Railway. Let me point out for a moment what the cost of construction was, and what these resources really were. I know my hon. friend from West Durham has given his own figures on this subject; I know that he has dealt with the question, and nobody is able to deal with it more ably, but I have also investigated the documents submitted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Parliament, and have made up calculations, the aggregate results of which are substantially those which my hon. friend arrived at, and practically the same as the statement made by the president of the company to the shareholders, in Montreal, on the 13th June last. I propose to submit a brief statement of the cost of the railway and the resources this country has placed at the disposal of the company. The cost of the Government sections, that is, such parts of the main line as were to be constructed by the Government, amount to the sum of \$33,500,000. This includes, of course, the cost of survey. I am aware the hon. Minister of Railways protested, during last Session, against this item being added to the cost of the Government section, but you cannot build a road without having first surveys made, and their cost is an addition to the cost of the road. The costs of the sections constructed and to be constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway is estimated to be \$51,500,000, the cost of equipment is \$3,000,000, or a total in these three items of \$93,000,000 to construct and equip the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. Let us consider for a moment the resources placed at the disposal of the company to build and equip this road. We gave the company, in lines constructed and to be constructed by the Government, including surveys, \$33,500,000, \$25,000,000 cash subsidy, 25,000,000 acres of the choicest land in the whole North-West, estimating these lands at \$2 an acre that would be \$50,000,000, I observe that in the report brought down last year by the company the land sales averaged \$2.36. The president of the company says that the lands sold this year averaged \$3.01 $\frac{1}{2}$  per acre. Putting the price, however, at only \$2 an acre, would give, for the 25,000,000 acres, \$50,000,000. Then there was the loan of 1884, \$29,810,000, and the loan obtained by the company on the security of transport and postal service and other effects, \$7,380,000, making a total of \$146,490,000 of resources. These were the total resources placed at the disposal of the company to complete the road that really cost \$93,000,000, but that was estimated, in 1884, to cost only \$84,000,000. This would leave a balance in the hands of the company, after paying for the completion of the road, in money and land grants, \$53,490,000, and, in addition, the company would have the road in perpetuity. But this is not all; these are the sums placed at the disposal of the company in cash and other aids. I have shown that after the road was completed and paid for by the people of Canada and handed over in perpetuity to this company, there would be still a balance of \$53,490,000 to divide among the shareholders. In addition to this, the company had and has at its disposal, from various other sources, large sums of money, which ought to have been used in the construction of the road. First, under the old contract, the syndicate was bound to take stock to the extent of \$5,000,000 at par. It did so, and that placed at its disposal to complete the road \$5,000,000 more. Second, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company placed in the market \$60,000,000 of the stock of the company, \$20,000,000 of which was sold to the members of the old syndicate at 25 cents on the dollar, yielding \$5,000,000 more; and \$30,000,000 of this stock were sold at 51 cents on the dollar, the larger portion of it being sold to the old

syndicate. That yielded \$15,281,764; \$10,000,000 were sold at 42 cents on the dollar, most of it to the members of the old syndicate. That yielded \$4,211,294. Mr. Stephen, the president of the company, in his letter of the 18th March, 1885, states that the net earnings of the company, up to 1885, amounted to \$1,626,063, or a total of \$31,119,111, being all assets outside of the cash and effects placed at the disposal of the company by the Government of Canada; or, in other words, the sum of \$177,609,111 which this company had at its disposal to construct, build and equip a road that will cost only \$93,000,000. This will leave in the hands of the company \$84,609,111 more than sufficient to build the road; and in addition to all this, this company own the road so completed and equipped for all time to come. Mr. Stephen, in his address to the shareholders in Montreal, arrived at precisely the same result by different calculations and a different mode of reasoning. He says the assets of the company, when the road is equipped and completed, will amount to the sum of \$230,960,585, less the sum of \$53,892,245, which is the debt properly chargeable against the road. In other words, according to Mr. Stephen's calculation, the company will have, in assets, when the road is completed, \$177,068,340. No wonder Sir Charles Tupper, in 1884, when submitting his proposition that year, declared that the people of Canada had given this company a magnificent subvention, and that this company had no claims on the liberality of Parliament or the generosity of the people; and no wonder Mr. Stephen, in his address to the shareholders, on the 13th June last, could with pride point to the wonderfully profitable speculation which the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were engaged in, when they would have at their disposal, on the completion of the road, assets valued at \$177,068,340. I have shown you, out of the documents submitted to Parliament by the company, and from the address delivered by the president to the shareholders, that this company has in cash and assets \$177,609,000 after paying for the construction and equipment of the road. It may be said, however, that a large portion of those assets were not in cash or were unrealised. That is true; but I ask what have the people of this country to do with that? Parliament ratified the contract with this railway company, giving them these aids, and the railway company undertook to provide the funds necessary for the completion of the road, outside the money we granted. It may be also said that the company could not construct the road out of unrealised assets. That is also true; but again I ask what have the people of Canada to do with that? The president says these assets are worth their face value, and it cannot be contended that the company are unable, with assets worth \$177,000,000, to raise the paltry sum of \$5,000,000. Further: the people of this country paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in hard cash, more than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company paid in hard cash to complete such portions of the road as they were bound to complete between Callander and the Pacific Ocean. I prove this out of the documents submitted by the company and from the address delivered by the president to his constituents at the meeting in Montreal, on the 13th of this month, and this also is apart from the \$29,493,000 realised by the company from their stock manipulations. In the Session of 1884 the company submitted to Parliament statements showing what they had expended and what would be necessary to complete the road. The company had expended in construction, \$23,078,950; they had expended, in rolling stock, materials and other works, \$10,871,050; the estimate of the cost to complete the road was \$27,000,000; or, in other words, the company had expended, or were to expend, on the construction of the main line, \$60,950,000, and these are the figures given by the company themselves to Parliament. Mr. Van Horne, the engineer of the company, stated subsequently that they would require four millions less than the estimate, because it was

found, owing to the easy nature of the works to be constructed, that they could be constructed for this amount less. Then, all the company expended and required to expend to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway was \$56,950,000. Let us see, from the documents which have been submitted to Parliament, how much the Canadian Pacific Railway received in hard cash out of the funds provided by the people of this country. They admit having received, or that they will receive by September of this year, \$25,000,000 subsidy. The land sales and the land grant bonds and bonuses make \$10,900,000. There is the loan of 1884, \$29,810,000. This makes in all \$65,710,000. I take no account in this of the loan of over \$7,000,000 on the security of the postal and transport service. According to Mr. Van Horne, they expended and required to expend only \$56,950,000. In other words, the company received, including the loan of 1884, in hard cash from Canada, \$8,760,000 more than they paid and required to pay to complete the whole line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. This was the condition of the account on the 1st January, 1884. Let us see the condition of the account in 1885. We get that from the document submitted to Parliament, and from Mr. Stephen's letter of the 18th March, 1885. Mr. Stephen says, in that letter, that on the main line and branches they had spent \$52,595,000. He does not condescend to particulars; he does not say how much was spent on the main line and how much on the branches; but, in 1884, he said that \$23,078,950 had been expended on the main line, and, according to his estimate and the estimate of his engineer, it required \$27,000,000 more to complete the main line, and for rolling stock \$8,000,000; or, in other words, they spent and required the expenditure, to complete the main line and the equipment, of \$58,078,950. How much did they receive up to the 1st January, 1885, according to their own documents submitted to Parliament? They received in cash subsidy \$25,000,000; loan of 1884—and again I do not take any notice of the loan of \$7,000,000—\$29,810,000; cash for land grant bonds, sales of land and bonuses, \$10,900,000, making an aggregate of \$65,710,000; and they paid out \$58,078,950, leaving a balance in cash, over and above what they paid out, of \$7,631,050. That is quite clear, because Mr. Stephen, on the 13th June, says:

"In considering the financial position of the company it may be well to remind the shareholders that at the beginning of the present year there remained in the hands of the Government an unexpended cash balance of \$9,633,032, available for the work under contract with the Government. This sum, as has already been officially stated, is sufficient to complete the work remaining to be done, according to the terms of the contract."

Here are the statements made by Mr. Stephen, that they had cash on hand of over \$8,000,000, and that that was more than sufficient to complete the works that remained to be done. Yet this company, with these statements submitted to Parliament and before the country, have the assurance to ask for a loan of \$5,000,000 and a total change in the character of the security, and hon. gentlemen in this House are found advocating their claims. I have thus shown the enormous sums which have been placed at the disposal of this company by the people to complete this road; I have shown that they have received from the people of Canada in cash and aids \$53,490,000 more than they required to complete and equip their main line; I have shown that they received in cash, in assets, and sales of their own stock, \$84,609,111 more than sufficient to complete and equip this road; I have shown that Canada paid, up to the 1st January, 1885, in cash, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, \$7,631,050 more than they paid out on the construction of the main line, and this apart from their stock-jobbing transaction. If you add to this \$7,631,050 the cash proceeds of the sales of stock, amounting to \$29,493,048, you have the aggregate of \$37,124,048 in cash received by the Canadian Pacific Railway up to the 1st January, 1885, more than they expended or were to

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

expend in the completion of the road. In addition to all this, Canada was generous enough to hand over to this company this road, with all its rights, powers, monopolies and franchises, for all time to come. It is worth considering for a moment, from my standpoint, how this enormous surplus at the disposal of this company, placed at the disposal of this company by the people of this country, was expended. The document submitted to this Parliament, the address of the president of the railway company to the shareholders, on the 13th June, showed beyond doubt that the company spent a sum of over \$38,000,000 on transactions outside the construction of the main line. They spent, according to their own showing, on the line and branches east of Callander, \$4,213,758; Algoma and western branches, a sum which I figure at \$4,733,798; on financial transactions of their own, \$1,389,474; on the equipment of branch lines, \$1,877,000; upon the improvement of Government section, \$1,241,790; advances to secure access to the sea board, \$5,858,473; on dividends upon their own stock, obtained by themselves at the lowest prices, \$5,378,000; and according to the president's letter they had in the hands of the Government on 1st January, 1885, to pay additional dividends, \$14,288,088. Now, according to this letter of the 18th March, to which I referred a moment ago, the company spent \$35,131,813 in transactions outside the main line, up to the 1st of January 1884. So the result of these calculations is that this company has exhausted, in transactions outside the contract, and with which this Parliament has nothing to do, a sum of \$7,631,050, the amount which the company received in cash from the people of Canada in excess of what they paid on construction of the main line, and the sum of \$29,493,048, which the company received on stock transactions, and an additional sum of \$1,855,000, or, in all, the sum of \$38,979,000, which this company has spent on transactions outside the main line. This, I say, accounts, to some extent, for the extraordinary condition in which this company now says it is placed. Now, Sir, it is worth while to pause for a moment and ask ourselves two or three serious questions. Why should the people of this country be charged with \$1,241,780 for keeping in repair the road which the Government of Canada handed over to the company well constructed and in good repair? Why should this fund, which the people of Canada placed at the disposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct the main line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, be charged with \$4,233,758 for the main line and branches east of Callander; or with \$4,733,798 for the Algoma branch and the western section; or with \$5,875,223 to obtain access to the seaboard and for leased lines? These transactions are private transactions, outside the contract, and entered into by this company upon their own responsibility, and with which the people of this country have no concern. Why should this fund be charged with \$5,578,000 for extortionate dividends and with the sum of \$14,288,288, a sum still in the hands of the Government of this country to pay the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company extortionate dividends upon the stock obtained by them, some of it at 25 cents on the dollar and some of it at 42 cents on the dollar? As well might you charge this fund and this country with a \$4,000 piano, or with a \$2,000,000 mansion, built in the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I am satisfied although we have not yet got to the bottom of the financial transactions of this company. Still the statements submitted to this Parliament exhibit a most scandalous disposal of the moneys placed by the people of this country at the disposal of this company for the construction of this railway. After wasting and squandering, a large portion of the money placed at their disposal for the construction of this railway; after having watered their stock and divided it up among themselves, after having placed in the hands of the Government

a sum equal to \$20,000,000, to pay themselves extortionate dividends, and after having drawn from the Government those extortionate dividends, they have the assurance, the unparalleled impudence, to come to Parliament and ask us for additional aid and a change in the security. Sir, I do not propose to discuss the stock transactions of this company; that has been done by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake); I propose simply to give you one or two specimens of the dealings of this company with their own stock. The company emitted \$30,000,000 of their own stock at 51 cents upon the dollar. Upon this stock the holders obtained a dividend of 6 per cent. on the face value of the stock, or nearly 12 per cent. upon the real value. The company issued \$10,000,000 of this stock at 42 cents on the dollar. A large portion of this emission passed under the control of members of the old syndicate, some of whom still survive as the incorporators of the present company. Upon this stock so emitted they drew dividends at the rate of 6 per cent. upon its face value, which would be equal to 14½ per cent. upon the real value, or the sum which these incorporators paid for their own stock. Another issue was made of \$20,000,000 of stock, at 25 cents on the dollar. Every dollar of that emission was taken up by and passed under the control of the members of the old syndicate who, I say again, are the incorporators in this company—passed under the control of George Stephen, president of the company, D. McIntyre, J. S. Kennedy, J. J. Hill, Donald A. Smith, Morton, Rose & Co.; and upon this stock they drew and will draw for ten years dividends equal to 24 per cent. upon the actual value of the stock; and yet these people have the boldness to come to this Parliament and ask us for an additional amount of \$5,000,000 and a change in the security taken by this Parliament in 1884. Sir, I do not know what this Parliament will do; I know what this Parliament ought to do, and that is, to refuse the application made by these gentlemen. Now, I want to say a word or two with respect to the advance made in 1884, and the conditions upon which it was made. It is known that in 1884 the Government undertook to guarantee a dividend of 3 per cent. upon the stock of this company; the company asked for a guarantee of the 3 per cent. upon \$100,000,000, and the Government undertook to guarantee a dividend of 3 per cent. on \$65,000,000 of stock only. When Parliament met, in 1884, I am satisfied the members upon both sides of the House were startled at the propositions and at the resolutions that were submitted by the then Minister of Railways, in which it was asked that this Parliament should give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company what was, in substance, a loan of \$30,000,000. Well, Sir, we were aware, out of the mouth of the Minister of Railways that this company had no claims upon the generosity of this Parliament; that this money, if voted at all, would be voted for the purpose of hastening the completion of the railway. It was admitted to us by the Minister of Railways, then, that the subvention made in 1880 was more than sufficient to construct the road, and yet he submitted certain further propositions. What were these propositions? That the time for the payment of the \$2,853,912, due by the company to the Government on the 1st of February, 1884, should be extended to the 7th November, 1888; that the sum of \$4,527,000, which was to fall due on the 7th November, 1888, should, with the previous sum, making together \$7,380,912, be paid on the 7th November, 1888; that, in addition, the Government should loan the company \$22,500,000, payable on the 1st May, 1891. The Minister of Railways justified these propositions; he was good enough to submit to Parliament, in lump sums, the cash received by the company from the country for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the condition in which the railway then was, the condition in which the works then were, and the hon. gentleman proceeded to declare:

"I will stake, Sir, my standing in this House on the accuracy of the statement I have presented; and if the hon. gentleman can show that I have not given a fair, frank and unvarnished statement of the figures and facts as they stand out in the public records of the country and the documents before the House, then I will admit that I have no claim to the confidence of the House in regard to the statement I am making on this question. I have said there is only one point which is a question of estimate at all. There are two points. The one is the estimate that the work with the supplies on hand can be completed for \$47,000,000. Well, all I can say is, that the chief engineer of the Department has gone carefully into that question, and, as the House is aware, has committed himself to the statement that he believes the figures of the company may be accepted as accurate."

Here we have the assurance of the Minister of Railways that the work would be finally completed, according to the estimates of the engineer, for \$47,000,000. The hon. gentleman staked his character and reputation for veracity on the accuracy of his figures. We had not much faith in the hon. gentleman's accuracy in dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway. What is the result? The result is that inside of twelve months the Minister of Railways' calculations are shown to be erroneous, and the company is here asking for additional aid; and I suppose, if the company receives at the hands of Parliament the treatment which the company usually receives, it will obtain that aid. The Minister of Railways upon that occasion stated, in order to justify the application then being made to Parliament, and to induce his followers to vote for the ratification of the proposition, that the conditions upon which British Columbia became part and parcel of the Union would in no way be violated by the ratification of the resolutions of 1884. The hon. gentleman declared:

"But while they do not ask the House to give them a single additional dollar, they ask us to use the credit of this country—which, thanks to the management of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Finance, never stood in a higher position—to obtain the means of accomplishing this great national work by the end of 1885; and that without imposing the slightest shadow of a shade of additional burthen upon the Government or upon the country, giving security for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract was to be completed, the 1st May, 1891."

The hon. member for Cardwell, who is a staunch supporter of the occupants of the Treasury benches, added his testimony to that of the Minister of Railways. He declared:

"If we receive but \$1,250,000 a year from the sale of lands—and remember that every dollar received from the sale of lands goes into the hands of trustees, for the payment of the interest and principle of the loan we are now advancing, we have the interest upon this \$22,500,000 paid to us, and the loan is not a charge upon the people of this country at all."

Here we have a statement made by the Minister of Railways and confirmed by the hon. member, for Cardwell that it is a possible thing to create a debt of \$30,000,000 without adding to the debt of the country, that it is possible to pay the interest thereon without adding to the burdens of the people. We pointed out the folly, the unmitigated nonsense of that statement, that it was possible to create a debt of \$30,000,000 and not have the debt, and to pay interest on those \$30,000,000 and yet not pay interest. We proved, by the course hon. gentlemen were then taking, that they were misleading the people and misleading this House, and inducing hon. members to ratify the proposition on the faith of the representations made. Our protests were vain, and our warnings fell upon deaf ears. What are the consequences to-day? The consequences are grave and serious—the consequences of encouraging the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in extravagance, in mismanagement, in squandering the money placed at their disposal, to construct the main line expended in constructing lines outside of their main line, in a system of stock watering and stock jobbing in their own stock, unparalleled in the history of the construction of any railway on this continent or of any railway in the world. The hon. member for Cardwell and the Minister of Railways told us last Session that \$27,000,000 would finally complete this railway. We were told by the Minister of Railways that the subventions of 1880 were more than suf-

ficient to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway from end to end, but in the condition of the money market it would not be proper to compel them to realise on their assets. We were assured, in 1884, that the loan of \$30,000,000 would be \$3,000,000 more than were required to finally complete the railway from Callander to the Pacific. What have we to-day? The president of the company, in his letter of 18th March, inst., declares that the company find themselves compelled to ask for other and better financial arrangements, otherwise the work will stop. It is admitted that the company is in financial difficulties; it is admitted that the company is unable to pay the contractors, and that the laborers are on strike. They are in financial difficulty, and the president of the company admits it. What a humiliating and degrading position do the hon. members on the Treasury benches occupy to-night, in the face of Parliament and the people after the assurances given in 1880 and repeated in 1884, that the grants subventions and loans were more than sufficient to complete the railway, when they are now obliged to come to Parliament and ask for an additional loan of \$5,000,000 more and enter into what are new terms of arrangement. The Minister of Railways, in 1884, declared:

"I say that they had such confidence in this work that they imperilled their own capital; and if we had not had the good fortune to make this contract with men of great wealth, great resources, great energy and enterprise, and great experience, we would have had a most disastrous collapse in connection with this work; and none of the progress and advancement and development which has taken place in connection with the rapid prosecution of this enterprise would have existed to-day. I do not rest these resolutions for a single moment on the low ground of any claim that these gentlemen have. They have no claim. They made a contract, and they received, by the terms of that contract, a magnificent subvention for the work, great as it was, that they were undertaking to deal with; and they have, no doubt, prospective profits of a large character before them. I do not ask for a moment that these resolutions shall receive the consideration of the House on any such claim."

These were represented to be men of great wealth, great resources, great energy, great enterprise; they were men of enormous and unlimited means; men whose fortunes were reckoned by millions; men who had no claims on the liberality of Parliament, or the generosity of the people of this country; men who would not, and could not come back to Parliament to ask for additional assistance; and that is just what these men did in 1884, what they have done in 1885, and what I am sure they will do in 1886, if this Parliament were foolish enough to give them what they want now. The hon. gentleman then proceeded:

"The Canadian Pacific Railway have property which, if realised at its fair value, is abundant to complete their contract, without any assistance from any source. Having an enterprise on hand that has established itself beyond controversy as an enterprise based on a sound commercial foundation, they are in a position to say that with anything like a fair realisation of the value of the property they possess, they do not require assistance from any person. I have told the House, in the first place, that they do not ask an additional dollar of subvention for the purpose of completing the contract they have made with the Government."

Yet, Sir, these men who have spent a large portion of the subvention of 1880 and the loan of 1884 in transactions outside of the contract, are here for the third time asking this Parliament to give them \$5,000,000 of money, and to change the security of 1884. Take Mr. Stephen's letter of 1884, and you will find that the sum of \$35,000,000 was spent in transactions outside of the contract—transactions of a questionable character—and having done so, they came to Parliament for \$30,000,000 more. If you take the letter of the 18th March, 1885, you will find admission made by the President of this company, that large sums of the money of this country, which was placed in their hands, had been wasted and squandered in speculation outside the terms of this contract. I say, with these facts staring us in the face—and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to successfully contradict one of these statements—it would be a scandalous thing for any Parliament to sanction the

**Mr. CAMERON (Huron).**

proposition which is now before us. If the security is good for any thing, and we were assured that it was valuable, this Parliament ought not to give an additional sum of \$5,000,000, and it ought not to touch this security. We find, further, that while discussing the resolutions of 1884, respecting the loan then to be made, the Minister of Railways made the following statement:—

"Then, Sir, as to the \$22,500,000, it is not proposed to pay the company one dollar of it, except as the work proceeds, and in instalments proportionate to the value of the work remaining to be done; so that, when the \$22,500,000 is exhausted, together with the \$12,710,788 of cash subsidy remaining in the hands of the Government, the Government shall have the certainty of the work being completed from end to end."

Sir, to-day, experience has taught us that we ought to have had some other guarantee than the personal assurance of the Minister of Railways as to the standing and financial position of these men. He proceeded:

"We have reason to know that all that a command of capital can do they have the advantage of, and we have reason to know that all that skill and energy, and a knowledge of precisely such work will do, has been secured, in order to make this a successful contract, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite what more is desirable or necessary?"

The First Minister confirmed the statement of the Minister of Railways. He found it necessary to strengthen the faith of hon. gentlemen supporting him, and he declared as follows:—

"It makes no difference if the security is good; if the capital is in the hands of gentlemen of honor and means, it is of no consequence where the money is expended." I believe the men who signed the first contract are men of honor and great wealth, who cannot afford to lose their character, prestige and credit in the markets of the world by breaking a contract."

The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), on that occasion, spoke as follows:—

"The assurance we have from the chief engineer of the company, and the assurance we had to-night from the Minister, that there is to be proper supervision in the expenditure of this money, in such a way that it shall only be spent having regard to the completion of the railway within the amount voted, affords to us the most perfect guarantee that can be afforded in any business transaction that the railway will be completed within the time, and for no further sum of money than is here proposed to be voted."

No assurance could be stronger, no statements clearer, than those I have just read, that the road would be finally completed on the subventions which were previously made and the loans which were then given. The Minister of Railways who pressed on the attention of Parliament the consideration of those resolutions, in 1884, is not here to answer for misleading the House. The hon. member for Cardwell is here, and I am curious to know what stand he will take on this occasion. Will he do as he always has done—eat his own words, and support the Government, or will he act the statesman and the patriot, vote against this loan and abandonment of the security—we shall see. We pointed out, in 1880 and 1884, that in addition to the company obtaining a monopoly in the construction of railways in the North-West Territories, north of this road—a monopoly which was injurious to the progress and prosperity of the country—they had obtained the monopoly south of the Canada Pacific Railway, that neither the Government nor the people of the Province of Manitoba were in a position to construct railways south of the line. The Province of Manitoba incorporated companies to construct railways south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, those charters were disallowed, because the Canadian Pacific Railway insisted upon that disallowance, considering those charters a violation of the terms of the contract. We protested against that in vain, year after year, and Session after Session, but ultimately we succeeded, and the Minister of Railways last Session announced that the Government proposed to insist on the company abandoning the monopoly clause in the contract. He said:

"I am glad to be able to state to the House that although, true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, to connect with American railways to

the south, such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line, so far as it has gone, such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and by the inherent power of its own advantages to maintain its position, notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected we are now in a position to review and to reconsider the policy of the late Government, and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any long period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition within the Province of Manitoba, and I am glad to be able to state to the House that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, than when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south."

Now, we will see what the Government will do. By these resolutions the Government do not propose to abolish the monopoly clause in the charter of 1880, or to grant relief to the struggling settlers in the outlying districts of Manitoba and the North-West. They propose that the railway company shall have \$5,000,000 more, and that the security shall be seriously impaired, but the monopoly remains untouched. Now, I say that time, the great solver of all problems, has solved the problems of 1880 and 1884. It is conclusively shown that the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite was a wrong policy. It is shown that every assurance, every promise, every pledge on the faith of which this Parliament was induced to ratify the resolutions of 1880 and of 1884, have all been shattered. It is shown that the protests made and the warnings given by the Opposition in 1880 and 1884 have been more than justified by subsequent events. Time has shown that the line pursued by the Opposition, from beginning to end of the discussions of 1880 and 1884, in relation to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the policy of the Government with respect thereto, has been amply justified by subsequent events. To-day, Sir, the company and the Government occupy the most humiliating position that the Government of this or any other country can occupy. By coming to Parliament and asking for additional aid they admit that the assurances, representations and promises made in 1880 and 1884 have all been foundationless and false. Now, Sir, let us consider the loan that this Government are now asking Parliament to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have shown, out of the mouth of the Minister of Railways and the supporters of the Government, that the subventions of 1880 were amply sufficient to complete the road from end to end, without touching a single dollar of the land grant or the proceeds of the sales of such; I have shown out of the mouth of the president of the company, and from documents submitted to Parliament, that the moneys placed at the disposal of this company by way of loan, in 1884, were more than sufficient to finally complete and equip the road from end to end, without touching a single dollar of the unrealised assets at that time, and without taking into account the money realised for the stock-jobbing transactions of the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in their own stock. Now, why is this company here now begging from Parliament an additional \$5,000,000? They are here because, as I say, they have wasted and squandered and misappropriated the enormous subventions placed at their disposal by the people of this country, in transactions outside of the construction of the main line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. What do they want? They want \$5,000,000 and a radical change of the security we took in 1884 to secure the repayment of our loan. That security appeared to be ample; we were assured by the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), that it was ample; on its face it appeared to be ample. It is worth pausing here for a moment to consider the nature of that security for the repayment of the \$30,000,000. We took security on the entire property of

the company, real as well as personal, owned or thereafter to be acquired and owned by the company, including the main line of railway, the extensions thereof, their branch lines of railway, and the whole of their equipment, rolling stock and plant, and all their steamers and vessels; also, the land grant of the company earned, and to be thereafter earned, saving the rights of existing mortgagees on the extension of the line of railway from Callander to Brockville and Montreal, and subject to the mortgage on the land grant. The Government also held security on all the moneys earned by the company for postal service and for transport service. The Government also held a lien on \$35,000,000 of the stock of the company, then deposited with the Government. Under section 6, subsection 2, of the Act of 1884, the Government had the power, in case of default in payment of the principal or interest for twelve months, to take possession of the road; in fact, the whole of the property should then become *ipso facto* the property of Canada, without any foreclosure at all. Now, the proposition contained in these resolutions is to add another \$5,000,000 to the magnificent subventions, grants, exemptions, franchises, monopolies and loans already granted to this company, and to change the nature of the security in material parts to the advantage of the company, the injury of the country and thus putting in peril the repayment of the loan 1884. Let us see what these changes are. By these resolutions we are asked to abandon absolutely the security we now hold from the company, created by the Act of 1884, to secure the repayment by the company to the Government of the \$30,000,000; such security covered all the property, real and personal, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Government, by these resolutions, agree to reduce the rate of interest payable on the loan of \$30,000,000 made to the company last year, from 5 per cent. to 4 per cent. The Government, by these resolutions agree to abandon the first lien or charge held by the Government on all the property, real and personal, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a security for the payment of the loan of 1884. The Government, by these resolutions, permit the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to issue \$35,000,000 of first mortgage bonds, secured by first mortgage on all the real and personal property of the company, and to give such mortgage the priority now held by the mortgage to the Government, securing the payment of the loan of last year to the Government. The Government propose, by these resolutions, to take from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company \$20,000,000 of these bonds at par, in full payment of such portion of the loan of 1884, and secured by a first mortgage on the real and personal property of the company. The Government propose, by these resolutions, that \$9,880,912, the residue of the loan of 1884, made by the Government to the company, shall be secured by a second mortgage on the land grant, thus also releasing the security held by the Government on the other real and personal property of the company for this loan. The Government thus propose to place at the disposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company \$15,000,000 of these first mortgage bonds. These are the proposed changes. Now, let us consider for a moment what are the effects of the proposed changes with respect to the security now held by the country for the repayment of the loan of 1884. We reduced the rate of interest from 5 to 4 per cent. As to \$20,000,000 of the loan of 1884, we take a second mortgage on the real and personal property of the company, except on the Algoma branch. It is only a second mortgage, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) says, because before we can take possession of the road, in case of default, we must pay \$15,000,000 of first mortgage bonds held by others than the Government. Under the agreement of 1884 the Government had a first lien, and on default for 12 months, at once became *ipso facto*

owners of all the property, real and personal, of the company. As to \$9,880,912 of the loan of 1884, we now hold a first mortgage on all the property of the company. The Government propose, by these resolutions, to abandon the whole of that security, and to take a second mortgage on the land grant only for that sum. By these resolutions, it is proposed not only that we abandon our first lien on the road and branches, and all the other real and personal property of the company to secure the payment of the loan of \$30,000,000, but that we agree to take, in lieu thereof, a second mortgage on the road and branches, and on the real and personal property of the company, except the land grant, to secure \$20,000,000, and we add \$5,000,000 to the loan. Not only do we do this, but we are, in addition, asked to take these mortgage bonds to the extent of \$20,000,000 at par. They may not be worth 50 cents on the dollar; but we take them at par, all the same; the loss may be very great, but we cannot estimate it, as we do not know the value of these bonds. The important question that now stares us in the face is, what should Parliament do under these circumstances? This company, having wasted and squandered a large portion of the assets placed at their disposal by the people, in transactions outside of the contract to build the Canadian Pacific Railway from end to end, should we come to their assistance and give them the additional sum of \$5,000,000, and change the nature of the security? Whether we can do so or not is scarcely open to discussion just now. This company have taken the precaution to pay the interest due on the mortgage out of the capital placed at their disposal by the Government, so that we cannot take possession of the road just now. But should we advance this \$5,000,000 and change this security? I say no. The company has ample means to build the railway on the subventions of 1880 and the loan granted by this Parliament in 1884, without even touching one single dollar of the proceeds of their stock-jobbery or the 20,000,000 acres of land that still remain in their hands. The president, in his letter of 18th March, says that the company found itself compelled to seek some new arrangement of its financial affairs to enable it to procure the necessary capital to finish the road. Mr. Stephen said what is not the facts, and what is not supported by the figures submitted by himself. In his letter he points out that on the 31st December, 1884, the company paid Mr. Stephen and others the sum of \$5,378,000 as dividends out of the capital of the company, which ought to have been expended in the construction of the road. These stockholders, it must be borne in mind, are substantially the members of the original syndicate, who agreed to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway on the subvention of 1880. I say, let these men pay back to this company the \$5,378,000 which they never ought to have taken out of the capital of the company, but which ought to have been expended on the construction of the road, and they will have more than is sufficient to complete the road, according to their own estimate. Mr. Stephen, in the same letter, says there was, on the 1st January, 1885, in the hands of the Government, \$14,288,000 to pay additional dividends. The money is there. What is it there for? Why was it not utilised by the company for the purpose of completing the railway, instead of coming to this Parliament and asking Parliament to lend them an additional sum. Let them be contended with moderate dividends, with reasonable dividends, with no dividends at all, until the road is finally completed, if necessary, and they will have more than sufficient to finish the road, according to the estimate of the company. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe said it would not be fair to use this money which is in the hands of the Government, because this stock is in the hands of widows and orphans in England. I say a large portion is in the hands of the original

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

corporaters. Let them pay back to the company, at least, the money they have illegally and improperly drawn by way of dividends, or let them apply a portion of the sums provided by themselves to pay dividends to themselves, out of the moneys in the hands of the Government, towards the construction of the road. Ought we, therefore, in this state of facts, yield to the company's demand? Ought we to sanction and affirm these resolutions, in the face of these facts? I say that in the face of these facts Parliament ought not to vote these additional millions. I do not know what this Parliament will do; I know what it ought to do. I know what the people of this country would do if the question were submitted to them. They would refuse to ratify these resolutions. Surely this Parliament will not be so unwise, will not be so weak, as to make this additional grant. No language can be strong enough to characterise the whole course and conduct of the Government with respect to the matter. There is not a particle of security provided by these resolutions for the final completion of the road, even with this additional grant of \$5,000,000. There is no security given to the people that even with this additional advance the road will be completed and in running order by the 1st September, 1886, or at any other time. We are asked to ratify this contract in the face of the fact that no security is offered for the final completion of the road. That is a thing this Government ought not to do and this Parliament ought not to sanction. The name of any Parliament that would sanction the ratification of these resolutions, in the face of the facts submitted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Parliament; in the face of the admission made by the president of the company, that the assets of the company are worth \$177,000,000; in the face of the fact that these men have drawn out of its capital over \$5,000,000 to pay dividends, and that they have in the hands of the Government over \$14,000,000 to pay future dividends; in the face of the fact that the president of the company, on the 13th June, admitted that on the 30th April over \$8,000,000 were in the hands of the Government, sufficient to complete the road, I say the name of any Parliament, in the face of these facts, that would ratify these resolutions, will stink in the nostrils of every honest man, and the names of its members will go down to future generations as political time-servers and slaves, who for the third time, at the bidding of an unscrupulous and corrupt Government, sold this country to this corporation. I say to the hon. gentleman who has charge of these resolutions, I say to this Parliament, I say to the people of this country, that if this company desires to stand well in the confidence of the people, if it desires to deserve that confidence, and the sympathy and the support of the people—if this company desires to escape the well-founded suspicion, if not something more than suspicion, of the misappropriation and misapplication of the funds placed at its disposal by a generous people to construct this railway, to transactions entirely outside of the original contract; if this company desires to escape the conviction, in the minds of many of the people of this country, that it has not only misapplied and misappropriated this money, but has used it for wholly illegitimate and illegal purposes, this company must give, what it has refused to give, a full and frank disclosure of its financial transactions, and must submit to an audit of its accounts by a capable, a competent, a reliable accountant; it must cease its stock-watering and stock-jobbing transactions, that have reflected no credit upon the company and great discredit upon the Government of this country; this company must abandon its unjust and unfair monopolies, monopolies that have proved so injurious to the best interests of the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territoriss; this company must not expect to control every railway in the Dominion

of Canada, and to grasp every pound of freight on this continent; this company must let live as well as live; this company must conduct and manage its business upon prudent business principles; this company must cease knocking, year after year, at the door of the Parliament of Canada, asking for more, more; this company must open wide the gates of legitimate railway competition in the North-West Territories and Manitoba; this company must not throw obstructions in the way of the progress, prosperity and development of the North-West, by insisting upon this Government checking, vetoing and disallowing all legislation for the opening up of that vast region to the west of us; this company must keep itself clear—what I fancy it has not hitherto done—of political entanglements and political alliances of a questionable character; the original proprietors of this company must refund to this company the millions they have illegally and improperly extracted from the capital of this company, which ought to have gone to build the railway, but which they have applied in the payment of illegal and extortionate dividends, or else this company must authorise this Government to appropriate at least a portion of the fourteen million dollars in their hands on the 1st January last, for the purpose of completing this road, instead of retaining it in the hands of the Government for the purpose of paying these extortionate dividends. Believing that to be the true principle, the honest principle, and the principle upon which the Government ought to act, and this Parliament ought to act, and the people of this country would act, I beg to move the following amendment:

That all after the word "that" be left out, and the following inserted "Canada, in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, gave the company vast aids, which were declared to be ample and final; Canada, in 1884, gave the company great additional aids, which were again declared to be ample and final; the shareholders of the company have already divided among themselves about \$7,000,000 in dividends, and have on deposit with the Government about \$14,000,000 more, to provide future dividends for themselves for over eight years to come, while they affirm that the railway will be profitable from the day of its opening; in the opinion of this House, the shareholders, if they desire more money for their operations, should propose to utilise their deposit for future dividends instead of asking Canada to impair its existing securities to make large further advances, and to allow the enterprise to be charged with \$15,000,000 additional capital, the interest upon which must be borne by the trade of this country."

Mr. CHARLTON. I have a few remarks to make on this subject, and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We adjourned very early last night, in consequence of the leader of the Opposition desiring not to proceed any further, and I think we had better go on to-night.

Mr. TROW. I think it is very unreasonable to compel members who are tired to go on to-night. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that this is a reasonable motion. The amount of speaking to-day has been more than usual. Only one member on the Government side has spoken, and to require our side to go on with this motion, with the expectation of reaching a division to-night, is unreasonable.

Mr. MILLS. I have no doubt that the more the subject is discussed before we reach committee the more brief the discussion will be in committee. The motion of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) was made with a view to record the opinions of the House. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side, who followed the leader of the Opposition, are anxious to record their votes upon this motion, and I dare say the First Minister and his followers will have no objection to recording their votes also. It does seem to me unreasonable that we should be forced to a division at this hour. We must remember that the Government, in 1880, proposed to give a large subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was to be once for all. In a short time

we were asked for a further sum, and now there is another application to Parliament for still further aid. The motion that is now put in your hands announces that there are fourteen millions of money in the hands of the Government at the disposal of this company. That is a very important statement, and we have had no statement from the hon. gentleman who followed the leader of the Opposition in defence of the proposition of the Government. How is it that a company, having fourteen millions of money in the hands of the Government, of which the Government are simply trustees, comes here and asks that we shall contribute something more to the support of this corporation.

Mr. HESSON. I think it is most unreasonable that the business of the House should be delayed in this manner. I submit that, after the eloquent and lengthy speech of the leader of the Opposition, very little more can be said by hon. gentlemen opposite. The question has also been ably discussed on the side of the Government. The Secretary of State gave us a very able and eloquent speech, and the Acting Minister of Railways also gave full information to the House as to the position of the company. The House knows perfectly well how the matter stands now.

Mr. CASEY. It is asking too much of hon. members at this hour of the night to speak upon this important question, especially after the light that has been thrown upon it by the discussion of to-day, a light that I think was new to many members on both sides of the House. And we ought also to hear from the Premier himself on the question. No matter who may propose these resolutions, we know that this is peculiarly the right hon. gentleman's own scheme. He must have important opinions about it, and important information to lay before the House, and we cannot suppose that he will so far forget his duty to the House as to allow this matter to go into committee without giving us that information. A number of us wish to discuss the matter, and an adjournment should be now taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will point out to the First Minister that he could hardly expect that a discussion of this character should be closed with four speeches, two by Ministers who are in charge of the measure. This measure is one of the most important, as the hon. gentleman must admit, we have had, and must evoke a good deal of discussion from this side of the House. Moreover, the hon. gentleman must remember that, with the exception of the leader of the Opposition, who had an opportunity, but only very recently, of perusing various documents for which he had asked, we were left in considerable ignorance by the direct action of the hon. gentleman's own colleagues of a good many points we ought to have known. In fact, the chief information I have had on the subject has been derived from the report only published two days ago by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It contained a good many startling statements, and the country at large will expect that the measure should not be hurried through. I regret, perhaps, as much as the hon. gentleman does, that the circumstances of this Session have been such that an immense amount of time has been consumed in matters which appear to me far less pressing and important than the discussion of the vital alteration of the terms on which the loan was made twelve months ago. If I thought there was any possibility of closing this discussion to-night and not renewing it at length on other stages, I should say that the hon. gentleman had some reason for the course he is pursuing; but he knows, and we all know, that in these money Bills numerous stages have to be taken, and it will be better that we should discuss it more fully first rather than at the three or four separate stages which this measure will have to take.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows there must be and will be a discussion on the para-

graphs of the resolution. If the hon. gentleman will undertake that we will get into committee in another day, I will agree to the adjournment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I certainly do not think hon. gentlemen desire to obstruct the measure; they only desire a reasonable discussion. There is one question which ought to be pretty thoroughly understood, and that is, that the whole time might be occupied by a couple of long speeches on the hon. gentleman's side, and that would render it very difficult for me to answer for hon. members on this side. If anything of that kind were likely to occur, it would be only reasonable to have speeches turn about.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I agree to that. To-morrow is to be devoted to another subject. If the hon. gentleman will agree that we get into committee on Friday, we can adjourn. I do not understand that we will get out of committee on Friday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there ought to be no difficulty in getting into committee some time on Friday night.

An hon. MEMBER. Or Saturday morning.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman sees that there is but a small number here just now, but I think there would be no difficulty in getting into committee on Friday night, some time or other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; on that understanding we will adjourn.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1:10 a.m., Thursday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 18th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. JAMIESON moved that the House proceed to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and the Liquor License Act, 1883.

Motion agreed to.

On the 3rd amendment,

"Page 2, line 7, after (5) insert:

"Section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'intoxicating,' in the 15th line thereof, the following words: 'Provided, however, that duly licensed medical practitioners may dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes and not otherwise.'

"Provided, also, that nothing in this Act shall be held to interfere with the purchase or sale by legally qualified physicians, chemists or druggists, of the following articles, that is to say:—

"1. The official preparations of the authorised pharmacopœas when made of full medicinal strength, and sold only for medicinal purposes.

"2. Physician's prescriptions containing spirituous liquors, if sold in quantities of not more than eight ounces at any one time.

"3. Any patent medicine, unless such patent medicine is known to the vendor to be capable of being used as a beverage, the sale of which is a violation of 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878.'

"4. Eau de Cologne, bay rum or other articles of perfumery, lotions, extracts, varnishes, tinctures or other pharmaceutical preparations containing alcohol, but not intended for use as beverages.

"5. Alcohol or methylated spirits, for pharmaceutical, chemical or mechanical uses."

Mr. JAMIESON. As to the first clause of the amendment, that is, the clause permitting doctors to dispense liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes, I move that it be disagreed

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to for the following reasons: Because it has already been rejected by this House, on the ground that it would be a violation of the principle of the Act, which precludes a medical man having an interest in the sale from giving a certificate, and does not oblige a medical man to keep a register of sales and make a return, which provisions are deemed necessary safeguards. As to so much of the second clause of the amendment as is numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4: Because it is unnecessary, inasmuch as the Act does not prohibit such sale. As to the second part of the said second clause, numbered 5: Because it contravenes the principle of the Act, which provides that the sale of alcohol and spirits for the purposes mentioned shall be made only on the certificate of two justices of the peace, accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant and registration of the sale, which are considered necessary safeguards against any abuse of the law.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not think the hon. gentleman's motion is correct in form. It begins by professing to set out that this House has already rejected this particular proposal for reasons so-and-so. This House has given no reasons for having rejected it. This House has simply voted against it, and one reason may have influenced one hon. member and another reason have influenced another hon. member; and this House has not, by any proceeding on its records, given any reason, up to the present time, for rejecting that proposal which the Senate thought fit to put in the form of a clause. The House simply voted against it. I think the hon. gentleman should not put authoritatively as reasons for the action of the House what certainly have not been put so by the House itself.

Mr. JAMIESON. It will be recollected that an amendment of this kind was made at the time the Bill was in Committee of the Whole, and it was afterwards moved to re-commit the Bill on the third reading. So far as the reasons are concerned, if the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) does not think that branch of the reasons is correct, he can easily strike it out, and we can go upon the remainder of the reasons, which I think are quite sufficient—that is, that it does not oblige medical men to keep a register and make a return, which are deemed necessary safeguards. This whole question has been discussed in this House already, and I do not think it necessary to enter into any lengthy argument in support of the reasons we have given here for not concurring in the amendments of the Senate. I have a strong opinion, however, that when this House rejects an amendment of that kind it should be conclusive, and that the other branch of the Legislature should not, in defiance of the opinion of this House, insert such a clause as is put into the Bill. The amendment is objectionable on various grounds. We believe it is open to a great deal of abuse in counties in which the Canada Temperance Act is now in force, and will be in force after it is adopted by the people. There is no safeguard whatever in this case, because a medical man dispensing liquor himself is not required to keep a register and make a return. Under the law as it stands at present, if a medical man gives a prescription to a chemist it is provided that the vendor of the liquor shall keep a register of the sale and make a return annually to an officer of the Government. No return of that kind is required by the amendment, and in my judgment it would be an unfortunate thing to open a door of this kind. If the medical man was an honorable practitioner, I grant there would be no objection to this amendment; but, unfortunately, in the medical profession, as in other professions, men are to be found who are not honorable, and who, perhaps, for a fee, will abuse any power which may be given to them by law, such as the power of dispensing liquors. I had better refer also to a part of the amendment in regard to druggists, more especially to clause 5. However, before proceeding

to discuss that, I may make a few remarks in regard to those parts of the amendment numbered consecutively from 1 to 4. There was a difference of opinion in respect to the rights of druggists to sell. That so far as my judgment goes, and the judgment of those with whom I have consulted on this question, we have come to the conclusion that there is no prohibition of the sale, such as is indicated here, under the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, and hence this provision is entirely unnecessary. But I think, even if there is a doubt, instead of opening a wide door like this, it would be advisable to wait until the difficulties arise, and then, if necessary they can be remedied by legislation in this House. So far as the 5th clause of the amendment is concerned, I object to it *in toto* as being very objectionable in its character. At the present time, under the provisions of the law, if a person wants alcohol or spirits of any kind for chemical or manufacturing purposes, he requires to procure a certificate from two Justices of the Peace, and endorse that certificate by his own affirmation, and the vendor of liquor requires to keep a register of the sale. Now, under this amendment, all these safeguards are done away with, and it will readily occur to hon. members of this House, how frequently a provision of this kind would be abused. A man requiring liquor for any purpose, would go into a drug store and say: Here, I require liquor for pharmaceutical, chemical, or mechanical purposes, and he would not be required to make any affirmation. All that is necessary is his own statement of the facts, upon which the druggist is bound to sell him the liquor, and he is not required to keep any register of the sale. Practically, there would be, to a certain extent at least, free trade in liquor through the medium of all drug stores in the country, and also through the medium of the medical men of the country. I do not understand why medical men require to be included in this provision as well as in a separate provision. This amendment is intended to apply to legally qualified physicians, chemists and druggists. The case of the physician has already been provided for by another amendment, if that amendment is agreed to by this House, though I hope it will not be.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, Sir, as a question of convenience, and in the interests of the hon. gentleman's motion, he had better adopt a different procedure. This amendment which we have under consideration, and with which he proposes to disagree, contains three distinct provisions, and he proposes in one motion to disagree, first with the first, then with the second, and then with the third, and for different reasons. Now, different reasons and different considerations are applicable to each, and the result of the hon. gentleman's proposal will be to unite in opposition to his motion, all those who desire any one of the limbs of the amendment to succeed, and who fail to agree to any one of his reasons. Therefore, it is better to take each distinct limb of the amendment by itself and to move disagreement for proper reasons. There is another reason. I think the hon. gentleman's motion is complex, and we have a rule on that subject that complicated motions may be divided. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he himself should divide them, but if he does not think that is expedient, I invite you under the general practice with reference to complicated questions, to consider whether the parts should not be put separately.

Mr. JAMIESON. So far as the consideration of the question is concerned, with the permission of the House, and if it can be done, I would agree to the proposition of the leader of the Opposition. I found a difficulty, inasmuch as it is embodied here as one amendment, and I supposed that under the rules of the House, they would have to be dealt with together. I would therefore move that the first clause be considered separately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better withdraw his amendment, as suggested by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and introduce them separately. The point taken by the hon. member for Victoria is a good one. He says there is no ground stated, and the hon. gentleman said in his remarks that the Senate ought not to have acted in defiance of the well expressed opinions of this House. Well, that is an unconstitutional doctrine. The Senate are not supposed to know what passes in this House, and it would be a violation of Parliamentary principle for them to take notice of what takes place in this House unless by ascertaining from our journals what we have done. If the Senate were to treat the subject stating that they knew what was doing in here, they would be committing a constitutional impropriety.

Motion (Mr. Jamieson) withdrawn.

Mr. JAMIESON moved, that Proviso 1 of the third amendment be disagreed to for the following reason:—

"Because it would be a violation of the principle of the Act, which precludes a medical man having an interest in the sale, from giving a Certificate, and does not oblige medical men to keep a register of sales, and make a Return, which are deemed necessary safeguards."

Mr. HICKEY. I think when this question was before the House before, it was unfairly lost, because a great many members of this House were called away on account of the troubles in the North-West. Be that as it may, the argument, as presented by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) is that physicians would have an interest in the sale of liquor, and also that no register of such sales will be kept. Alcohol and the different spirits will be kept by physicians like every other drug. I do not see why physicians who are educated and skilled in these things, should be required to keep a register of the sales of alcohol or spirits in any form, while they are permitted to deal out strichnine, arsenic, and other violent poisons. The fact of the matter is, it is absurd, and it is only the overstrained ideas of intemperance on the part of some people who cannot see anything right in views differing from their own, that would induce men who are sensible in other things, to try to enforce restrictions of this kind upon an honorable profession. They say it would lead to a free trade in alcohol. Well, that has not been so in the past, when the restrictions were no greater than they will be to-day. There has been no inducement for physicians to make bars of their drug stores, and I am sure that if there is a man in the profession who will sell liquor for five or ten cents a glass; if there is a man in the profession who would do so low and mean a thing, who would so far forget the amenities of his profession, he would be mean and low enough to sell a prescription for that five or ten cents worth of liquor and let a man go to a drug store and get it, because there is no restriction on his prescriptions. But, forsooth, if he found it necessary to administer a dram or an ounce or two of brandy the same as any other medicine, that is a crime. It need only be looked at for a moment to see what puerile suggestion the Temperance Alliance are seeking to force on the public at large. Supposing such an indecent trade should be carried on by any physician, there could be no possibility of restraining it even by the means proposed; the same deed could be done under another form; and why should we, as an honorable profession, be branded in this way, and be prevented from prescribing one drug and not another? If a physician should be brought up by some miserable creature before the court and convicted under this proposition, there is no doubt in my mind that on an appeal to a higher court the judgment would be set aside, on the ground that this Parliament, by a law of this kind, has no right to say what a physician shall or shall not use as a medicine in the practice of his profession. But the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) gives his case away. He says that if all physicians were honorable men, it would make no dif-

ference. I believe they all are; but it is possible there are a very few in our profession who would do this wrong, and should the whole profession be branded as rascals and scamps because a few might so far forget themselves as to take this unworthy advantage of their position? The amendment made by the Senate is very clear. It says:

"Provided, however, that duly licensed medical practitioners may dispense alcoholic liquors exclusively for medicinal purposes, and not otherwise."

Now, if that is not enough to protect the interest of temperance, I think words and law will fail to restrict an evil disposition on the part of anybody. It is impossible to prevent every person in the community from transgressing the best laws we have. The intention of the Bill is that it shall not restrict physicians in the prescription of alcohol as a proper medicine, and why impose a fine on them for dispensing the same? The next step taken to brand the profession still more is to allow priests and other clergymen to give prescriptions of these medicines. The hon. gentleman says it is opening a wide door. There are very few physicians in the profession who would take improper advantage of this provision, and the few will not open a wide door, and if these restrictions are imposed on respectable men, the law will only be systematically broken by men who are merely striving to accomplish their legitimate ends. Therefore, this provision throws no safeguard around the cause of temperance, which we all desire to advance, and I hope the House will say that it is only just to the people, for whom we have to do as physicians, and to the physicians themselves, not to impose on them any further restrictions than the amendment of the Senate provides for.

Mr. ORTON. I think the amendment of the Senate is a very proper and wise one; and notwithstanding the very unfavorable opinion the hon. member has of the profession to which I belong, I cannot help looking upon his motion and his remarks as only a wanton insult to that profession, one of the learned professions of our country; and I think neither the temperance men nor this House are in possession of such facts as to warrant them in placing an embargo on the medical profession in the discharge of their duty. We all know that medical men are frequently called on in an emergency, and that stimulants in some form or other are constantly prescribed by them; and I think it is nothing more than proper that they should be allowed to use their own judgment in the cases they are called upon to deal with. I cannot, for the life of me, see how this can possibly open the door to the indiscriminate use of alcohol for other than medicinal purposes. If any medical man in this country were known to prescribe in order to sell liquor, he would soon be discarded by the profession and would not long continue to hold a license to practice; and when this amendment simply provides that duly licensed medical practitioners may dispense alcoholic liquors exclusively for medical purposes and not otherwise, I do not see anything unreasonable in it. I do hope this House will not try to place such a restriction upon the profession. Then, with regard to keeping a register, why should a medical man be required to keep a register of the number of doses he administers of alcohol any more than of opium or morphia? Every medical man who has had a practice in a city knows that opium and morphia, and various other drugs of the same kind, are becoming daily more and more used to the great injury of the public; yet medical men are not obliged to keep a register of the various doses of these drugs which they administer to their patients, and I think it is very unreasonable to ask them to do so in the case of alcohol.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken, both of whom I believe are physicians, should not be too quick to take offence where no offence I am sure was intended. No one ever thought of wantonly insulting the

Mr. HICKEY.

medical profession; this is in the main a noble and splendid profession, composed of honorable men; but we should be going too far, if we subscribed to the opinion that it contains no black sheep. The fact has come out during the administration of this law, that there are physicians who have made it a strict purpose openly stated to defy the law, and to have its provisions broken under the guise of their medical position; and the framers of the Act believed that if physicians were allowed to sell as they pleased, without making any certificates of returns, it would be opening a very wide door indeed. It would make the enforcement of the law very difficult, and give our enemies one more and stronger point than all, in the strong reasons they urge against an Act of this kind—that it will be violated and that it cannot be enforced. It will be observed that under this amendment, all medical practitioners duly licensed may dispense alcoholic liquors. There is no limit. We had provided in this measure a penalty against doctors who would give certificates under false pretences, but that has been stricken out by the Senate, so that there is now no way in which they can be made liable to penalties. I acknowledge it is very hard in some cases that a physician, who is far away from a place where liquor can be obtained, cannot keep liquor and dispense it himself; but we have to make an average, and it is a question for the House to decide whether they will open the door wider for abuse, or shut it, as closely as possible, even though in some unusual cases it may work hardship. There is, however, the practical experience since the law has been in force, that in the many counties in which it has been in force, not a single case of hardship has been shown to have occurred under the operation of the Act. That goes far to show that in practical experience, the hardship is not so great as one might otherwise think it would be.

Mr. FISHER. I agree with the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), that to refuse concurrence in the amendment of the Senate is in no sense an insult cast upon the medical profession. The question raised in this amendment was fully discussed when the Bill was before the House and an adverse vote given on it, and I am a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Dundas now alluding to things which were then, I think, effectually disposed of. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), a few minutes ago, seemed to consider that in passing the amendment now before us, the temperance people were casting a reflection on the medical practitioners, since we allow clergymen to give certificates permitting druggists to sell liquor for medicinal purposes. If the Senate amendments were one that proposed to allow physicians to give certificates to other persons for the sale of liquor, there might be some force in that argument, but as it is to allow medical men themselves to sell liquor, without a certificate from any other medical man or from anybody, the question is a very different one from that of giving the privilege to clergymen of granting certificates authorising others to sell liquor. Under the Act, as originally conceived medical men were allowed to give certificates to their own patients that the liquor was required for medicinal purposes. Those patients then had to go to a druggist or other authorised vendor and obtain the liquor, and it was specially provided that the medical men who gave the certificates should not have an interest in the sale. But under the amendment of the Senate, no certificate is required; the man who prescribes the liquor may sell it, and you can understand at once that he will have an interest in the sale, and will therefore be more apt to prescribe liquor for his patients. The hon. member for Dundas says that medical men, who are allowed to sell poison, ought to be allowed to sell what he says is not poison. I am not going to discuss the question as to how much of a poison alcohol is, but it is a very different

thing to allow a medical man to sell poison, which everybody knows to be dangerous, and which the medical man has to label as poison when he sells it, and to allow him to sell liquor, which a great many people, including probably the medical man himself, do not consider to be poison. Everyone knows that the selling of poison is hedged around by a great many safeguards. People are not liable to take willingly what they believe to be poison, but unfortunately many people are tempted to take liquor for the mere pleasure of drinking it, and it is to prevent medical men selling liquor for drinking purposes that we object to this amendment of the Senate. I do not wish to cast reflection on the medical profession, as a profession, but I regret to say I know instances of medical men who cannot fairly be called the honorable men, to whom the hon. member for Dundas and the hon. member for Wellington have alluded, but who would not hesitate to sell liquor. It happens that in my own county, where a prohibitory law has been long in force, one of the first men fined under the law for selling liquor illegally was a medical man. About a year ago in my county, a medical man was prosecuted for selling liquor, the proof was conclusive that he had sold it for drinking purposes, but in consequence of a legal quibble he was not convicted. From my experience and from what I have heard from other parts of the country where a prohibitory liquor law has been in force, I consider it absolutely necessary for the proper enforcement of the law that medical men should not be allowed to sell liquor as much as they choose. True, the Senate amendment says only for medicinal purposes; but when we hear members of the profession say they will do all they can to prevent the Scott Act being enforced, we can understand they will prostitute their position and sell liquor, which is not for medicinal purposes, assuming it to be for medicinal purposes. Medical men are not supposed to be traders and merchants, and if they desire to have liquor given their patients, it is much better in the interests of their own profession as well as of morality and good government, that they should not sell liquor themselves, but allow the ordinary dealer to sell it. In the Scott Act, it is specially provided that only one person in a country municipality, two in towns, and one to every 4,000 people in a city, should be allowed to sell liquor, but under this amendment we will have an unlimited sale of liquor. That is a contravention of one of the principles of the Scott Act, which is that the sale of liquor for medicinal purposes should be restricted to a few in the community. For these reasons, I protest against the adoption of the Senate amendments.

Mr. McCRAVEY. I can corroborate all that has been said by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) as well as by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). I quite agree with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) that the medical profession is as honorable a profession as we have. In fact, if all the members in the medical profession were as honorable as those who have seats in this House, there would be no danger in passing this amendment, but I am sorry to say that the medical profession, as far as I know, are like other men. There are good and bad among them. I think that I can speak somewhat feelingly on this question. We have a very large number of very honorable medical men in the constituency which I have the honor to represent. We have some men who have declared that they would do all they possibly could to destroy the efficiency of the Scott Act. The House will recollect the return brought down last year showing the number of certificates given by physicians for liquor, and it will be recollected that one of these physicians granted some 1,700 certificates in about eight months, or about eight per day. This physician was a man who had very little practice compared with what others had, and it would be very dangerous to grant this privilege to such physicians as these, who would practically have power to dispense liquor to his patients whenever they came to him

and insisted upon having it. This is not an isolated case. I know of several cases of the same kind, and I think this is a very dangerous amendment, and I trust this House will not agree to it. I am strongly opposed to this amendment, as I believe it to be one of the most dangerous amendments which have been incorporated in the Act.

Mr. PLATT. I do not attach as much importance to this amendment as hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon it, both for and against, seem to attach to it. However, I have striven to discover some disability that would attach to medical men if this amendment were not carried, and I can imagine no position in which I could be placed as a medical man in which I could suffer at all as to the dispensing of liquors if the amendment were not carried. I do not think the medical profession require or ask that such an amendment should be made. I believe it would be placing the medical profession in a worse position than we stand at present. We do not wish to be made an exceptional class as to the handling of intoxicating liquors. We do not wish to have patients coming to us at all times of the night and all times of the day, writing their own prescriptions for us to dispense. I think if a vote of the medical profession of the country were taken, they would say that no disability attaches to the profession from the law as it now exists. The law is not intended to interfere with the legitimate dispensation of any drug or medicine that a medical man sees fit to administer or dispense, and I would have no fear of any interference of the law, so far as my practice of medicine is carried out, or will be carried out in the future, nor need any medical man have any fear, who uses alcohol in the strictly professional sense. I know there are black sheep in every flock, and there seems to be a suspicion in the minds of some hon. gentlemen that there are some black sheep in the medical profession. If that be the case, let a safeguard be thrown around the profession, as it is around other professions. I do not think that any insult has been thrown upon the profession in this matter, and I do not ask for myself or for the members of the profession in the section of the country in which I live, that this amendment shall be concurred in.

House divided on motion of Mr. Jamieson to disagree with proviso 1 of amendment 3.

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Allison,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Foster,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Gillmor,	McLellan,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gordon,	McMullen,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Guillet,	McNeill,
Barnard,	Gunn,	Mills,
Bernier,	Hackett,	Mulock,
Blake,	Harley,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Hilliard,	Platt,
Bowell,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Scraper,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Sommerville (Brant),
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Sommerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jenkins,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Kaulbach,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cassey,	King,	Taylor,
Catudal,	Kinney,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kirk,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Langelier,	Vail,
Colby,	Laurier,	Wallace (York),
Davies,	Lister,	Watson,
Dundas,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Hastings),
Fairbank,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	McCraney,	Wright—75.

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dodd,	Mitchell,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	Orton,
Bell,	Fortin,	Pain,
Benoit,	Gaudet,	Paterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gault,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Gigault,	Pruyn,

Bossé,	Girouard,	Riopel,
Burnham,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hamilton)
Burns,	Guay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron (Victoria),	Guilbault,	Ross,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hall,	Royal,
Carling,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Caron,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Casgrain,	Homer,	Small,
Chapleau,	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Goughlin,	Kranz,	Taschereau,
Coursol,	Labrosse,	Tassé,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vabin,
Daly,	Lesage,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers (Mask'ingé),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wells,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McCarthy,	White (Gardwell),
Desjardins,	McGreavy,	Wood (Brookville),
Dickinson,	Massue,	Wood (West'm'land)—84.

Motion negatived.

Mr. HICKEY moved that the amendment be now concurred in.

Mr. JAMIESON moved, that so much of Proviso 2 of the third amendment, as is numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4, be disagreed to for the following reason:—

"Because the same is unnecessary, inasmuch as the Act does not prohibit such sales."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I wish to call attention to one fact as a reason why the motion should not prevail, and is not, in my opinion, necessary. The College of Pharmacy has taken a high legal opinion upon this matter, and that opinion is, that druggists are liable to prosecution under the Act as it now stands, and they ask for these amendments to protect themselves. I think the amendments are in the interests of the people, and will not lessen the prohibitive character of the Scott Act. This legal opinion having been given, and the amendments having been inserted by the Senate in accordance with the wish of the College of Pharmacy, and not opposed by strong supporters of the Scott Act, I think they should be allowed. The members of that college are very respectable citizens, and I am sure they have no intention of destroying in any way the effect of the Scott Act by these amendments.

Mr. JAMIESON. So far as some of these amendments are concerned, I do not suppose there will be any objection to them. Of course, my impression is, and it is the opinion of others with whom I have conversed upon this question, that the Scott Act does not prohibit chemists and druggists from dispensing many, or in fact all, of the preparations which are enumerated here. The most objectionable one—and if it were eliminated I would have no objection to the rest—is the fifth one, alcohol.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not now before us; we have not reached the fifth.

Mr. JAMIESON. Then only one question arises in connection with this matter. Under the Canada Temperance Act a chemist or druggist requires to hold a license before he can dispense intoxicating liquors of any kind, even under the certificate of a medical man. I do not quite understand the effect of this amendment. A druggist, if this amendment became law, would be able to dispense liquors under the certificate of a medical man without holding any license.

Mr. SPROULE. I entirely disagree with the opinion of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), because, if you accept the plain wording of the Act, no other interpretation can be given of the provision than that druggists will be prevented from selling. The Act says that from the day the Act comes into force no person shall be allowed to sell alcoholic liquors, etc., or any mixture containing alcohol, capable of being used as a beverage—except for medicinal purposes. It does not make any exception when, for medicinal purposes, it says they shall only be sold by druggists or other vendors who may be specially licensed by

Mr. PLATT.

the Lieutenant Governor in Council. It may be that in a large village or small town there are two or three druggists and as many medical men. Each medical man sends his prescriptions to his own druggist. But one druggist only will be fortunate enough to secure a license, and the other druggists will be unable to dispense or sell any alcoholic liquor, even under the prescription of a medical man, however small the quantity. This is the opinion given by a very respectable legal firm in Toronto—as mentioned by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland)—at the request of Mr. Elliott and other druggists of Toronto, some druggists of the city of London, Hamilton and other places. The professional opinion given by that legal firm was this: That it was impossible for any druggist to dispense or sell liquor not only for medicinal purposes but for preparations contained in the pharmacopœa, without violating the law. As I understand the wording of the Temperance Act, it is this: That all classes of alcoholic liquors that may be used as beverages are prohibited. There is no denying the fact that the ordinary tinctures can be used as beverages. Therefore, they are included within the law, and any person dispensing or selling them violates the law. With respect to bay rum, which is a preparation in the pharmacopœa, it may be used as a beverage. So the selling of that article will be a violation of the law. To sell tinctures and many of the medicinal wines will be a violation of the law. When we have the high authority I have mentioned, that the sale of these articles will be a violation of the law, I think the House ought to concede the necessity of the amendment, so as to prevent a very large class of the community from violating the law. If the law is framed so that an ordinary business cannot be carried on without violating it, it would only make the vendors disregard the law, and druggists would dispense them whether they violated the law or not, when they believed such articles were essential to the health of the people.

Mr. CASEY. There is no question as to the violation of the principle of the Scott Act in the point under discussion. This matter was very fully discussed when the Bill was before the House in the first instance, and I understood there was a general consensus of opinion among legal gentlemen that the Scott Act as it stands allows the sale of such preparations as are mentioned in the amendment. There seemed to be no question, then, as to the liberty given to druggists to sell medicinal preparations and dispense prescriptions containing alcohol. For that reason I suppose no action was taken in the House. But attention has since been called to a very high legal opinion given on the other side of the question to the effect that the Scott Act does not protect the druggists in making prescriptions or selling medicinal preparations containing alcohol. As this is a purely legal question concerning the meaning of the Act, I do not intend to pronounce an opinion of my own, but I will merely say that in the meantime, unless and until we have an equally strong and influential legal opinion to the opposite effect, I should feel bound to follow the legal opinion already given as that of gentlemen who are paid for giving it and who have given it their full attention. For that reason I intend to support the retention of the Senate amendment. That is my position at present; but, of course, if the House is satisfied that the Scott Act does afford sufficient protection to these tradesmen, I think it would be introducing needless surplusage to retain this amendment. We have not yet heard from the legal authorities of the House on the subject. If they say it is absolutely unnecessary, I am willing to vote to strike it out; if they say there is the least doubt, and that it is necessary to protect the druggists, I shall agree with the amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the reason the hon. gentleman has offered to the consideration of the House for disagree-

ing with this amendment, is somewhat unfortunate. It has been stated that there is a doubt as to the real meaning of the Temperance Act, and that this amendment is proposed in order to remove that doubt. The hon. gentleman now proposes a motion to disagree with the amendment on the ground that it is unnecessary. He does not say that he objects to the provisions of the amendment but simply that they are unnecessary, that the Act as it stands means what the amendment proposes. Well, of course, it is, as a rule, a very futile procedure to make an amendment in order that the Act shall continue to mean that which it already means, but if there have been well grounded doubts as to the interpretation of the Act, and if that interpretation be obscure, I do not know that it is a very strong reason to disagree simply because the amendment is unnecessary. Now, I do not state with any degree of positiveness—for I have but just looked at this amendment—but I do throw out for the consideration of the House the suggestion that there is a great deal more in this amendment than the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) appears to think, and that we have a much graver question before us than that which he has raised in the speech he has made. As I understand it, under the Temperance Act, as it now stands, prescriptions of alcoholic liquor can be filled only upon a special form of prescription and by the specially licensed druggists. Now, the question has been suggested, as the only question arising on this amendment, is the doubt whether prescriptions of the character of compounds, but not really capable of being used as beverages, are safely to be supplied by the ordinary licensed druggists, not specially licensed nor under a special prescription. I confess it to be my opinion that under the Temperance Act, as it stands now, a prescription that is really a medical prescription, although it may contain alcoholic liquor, is prevented from being filled by the ordinary druggist. It must, however, be a medical prescription in this sense: that it is not alcoholic liquor, and that it is not capable of being used as a beverage. If the prescription be, for instance, of brandy, or rum, or whiskey, 8 ounces of it, with a little taste of something put in in infinitesimal quantities, which will perhaps enhance the agreeability of the dose of 8 ounces of alcoholic liquor, then that is capable of being used as a beverage, and I fancy the prescription is to be filled only under the special safeguards of the Act. But now I find this amendment, and I would suggest that in certain of its clauses it goes so far as to open the door to prescriptions really of alcoholic liquor by all licensed druggists, although those prescriptions be not prescriptions containing the special certificate, and although druggists be not specially licensed druggists under the Temperance Act; because the 2nd clause of this amendment says:

"Physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors, if sold in quantities of not more than 8 ounces at any one time."

Now, under that, I maintain that the physician may prescribe 8 ounces of brandy, or whiskey, or rum, and that it may be sold without a special certificate, and the prescription may be filled by any ordinarily licensed druggist. Then you get no registration of such prescriptions, you get none of the safeguards which were provided by the Temperance Act. Therefore, it appears to me, at this moment, that the effect of this amendment is very much wider than the hon. member for North Lanark seems to have supposed, and that in effect it opens the door to an unregulated sale, by all the druggists in the country, of prescriptions of alcoholic liquor not exceeding 8 ounces, without special certificate, without requiring a certificate, and without those prescriptions which, under the Temperance Act, surround the sale of alcoholic liquors. If that view be correct it is clear we have now a much more important question before us than the hon. member supposed, and that the reason for disagreeing with this amendment

ought to be of a different character from that which is in your hands, namely, that it is unnecessary, because in the opinion of some it may be unnecessary, and in the opinion of others it may be very harmful indeed.

Mr. ORTON. I have not heard a legal opinion expressed upon the subject, but I do know that wholesale druggists consider the Act as it is now interferes very seriously with their business—not only with that of the retail druggists but with that of the wholesale druggists. Mr. Elliott, of Toronto, told me that the Act under the present shape prevents him from carrying on his ordinary business as a wholesale druggist, and that it interferes with the manufacture of the ordinary preparations required in his business. I merely state what I said to be the opinion obtained by the Pharmaceutical Society, and I have no doubt the question was considered carefully by them. For that reason, and as the hon. gentleman who moves to disagree has given only one reason for dissenting from the amendment, namely that the Act already gives the power, I think this House can do no harm by removing any doubt upon the question.

Mr. SCRIVER. In justice to my hon friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), I wish to state that he did not state that the only reason for dissenting from the amendment was that there was no necessity for it. I heard him distinctly raise the point suggested by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, namely, that it would greatly increase the powers of selling on the part of unlicensed druggists, whereas, in the Act as it now stands, the sale is confined to one particular druggist in each municipality, or to druggists representing a certain number of inhabitants in cities and towns. He held that if the amendment is passed, there would be no restriction in this respect, and that all properly licensed druggists would be permitted to sell under such restrictions as are given in the Act.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly there are much stronger objections to this amendment than those which have been put forward by the hon. member for Lanark, if the opinions which have been given by the hon. member for Durham are correct. It practically allows any and every druggist and chemist in the Scott Act county to sell liquor without keeping a register and without requiring a certificate from a medical practitioner or a clergyman. I confess that in reading over the amendments of the Senate I did not so understand it. I supposed it only meant physicians' prescriptions containing alcohol, but not those made entirely of alcohol; but I do not profess to be able to say whether that is the case or not. I should suppose that if it meant simply physicians' prescriptions of alcohol it would have stated so specifically, but that if it said "containing alcohol" it would mean that the compound contained something else besides. If it does not mean pure alcohol, there is no great objection to the amendment, and if it does the objection is absolutely necessary. If the House does not wish to impair the whole working of the Scott Act in those counties where it is adopted, or in which it may hereafter be adopted, they should reject the amendment. I was not at first myself disposed to think that there was any particular objection to this amendment of the Senate, but now I must concur in the motion to reject it, for if the opinion of the hon. member for West Durham is the correct legal opinion, there is no question but this clause, if passed, will practically annihilate the good working of the Scott Act in those counties in which it is adopted, and if this House wishes to take upon itself the responsibility of doing that, then they should concur in the amendment. But I protest vigorously against its passage, if it is possible that the amendment may be construed to have that effect; and I think that it is my duty and the duty of every one who has at heart the practical and efficient working of the Scott Act, to reject the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that the second paragraph of the amendment from the Senate, is very wide, and it is liable to the statement made by the leader of the Opposition. However, the House must remember that we have already decided that the duly licensed medical practitioners may dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes, and if they can then certainly druggists can prepare the physicians' prescriptions to the same effect. It does not make any alteration; it only gives the druggist the right to make up the prescriptions which the physician prepares, and which we have already decided to-day they would have a right to do. With respect to the restrictions of the Canada Temperance Act, there is no doubt that a druggist even for medicinal purposes, cannot sell any intoxicating liquors without a special license from the Lieutenant Governor. The only question is whether he is confined to the sale of the liquor itself, or whether the druggist can make up a prescription, one of the component parts of which is alcohol. Well, I think there is more than a doubt upon that, but I speak with hesitation, as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition thinks that on the whole it will not interfere with the prescriptions which are made up legitimately by a medical man, although such prescriptions contain alcohol. I think there is more than a doubt upon that point. I think if the article sold contains alcohol, although it may be mixed with other ingredients, yet the statute may apply.

Mr. FOSTER. The Act as it stands at present, says that certain druggists and vendors shall be licensed, and those shall be the only persons duly authorised to fill prescriptions. They have to keep a register of those certificates and have to make a return of them. Now, by the amendment already passed, you have allowed physicians to dispense all prescriptions they chose to give. That certainly takes away all these cases of hardship spoken of by our friends the physicians, who were in favor of that clause. Now, in addition, if this passes, you are going to allow every chemist and druggist to sell physicians' prescriptions without license, to keep no register, to make no return, and it will certainly take away all the safeguards of the Act, and leave a widely opened door to continual abuses.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We are certainly under great disadvantage in discussing this question, inasmuch as we have not before us the amendments passed in the Senate. We have only been supplied with the Bill as passed in Committee of the Whole in the Senate, not the Bill after its third reading, and in this particular case, it is very awkward to be obliged to talk on a subject like this when we have not really had an opportunity of looking at the precise words of the amendment made by the Senate. Why we should be called upon to disagree from amendments we have never seen, I really do not understand. I think we ought to have some means by which we could get possession of the exact words of the amendment, especially such an amendment as this, before we are called upon to vote on it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I agree with my hon. friend on that point, but if he will look at the Senate's proceedings of the 26th of May he will find that they are all set out at length. With reference to this particular question, I cannot say that I see any difficulty in disposing of it. The reason my hon. friend from Lanark proposes to give for dissenting to this amendment is that it is not necessary. The hon. member for Oxford has stated, I presume from his own knowledge, that a high legal authority has pronounced that it is necessary. In that state of affairs, surely we are not going wrong in simply voting to remove a doubt; because that is all we are doing. If these particular articles are not covered by the Scott Act, as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) says, there is no harm in saying they are not. If there is a doubt

Mr. FISHER.

about it, and it is not intended they should be covered, the doubt would be removed. That being the only reason he gives for his motion to reject the Senate amendment, it seems to me it is wholly without foundation.

Mr. JAMIESON. So far as I was concerned, I did not think it necessary to cover a quire of paper with reasons; and, moreover, in looking into this matter, I was not very sure as to the meaning or the extent of the second paragraph. I had my doubts with reference to it, and I suggested these doubts, I think, when I spoke a few moments ago. Now, I agree with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) and some others, who say that the adoption of this amendment in the present shape, and with the light we have now thrown upon it, would be a very serious obstacle in the way of enforcing the Canada Temperance Act. Are we prepared to allow every chemist and druggist throughout the country, in counties where that Act has been adopted, to dispense alcoholic liquors to the extent of 8 ounces? I think it would be a most unwise thing to do, and as one who has a strong opinion of the efficiency of the Canada Temperance Act if properly worked, I most decidedly object to it. So far as any legal opinion is concerned, I hold it is not binding on this House. We, as the representatives of the people and the guardians of the rights of the people, have to exercise our own judgment on all questions of this kind, and I trust that in dealing with this question the members of this House will act independently, and not be governed by any legal opinion which may be given.

Mr. HICKEY. I think the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 was not intended by its promoters or supporters to operate against the legitimate use of alcoholic spirits. It was only intended to meet the ordinary sale of liquors in bar rooms. But now it is desired by these people to interfere, not only with the legitimate use, but the skillful use, of these things. We allow druggists to handle morphia and other poisons of various kinds, but because it is liquor, which these people wish to keep out of bars, they seek to annihilate this trade as well. The Act asks to restrain and prevent the general sale of liquor, but when these gentlemen attempt to interfere with the legitimate sale of alcohol as a drug I think sensible men cannot sympathise with them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I just rise to say that several counties in the Dominion are making very large sacrifices for the purpose of giving the Scott Act a fair trial, because they will virtually lose all the license money which they have been accustomed to receive for the privilege of selling liquor. If the Act is going to be so amended as to allow druggists and doctors to sell liquors, the efficiency of the whole Act is going to be virtually destroyed. The people are deeply interested in this matter, and if we are going to give the Scott Act a fair trial, we should allow them to have their own way; but if we are going to allow druggists and doctors to sell indiscriminately, without any restriction, we are going to produce a demoralising state of things in connection with the liquor traffic that is going to have a serious effect. After the opinion expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think it quite clear that, if this clause is allowed to pass in its present form, it will enable druggists to deal out liquor without any restriction whatever. If we are going to do that, we had better annul the Act altogether, and leave things as they are.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I suppose that as this amendment is printed in the Minutes of the Senate, we may refer to what took place there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In another place.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The remarkable circumstance is that this particular sub-section was actually accepted by

those supposed to be the friends of the Canada Temperance Act in another place. There are five sub-sections; the first relates to preparations authorised by the ordinary pharmacopœa, the second to physicians' prescriptions, the third to patent medicines except such as are known to the vendor to be capable of being used as beverages, the fourth to eau de Cologne, bay rum and articles of that kind, and the fifth to alcohol or methylate spirits for pharmaceutical, chemical or mechanical uses. The only objection made by the Hon. Mr. Scott, whose name has been attached to the Canada Temperance Act, as its original promoter, was to the third and fourth of these sub-sections, but he made no objection to the one relating to physicians' prescriptions. It appears to me, looking at what occurs in cities and large towns, that it would be exceedingly inconvenient if this amendment were not inserted. It is well known that these medical men do not make up their own prescriptions, generally speaking, but send them to the druggists whom they favor. There has been a suggestion—I think an improper one—that there has been a kind of partnership between the medical man and the chemist; but the ground on which they put this practice is this, that as they are responsible for the medicine they prescribe, they should have some choice in the way in which it is put up, and they therefore hold themselves responsible for the character of the chemist to whom they entrust the dispensing of their prescription. A medical man will generally advise his patient to go to a particular druggist to have his prescription made up. In a large city a druggist might be appointed who is not in the confidence of the medical faculty; and surely it would be inconvenient if a medical man were compelled to send his prescriptions to a druggist in whom he had no confidence, or else adopt the plan of making up his own prescriptions, which he had abandoned long years ago. I fancy that must be the reason why this particular sub-section was accepted, and in fact it was accepted in another place without any division at all. Under these circumstances, I shall vote for the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. McCRANEY. It is quite clear, from the position taken by the hon. the leader of the Opposition and the hon. the leader of the Government, that there is a great deal more in the amendment than at first appears. It appears quite clear that any druggist can sell up to the amount of 8 ounces of liquor. Now, we have passed a clause giving to physicians the right to prescribe up to 8 ounces, and I think it is a very dangerous clause. While I agree there are many honorable physicians, I know there are a great many who are not so honorable; and what is there to hinder a hotel keeper taking a physician who would be dishonorable enough into his hotel and having him prescribe and dispense liquor? Or what is there to prevent a hotel keeper engaging a licensed druggist in his hotel and having him prescribe liquor, and sell it? Or what is to prevent an unscrupulous physician from turning his drug shop into a common dram shop and dispensing liquor up to 8 ounces, to all who require it? Or what is to prevent a dishonorable druggist from doing the same under this clause while he is exempt entirely from paying any license? The Parliament of 1878 gave the country the Scott Act, and I think it is the duty of this Parliament to make that Scott Act workable. It is unfair to the people who have spent much time and money in order to carry out this principle of prohibition to put them off in this way, by inserting an amendment which will tend to destroy the efficiency of the Act.

House divided on motion of Mr. Jamieson to disagree with proviso 2 of 3rd amendment.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,  
Allison,  
Armstrong,  
Auger,

Foster,  
Gillmor,  
Gordon,  
Guillet,

McIntyre,  
McIsaac,  
Melélan,  
McMullen,

Bain (Wentworth),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Barnard,  
Bourassa,  
Bowell,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Oimon,  
Oochrane,  
Colby,  
Dundas,  
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),  
Fisher,

Gunn,  
Hackett,  
Harley,  
Hilliard,  
Holton,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
Jamieson,  
Kaulbach,  
King,  
Kinney,  
Kirk,  
Macdonald (King's),  
McCraney,

Mulock,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Ray,  
Scriver,  
Shakespeare,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Taylor,  
Trow,  
Wallace (York),  
Watson,  
White (Hastings),  
Wright.—54.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Bernier,  
Billy,  
Blake,  
Blondeau,  
Burnham,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Cameron (Victoria),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Cartwright,  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
Chapleau,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Davies,  
De St. Georges,  
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),  
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),  
Desjardins,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,

Dugas,  
Dupont,  
Fairbank,  
Farrow,  
Ferguson (Welland),  
Fortin,  
Gagné,  
Gaudet,  
Gault,  
Gigault,  
Girouard,  
Grandbois,  
Guay,  
Guilbault,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Heason,  
Hickey,  
Homer,  
Hurteau,  
Jenkins,  
Kilvert,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landerkin,  
Landry (Montmaguy),  
Langelier,  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Lister,  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Mackenzie,  
Mackintosh,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McCarthy,

McDougall (O. Breton),  
McGreedy,  
McNeill,  
Massue,  
Mills,  
Mitchell,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,  
Orton,  
Paint,  
Paterson (Essex),  
Pinsonneault,  
Platt,  
Pope,  
Pruyn,  
Rioppel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Rykert,  
Small,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Taschereau,  
Tassé,  
Tupper,  
Vail,  
Valin,  
Vanasse,  
Wells,  
White (Cardwell),  
Wilson,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westm'land)—108.

Motion negatived.

Mr. BLAKE. I could not assent to the motion of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), being of opinion that the second proviso is not the law as it stands. It is tolerably clear with reference to the prescription of 8 ounces, that the proviso cannot be carried out under the existing law and therefore it is an enlargement of the Act. I therefore could not support the motion of my hon. friend on the ground that the amendments are unnecessary because the powers given in them can be exercised under the law as it is. I am, however, opposed to the second sub-section or proviso and cannot record my vote in favor of its passing. As to the other ones, although there is some doubt as to their being susceptible of passing, yet upon the whole I have decided to give my individual support to the other 3 provisos which were under discussion on the motion of my hon. friend from Lanark. There remains 5 to be dealt with under different circumstances to all those 3. It seems to me the hon. gentleman's argument is quite correct that they are practically unnecessary, although I felt some little difficulty about them, and on the whole I think the argument is in favor of passing them in view of the doubt. As to the second sub-section, I think—and this view, I believe, is concurred in by the First Minister—that this is a very wide clause, being, in fact, quite a new proposition which was not in the Act. The First Minister pointed out that the House had just agreed to an unregulated sale by physicians themselves of alcoholic prescriptions. That is true, but it is carrying the case a good deal further to provide for the unregulated sale by druggists, on prescriptions. At any rate those who voted against the unregulated

sale by physicians will feel it necessary to vote against the unregulated sale by druggists.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to say, in view of the course I am going to take, that I have voted against the amendment of the hon. member for North Lanark for the same reasons as those given by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and that I intend to vote against this amendment for the same reason. There is in my mind a doubt as to whether the Scott Act exempts druggists from the penalties of the law, because we have a legal opinion one way and a legal opinion the other way. My hon. friend from North Lanark says we should not regard legal opinions but use our own judgment. We must use our own judgment in making or amending laws, but one thing on which we form our judgment must be the interpretation of the laws as they at present stand. When we are asked to amend a law, we must know how that law stands, and must take the best legal opinions, if there have been no judicial decisions. In this case, the legal opinions show that there is a doubt, to say the least, as to the position of the druggist under the Scott Act. I am quite willing to support as much of the Senate amendment as is intended to remove that doubt, without going any further, but I must refuse to accept sub-section 2 of that amendment which seems, on the excellent authority of the leaders of both sides, to go a great deal further. If that sub-section is removed or changed, I will support the rest of the amendment, but until it is so struck out or amended, I shall feel it necessary to vote against the amendment as a whole. I have no doubt the hon. gentlemen who have charge of this Bill will be able to express their views on the subject by way of some amendment or resolution to meet the case.

Mr. ORTON moved concurrence in the amendment from the Senate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to be logical, I think we must vote in favor of the second paragraph now before the House, that is to say that nothing in this Act shall interfere with physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors, if sold in quantities of not more than 8 ounces at any one time. We have already voted that duly licensed medical practitioners may dispense alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. If the medical man himself can dispense alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes, I see no reason why he may not give a prescription for the druggist to make up. If he had the drugs and appliances himself he would make the prescription up himself, and I think this is a necessary consequence of the first vote on this question. We know that, as a matter of fact, in cities the medical men do not keep dispensaries and do not make up their own medicines, and therefore, if this were objected to, the result would be that, in the country parts, where medical men do make up their own prescriptions and have the alcohol in their dispensaries, they would be able to make up the prescriptions, but, in a town or city, they could not do so. The medical man would have to keep the alcohol on hand in his own dispensary in order to avoid the provisions of the Act. I must support the second paragraph.

Mr. MILLS. As I understand the second section, the prescription might be pure alcohol; it need not contain any other ingredient, as it would if prescribed by a physician; and to authorise the sale by an ordinary druggist would be scarcely consistent with the other provisions of the Act already agreed to by this House. It was provided in the Canada Temperance Act that, if alcohol is to be used as a medicine, it must be sold by a party who has no interest in the physician's prescription, and there must be a registration as well. There is no provision for registration here; there is no provision that it shall not be pure alcohol. What we are doing here is to render the Act wholly inoperative.

Mr. BLAKE.

We ought either to repeal the law altogether, or to give it a fair trial where the majority of the electors have adopted it; but this House, by these amendments, is doing everything in its power to make it impossible that the law can be fairly carried out.

Mr. JAMIESON then moved, that the second paragraph of proviso 2 of the said third amendment be disagreed to for the following reason:—

Because it is not in accordance with the spirit of the Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Surely that amendment is not in order. My hon. friend, first of all, moved that the amendment to four paragraphs be not assented to. Then, that having been voted down, he moved that one of those amendments be not assented to. Surely we are not called upon to vote a second time on the same thing. The whole includes the part.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two reasons against the views of the hon. gentleman. The whole may include the part, but some parts of the whole may be unobjectionable, and others may be objectionable. In the first place, while some of us were opposed to the passing of the clause, others were opposed also to the reason which was proposed to be given. This is a very different reason to that proposed formerly.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Then the motion should have been by way of amendment—

Mr. BLAKE. No, not at all.—

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria)—to the motion of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson).

Mr. BLAKE. No, it is a fresh motion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I wish to say one word in explanation of my position on this amendment. The House has adopted the amendment to allow physicians to dispense liquors in limited quantities, and if we leave this clause in this amendment allowing druggists to fill prescriptions of 8 ounces in Scott Act counties, many doctors, if they cannot give these prescriptions to druggists, will be compelled to keep the liquor and dispense it for themselves. This clause in this amendment, I think, is a considerable improvement to the amendment already adopted by the House, and for that reason I shall have to vote against the amendment of the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson).

House divided on motion of Mr. Jamieson as above.

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Allen,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	McLelan,
Allison,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	McNeill,
Auger,	Foster,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gordon,	Paint,
Barnard,	Guillet,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Ray,
Blake,	Hackett,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Somerville (Brant),
Bryson,	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burpee,	Innes,	Springer,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Taylor,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jamieson,	Temple,
Cartwright (sir Rich'd),	King,	Trow,
Casey,	Kinney,	Vail,
Catudal,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Cimon,	Laurier,	Wallace (York),
Cochrane,	Lister,	Watson,
Colby,	Macdonald (King's),	Wells,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	McCraney,	White (Renfrew),
Dundas,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McIsaac,	Wright.—75.

NAVS :  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dupont,	McCallum,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McCarthy,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	McDougall (O. Breton),
Bell,	Fortin,	McGreevy,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Massue,
Bergeron,	Gaudet,	Mitchell,
Billy,	Gault,	Moffat,
Blondeau,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Burnham,	Girouard,	Orton,
Burns,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Cameron (Inverness),	Guay,	Pinsonneault,
Cameron (Victoria),	Guilbault,	Platt,
Campbell (Victoria),	Haggart,	Pope,
Carling,	Hall,	Pruyn,
Caron,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Casgrain,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Chapleau,	Homer,	Robertson (Hastings),
Costigan,	Hurteau,	Royal,
Coughlin,	Jenkins,	Rykert,
Coursol,	Kilvert,	Small,
Curran,	Kranz,	Sproule,
Cuthbert,	Labrosse,	Stairs,
Daly,	Landerkin,	Taschereau,
Daoust,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tassé,
De St. Georges,	Langelier,	Tupper,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Langevin,	Valin,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Lease,	Vanasse,
Dejardins,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Dodd,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westm'land)—90.

Motion negatived.

Mr. JAMIESON then moved, that that part of the said clause 2 numbered 5 of proviso 2 of the said third amendment be disagreed to for the following reason :—

Because it contravenes the principle of the Act, which provides that the sale of alcohol and spirits for the purposes mentioned shall be made only on the certificate of two justices of the peace accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant and the registration of the sale, which are considered necessary safeguards against an abuse of the law.

He said : I have a few words to say upon this motion before it is put to the House. At the outset I beg to say that if this House wants free trade in liquor they had better adopt this 5th section. That is my judgment of what is proposed in this 5th paragraph. Under the Canada Temperance Act if liquor is required, alcohol or methylated spirits, which mean pretty much the same thing, if they are required for manufacturing or mechanical purposes, or for the purpose of any art or trade, a person can get them by procuring a certificate under the hand of two justices of the peace accompanied by his own affirmation, and the sale must be registered and a proper return made. Now, I contend that these are necessary safeguards to the effectual working of the law. What is proposed by this amendment? Why, the proposition here is to allow any druggist, any chemist, and any physician, in the event of any party wanting liquor for any purpose whatever, to sell it to him without his producing a certificate, or without a register being kept, and without any check whatever being placed on the sale of it. Under this paragraph all the purchaser requires to say in going into a drug store is that he requires liquor for any one of those purposes. I ask you whether this House is prepared to adopt a principle of that kind. I trust the good sense of this House will not allow any provision of this kind to prevail in counties and cities where the people have adopted the Act in good faith believing that it would prohibit the sale of liquor for beverage purposes; because there is no doubt this will permit the unrestrained sale of liquors in all counties where the Scott Act has been adopted. I have most serious objection to it, and I trust the House will see it in a proper light. It is simply an attempt to destroy the effectiveness of the Canada Temperance Act and to render the efforts of the people to enforce that Act, completely abortive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree to a considerable extent with my hon. friend. I think this 5th clause is opening a very wide door, and I shall vote with him that it be not concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to move an amendment to the 3rd amendment from the Senate, by adding the following words :—

Provided also that all such physicians, chemists and druggists, selling alcoholic or spirituous liquors under the provision of said amendment, shall be subject to the same regulations and restrictions that govern vendors licensed by the 4th sub-section of the 99th section of the Act.

Mr. ORTON. The adoption of this proposition will subject medical men to a great deal of trouble. There are hardly any prescriptions for eight or four ounces but what contain spirits either as tinctures or some other shape. Nearly all the medical prescriptions are made up in that form. There will therefore have to be kept a record of every prescription, and that will cause unnecessary trouble.

Mr. FISHER. Under the Scott Act as originally passed, those who were licensed to sell for medicinal purposes were obliged to receive certificates from medical men that the liquor was really for medicinal purposes; and they were also obliged to file that certificate and keep a record, and make a return to the Department of Inland Revenue once a year of all such sales. If either druggists or chemists are allowed to sell only under such regulations, physicians should be made subject to the same regulations as licensed druggists under the Scott Act. It seems to be very unfair that under a license given to one man he is hedged round by regulations, while all other druggists and chemists and physicians will be allowed to sell without those restrictions.

Mr. HICKEY. This is an attempt to make a farce of the action which this House has already taken. The idea of an hon. member making a motion that a physician who has already been authorised under this Bill to dispense certificates should be called upon to obtain a certificate from another physician. That is what the amendment amounts to. The amendment is beyond my comprehension, and it looks to me to be absurd.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The meaning of this resolution is this: That no physician, chemist or druggist shall sell alcoholic or spirituous liquors unless he obtains the certificate of another medical man.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so. One of the provisions of the Act is this:

"Provided also that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes, or for *bona fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, shall be lawful only by such druggists and other vendors as may be thereto specially licensed by the Lieutenant Governor in each Province, the number not to exceed one in each township or parish, nor two in each town, and in cities not exceeding one for every 4,000 inhabitants; such sale, when for medicinal purposes, to be in quantities of not less than one pint, to be removed from the premises, and to be made only on the certificate of a medical man having no interest in the sale by the druggist or vendor, affirming that such liquor has been prescribed for the person named therein."

This resolution destroys the whole effect of the resolutions we have carried already. It is a direct contradiction of what we have already voted in favor of.

Mr. JAMIESON. There may, of course, be something, and perhaps a good deal, in what the leader of the Government has said, but such was not the intention of the resolution. I think, with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), that there should be some record kept of the sales which are made under the amendment we have adopted to day. I really see no reason why persons, who under the amendments which the Senate have made to the Act should be placed in a better position than the parties who are appointed to sell under the original Act. I have no doubt this amendment can be changed in such a way as to avoid the difficulty suggested by the leader of the Government, and I think if an opportunity is given for a few moments' consultation we might be able to frame such an amendment as would commend itself to the hon. gentleman and to the House. I think the spirit of the amend-

ment is correct. We ought to adopt something in the direction of that amendment, if not in its very language.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It simply amounts to this: That in any county where the Scott Act has been carried it is possible, nay more it is probable, that there will be a certain number of vendors of liquor who neither have licenses nor are required to keep a record. That will be the practical effect of the matter as it stands just now. It is asking very little after the House has seen fit to pass the amendments that a record shall be kept. Those medical men who do not propose to abuse the law can have no objections to the proposal, and there should be some check on those medical men who might seek to abuse the privilege.

Mr. FISHER. In drawing up the amendment I had not the intention of accomplishing what the leader of the Government intimates this amendment would accomplish. All I desire is that all physicians, druggists and chemists who might sell under the provisions of the amendment should be made subject to the same regulations as those who are licensed under the original provisions of the Canada Temperance Act. I believe the leader of the Government is correct, and that by the wording of the amendment a physician selling would be forced to get a certificate from another physician. I think, however, an addition might be made to the amendment by which physicians themselves selling would not be obliged to obtain such a certificate. But I think it is very desirable that they should be made subject to all the other restrictions and regulations contained in sub-section 4 of section 99 of the Act. It is also especially desirable that chemists and druggists should still have to obtain a certificate and should have to keep a record of their sales and to make a return to the Department of Inland Revenue. If such an amendment as I speak of, excepting physicians who sell from requiring the certificate of another medical practitioner, should be added to the amendment, I think it would meet the views of the leader of the Government and would still accomplish what I desire by my amendment.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If you refer to the Votes and Proceedings of the 13th April, you will find the following motion by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey):—

“Provided that nothing in this Act shall interfere with the rights and privileges of medical men in the use of alcoholic liquors, when required and kept for professional purposes.”

I think that the House is committed to that proposition, and that we cannot go back upon it now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That was struck out.

Mr. HICKEY. I think it is impossible to obtain the result which the hon. gentleman wishes by this motion. He says that his object is to keep track of the quantity sold. Well, that is one of the objects of the Scott Act, I admit, but the result of this would be that if there were one ounce of spirits, or a small quantity, in a prescription, he would have to keep a record of it. In fact, he would have to make a separate prescription for the spirits, apart from the other ingredients, which would be wholly impracticable to physician and druggist. Besides, as I understand it, the great object of the Scott Act is not to show how much is sold, but to restrain the selling for beverage purposes. I think the motion should be withdrawn.

Mr. FISHER. I would rather it were voted upon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) would move his amendment.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not propose to move it as an amendment to the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. JAMIESON.

Mr. SCRIVER. I wish to move the following amendment to the 3rd amendment from the Senate:—

Provided always that such physicians, druggists and chemists selling alcohol or spirituous liquors, shall keep a register of all such sales, indicating the names of the purchasers and the quantity sold, and shall make an annual return of such sales on the 31st of December in every year, to the Collector of Inland Revenue within whose revenue division such physician, druggist, or chemist resides.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see any great objection to this amendment if it were not that it would cause an infinite degree of discomfort and trouble to the medical profession, and I hope it will be well considered by the medical men. We will suppose a doctor in practice gives 200 or 300 prescriptions in a year, and perhaps more—some of them giving them by the thousand. Well, for every one of the prescriptions in which there is a table-spoonful of spirits there must be a record of the quantity, however small it is, and a return made to the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. This amendment only refers to this section, which provides that they may dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes, and chemists and druggists are mentioned in the same connection.

Mr. BLAKE. The prescription of alcoholic liquors was limited by the Canada Temperance Act. There were certain precautions, and now the House this afternoon has agreed to an amendment which gives enlarged power to physicians to prescribe and to fill the prescriptions themselves, and when they are doing that under a new clause, we propose to introduce some regulations enabling the people to learn how much is done under this new power, and not with reference to the old powers.

Mr. HICKEY. I do not wish to put any blocks in the way of putting the Act clear and right to the people, but I cannot see how a druggist selling liquor on a physician's prescription, could keep track of it at all. The right hon. Premier correctly stated the case. If one drachm of alcohol were in a prescription containing other ingredients—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HICKEY. That is what the clause says.

Mr. FISHER. It says spirituous liquors.

Mr. HICKEY. If it is not a prescription, of course I have nothing to say. If it is pure alcohol, the druggist might be compelled to keep a record; but it would be impossible for a physician to do it, especially a country physician, and he would be made to systematically break the law every day.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The question is whether this amendment is large enough to include the case of a physician or druggist selling alcohol or spirituous liquor mixed with some other ingredients. If it is intended only to apply to prescriptions of pure alcohol or spirituous liquors *qua* such, and not as ingredients of other medicines, it would be reasonable enough, perhaps, that a record should be kept. But if these words are so large as to include prescriptions of alcohol or spirituous liquors used as the component parts of other medicines, it would be a very onerous duty to throw on the physician or druggist to compel him to keep a record of that.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). From a medical standpoint I do not see any objection to this requirement, if it is only intended to apply to the case where a medical man becomes a retailer of liquor. If he wishes to take that position and to benefit by the profits of that sale, he should take the responsibility of keeping a record. I am not a lawyer, but I sometimes try to view things from a practical, common sense standpoint; and as far as this House is concerned, I think it cannot determine whether I prescribe alcohol or buttermilk to my patients; it cannot force me to keep any

record; but if I go into the market as a retailer of whiskey, you have a right to make me keep a record.

Mr. JENKINS. I think these amendments are intended more for the convenience of the public than for physicians or druggists, and I think it would be rather a hardship to force them to keep a record of the very small quantities of alcoholic liquor they prescribe or sell. If a physician prescribes for a patient, he may wish to prescribe at the same time brandy or other alcoholic liquor, and if he does, he has to write a separate prescription for the stimulant, and the patient, in order to obtain the liquor, is obliged perhaps to go to a different part of the town from where the druggist lives who makes up the medicine. If a druggist is allowed to make up a prescription of half a pint of brandy or wine, which is of great convenience to the patient, I do not think he should be called on to keep a record of this. In the first place it is a small matter; and in the next place the object can be attained without the record, because every druggist keeps a copy of the prescription sent to him, and if the Act were so amended as to compel the druggist to show the copy of the prescription, the same object would be attained without putting him to extra trouble.

Mr. FISHER. I think these amendments to which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has alluded, are intended for the benefit of the public at large, and not particularly for the benefit of druggists or chemists to whose business they apply. It is because in places where prohibition has been adopted, some restrictions have been placed by the original Act upon the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the hands of druggists and chemists that this sub-section 4 of section 99 of the original Act was inserted; and when we are now very much enlarging the powers of these druggists and chemists, inasmuch as we are giving all of them the privileges which by the original Act were only given to a few, I think it is fair and right, and the only measure consistent with the original Act, to hedge them around with the same restrictions which we apply to the licensed druggists. My hon. friend opposite was mistaken in supposing that this amendment applied to medical compounds containing liquor. As I understand the amendment, it has only the same scope as sub-section 4 of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act; it only applies to intoxicating liquors, and not in any sense to medical compounds containing alcohol; it is only when those compounds might be used for drinking purposes as beverages, that this amendment applies to them; and then and only then I think it is absolutely necessary that some such restrictions as this amendment provides should be imposed upon the sale by chemists and druggists. As the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) very justly and aptly remarked, if chemists and druggists choose to descend to the retail sale of liquors, it is just and right that the same restrictions should be imposed on them as are imposed on hotel keepers or other vendors. When they sell liquor made up in prescriptions with other drugs, neither this amendment nor the Scott Act interferes with their sale; but if medical practitioners choose to engage in the retail sale of liquor, it is proper and consistent with the Scott Act, to restrict the sale.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Add the words "as a beverage" and we will not object to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONADD. I merely wish to state that personally I saw no objection to this provision; but I pointed out that I thought it would be a great inconvenience to the medical men. However, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) who is a medical man, sees no objection to it, and I have none.

Amendment agreed to; and 3rd amendment from the Senate, as amended, concurred in on a division.

On the 6th amendment,

Mr. JAMIESON. I move that the 6th amendment be disagreed to for the following reasons:

Because abuses have arisen in counties in which the Act has been adopted, owing to the absence of a penal clause of this kind and a provision is necessary in order to the proper and effective enforcement of the Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to state what the clause is, as it passed the Commons, and what the amendment is of that clause?

Mr. JAMIESON. The clause as amended by this House is as follows: Section 99, sub-section 4, Canada Temperance Act, by adding to it, amongst other amendments, the following words:

"And any medical man who gives such a certificate for any other than strictly medicinal purposes shall, for the first offence, be liable, on summary conviction before any one or more justices of the peace under the Act thirty-two and thirty-three Victoria, chapter thirty-one, to a penalty of twenty dollars, and for a second or any subsequent offence shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of forty dollars."

This clause, which we call the penal clause, has been struck out by the Senate, and I have just moved that we disagree to that amendment for the reasons given in the motion. This question was fully discussed when the Bill was before the House, and at that time it was the deliberate judgment of the House that a clause of that kind is necessary. I do not think it necessary to repeat the arguments used in favor of the clause. Hon. gentlemen who have experience of the working of the Canada Temperance Act, more especially in Halton, have found that it was absolutely necessary that an amendment of this kind should be made to the original Act. This clause is not intended for honest, but for dishonest, medical practitioners. In fact, I know that many respectable medical men are in favor of this clause, on the ground that it is a protection to them. Where a penal clause of this kind is hanging over the head of a man who is required to do a certain thing, he is not so liable to be importuned, at all hours of the day and night, to give certificates when they are not absolutely necessary. It is only proposed to punish a medical man when he gives a certificate colorably. No honest man would do anything of the kind.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not recollect that that clause was exhaustively discussed in this House. My recollection is that it was at a late period of the night, after the whole House was tired out with the prolonged discussion on other points, that the clause was passed through on division, and I believe the great majority of the House did not thoroughly appreciate what they were doing when they passed it. There was so much confusion, so many contradictory amendments moved, that by the time this clause was proposed, the great majority of the House had got into such a muddle as to what was proposed and carried, that they did not thoroughly understand its import. I am afraid from the laughter that greets my remarks that it may be supposed to insinuate that the strong temperance advocates in this House had, during the prolonged sitting, been indulging in non temperance stimulants to such an extent, that they had become a little befogged. I mean nothing of the kind. I never meant to insinuate directly or indirectly that any gentleman who voted for rigid prohibition ever exceeded or indulged in the improper use of stimulants. I have heard it said that such was the case, but for my part I made no such imputation and I had no such thought. But to come seriously to this question, I think we ought to well reconsider the matter now that the Senate in their wisdom have thought fit to strike out this clause. I think it behoves us now, before dinner, if you like, instead of after dinner, now at an early hour of the day, when we can enter upon this discussion in a fair and impartial way, and when everyone here knows what has been going on and what has been moved, to consider what we are doing. What are we doing

if we refuse to agree to the amendment of the Senate? We are saying that the learned profession of physicians is to be put on a par with every tavern keeper and with every bar-room loafer who violates the Scott Act. All are placed in the same category, to be dragged before the police magistrate and fined a paltry contemptible \$20 for the first offence and \$40 for the second for violating their solemn duty as members of an honorable profession, for violating the law deliberately and knowingly. Surely it is not intended to pass such an insult upon a profession so deserving of public confidence, so deserving of the respect and confidence of the House, instead of its contempt, as the medical profession. That will be the result of striking out the amendment. My hon. friend says: We do not intend this to apply to the respectable members of the profession. What does that mean? It means that the members of the profession who are not respectable and are not to be trusted are so numerous that they require the paltry terror of a \$20 or \$40 fine, or commitment to gaol for ten or twenty days if it is not paid, to deter them from a dishonorable breach of their duty as medical men. Surely such measures are not requisite to sustain the temperance cause. Surely, if that cause requires to be bolstered up by an attack of that kind on the medical profession and by a measure so objectionable as that, there must be something rotten in it, there must be something of an improper character, and Parliament ought not to be asked to strike out the amendment made by the Senate in the interest of the public and of the medical profession, and I think properly made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I certainly cannot agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken. We have given very considerable powers to medical men, we have enlarged their powers under the Canada Temperance Act in order that they may more freely exercise their profession for the public good, but, as we have given them very large powers compared with those given to them in the original Act, I think it is quite right that we should see that there shall be no abuse of those powers. We know that, while it is a most respectable profession, yet there are black sheep in it, and, if a medical man to whom these powers are given for medicinal purposes, should use alcohol to a considerable extent and basely betray the provisions of the law, he should be signally punished. I think the clause is a very good one, because there ought to be some punishment provided for those who deliberately break the law.

Mr. WILSON. I ask the First Minister why he imposes a penalty upon physicians, when two magistrates or a minister can give a certificate and no provision is made for punishing anyone but a physician? All I want is that the magistrate should be placed in the same position as the physician.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the committee are under a misapprehension as to the character of this penalty. It does not refer to any new powers conferred upon physicians, but only to the old powers conferred upon them under the Scott Act; and I am sure that anyone who comes from a Scott Act county knows that it is essential to the carrying out of the law to provide these penalties. Nine-tenths of the profession do not give these certificates wrongly, but there is a small residuum who require to be looked after.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. We were discussing the propriety of restoring an amendment providing for the punishment of a certain class of persons who violated the terms of the Temperance Act respecting the sale of intoxicants upon medical or other certificates. The clause as it stood in the Bill was inserted when none but a certain class of persons were to be

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

authorised to sell. Then there was a proposition by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Bourbeau) to include clergymen in the number of those authorised to give certificates, and retaining the penal clause. Now I think it is right and proper that the penal clause should be restored. I wholly dissent from the amendment proposed by the Senate in this particular. I dissent, also, from the views expressed by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) who stated that physicians were a highly respectable class of the community, and that it was an insult to them to insert such a penal clause in the law. Well, Sir, I think the days for class legislation of that sort have gone by. Before the law all classes of the community ought to stand upon a footing of equality. We do not know anything about one class enjoying alone the title of being a respectable class, and free from the penalty imposed upon others. What we propose to deal with is that particular class of persons who violates its provisions. If a medical man disregards the law and violates its terms and sells contrary to its provisions, there is no reason why he should not be subject to punishment in precisely the same way as any other man; he should be dealt with in exactly the same way. Now it seems to me that we ought to provide that medical men or others, if they give certificates improperly and contrary to the intent of this Act, should be punished. We should not designate medical men for we have given up the notion that there are no others but medical men grant the certificates; but every person, no matter what his profession, who has the power of granting a certificate and who violates the law, ought to be punished. I think there is no obstacle to our amending a defect in the section as it originally stood and as the Bill left this House. The section, when it was first introduced, was right and proper as it now is, but when this House extended the class who are authorised to grant certificates, it ought to have altered the phraseology of this particular section, and I think that ought to be done now.

Mr. HICKEY. I quite agree with the remarks of the member for Bothwell, and I have no objection to the penalty clause, as moved by the hon. member for North Lanark, being made to apply to medical men; but, I think, in justice to medical men, that others who are qualified or authorised under this Act to grant certificates, ought to be liable to the same penalties that physicians are. I therefore move that the clause be further amended by adding after the words, "medical men," the words, "or other person authorised to grant certificates under this Act."

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman's amendment will not be in order until this House resolves to restore the clause which has been struck out by the Senate. This clause has been struck out by the Senate. The motion now before the House is to restore that clause and disagree to the amendment made by the Senate. As soon as the House resolves to restore that clause, then this amendment will be in order so as to amend the words so restored. Until the clause is restored it cannot be amended.

Motion (Mr. Jamieson) to 6th amendment, agreed to.

Mr. HICKEY. I now beg leave to move the amendment I have just read.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I should like to know whether we can carry that amendment, for the reason that if we can, it seems to me that we can amend the Bill in another particular as it went from this House. The clause which has just been restored was put in by this House and went up to the Senate. It refers to the persons who are proposed to be included in the class who may issue certificates. The power given to issue certificates was given in this House and not in the Senate at all. This House at that time made no amendment whatever, and did not require that these persons should be subject to this penal clause. We are

therefore amending the Act as we passed it; and what I would like to know is whether we can do it now simply from the accident that we restored the clause that was taken out, and, if we can, it seems to me we can amend it in another particular. The reason I ask is that I am anxious that it should be amended in another particular, in order to restore words which were inserted in this House in Committee of the Whole, but by some mistake were not in the amendments that were concurred in by the House afterwards.

Mr. BLAKE. The House has just disagreed to the amendment to the Senate who had expunged words which this House had left in the Bill. The result of disagreeing with that amendment has been that the Bill now stands as it left this House. Well, then, is the amendment which is now proposed by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) a consequential or relevant amendment to anything the Senate has done? I think not, Sir. As long as the Senate had stricken out our amendment altogether, the amendment of the hon. member for Dundas, of course, could not be relevant to anything they had done, because they had expunged the whole thing. What we have now done is to wipe out their alteration, and we have left the clause as it was in our House. Then, is the proposal of the hon. gentleman consequent to, or relevant upon, anything the Senate has done?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is. I think this amendment is consequential to or relevant upon the amendment adopted by the Senate. These amendments proposed are for the purpose of making the clause adopted by us, and sent by this House to the Senate, acceptable to that House. In this view I am supported by the decision of Speaker Brand, who decides that:

"If the House decides to disagree with an amendment by the Lords to strike out words, the effect being to restore the words struck out by the Lords, the words of the clause kept alive by the disagreement of the Lords' amendment, will then be open to amendment."

So this amendment is in order.

Amendment agreed to.

On the 8th amendment,

Mr. JAMIESON. I move that this amendment be concurred in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. JAMIESON. The object of this amendment is simply to apply the search clauses of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, to the Temperance Act, 1864. I think the amendment is a proper one. This was certainly an oversight at the time the Canada Temperance Act was passed. Anyone looking over the clauses of the Act will come to the same conclusion. There are a few counties in Canada where the Temperance Act of 1864 is at present in force, and I think it is only right that in those counties and places they should have proper facilities for enforcing the law. This amendment is for the purpose of giving them those facilities.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I confess I have tried to understand the explanation of the hon. gentleman, but probably owing to the density of my intelligence, I have been quite unable to do so. If the hon. gentleman would give us in Saxon English what is proposed to be done, we might understand it. What clauses of the Act of 1864 are proposed to be brought into force by the Act of 1885; what are the particular provisions intended to be brought into force? What does the hon. gentleman mean? I do not understand his explanation, and no member in this House, except ardent temperance advocates will understand it. No doubt the hon. member for King's and the hon. member for Bromo understand it; but I think, if you except those three hon. members, no one else understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Victoria should accept it as coming from the Senate in whose wisdom he has already expressed great confidence.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). We want to give an intelligent vote upon it.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am sorry I have not been able to reach the comprehension of the hon. member for Victoria. I am afraid that perhaps he is in the condition in which he described the House to be in when a certain amendment under discussion this afternoon was passed. However, when I stated a few minutes ago that the object of this amendment was to incorporate into the Temperance Act of 1864 what are known as the search clauses of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878; that ought to be quite clear to any hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What are the clauses.

Mr. JAMIESON. There are a few counties in the Dominion where the Temperance Act of 1864, popularly known as the Dunkin Act, is still in force.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Why could you not have said so at first.

Mr. JAMIESON. I did say so. Probably I was misunderstood because I used the legal name of the Act, instead of the popular name. I referred to the Temperance Act of 1864, popularly known as the Dunkin Act. That Act is in force in a few counties of the Dominion, and the object of this amendment is to give the advantage to the counties in which that Act is in force of what are known as the search clauses of the Scott Act or Canada Temperance Act of 1878. The Senate in its wisdom thought proper to make this amendment. I think it is a wise amendment. I wish all the amendments were of this character.

Amendment agreed to.

On the 10th amendment,

Mr. JAMIESON. I move that this amendment be disagreed to, for the following reason:

Because forms are necessary for the efficient enforcement of the Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not think any explanation is necessary. The effect of the Senate amendment is to strike off the schedule of forms which was passed by this House. It was the judgment of this House that those forms would be necessary in order to the efficient enforcement of the law. Now, I do not see any reason why a schedule of forms should not be appended to an Act of this kind. It is well known that magistrates, as a rule, are not skilled in the law, and it is a very great aid to them in the administration of the law to be able to fall back on statutory forms. Moreover, we have a precedent, because the Liquor License Act of 1883, which was passed by this House, contains a set of forms, and nearly all the license laws of which I am aware, have similarly attached to them such schedules of forms.

Motion agreed to.

On the 11th amendment,

Mr. JAMIESON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the 11th amendment be disagreed to for the following reasons:—

Because it is a violation of the fundamental principle of the Act which, when adopted, prohibits the sale of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes; and because the Act has already been adopted in good faith by the electors of sixty-one counties and cities of the Dominion, believing that under the express provision of the law it would continue in force unimpaired for three years, and would then only be repealed by the same authority which adopted it; and the passing of the amendment would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament with the electors of those counties and cities; and further, because the amendment is in direct opposition to the wishes of a large proportion of the electors of the Dominion, as manifested by the petitions presented to Parliament.

In dealing with an important amendment of this nature I think the House will indulge me for a few moments while I express my views in reference to the character of the amendment. It cannot be concealed from this House that the amendment which has been made by the Senate and which is now under consideration is a very important one; neither can we conceal from our minds, as the representatives of the people, the fact that the people of this Dominion to-day, or a large proportion of them, at least, have their eyes turned towards this House, watching anxiously and earnestly for our action upon this question. In my judgment, should this amendment become the law of this country, it would be perhaps more far-reaching in its effect than any law we have passed in the present Session of Parliament. Years ago, in the history of this country, the people, by petition and otherwise, knocked at the door of Parliament and asked, and almost demanded, that the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes should be granted by Parliament. After repeated attempts a half-way measure was granted in the Temperance Act of 1864. No doubt it was a step in the right direction. No doubt the temperance people at that time regarded it as a boon. However, when the Act came to be adopted by the people, it was ascertained that there were serious defects in the law, which rendered the enforcement of it very difficult. But few counties in the Dominion availed themselves of that law. In some counties where the Act was adopted it was not enforced, and was afterwards repealed by a vote of the people. The temperance men of this country came to the conclusion that another step in advance should be taken. In 1874 a convention was held in the city of Montreal, composed of representative men and prohibitionists from all sections of the Dominion. I had the honor of being present at that convention, and I can truthfully say it was a representative body of men. This question of the evils flowing from the traffic in intoxicating liquors was fully discussed by that convention, and finally, as the deliverance of the convention, certain resolutions were proposed to ask the Parliament of this Dominion to submit to the people the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic, by means of what is commonly called a plebiscite. It was thought that would be the better way, in order to dispose of the question once and for all. I believe that was the proper course to take, and, for one, I regret that the demand of that prohibitory convention was not acceded to by the Government of the day. Had it been acceded to, it is probable that this question would have been settled ere this by the people of the Dominion. It was, however, urged that that would be an unconstitutional means of ascertaining the opinion of the people, that in no colony of the British Crown had such a course hitherto been adopted. Well, we are often adopting lines of action that have not been adopted in past times; and, in my judgment, it was a mistake at that time not to settle the question in the way proposed by that convention. However, when the Government of the day refused to accede to the proposition made by that convention, they proposed that a more stringent prohibitory local option law should be passed by Parliament. The temperance people of the Dominion concurred in that view; and as a result, in 1878 the Canada Temperance Act became the law of this country. Now, as I understand it, the object of that law was two-fold. In the first place, the object was, that if in certain defined localities the majority of the people were in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic for beverage purposes, by a certain process provided by that Act, they could, by their votes, prohibit the sale for a period of three years. In addition to that, I believe the object of that law was that there should be some machinery upon the Statute Book of this country by which, in some proper and legitimate way, the sense of the people of this Dominion could be had on this great question. Now, Sir,

Mr. JAMIESON,

what has been the result of that law? If the House will indulge me for a few minutes, I will give them a few figures, showing the manner in which it has been received by the people of this Dominion. In the Province of Ontario, containing 38 counties and unions of counties, and 10 cities, 24 counties and 2 cities have already adopted the law. In the Province of Nova Scotia, containing 18 counties and 1 city, 12 counties have already adopted the law. In the Province of New Brunswick, containing 14 counties and 2 cities, 9 counties and 1 city have already adopted the law. In the Province of Quebec, containing 56 counties and 4 cities, 5 counties have already adopted the law. In the Province of Manitoba, containing 5 counties and 1 city, 2 counties have adopted the law.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). How many in British Columbia?

Mr. JAMIESON. None in British Columbia, from the simple fact that the law in its present shape is not applicable to that Province. Now, there have been seventy-five contests in all, under the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, including repeal votes; in thirteen cases the verdict of the people was against the adoption of the Act, and in sixty-two cases in favor of the adoption of the Act. At the present time the Canada Temperance has been adopted in sixty-one counties and cities in this Dominion; and, what is perhaps more remarkable still, in not a single instance has the Act been repealed by any county or city in which it has been adopted. I do not think that in the history of any country or of any political party has such a victory been scored in favor of any principle or any movement, whether political or moral. At the present time, contests are in progress in 21 counties and cities of the Dominion; and to day, in the Province of Ontario, the poll is being held in three counties, with what result I am not advised at the present moment, but I have no doubt the result in those counties will be similar to the result in the great majority of the other counties in which a poll has been taken on the question. Now, Sir, we come to the question, what has given rise to the Bill now before the House? It will not be contended that in all cases an Act when passed by the House, is likely to be a perfect piece of legislation. A law has to be in operation for some time before the defects, which are necessarily incident to all laws, can be discovered. In the operation of the Canada Temperance Act certain defects have become apparent and certain machinery has become necessary for the more efficient enforcement of that law; and I ask this House whether it is not a reasonable proposition that the Parliament of Canada, having given to the people this law, were bound to make it as efficient as possible. With the view of doing so, I, at the instance of the legislative committee of the Dominion Alliance, had the honor of introducing into this House the Bill now under discussion. I may say, further, that owing to an unfortunate oversight at the time the Liquor License Act of 1883 was passed by this House, it has been found, or at least it was decided by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, that the penal and enforcing clauses of the Canada Temperance Act were repealed by the 145th section of that Act. On that ground alone, those in favor of the Canada Temperance Act were justified in coming before this House and asking for such amendments as would put an end to any trouble arising under it in consequence of the decision of the court of New Brunswick. I ask, then, Parliament having passed this law, and it having become necessary to amend it in some respects, and the amending Bill having been brought before Parliament—whether it was just or fair on the part of another branch of the Parliament of Canada to tack on to that amending Bill a provision, the effect of which is absolutely to destroy the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. I do not wish to speak in disre-

spectful terms of any branch of the Legislature of this Dominion; I should be sorry to do so; but, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the branch of the Legislature which made that amendment is out of sympathy with the people of this Dominion. The object of this law is to promote temperance, we are told. Take up the preamble of the Canada Temperance Act, and we are told there that it is desirable to promote temperance in the Dominion. If these amendments become law, I, for one, will ask Parliament either to repeal the Act, or, at all events, to give it a new preamble, and not make a farce of the whole matter; for I contend that the amendment which is proposed, and which is now under discussion, is not calculated to promote temperance, but is calculated to give the people of this Dominion, under the present circumstances of the law free wine and beer. I ask whether the people of this Dominion, who have in so many counties and by such overwhelming majorities adopted this law, should be treated in this way by Parliament? I say that to treat them in such a manner is unfair and unmanly. I would like to know what authority will grant licenses for the purpose of carrying out the provision of this amendment. Can the Parliament of Canada do so? That is a problematical question. There is confusion in reference to the liquor laws of the Provinces and of this Dominion, and to pass the amendment in question will make confusion worse confounded. In my judgment, this House has no power, in the event of the amendment becoming law, to pass a Bill to grant licenses. In view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court, I contend this Parliament has no power to pass a law granting licenses for the sale of wine and beer under this amendment. If this Parliament has no power—and I do not think, under the present circumstances, it will assume the power—I ask is there any provincial law under which licenses can be granted. In my opinion there is none such, and the simple effect of the amendment will be to give the people of the Dominion free trade in wine and beer, and to destroy most effectually and for ever the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. That is the issue which is presented here to-night in the amendment now under our consideration. I have no hesitation in saying that should this amendment become law by the joint action of this House and the Senate, I, for one, instead of attempting to have the Canada Temperance Act enforced, instead of aiding to bring about its adoption in any county, will take the earliest opportunity to ask Parliament to repeal the law, because I believe the passage of this amendment will be nothing more or less than a repeal of the law. It will be actually worse than a repeal of the law, because it will leave it a dead letter upon the statute book; and, above all things, Parliament ought to be careful not to pass laws that will be inoperative or to amend them so as to render them inoperative. Now, I hold that the Canada Temperance Act should have fair play; I believe that I am but voicing, when I say so, the sentiments of the large majority of the people of this Dominion. In the contests which have already taken place for the adoption of that law, the majorities in favor of it have been wonderfully large, aggregating a majority of over 46,000 of the electors. Can we, as a Parliament, professing to represent the popular sentiment of the country, go back on such a record as that? Can we take away from the people, or render less effective, a law which has been received with so much favor by the people? I trust this Parliament will pause before they take that step, the consequence of which may be very serious to the people, and, I have no doubt, to many gentlemen sitting in this House and voting on this question. There is another view to be taken of this. No doubt it was the duty of Parliament to enact laws for the good government of the people, but Parliament has also the power to enact laws and give to the people the privilege, the oppor-

tunity, of saying, in some solemn, binding manner, whether such laws will be adopted by them. This is the principle of local option, and it is a principle which is embodied in the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. Now the electors of a large number of counties in this Dominion have adopted the law. Is it proposed that the law shall be repealed; that it shall be abrogated by the same authority that enacted it? Not at all. Here, in my judgment, is a compact entered into between the Parliament of Canada and the people. The Parliament of Canada said to the people. Here is a law which, in your option, you may put into force in your municipalities for a period of three years, and that law cannot be repealed, once adopted, except at the end of that three year period, and then it must be repealed by the same authority by which it was enacted, namely, the sovereign people. What is proposed by this amendment? It is proposed that, after having granted that privilege to the people, after having induced the people to act on that privilege and put into operation the law—the Senate, in their wisdom, propose to say that the people, after having solemnly ratified this law, shall not receive what they believed they were receiving at the time they solemnly cast their votes in its favor. The proposition is a monstrous one. It is well known to every lawyer that it is a principle of constitutional law that no law can be repealed or abrogated except by the same authority, or at least as high an authority, as that by which it was enacted. But that principle is being cast to the winds in the amendment before us. I do not know how it may be in the other Provinces of the Dominion; but speaking for my own Province, I know that where the municipal council submit a by-law to the people for ratification, and the people have ratified it, the council are prohibited from interfering with it in any shape or form until the time prescribed for its duration has elapsed. Here, however, in a much more important matter, after the people have sanctioned the law by their vote and gone to a great deal of trouble in the different municipalities of the Dominion, for the purpose of putting the law in force, it is now proposed by the action of the Senate, in which they ask the concurrence of this House, to deprive the people of their right. I trust Parliament will never do so, but will have respect for the higher parliament, the sovereign people of the Dominion, and not attempt to take away from the people one of their most cherished rights, granted to them by the law which is now under our consideration. Perhaps it will be said that a large number of petitions have been presented to this House and to the Senate in favor of the amendment. I have no doubt that a great many petitions have been presented with that object in view, but we must not lose sight of the fact that a very large number of petitions, a two-fold greater number of petitions, containing at least double the number of signatures, have been presented to this House since the commencement of the Session against any interference with the Canada Temperance Act which would make it less restrictive than it is at the present time. I cannot say that I lay very great stress on petitions got up in that promiscuous way, but, under the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, petitions are gotten up in such a way that they can be relied upon. In that case, the petition must be signed by an elector and by nobody else; the elector must have affixed his own signature to the petition; that signature must be attested by a subscribing witness; that subscribing witness must make a declaration in reference to the signature which he attests. And what are the facts? In twenty-one counties in the Province of Ontario the signatures to the petitions now filed in the Department of State foot up to the number of 66,000, and, in addition to that, the votes of the people, in counties in which the Act has been submitted for their ratification, have been largely in favor of the principles contained in the Canada

Temperance Act. Let us look a little further. It perhaps may be said by some of the gentlemen who are about to address the House on this question, that this House will not be asked to concur in the amendment made by the Senate pure and simple: that this House will simply be asked to apply the amendment to counties in which the Canada Temperance Act has not already been adopted. The effect of that would be, at the present time, to put an end to this agitation, from one end of the country to the other. I have no hesitation in saying that there would not be found a corporal's guard of men in any county who would be foolish enough to attempt to adopt the law if the amendment now under consideration were inserted in the Act, and I say it would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament. Take the action of Parliament in the past; take the action of this House at the last Session, when, by an overwhelming majority, we pledged ourselves to give the people prohibition, when we were able to convince Parliament that public sentiment was in favor of that principle. What would be the effect of this amendment? It would be to take away from the people the only means they have of ascertaining public sentiment upon this question, and I say such a proceeding would be unfair. The Canada Temperance Act, a few years ago, was sneered at, was looked upon as an innocent measure, that would never accomplish anything in the direction of prohibition or of promoting the temperance sentiment; but, now that it has been received with favor by the people, we have a proposition submitted to Parliament, and sanctioned by one branch of our Legislature, with the view of strangling that Act and putting an end to all agitation, putting an end to every effort on the part of temperance men in this Dominion to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I do not know that I shall discuss this question at any greater length. I have no doubt that other hon. gentlemen in this House will consider it of sufficient moment and importance to give their advice to the House upon it. I must say that the matter has assumed a very serious aspect, and that there is an attempt by this amendment to deprive the people of a cherished principle, that is, the principle of local option, as applied to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and I trust the members of this House will consider well the situation before, by their votes here to-night, they say to the large majority of the people of this Dominion that they shall no longer have the benefit of a law which has been so beneficial in the counties in which it has been adopted, in putting an end to the traffic in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. I leave this question with the House. As the member having charge of this Bill, I deemed it my duty to discuss the question at greater length than, perhaps, I should otherwise have done; but I know that, under all the circumstances of the case, considering the gravity of the situation, considering the importance of the question now before the House, I shall be pardoned for the time I have occupied in discussing the question.

Mr. SMALL. I beg to move, in amendment:

That all after "that" be struck out, and the following be added to the said amendment:—In counties or cities hereafter adopting the said Act.

The effect of that is that the amendment made by the Senate to the Canada Temperance Act shall not apply to counties which have already adopted the Scott Act. The amendments made by the Senate have been considered retroactive, and the amendment I now propose is to the effect that they shall apply only to counties in future adopting the Scott Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it possible that we are to have a piece of legislation like this brought down to the House; that we are called on to vote upon it; that by adopting it we shall essentially alter the character of an Act, the passage of

Mr. JAMIESON.

which we have been years in obtaining from Parliament, which has remained on the Statute Book for seven years, and in that time is supposed to have taken a settled position, and against which we have scarcely had the first scintilla of popular opinion, asking this Parliament to take that law off the Statute Book? Is it possible that a measure so important as this is brought down to the House, and that hon. gentlemen are asked to vote upon it, with no further reason being given for this fundamental change than a simple statement that this does so-and-so, and thereby partially takes away from what the Senate amendment proposed? Are there any reasons why this legislation should prevail? If there are, let us have them. But let not hon. gentlemen bring a measure like this down to the House, claiming, as they did, and do, that the weight of intelligence is upon their side of the question, claiming that while we may be strong-headed, while we may be fanatical and given to enthusiasm, they have the cool reasoning power. If they have the cool reasoning power, let them exercise it now, and give this House some substantial reasons why we should make such a fundamental change.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I confess I am somewhat surprised if the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) means the few remarks he has just made to be in opposition to the amendment made by my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Small).

Mr. FOSTER. I have much more behind.

Mr. CAMERON. Well, I suppose, then, his speech is not addressed to the amendment but to the original motion. I take it that his speech should be addressed to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Small), which we are now considering, and whether the Senate amendment—which, I have no doubt, is retroactive in its operation, and applies to all counties in which the Act has as yet been passed—should be made to apply to them or should be restricted to the counties in which the Act has not yet been adopted. If the hon. member for King's and my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) think it is better that the Senate amendment in reference to beer and light wines should apply to all counties, whether they have yet adopted the Scott Act or not, then I suppose they will vote against the amendment of my hon. friend. If, on the other hand, they think it is better that the Senate amendment, if ultimately adopted, should apply only to counties in which the Scott Act has not yet been adopted, then I presume they will vote for my hon. friend's amendment. I do not understand the observation of my hon. friend from King's. He said he has more, that he holds back. Well, if he wants to express any opinion on this question, he ought to have expressed it on the amendment. If he means to oppose the adoption of the Senate amendment *in toto*, he should have addressed his remarks to that, and not the amendment of my hon. friend from Toronto. For my part, it is no secret, I have before now expressed in this House my opinions against the constitutional propriety of Scott Act legislation *in toto*. I think my opinions on this subject are sufficiently well known; but I confess that a good deal is to be said in favor of the amendment of my hon. friend from Toronto, and it is a matter of considerable surprise to me that the advocates of total prohibition in this House should oppose that amendment. They choose thereby to place themselves in the position of saying that they would rather the Senate amendments to the Scott Act should apply to all counties, whether they have carried the Act or not, than to have it applied only to those counties in which the Act has not yet been carried. That is the effect of their voting against the amendment of my hon. friend from Toronto. The motion of my hon. friend from North Lanark is, that the Senate amendment be rejected. My hon. friend from Toronto proposes a middle course, and he says: I am prepared to allow the Senate amendments to apply only to those counties

which have not yet adopted the Scott Act, instead of applying it to all counties. My hon. friends who support prohibition in this House oppose that; so they would rather have the amendment applied to the whole Dominion than have it applied only to those counties in which the Scott Act has not yet been adopted. I should like to understand what their position is. Before sitting down, I wish to say one word about a remark made by my hon. friend from North Lanark. It was hardly a remark that ought to have come from a personal friend—to say nothing of a political friend. If he meant it in earnest, it was, I need hardly say, wholly unfounded—I mean his remark that probably my observations were attributable to the fact that I was under the same influence that had misled the House in their former action, as I ventured to point out before dinner. I say if he meant it in earnest, I need hardly say it was unfounded; if he meant it as a joke, I think it was impertinent.

Mr. JAMIESON. I certainly meant it only as a joke.

Mr. CAMERON. I have already expressed my opinion of it as a joke, and I must leave my hon. friend to apply the remark I have made to his observation; because this kind of personal jokes approach very near, if they do not quite reach, what is generally described as impertinence from one gentleman to another. I regretted to hear the observation of my hon. friend, because, I need hardly say, that I do not think I am open to an insinuation of that kind, either in earnest or as a joke. I think that I am as well prepared to discuss this subject in a sober and serious manner as my hon. friend—in fact, I think I am a great deal better prepared. I think there are several kinds of intoxication. There is an intoxication arising from a too free use of spirituous or vinous liquor; I think there is intoxication arising from success, and I am afraid the hon. gentleman, and his friends who think with him, are laboring, to some extent, under that kind of intoxication. When the Bill was before this House, on a former occasion, they met with what they considered great success. They carried things right and left, and as they chose. We, poor unfortunate members, who honestly and conscientiously thought they were going too far, were howled down. We were not allowed an opportunity of discussing even the proposition placed before the House. I know several members on this side of the House, and some on the other side, who wished to propose amendments, who abandoned the idea of doing so, because they felt that the House, under the influence of the hon. member and his associates, were intoxicated with the success of the prohibition cause. And, so intoxicated were they that they would not listen to reason. There is, also, another kind of intoxication. There is intoxication arising from credulity and bigotry, which misleads and misguides men's judgments so that they cannot form a candid and impartial opinion upon the subject under discussion. That kind of intoxication, I think, has affected the hon. gentleman and his associates. I think, therefore, that the remark I made just now is quite justified, that there are various kinds of intoxication, and that kind of intoxication under which the hon. gentleman and his associates labor is far more prejudicial to a proper discussion and fair judgment upon any question of this kind even than the intoxication arising from the undue use of spirituous or vinous liquors. I think, also, perhaps it might be said that some of the most enthusiastic supporters of the prohibition cause occasionally labor under the other kind of intoxication. I do not allude to any hon. gentleman in this House; I allude to the well-known fact that some of the most noted prohibition stump speakers occupy their leisure time in indulging in bouts of beastly intoxication from spirituous liquors. That is what I allude to. I do not mean to say that any hon. member who votes conscientiously for prohibitory

measures is ever under any influence of that kind; but there can be no doubt that some of the most vehement and loudly-spoken advocates of temperance by no means practice that noble virtue.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. gentleman speak to the amendment?

Mr. FOSTER. I have spoken once; I have not yet spoken to the original amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment moved by Mr. Small. I think the hon. gentleman has spoken to that.

Mr. FISHER. I regret that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) has not been able to continue and address the House upon this occasion; but I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) to pass unchallenged. That hon. member has taken upon himself to accuse the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) of impertinence, and in making that accusation against him he has founded it upon an allusion made by the hon. member for Lanark to the state in which the hon. member for Victoria happened to be when he made a few remarks a little while ago. I think the hon. member for Victoria, having taken that ground, can be fairly accused of impertinence, not to one individual member, but to the whole House, individually and collectively, in consequence of the words uttered before dinner, when he declared that the House did not know what it did when it passed the amendments to the Act. If that reasoning is to apply to the hon. member for Lanark, they must react on the hon. member for Victoria. That hon. member has been guilty of impertinence—not that I would have alluded to it, except for his attack on the hon. member for Lanark—but he has gone a little too far in accusing that hon. gentleman, and other people in the country, who are advocates of temperance, with being intoxicated with their success. It is true that on many occasions the temperance people have been blessed with success attending their efforts. But, unfortunately, I regret to say this afternoon, if we have been in the past at all inclined to be intoxicated, to-day it has been taken from us, because our efforts this afternoon in this House did not meet with that success which I should have been glad to have seen them meet with. I regret to say that, in consequence of the action of the House this afternoon, the temperance cause in this country has received a severe blow, from which it will take some time, until the next general elections, to recover. But I believe the proposition which is now before the House would, were it to be passed, be even a much greater blow than we received this afternoon. The proposition before us is that for the future the Scott Act, where adopted, will not apply or interfere with the sale of wine or beer. This is, as the hon. member for King's said, a few minutes ago, a very important question, and I regret that such an important question should have come up in the manner in which it has come up on the floor of this House. I regret it should have come up towards the close of a very long Session, and at a time when hon. members are wearied with their labors, when hon. members have not really time to give to its consideration. I call it a very important question, because I believe that by the acceptance of the proposition now before the House the practical good effects of the Canada Temperance Act will be entirely destroyed. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has given us a short, and, I think, effective account of the history of temperance legislation in this country. And now we are called upon to take a retrograde step, because we are to

consider the term "intoxicating liquors" very much more limited in its nature than that term has ever yet been considered to be. If light wines and beer are no longer to be considered intoxicating liquors under the terms of the Canada Temperance Act, I ask this House to consider to what it is to lead. I am not going now to discuss the question at length, as to whether greater evils of intemperance are likely to arise in consequence of indulgence in light wines and beer than in consequence of indulgence in whiskey and other strong drinks. I believe, however, the effect of the amendment will be, not to induce greater consumption of light wine and beer, but that it will also practically continue the use of whiskey and other strong drinks in such counties as might adopt the Scott Act with this amendment tacked on to it. Were the amendment carried and the temperance people were to secure the adoption of the Scott Act, then, in those counties, with light wine and beer allowed to be sold, while whiskey and other strong liquors are forbidden, those strong liquors would go into the light wines and beer, and be sold in great quantities as wine. I do not believe pure beer and pure light wine will be sold. I believe that a small quantity of beer and light wine will be sold with a very great quantity of whiskey added thereto, so that the intoxicating effects of the beverage will be just as bad as the alcoholic effects of pure whiskey. In fact, Sir, I might go further, and say that the effect of that beverage would be worse than the effect of pure whiskey, because, I regret to say, that I believe it to be the case, that light wines and beer, as produced in this country, are more likely to be adulterated by all sorts of poisonous trash than is the whiskey of this country. Whiskey is probably the cheapest and most easily procured intoxicating beverage in this country, and the result is, that persons desiring to become intoxicated, or to use stimulants, are more likely to take whiskey than any of the various concoctions sold under the names of light wines and beers. And, Sir, whiskey is so cheap in this country that there is not the temptation to adulterate it that there is to adulterate light wines, at all events, even if I do not, in that respect, include beer. We find that in this country light wines are not made to any great extent, and those sold are almost invariably adulterated. It is scarcely possible for the people of this country to obtain, except by paying a very high price for it, pure light wines, such as claret or Sauterne. The result is, that if this amendment were passed, the people in the counties that adopted the Scott Act so amended, would be tempted and almost forced, if they did not wish to evade the law, to buy an adulterated article; and I believe that one of the greatest evils connected with the use of intoxicating liquors is the evil arising from the adulteration of those liquors. Were wine, whiskey and beer to be sold pure, as they are made, when rightly made, I believe the evils of intemperance would be greatly reduced. I do not wish to say that the extent of those evils would not still be very great, but that they would be greatly reduced; and it is because I believe this amendment points in the direction of encouraging the adulteration of pure drink, whatever it may be, that I am most earnestly inclined to oppose it. I am inclined to oppose it, furthermore, because I believe, as I have long believed, that even the use of wine and beer when pure, when not so strong and bad in their alcoholic effects, would still be worse than the prohibition of the sale of those liquors. But I consider, even putting that aside, that the argument which I have brought before this House is a very strong one against the adoption of this amendment. It is true, Sir, that the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto takes away a great objection that I had, and that no doubt others had, to the amendment passed by the Senate, which was retroactive in its effects. As representing a Scott Act county, with others representing such counties, we could not for an instant accept the original proposition from the Senate, knowing that the counties,

Mr. FISHER.

which have, with their eyes open, knowingly and designedly adopted the Scott Act, believing it to be an Act involving entire prohibition, would not for an instant consent to allow the proposition that the sale of light wines and beers, should be permitted in those counties. But I consider the proposition of the hon. member for Toronto is unfair to a very large body of people in this country. I allude to the large body who have already petitioned the Secretary of State and the Governor in Council to allow the Scott Act to be submitted in their counties. The hon. member for Lanark has just stated that there are to-day twenty-one counties in which steps have been taken for the submission of the Scott Act. Now, those people have taken those steps with the full expectation and intention of getting a chance to vote on the Scott Act, as it stood before it was amended by the Senate, and those people, representing, I think, the majority of the electors in twenty-one counties and cities of this Dominion, would be very unfairly treated were this amendment of the hon. member for Toronto accepted. Speaking, as I can speak, of the sentiments of a large number of the temperance people of this country, and speaking of the sentiments of those counties which have brought about that petition, I believe they would probably not act upon them at all, and the consequence would be that they would have been put to a very large amount of trouble and expense, all to no purpose. I think it would be fair to consider the breach of faith to those people. But, Sir, I think there is another objection to the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto, and that, Sir, is, what I can, perhaps, fairly call a breach of faith to the temperance people of this country. It is a well-known fact that during the last year the temperance people have made a strong, vigorous and very successful campaign throughout the country, for the adoption of the Scott Act. That campaign was largely due to the initiation of the Dominion Alliance, which holds its annual meetings in the winter time, in Ottawa, and that Alliance, and the people who support it, having been successful in their campaign last year, are now entering upon another campaign, similar to the one of last year. They desire by these means to submit the Scott Act in various parts of the country, and to bring to bear that pressure on the House of Commons, that influence on the House of Commons, which is a legitimate influence, to bring about total prohibition in this country. Every hon. gentleman within these walls recollects very well that last year we passed here a prohibitory resolution, by which, when this Parliament becomes fully convinced that the temperance people of this country were in the majority, and that this country was prepared to enforce a prohibitory law, this Parliament would pass such a law. By what means can this Parliament be shown that the people of this country are in favor of a prohibitory law, except by the submission and adoption of the Scott Act. In the various counties of the Dominion, at the time when the discussion took place in this House, the Scott Act was pointed to as a way by which the people who desired prohibition could get prohibition, and the result was that the Dominion Alliance answered that challenge and passed the Scott Act in very many of the counties of Canada. The result has been, I think, pretty fair proof to the Parliament of this country that the people are in favor of prohibition. But that proof is not conclusive, and if the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto is passed, I see no way by which that proof can be made conclusive. It is possible, and I think probably it is the fact, that the hon. member for Toronto, and his friends supporting him on this question, do not wish to see that proof made conclusive. I think, probably, those supporting the amendment wish to prevent, and think that by this means they can prevent, this proof to the House that the people of Canada desire prohibition. I think, perhaps, that if their motion were allowed to pass, they might so prevent it, but I believe that even that will

not accomplish the object, because I believe the temperance people of this country will find another way by which they can prove to this House, or if not this House, to a succeeding House, to the Parliament of Canada, that they do desire a total prohibitory law. I do not believe for an instant, Sir, that I have exhausted all the arguments which would show the evil effects of the law which the hon. member for Toronto wishes to pass through this House. But there are other gentlemen in this House who can bring forward these arguments and proofs, and I will merely add that I am quite convinced that this amendment, if passed, will put an end entirely and wholly to the Scott Act agitation now going on in this country, that it will prevent future Scott Act agitation, and will inflict a blow on the temperance progress of the country which it would be difficult indeed for the temperance people of the country to recover from.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not understand that the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) implies at all an undertaking on the part of those who vote for it that they will vote for the amendment of the Senate as amended by that amendment. The underlying principle of the Scott Act, as it is popularly called, is that the people themselves shall decide whether they desire, or do not desire, prohibition; and the ground on which the Senate amendment is proposed to be modified by the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto, as I understand it, is, that in a number of counties of this Dominion the Scott Act has already been adopted by large majorities, and it would be exceedingly unfair, in the face of an expression of opinion of that kind, to impose on those counties a condition different from that which they believed would exist when they adopted their by-laws. Without, for myself, intimating that I will vote for the Senate amendment, by voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto, I intend to cast my vote for that amendment. I do so simply because it affirms the principle that the people having in several counties decided in favor of the Scott Act, it is not fair for this Parliament to interfere and create a condition of things different from what existed when they adopted that Act. I should deeply regret if anything was done by this Parliament to interfere in the slightest degree with the people in the future, in doing as they have been doing in the past, with possibly some modification, enabling them to express their opinions in any of the counties, either as to the license laws, as to a modified system of prohibition, or as to whether they desire that no intoxicating liquor shall be sold at all. I rise for the purpose of simply explaining my own position, that I shall vote for the amendment, without stating that I shall vote for the Senate amendment, as amended by the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto.

Mr. COLBY. Listening to the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) and to the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend at my right (Mr. White, Cardwell), I think it may be accepted now as being the unanimous sentiment of the House that retroactive legislation, which would affect those constituencies which have already enacted the Scott Act, would not receive sympathy or support in any quarter of this House. I think I may say that, judging from the amendment now before the House, from the known views of the gentlemen who have supported that amendment, and from the resolution proposed by the hon. member opposite that I agree not only with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, but with all the members of this House, in going that length. But I must go a step further than the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has gone. I must say, I could not support these amendments—as high a respect as I have for the hon. body that passed them—as applicable to the Scott Act in any form whatever. I think this is a question which very nearly concerns the honor and

the dignity of this House. We passed the Scott Act with unanimity; we adopted the sentiments embodied in the preamble and the various sections of that Act as the unanimous will of the Parliament of Canada. Up to the present time, on every occasion when any proposition affecting the Scott Act has been made, this House has, with unanimity, done everything in its power to improve the working of that Act, according to the views of those most interested in its well-working. A year ago, as the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has said, this House placed itself on record as affirming that in the opinion of this House total prohibition was the true remedy for the evil which all admit to exist. Strengthened by that resolution, the friends of prohibition have exerted themselves with extraordinary vigor during the past year in order to show that the sentiment of prohibition was largely participated in by the people of this country; and every expression, up to this time, is confirmatory of the wisdom of Parliament in enacting the Scott Act, and in adopting the resolution of last Session. Why is it that now, at this stage, after this expression of opinion from the people at the polls, when 27 counties out of 33 which have voted on the Scott Act have decided favorably to that Act—why is it that now, for the first time since the Scott Act was passed, propositions subversive of its principles are received with favor? Are we to stand before the country as having been disingenuous when we passed that law—in having been disingenuous when we adopted the resolution of last session? Are we to stand before the country as a Parliament ready to trifle with a great moral question, which exercises the thoughts and the hearts of the people of this Dominion, from one end to the other? Are we to reverse our former expressions by a side wind? Have we not the courage of our convictions? Has anything occurred since our past actions that would justify us in receiving with favor propositions not made in sympathy with this Act, not made or supported by persons in sympathy with the Act, but made by opponents of the Act, and advocated on the ground of hostility to it? Do we do this on account of any new light we have received since the last session of Parliament? Are we going to change about in that way? Then, assuredly, we ignore the sentiment of the people, so far as they have given evidence of it. Now, I do not believe we can consistently do so. I do not believe we should allow a measure to be foisted on this country that will, in the sentiment of those who most favor the Act, be subversive of it. I have the highest respect and regard for many gentlemen who advocate a different method of treating this great evil; I have the highest regard for those who believe that a stringent license law is the best remedy; I know there are good temperance men in this House and the country, who do not believe in the Scott Act—who believe that a stringent license Act well enforced is the proper way of meeting the evil, and I respect the sentiments of those people. I believe, also, that there are gentlemen who believe in the doctrine, which is somewhat new in this country, that the true remedy is not in total or local prohibition, but in the permissive use of light wines and similar beverages used in other countries. I do not believe all those who advocate that doctrine do it with the view of subverting the principles of temperance in this country; I know that a good many good temperance men, who have given thought to the subject, believe that the true remedy is not prohibition on one side, nor in the licensing of liquor on the other, but in that other course, by which light wines, beers and ciders may be used. I respect their opinions as sincere; I feel bound to acknowledge that they are honest when they express them; I am disposed to give them every opportunity, individually, of having those opinions tested; and if any gentleman will propose in this House that they shall have the same opportunity of testing their experiment that the prohibition party have, I will concur in that.

I will concur in a proposition to the effect, that if, at any time, one-fourth of the electors of any municipality, other than Scott Act municipalities, represent, in the manner provided in the Scott Act, that they desire an Act which will contain this clause, and this alone, the permission to sell ale and light wines, I have no objection to that experiment being tried. Then you would have the two side by side; but do not make a mongrel thing of it; do not graft this clause on to a prohibitory law, and say, afterwards, the law is a failure. Do not spoil both experiments; do not spoil the experiment that is being tried by those who are in favor of prohibition, by bringing in something which is incongruous with that idea. If a certain number of counties want a prohibitory Act, let it be enforced in those counties; if other counties want to carry out the sentiments and opinions of those who believe that the use of wine and beer is the true remedy, let that experiment be tried in those counties. You will then have both experiments tried side by side, and the public will be able to judge as to the value of each. The members of this House, one and all, profess to desire, in the best possible way, to lessen or prevent certain evils which are universally admitted to be evils; and I believe that all reasonable experiments in that direction should have a fair trial, so that after they have been tested for a period of years the intelligent public will be able to recognise which is the best. If I believed, as many do, that the Scott Act, if enforced, would show its own defects and satisfy the people of its own worthlessness, I would want to have the experiment so tried that I would be able to say: Here, you have the Act; here, you have your own method of enforcing the Act, and here is the failure that results from it. But, just so long as you tamper with it, just so long as you graft on it features which the supporters of the Act do not approve of, just so surely will they not be satisfied with any adverse experiment, but will account for its failure by other causes. If you had let us alone, they will say, if you had not tampered with the Act, it would have been a success; now it is not a success, through your interference. The advocates of the Scott Act are sufficiently handicapped already in their efforts. They have against them the thousands who oppose it from motives of self-interest; they have against them all those who believe that prohibitory Acts are restraints on the freedom of the subject; they have against them all those who believe the true remedy is a thorough license Act. They are handicapped further by the evident fact that their experiments cannot have a fair trial, through any system of local option, since, while in one county the Scott Act may be in full force, in an adjacent county the Act may not be in operation, rendering violations of the Act less difficult. Holding these views, respecting the convictions of those who believe honestly that the true remedy lies, not in prohibition, but in other methods, I think they ought also to respect the convictions of those whose sentiments are embodied in the Statute Book, endorsed by the action of this House, and who now desire to work out that problem which Parliament some time ago gave them an opportunity of working out. Under these circumstances, I feel bound to oppose any proposition to graft this clause, in any shape or form whatever, on this Act, believing it will spoil both experiments, believing that neither will have an opportunity of fair play, the two things being incompatible. I would be willing to see both experiments worked out separately and fairly, so that the people would have an opportunity of judging which was the best; but I am opposed to any proposition to combine these two incompatible things together in the one Act; and I may say, I for one, cannot very well afford to disregard the expression of public opinion which has been had during the past year. In my own county there were as many votes of the electors passed upon the Scott Act—less 46—as at the last parlia-

Mr. COLBY.

mentary election, and the Scott Act was supported by as large a majority as that which sent me to this House. I certainly cannot, under these circumstances, disregard the wishes of my people; and if I were not prepared to carry out the clearly-expressed wishes of my constituents in this particular, I would feel it my duty to resign my position as their representative, and allow them to send some one here whose sentiments, actions, votes and speeches in Parliament would be more in accordance with their expressed views and wishes.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not understand the effect of the motion of the hon. member from East Toronto (Mr. Small) to be what my hon. friend from Cardwell explained it to be. I do not understand its effect to be simply limiting the amendments passed in the Senate to counties in which the Scott Act had not been passed. I think there is something in addition. I think the motion says that the amendment of the Senate shall be approved of.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is taken out.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion, as originally put in my hands, is, that all the words after "that," of the said motion, be struck out, and the following words added: "In counties and cities hereafter adopting the said Act, and that the said amendment be agreed to with the amendment hereinbefore set out." But these last words I must strike out, because they bind the House to a future motion, and the motion stands, that all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following words be added: "In counties or cities hereafter adopting the said Act."

Mr. SCRIVER. Then I see no reason why the House should not accept the amendment. If I understand the motion rightly, it would not have any effect on the action of the House, with regard to the amendments made by the Senate, but simply limit them, if they should be approved by the House, to counties in which the Scott Act may hereafter be adopted.

Mr. MILLS. As I understand the proposition of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), it practically limits the operation of the Scott Act to counties in which it may hereafter be submitted to the people. In all these counties it is provided total prohibition shall be destroyed; you may prohibit the use of spirituous liquors other than light wines and ale and beer, but these you have no power of prohibiting. That is the effect of the amendment put into the Speaker's hands. It is perfectly clear that it is a repeal of the Scott Act, so far as the light wines and the ale and beer are concerned, in all cases where that Act may in future be submitted to the people. I am opposed to any such limitation. I believe that, if the people choose to adopt the principle of prohibition in any counties where the principle has not yet been adopted, they should be as free as they have hitherto been under the Scott Act. If the hon. gentleman had submitted to the House a proposition to say that those who did not wish to go so far as to adopt the principle of total prohibition, but believed they would promote Temperance better by allowing the use of light wines, ale and beer, might have the three alternatives of total prohibition, light wines and ale, and a strict license system, that would be very different; but that is not the proposition. The proposition now in your hands is to permit the present Temperance Act to operate in all those counties where it has been adopted, but to provide that in all other counties that power shall not in future exist; the people shall only have liberty to prohibit the use of ardent spirits.

Mr. CURRAN. In attempting to reply to the hon. member who spoke a few moments ago, (Mr. Colby) I feel that the task I am undertaking, in giving expression, in a few words, to my ideas upon this very important subject, is far more difficult than it would be under ordinary circumstances in following one of the usual prohibition orators

who speak upon this subject. It strikes me very forcibly, judging from the admirable tone of the eloquent speech which my hon. friend has delivered here to-night, that he seems to have fully conceived the idea of the great theologian and philosopher, who said that in all essentials there should be unity, in matters doubtful, liberty, and in all things charity. Certainly he has taken, so far as his expressions go to-night, a most charitable view of the situation. He has not mixed up, as most people do, on occasions of this kind and on prohibition platforms, hatred and holiness; he has not sought to impute sinister motives to those who disagree with him, and I must say that his address this evening was one of those most likely to carry conviction, because he has studiously avoided that grievous error into which the advocates of prohibition in this country have fallen of late, that of holding up to contempt even the highest body in the land, because they venture to differ with them, of hounding down those who may happen not to entertain the same ideas as themselves, and refusing all liberty of thought, and exercising, instead of the charity which my hon. friend has extended to all, downright and unqualified coercion. I desire, on this occasion, to say, in opening these remarks, that, so far as I am personally concerned, I do wish, from the bottom of my heart, that every man, woman and child in this land, whose health would permit, should be a total abstainer from intoxicating liquors. I, myself, am a member of the oldest temperance organisation in the city of Montreal—the parent society of all the Catholic total abstinence organisations in that great city, and have been for some years past. I have followed anxiously the progress of that body and of the sister societies, and I have sought to find out for myself what the true principles were upon which those with whom I have been associated endeavored to act. I think there is a wide difference, a marked difference, between temperance and prohibition, and I believe that I am justified in the course which I am adopting here to-night, in giving expression to these few words in favor of the amendment, because those organisations to which I have referred, and which have been in the field of temperance for so many years, acting consistently, acting generously, acting nobly and religiously, have laid down what they conceive to be the true platform upon which this question should be agitated; they have promulgated, in a document which has been submitted to the Local Legislature only in the last Session, their programme as to what should be done in reference to the temperance question. They have asserted that the way to deal with this question is not by prohibition, but is by a strict licensing system, which will restrict these licenses to persons whose character would entitle them to carry on a legitimate business, and in whose conduct the State might repose confidence; and in the second place, they have laid down as a rule that there should be, on the part of the Government of the country, a strict law, faithfully and rigorously carried out, to analyse those liquids which are handed over the counters in various parts of the country, to see that they contain nothing that is injurious to the human system. These are the two rules they have adopted, and I feel that, in following out the precepts indicated therein, I am following a true course. But we have been asked to-night, in a very empathic manner, by one of the most powerful and polished orators of the temperance cause, one who, I am happy to say, generally avoids those extravagances of language which characterise others who are high up in authority in the camp to which he belongs, we have been asked by the member for King's (Mr. Foster), what are the reasons; are there any; why is this attempt made; has any agitation taken place; have we any expression of opinion? Are there any reasons, moral or material, any reasons of any kind whatsoever, that would induce this House to adopt the amendment that has just been proposed? Well, I think there are reasons; I

think there are powerful reasons; I think there are great moral reasons; and I think we have seen arrayed, on behalf of this amendment, or something in its nature, gentlemen occupying eminent positions in the ecclesiastical world, not exclusively gentlemen belonging to one denomination, but gentlemen of different denominations, who have spoken, and spoken out vigorously, and honestly, and frankly, and have not hesitated, whatever might be the consequence, to give expression to their views upon this question, which is being so violently agitated. Why, Sir, I think I can afford to stand in company with such a distinguished man as Archbishop Lynch, of Toronto, who, only a short time ago, addressed such a strong and vigorous letter to the public press of this country on this very question. And, Sir, let me point out—and I promise not to weary the House long, because I thoroughly understand that at this late stage of the Session short speeches are far more palatable than long ones—allow me simply to point out one or two of the passages of that letter. He tells us that prohibition is not a sound doctrine; he tells us that it cannot prevail, and he says, to use his own language:

"It is difficult to enforce a moral virtue on unwilling people. They will always claim the right to do as they please, provided they do not injure their neighbors. The church has encouraged voluntary temperance by means of associations; and the Pope has even granted indulgence to these temperance societies."

And so forth. And he goes on to say that he himself, as well as his clergy, have endeavored to exercise all their influence to suppress intemperance, and that he has no reason, and neither have they, to be discouraged at their results. But he goes still farther, and he lays down a doctrine by which I have always been guided in voting against prohibition in this House. I have felt that this doctrine of prohibition is an anti-christian doctrine, and I have the high authority of the Archbishop for saying so, and that is quite good enough authority for me. He tells us:

"It has been asserted that the use of wine is prohibited in the bible. This is not the case. Our Divine Redeemer instituted one of his greatest sacraments in bread and wine."

And so forth. Having referred to this distinguished authority, I may now refer to the remarkable discourse that was made only a few days ago by the Rev. Principal Grant, of Queen's College, Kingston. Amongst other things, he said:

"There were various currents of opinion on this subject, and they should endeavor to embrace such opinions as were reasonable and moderate, instead of forcing them to adopt extreme opinions. There was only one opinion amongst them with regard to the sin of intemperance, but some of them might think that too much was made relatively of the one sin, and that there were even greater evils in the land."

I thoroughly agree with the reverend Principal in that respect; I thoroughly agree that this one sin of intemperance does not overshadow the whole decalogue, and that it is rather too cheap a certificate of all the virtues merely to be a supporter of the Scott Act. He says:

"Men who wished moderate measures were just as strong in their advocacy of temperance, and hatred of intemperance, as the more extreme of them. There was only one opinion with regard to the end to be obtained, which was to get a sober community, but they might differ as to the means that were best calculated to attain that end. Was moral terrorism to be exercised upon men who were not such extremists as others. Those who attempted to terrorise over others, who did not go as far as they, were the greatest enemies of the good end desired—for they were driving out of the ranks those who would feign co-operate with them for the suppression of the great evil of intemperance."

And, Sir, can we find more striking proof of the truth of the assertion of that distinguished gentleman than the utterances of public orators and the writings of the press on behalf of this Scott Act, in the means they have adopted to drag down to the lowest point possible the Senate of this Dominion, who speak of those men as unworthy of any respect, and to use towards them the grossest epithets. But that, after all, I believe, is nothing but the ordinary language of those who have spoken upon this subject with reference to those who are opposed to them. I can men-

tion still others—speaking on the moral point alone—who are equally strong men, whose opinions are worthy of the greatest respect from this House, or from any other body in the Dominion. It is not merely one section of the community, as I said, who have pronounced in favor of the proposition of my hon. friend from Toronto; but we find that the professors of Trinity College; that the professors of St. Michael's College; that a large majority of the physicians of Hamilton; that a large number of the physicians of Toronto—I think, 37—that the mayor of Toronto, and 36 aldermen of that city, and a large number of other persons in exalted positions, whose opinions are worthy of respect, entertain the views that are set forth in the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Small). I shall not say one word about the petitions that have poured in here. We all understand the value of petitions, but certainly we have seen laid upon the Table of this House, from various sections of the Dominion, a sufficient number of petitions to convince us that in this country there is a very strong feeling in the direction of the motion of my hon. friend from Toronto. But, Sir, there is something more than the names of the prominent men and the influential bodies to which I have adverted. There is something more, and it is this: That this law is practical confiscation; it is practically robbing men of their property; it is practically taking from men their means of subsistence; it is depreciating, without any compensation, property that they have honestly acquired. I am not one of those who believe that the brewers and distillers of this country are a set of rascals and scoundrels, who deserve to be denounced. I cannot agree with those who speak of men like the Dow's, the Scott's, the Molson's, the O'Keefe's, and hosts of others through this country, men who stand high in the social circle, men who contribute largely to public charities, men who have done their duty nobly by their country in various ways, men who have carried on a legitimate and legalised business—I say I cannot agree with those who denounce those men on account of the traffic in which they engaged. Sir, let me ask if there is still another ground upon which we can base our argument; are there not other reasons which can be urged? Apart from moral reasons altogether, I say we have good material reasons why this amendment should carry. If we desire to promote temperance in its true sense, if we desire to see the country progress in sobriety—although to-day it appears, from statistics, that Canada is as sober a country as there is in the world, that there is no reason why a feeling of terror should creep over us, on account of the intemperance of our people—I say if we desire to promote true temperance we should look at the experience of other countries. We find that in almost every one of them there is a larger percentage of alcohol used than there is in the Dominion of Canada. Beginning with the United Kingdom, we find that the people consume 1·92 gallons of wine, beer and spirits per head; in France, 2·65 per cent; Germany, 1·60 per cent.; Holland, 2·05; Belgium, 2·07; Denmark, 2·60; United States, 1·31 Canada, only 75 per cent. of 1 gallon. Yet how is it that in France there is little drunkenness among the people? Simply because they use the wine of the country, and are not addicted, outside of the cities, to the use of ardent spirits. There we have a sober people, a people who are not addicted to the habit of drunkenness, and we have a country where the idea of introducing prohibition would be laughed at from one end of the land to the other. The form of our alcohol is far more injurious, and I am satisfied that, in a moral sense, and in that particular we would be making a great step forward by adopting the amendment now before the House. Let me ask, how are we going to deal with those people whose businesses are going to be destroyed? Have they no stake in the country? Let me give you a few statistics. The number of licensed hotels in Ontario is nearly 4,000; in the whole Dominion about 6,000. The assessed value of those

Mr. CURRAN.

in Ontario, in 1883, was from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000. The number of brewers in Ontario and Quebec is 104, and the capital employed, as estimated by the Inland Revenue Department, is \$4,112,888; value of buildings, \$2,397,470; of plant, \$1,331,227. The capital invested in distilleries is \$4,000,000. We have all this capital invested; we have all these men, not only having their own capital employed and their industry threatened, but we have those who are engaged in those industries, those who earn their bread in those establishments, thousands and thousands of them employed directly and indirectly, and we would deprive them, without one cent of compensation, of their occupation, and deprive their employers of what is justly their own—depreciate their property in value and beggar them by the operation of this Act. But we have still more. We have heard here to-night that there was some amount of sympathy with those who favor wine and beer, but apart from the brewers, there is an immense amount of money invested in the vineyards of the Dominion, and you will find, apart from the brewers and distillers, there are coopers, hop-growers, barley-growers and various other branches of business, that are directly and indirectly affected by this legislation. But there are still other arguments. I spoke a few moments ago from the purely moral point of view. In regard to the material aspect, we have the opinions of those whose opinions are worthy of respect. We have had laid upon this Table petitions from bankers, from loan societies, from various monetary institutions, all showing the great depreciation in value that would take place in the country under this system; and I think, with all those facts staring us in the face, we cannot have much hesitation as to how we should vote upon this occasion. But I ask this question: Is it likely that this particular movement will be a success, without having behind it the great moral force of the actual total abstainers? I say you cannot make a people sober by Act of Parliament. Surely you cannot expect that a greater good, a more effective temperance movement and more permanent results can arise from this Act than from the great temperance movement that took place in Ireland some years ago—the greatest movement ever known in the world. I refer to the movement of the celebrated Father Matthew. One or two lines from an authority who has written on this subject. I refer to Mr. A. M. Sullivan, one of the ablest men in Ireland, who died only a short time ago, a distinguished member of the House of Commons of Great Britain, a man who stood high for his abilities and eloquence; and I may say he was one of the foremost champions of temperance, as we understand it—that is, by moral suasion, the effect of temperance societies and of religious conviction. In writing upon this great movement led by Father Matthew, what does he say? Speaking of the two great leaders of that day, O'Connell and Matthews, he said:

"In widely different characters, however, these two men won eminence and praise. One was a political leader, the other was a moral reformer. The one commanded the allegiance of a party in the State; the other received the homage of all. There is scarcely a country in the civilised world in which the memory of Father Matthew is not revered. Wherever good men are laboring for the elevation of humanity, the story of his career is an incentive to brave endeavor; and how far his work has perished with or survived him is a question which excites solicitude."

Speaking on the same subject, at another passage he says:

"I have said that the astonishing success of the Temperance movement, from 1838 to 1845, was largely the product of enthusiasm, and was certain to be followed by a reaction. Even if no unusual misfortune had befallen, some such retrocession would, I am confident, have been suffered, but nothing that would have seriously impaired the reformation which Father Matthew had wrought."

So spoke that eminent historian and distinguished temperance advocate of the work of the temperance apostle, which was aided, not only by his own eloquence and ability, but by the religious enthusiasm that accompanied the work.

Yet he says reaction was sure to follow. Under the Scott Act there will be something more than reaction. It is certain some day to be repealed, but not until the law itself has fallen into contempt and that the country has suffered deeply both in its moral and material interests. I say, in this case, just as in the case of every other movement of this kind, it is better to adhere to the good old idea, leaving the morals of the people to the clergy who have charge of them. They are the men who have most influence, who strike most deeply into the hearts of the people, and instead of seeking to supply their place by legislation, let us honestly and sincerely labor in the direction which is indicated in the admirable letter with which I opened my speech, from His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, and I am satisfied that by working on these lines men who are honest and sincere, men who desire to see their fellow-countrymen and women abstaining from intoxicating liquors altogether, will have far more influence, will have far greater weight, their words will go further, their example far more effective; and I am satisfied that just as in this work the author pays the highest tribute to the brewers and distillers of Ireland, during the time of the Matthew movement, and pays the highest tribute to their magnanimity on every occasion, when they were appealed to on behalf of works of charity and benevolence, so I say that the men engaged in the trade in this country will not regret the temperance movement which will go on—not a movement of confiscation, not a movement under which, by law, a certain section of the community cajole some and terrorise others, by which they close the mouths of one section of the community and intimidate another from acting; but I say these men will hail with general satisfaction a genuine temperance movement, a movement which will have a lasting effect, because it will be based on the principles of true Christianity, will find its way deep into the hearts of the people, and will have a lasting and permanent effect, which no legislation like the Scott Act can ever give.

Mr. CASEY. I do not rise to discuss the question of the Scott Act in the abstract, or the propriety of using alcoholic liquor, but I shall simply confine myself, as far as possible, to the question directly before us, which is, in the first place, whether we should accept the Senate amendment as it was adopted in that House, or, in the second place, whether we should accept it with the change proposed by the motion now in your hands. I think the amendment as it was made by the Senate is so evidently against the sense of the House that it is hardly worth while discussing it. It would be so eminently a breach of faith to those counties where the Scott Act has been adopted, with the intention of securing total prohibition, to change the Act, after they had adopted it, and allow the sale of some intoxicating drinks, that the House appears to have rejected that idea altogether, for I understand that the amendment now in your hands proceeds from those who are, in the main, favorable to the general line of the Senate amendments, and it will be accepted by them, I suppose, as the shape in which they would wish the matter to be submitted to this House. With regard to the question of whether the Scott Act, when submitted in future, shall not apply to ale and light wines, I have simply to say that I consider the Scott Act still an experiment. In 1878 this House unanimously agreed to give the people of any county in this Dominion the right to try this experiment. They have been trying it here and there ever since, and, of late, to a greater extent than formerly, and it has been found necessary to ask for certain amendments, not to the enacting clauses of the Bill, but to its machinery, in order that the experiment might continue to be tried—I do not say necessarily with success, but with fair play. The Bill which is now sought to be amended was brought before this House, and it appeared to

be the opinion of the great majority that we should confine ourselves to doing what was asked for by the Bill, and so amending the machinery of the Act that it would be completely workable. That seemed to be the opinion of the House, because nearly every amendment looking to changes in the enacting clauses of the Bill was rejected by the large majority of this House. That was the general impression as to the feeling of the House on that subject, and the amendment which has since been proposed in the Senate was not, so far as I can remember, proposed here at all. It was not supposed that it would have the slightest chance of being accepted, after the opinion which the House had expressed on several other divisions. I think, under these circumstances, and looking at the state of public opinion in the country, looking at the numerous and very recent victories of the Scott Act in the different counties, I take it still to be the view of the majority in this House and the country that the Scott Act experiment should be still further continued, that the people of Canada should have it in their power to adopt the Scott Act, in the shape of a really prohibitive Act, as it is at present. I am not discussing whether the people should adopt it or not, but I say that they should continue to have the right, as they have had for some years back, of adopting that local prohibition, if they see fit. And I think it is equally clear that the sense of the country generally, and I believe the sense of the majority of this House, is to the effect that the proposed changes in the law would not only allow wine and ale to be sold, but would break down almost entirely the prohibitory character of the Bill. I do not know how fully such an experiment has been tried elsewhere, but it does seem to me that if you allow bars to be kept open for the sale of ale and wine you will, to say the least of it, enormously enhance the difficulty of preventing the sale of whiskey and other distilled liquors in the same bars, perhaps out of the same packages and in the same glasses, as those used for the sale of light wines. In the case of wines, it is easy to fortify them with spirits to such an extent as to make them a great deal more exhilarating than they are in their natural condition, and no doubt wines so fortified would be very strong, if wine was allowed to be sold. I think, then, Sir, that the proposed change would virtually do away with the object of the Scott Act. The object of the Scott Act is to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors, and if you permit the sale of such liquors under the Scott Act, I do not see much use in allowing the people to try the experiment at all, or to pass a so-called prohibitory Act, which is not prohibitory. I think, if you make these changes in the Bill, it would be much better to wipe it off the Statute Book altogether, and not go through the farce of pretending to try local prohibition when we are really trying only what is, at the best, partial prohibition, and what will be, in the majority of cases, no prohibition at all; for I am quite certain that if bars are open for the sale of these light drinks something harder, as the phrase goes, will be sold along with the light drinks. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who spoke just before me, said that the Scott Act was a confiscation of property. That question has been discussed a good deal already, and may be discussed again, but I do not believe this is the time to discuss it. We are not discussing whether there should be a Scott Act or not; we are discussing whether it should be modified in certain respects. The House is clearly in the mood to retain that Act in some shape; it is therefore quite out of place to discuss whether it involves the confiscation of property or not. If it does, and if the House and the country can be made to see that it is unjust to any body, then compensation can be demanded and undoubtedly could be had; but this is not the place or the time to raise that question, and it is not, I think, in accordance with the propriety of debate, to attempt to arouse feeling against those who take the temperance view of the question by pointing to alleged injustices in the Act itself, which are

not involved in the question now before us. The same may be said of the hon. gentleman's remarks as to the respectability of brewers and distillers, and the unchristian nature of the Act altogether, and of the high authorities he quoted against it. These are all debatable subjects, but they do not concern the case before us at present. The opinions of archbishops and other high dignitaries must be received with respect, of course, even by those who do not feel those opinions to be obligatory on their consciences; but I do not see that they have any bearing on the present question, whether we should accept the amendments of the Senate or not. These are arguments directed against the question of prohibitory or permissive legislation of any kind, and do not concern the immediate question we have to consider. My hon. friend, also speaking of the amount of capital invested in the liquor traffic generally, referred to a very large amount as being invested in Canadian vineyards. I know that the amount is very considerable; I know that pretty extensive vineyards exist in my own part of the country, but the hon. gentleman is very far out in quoting these figures, because, as it happens, native wine is exempted from the provisions of the Scott Act altogether, which does not prevent the owners of these vineyards from deriving a full profit from them. Sir, to learn the opinion of the people on this question we need not go further back than this very day. I have been informed that the Act has been adopted in Middlesex and in Lincoln by large majorities, while in Perth the result appears to have been unfavorable to the Act, though there are a number of places to hear from; but when we find that out of three counties in which the Act is submitted on a given day it has been adopted in two, I think we are bound to conclude that the opinion of the country, as shown in the only way in which it can be shown, is still in favor of trying the experiment. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) dropped one or two suggestions which I think are worthy of attention, and which should, perhaps, be put into practical shape before this question is settled, if it be considered necessary to put them into practical shape this Session. He suggested that the people might have the option of voting on the Scott Act as it stands as against the Scott Act with beer and wine in it. I do not see so very much objection to that, although I do not believe the adoption of a partially prohibitory Act would have much meaning; but if there be a county which is not willing to adopt prohibition pure and simple, but is willing to adopt prohibition of distilled liquors, I think that experiment might be tried. I think, however, that this should only be done in counties where the Scott Act has been submitted and has failed to carry, or in counties where there was not a sufficient number of petitioners to obtain a submission of the Act itself. There may be places where a modified Act is the only one which would suit the people, but I think it would be wrong, in the interest of the experiment we are trying, and in the interest of public morality, if we prevented those counties which prefer the Scott Act as it is from having that kind of an Act, in order to suit counties which prefer modified prohibition. Several schemes have been canvassed in my hearing for the submission of those alternatives to the people; there may be a chance, later on, of discussing some scheme of that sort; but what I wish to point out is, that if there is any injury done by making the Scott Act, at all times and in all places, a wholly prohibitory measure, the way to remove that injury is not by providing that the Scott Act, always and in every place, shall be merely a partially prohibitory measure, but by providing that the people shall have an opportunity of trying two or three alternatives at different times, until they find one which will meet their peculiar views. With these views, I cannot help voting both against the amendment in your hands and against the amendment which has come down from the Senate, either

Mr. CASEY.

in its present shape, or amended, as it will be, if this amendment passes.

Mr. GIROUARD. I rise, not for the purpose of making a speech. I wish to call the attention of the House to some statistics which came under my notice four or five weeks ago. In the *Cincinnati Enquirer* of the 28th of March last, I find a condensed report of a commission which was appointed by the Swiss Government, upon the causes of the spread of intemperance into that country; and as I believe the figures and statements contained in that report have a great bearing upon the question under consideration, I will ask the permission of the House to trouble it with a few extracts. The article is headed: "Drink in all Countries," and is taken from the *London Times*:

"The consumption of alcoholic drinks in Switzerland, especially in the objectionable form of ardent spirits, and that of the still more pernicious absinthe, has so portentously increased during the last ten years, and the evils resulting therefrom are so great and manifold, that a short time ago the Federal Council resolved to undertake a searching inquiry into the whole subject, with a view as well to setting the facts in their true light as to the suggestion of such corrective measures as the necessities of the case may appear to demand and legislation be able to compass. The work, as all who consult the message of the Federal Council on the subject will agree, has been well and thoroughly done. The message is supplemented by a report from Dr. Schuler, Federal Factory Inspector, and accompanied by a bulky volume, in which are set forth the laws and experiences of several foreign States on the drink question, prepared by the Federal Bureau of Statistics. All these productions are published in the two principal languages of the Confederation. The message and Dr. Schuler's report are admirable examples of compression. They contain, within a small compass, not alone pretty nearly everything that behooves Swiss legislators to know, but much that must needs prove highly useful to all who are interested in the condition of the people and the great question of drink."

Then the article goes on to say, that between 1851 and 1855:

"The imports of spirits are increasing much faster than the imports of wine. Between 1851 and 1855 they were 35,588 quintals; according to the latest returns they are now 130,000 quintals. Here, again, we have to note the significant increase that took place after the war. This increase has been going steadily on ever since."

On the other hand, when the importation of spirits was increased, the production of the native wines in Switzerland decreased:

"The vineyards of Zurich, Scallhausen and Aargau, which gave nearly 500,000 hectolitres in 1874, and upwards of 800,000 in 1875, gave only 314,000 in 1881 and 113,000 in 1882, and the annual average falling off in the Confederation at large is estimated at from a-fourth to a-third, as compared with 1874, 1875, 1876, and previous years. Cider, which was once produced more largely than wine, has suffered even a greater diminution."

Then, in this report is a table carefully compiled from the latest returns, showing the consumption per head in divers countries, of spirits, wines and beer, and in this statement Canada stands as the most sober country in the world:—

	Spirits 50 Deg. of Alcoholic Strength. Liters.	Wine. Liters.	Beer. Liters.
Canada .....	3·08	0·29	8·51
Norway .....	3·90	1·00	15·30
United States.....	4·79	2·64	31·30
Great Britain and Ireland.....	5·37	2·09	143·92
Austria-Hungary .....	5·76	22·40	28·42
France .....	7·28	119·20	21·10
Russia .....	8·08	Unknown.	4·65
Sweden .....	8·14	0·36	11·00
German Zollverein.....	8·60	6·00	65·00
Belgium.....	9·20	3·70	169·20
Switzerland .....	9·40	55·00	37·50
Netherlands .....	9·87	2·57	27·00
Denmark .....	18·90	1·00	33·33

This table is followed by a condensed report of the liquor-drinking habits of the people in different countries:—

"France is thus, of all nations, the largest consumer of alcoholic drink; next come Belgium and Switzerland, almost neck and neck; Denmark makes a good fourth, while England ranks only fifth and Germany sixth. If the facts on which these conclusions are based had any less trustworthy warrant than that of the Swiss Government and its excellent statistical bureau, their accuracy might be open to doubt, so widespread is the belief that an abundance of light and low-priced

wines necessarily promotes moderation, and that we English are heavier drinkers than our continental neighbors. But these wines, though light, are dearer than they used to be, and contain more than twice as much alcohol as beer, and Frenchmen take wines almost as freely as Englishmen take malt liquor. Everybody in France, even women and children, drink some wine, and for a man in fair health, two liters a day are not considered too much. Frenchmen, moreover, are very fond of black coffee, and a half cup of black coffee is almost invariably accompanied by a 'petit verre de cognac.' The consumption of spirits in the shape of cognac, absinthe and vermouth must be very great, and has, doubtless, as in Switzerland, been increased by the relative scarcity and high price of wine. Then there are no total abstainers in France, and though there is more drinking than in England, there is probably less drunkenness. An English workman takes his 'drop too much' on the Saturday and Sunday, and redresses the balance by taking next to nothing on other days. A French workman makes no difference between one day and another; he may never get drunk, yet at the end of the week he has probably swallowed twice as much alcohol as his English confrère."

I call especially the attention of the advocates of prohibition to the following statistics:—

"A singular and suggestive fact brought out in the message is that, contrary to the generally received theory, there seems to be no direct connection between drunkenness and facilities for drinking. Two maps are given side by side, one colored, so as to show the proportion of deaths from alcoholism in every canton of the Confederation; the other shaded, so as to show the number of taverns per 1,000 inhabitants in the same district. The canton in which there are most deaths—10·1 per 1,000 of the total number certified—is Solothurn, and in Solothurn there are eight public houses per 1,000 inhabitants. In Thurgau, on the other hand, with twelve public houses per 1,000, the proportion of deaths from alcoholism is only ·9 per 1,000. Graubunden, with ten public houses per 1,000, has 2·7 deaths per 1,000; while Berne, with 8·3 deaths per 1,000, has no more than four taverns per 1,000. In Ticino it is just the reverse—ten taverns and a death rate of 1·3. The same in Canton Schwyz, twelve public houses and 2·9 deaths. The only canton in which the number of public houses seems to have any relation to intemperance is Neuchatel, where they are nine per 1,000, and the deaths 10·2 per 1,000."

My attention was also called, the other day, to a little paragraph which appeared in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Paper* of 30th May, which said:

"The assembling of 600 brewers is the rare sight that New York has just witnessed. They represented 3,000 breweries, which manufacture 16,000,000 kegs of beer every year and employ 500,000 men—one thirtieth of all the able-bodied workmen in the United States! No beer was served to the convention, though it was held in a beer garden, and the brewers all sat around drinking cold water! Then, stranger yet, there was a 'temperance address,' in which the orator bewailed the evils of intemperance after the best style of Gough, and urged that temperance be promoted by encouraging the use of malt liquors and by controlling, and, if necessary, prohibiting the sale of distilled liquors. To effect this end, he called for the abolition of taxes on beer and the increase of taxes on whisky and other spirituous liquors, 'which are the curse of the world.' The view taken is by no means new, but it assumes a novel aspect, by being put forth seriously, and no doubt sincerely, by brewers, who appear in the role of reformers. The question raised is not to be lightly laughed down or safely ignored. It will make itself heard and demand consideration. Neal Dow's recent statement, that ardent spirits were causing more distress in Maine than ever before, coupled with the admitted failure of prohibition in Kansas and Iowa, makes it imperative that the problem of drunkenness be re-examined."

I submit these statements and figures to the serious consideration of the members of this House, who, I have no doubt, are all interested in the promotion of the cause of temperance. My own opinion is, that the amendment which has been proposed, to permit the use of light wines and beer, is the best one—not only the best one, but the only one—for promoting the cause of temperance. When I was in Europe last year, not spending a very long time, but long enough to notice whether there was any drunkenness or not, when I travelled through France and Italy, I was greatly astonished that I did not find a single man under the influence of liquor, although light wines were distributed at all the railway stations, hotels and restaurants, and were taken by everyone—men, women, and children—the same as water in this country. From the statements which I have read and from the experience of the past, I believe that the system of permitting and encouraging the use of light wines and beer will be the best mode of promoting the cause of temperance. I must admit, however, that there is a great deal of force in the argument

of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby). Many people believe that this moderate mode, between the licensed tavern, where all sorts of liquors are to be found, and prohibition, is not the right one. I must admit that there is a great deal of force in my hon. friend's argument, when he says: Let the two plans be tried; let the people judge for themselves, in regard to this matter; and I hope that some hon. members who have paid more attention to this subject than I have, will, before this discussion is over, bring in an amendment to meet this difficulty, so that the people will have the option of trying the Scott Act with a prohibitory clause, or of trying the Scott Act with light wines and ale. Finally, if any measure of that kind is to be adopted, I hope the Government, in order to give more effect to it, will do something towards promoting the cause of temperance in the sense in which I understand it, and in the sense in which it is understood by so many. I hope that the Government will remove all duties upon light wines and beer, so as to make them a cheap drink, that will be accessible to the mass of the people of this country. My firm conviction is, that if you have prohibition as far as ardent spirits are concerned—prohibit strong drinks if you like; I have no objection to that, if we have cheap light wines and beer instead, with no duty—that would be not only the best mode, but the only mode of promoting the cause of temperance.

Mr. FAIRBANK. With the theory of those who honestly believe in the doctrine that it may be better to indicate, by legislation, to the community, what they should drink, rather than prohibit their drinking altogether, those who maintain that the moderate use of pure wines and light ales is not injurious, those who maintain that for certain communities that settle in this country—I refer more particularly to the Germans—an absolute prohibitory law is severe, with those who maintain, and honestly maintain those ideas, I certainly have no quarrel, and it is a matter of no importance to this House whatever as to what my individual opinions upon these points are. But, if any scheme of this kind was at any time seriously proposed for our consideration, it would be necessary, I think, for those who proposed it, to indicate somewhat clearly how those pure articles are to be obtained. We are well aware that the use of the compounds of almost everything, and that wine adulterated in almost every manner, is not carrying out the idea that those hon. gentlemen have. Representing, as I do, a county which has, by an overwhelming majority, adopted the Scott Act, I may be asked, as this amendment cannot affect my county, why I should occupy the time of the House. It is not clear that the amendment does not affect those constituencies which have adopted the Scott Act. I believe it is always a sound principle in military matters to guard well your frontier. If the counties which have adopted the Scott Act are to be surrounded by counties in which it is prohibited, the chance of success is very materially reduced. The amendment is not to allow any county which has not yet adopted the Scott Act to exclude these lighter drinks; and that is an undermining principle, with regard to those counties which have adopted the Scott Act already. It does not propose directly to cut down the Scott Act, but it proposes to girdle it so that it will naturally die. Again, the proposition would tend largely to prevent the adoption of the Scott Act with this amendment added. There are many, as you are well aware, zealous temperance men, who have no sympathy whatever with the movement in favor of light wine and ale. They believe, and honestly believe, that it is only the door to more intoxicating drinks, and that its tendency is not good. That class of men would not move in the direction of the Scott Act with this amendment. They would unite with those who are entirely opposed to the Scott Act; they would unite and conquer. The amendment, to my

mind, simply means that this House shall assert that the Scott Act is wrong, and that it must be allowed to go no farther—in fact, that it is of the nature of an infection; that we must deal with it as we do with infected cattle, and segregate it. I do not believe this House is prepared to do that. The proposition, as it comes from the Senate, involves an amount of trifling with the people which I do not for a moment believe this House will entertain. To my mind the proposition is monstrous. Having granted seven years ago this local option to counties, many of them have taken hold of it vigorously, and have adopted it, and now the opponents of the Scott Act, finding that they could not successfully defeat it in an open fight—because great exertions have been made to defeat it, and great sums of money have been spent in the trial counties—finding that they cannot oppose it in a fair and legitimate way, they now attempt to undermine it by means of this amendment, which I think, is entirely opposed to the sense of fair play which should prevail in this House. I believe it is contrary to the sentiments of a majority of the men of this country, and of 95 per cent of the women of this country.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not desire to detain the House, but I must say that I am decidedly opposed to the amendment. It *pro tanto* endorses the amendment of the Senate, and I have no doubt the object of it is to render the Senate amendment a little more palatable to some members of the House. Now, Sir, I trust that all who are opposed to the Senate amendment, permitting beer and light wines to be sold in the Scott Act counties, will vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Small).

House divided on amendment of Mr. Small.

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Benoit,	Gaudet,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Paint,
Billy,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bryson,	Guay,	Pope,
Burnham,	Guilbault,	Pruyn,
Burns,	Hall,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Riopel,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Carling,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Caron,	Kilvert,	Ross,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Royal,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Rykert,
Coursol,	Landerkin,	Small,
Curran,	Langevin,	Stairs,
Outhbert,	Lesage,	Taschereau,
Daly,	Livingston,	Tassé,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Vessaluniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	Vanasse,
Vessaluniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Wells,
Dodd,	McCarthy,	White (Cardwell).—78.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Allan,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McIntyre,
Allison,	Fisher,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	McLellan,
Auger,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fortin,	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	Mills,
Barnard,	Gault,	Mulock,
Bell,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gigault,	Ray,
Blake,	Gilmor,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Guillet,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Harley,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Hickey,	Springer,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Innes,	Taylor,
Casey,	Irvine,	Temple,
Oasgrain,	Jamieson,	Trow,

Mr. FAIRBANK.

Catdral,  
Charlton,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Davies,  
Dickinson,  
Dundas,  
Fairbank,  
Farrow,

Jenkins,  
Kaulbach,  
King,  
Kinney,  
Kirk,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Macdonald (King's),  
McCraney,

Yail,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Watson,  
White (Hastings),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wilson,  
Wood (Brookville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Wright.—86.

Amendment negatived.

On the main motion,

Mr. FOSTER. Having been so unfortunate as not to be able to present my argument at a time when it might have been more appropriate, I seize the present opportunity to say a few words on this question. I took occasion, when up before to ask any hon. gentlemen who were in favor of this amendment and the principle it involved to give their reasons why this legislation should pass. In reply to that, several hon. gentlemen have spoken, amongst them my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron), my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Curran), and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard); and these hon. gentlemen have certainly not been wanting in mental ability nor in experience in parliamentary debate to present the best side of the case that it was possible to present. I respectfully call the attention of the House to the arguments which have been presented by these hon. gentlemen, in order to induce the House to pass this legislation. And first I will deal for a moment with my hon. friend from Victoria. The first argument he gave why the wine and beer clause should be introduced into the Scott Act was this: that he had an opinion; he had expressed it before and he adhered to it yet, that this Act was unconstitutional, and I suppose the thought that the unconstitutionality of the Act would immediately disappear when the wine and beer clause was added to it. The second argument that he advanced in favor of the wine and beer clause was this: He said to the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), "if you do not vote for one of these, you will vote for the other, I suppose." His third argument was that the member for Lanark had either made a joke or had spoken in earnest, and if he had done the former of these two things it was an impertinence. He then proposed this statement: That hon. gentlemen of his way of thinking were just as able soberly to discuss this question as the hon. gentlemen of our way of thinking. Then he undertook what he called his sober argument, I suppose; he launched out into a description of the different kinds of intoxication. He declared there were at least three kinds—there might be four. One was the intoxication of spirituous liquors, and of that he said but little. Another was the intoxication of enthusiasm, which he blamed upon gentlemen who are opposed to his amendment. The third was the intoxication of prejudice and bigotry, which he tried to show belonged to those who advocated the Canada Temperance Act, and no others. The fourth was a kind of intoxication which he insinuated was indulged in by gentlemen who stood upon temperance platforms, although he disclaimed an intention of imputing it to any members in this House. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that those were the sole arguments which the hon. member for Victoria advanced as a reason why we should introduce this legislation and destroy the Canada Temperance Act that far. It is not because the hon. gentleman lacks ability; he is an able man. It is not because he is unaccustomed to debate; he is a lawyer of a great many years' standing, and therefore he cannot be accused of lack of skill in presenting his ideas. I cannot account for it in any way other than this: he had no case, and he beat about the bush for a little while, to allow him to retire under cover of the noise. I next come to speak of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). He proceeded to give his reasons why the wine and beer clause should be introduced.

But that hon. gentleman let the cat out of the bag entirely. He did not bring forward one single argument why wine and beer should be introduced, but he proceeded to make an anti-prohibitory speech from first to last, and that is just exactly what, in my opinion, this movement means. It is not simply that you may get a better proposition before the public, that you may get a better *modus operandi* in the counties and cities; it is to place something in the Canada Temperance Act which, if it had been inserted as the Senate put it, would have destroyed it in every county and city where it has been carried, and if the amendment were adopted it would have immediately stopped all agitation for the further adoption of the Act. These are arguments against prohibition entirely. Let us examine them for a moment. The hon. member went on to say that a temperance advocate united hatred and holiness. Very well. If that is his opinion, I am willing he should enjoy it. It is not, however, any argument why wine and beer should be placed in this Act. He said that temperance and prohibition are widely different. I grant that in part. I hold that every honest prohibitionist is a temperance man, and that a man may be a good temperance man, so far as it goes, although it does not go the length of temperance legislation, and still be opposed to prohibition. But that is not an argument why wine and beer should be put into the Act. He goes on, and gives reasons why this legislation should be made. What are they? The first reason is that Archbishop Lynch says prohibition is bad; that Principal Grant says prohibition is bad; that the professors of Trinity College, the professors of St. Michael's College, and thirty-seven physicians in Toronto, all say it is bad; and because of those incontrovertible reasons why the Scott Act is a bad measure, the wine and beer clause should be put into the Act. I give as much respect to Archbishop Lynch as to every other high dignitary, every other able man; but I decline to bow and give up my private opinion, the result of my observation and experience, to Archbishop Lynch or any other man in this Dominion. Archbishop Lynch has said that prohibition is not sound. I give him, with all due courtesy, the freedom and right to his opinion; I honor him for stating it; but that does not make me, one way or the other, in conjunction with that opinion. Archbishop Lynch says you cannot force moral virtue on an unwilling people. I believe that, and I stand on that statement with Archbishop Lynch and the member for Montreal. But when you protest or try to protest against the opening of a saloon opposite your own home, you are not trying to force virtue upon an unwilling people, but you are trying to take away an immoral vice from over against your own door; and there is a wide difference between the two. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) says that Principal Grant does not believe in the Scott Act. Principal Grant is a clever man, an experienced man, in several directions, a man for whom I have the highest respect; but he is only one man, and I do not care what he believes with respect to the Canada Temperance Act or the principles of prohibition; I propose to have my own opinions. I will take his opinions and weigh them, and give them all proper attention, but at the same time I will not sink my entity. Principal Grant is but one. One of what? One of an immense christian assembly in this Dominion, which has its great body of ministers and a great body of adherents, and that general body met in its representative capacity the other day in Montreal, and after it had gone over its temperance report it made this emphatic assertion:

"This Assembly records its emphatic protest against the recent action of the Senate of Canada in passing amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, calculated to destroy its usefulness; and that in the face of the popular will previously expressed in the manner provided by constitutional Government; and hereby expresses the earnest hope that the House of Commons will reject said amendments, and consent to no

change of the Act, except in the direction of strengthening its prohibitory character and increasing the means of enforcing it."

The newspaper, which may be relied upon as regards its reports, was no doubt correct in making this statement:

"Rev. Mr. Macdonnell, of Toronto, and Rev. Robert Campbell, having spoken in favor of the amendment, a vote on Principal Grant's amendment was called for, and on its being put to the vote was lost by an overwhelming majority, amid loud applause. The recommendations of the committee were then carried *en bloc*, several members of the Assembly dissenting. The Assembly then adjourned at 11:30 o'clock."

There is the opinion of the Presbyterian Assembly of the Dominion of Canada, of which great, learned and earnest Christian body Principal Grant is one member, one honored member, but only one; and that great body, coming up with its wealth of experience and observation from every part of the Dominion, from counties which have had the Scott Act in operation for several years, that body with overwhelming force and earnestness gave an emphatic nay to Principal Grant's contention, and made its appeal to this House of Commons, which I believe must give it as much consideration as it would to Principal Grant's assertion or the opinion of Archbishop Lynch. Grant that the professors of Trinity College are opposed to the Act. I can bring you professors from other colleges who stand equally as high, who are in favor of prohibition. Grant that thirty-seven physicians of Toronto are against it. I can bring you thousands of physicians who are strongly against the use of alcohol, even in moderate quantities as a beverage, and who believe that the dram shops should be taken away by legislative enactment. The member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) gives another reason why the amendment should pass. He says the Scott Act means confiscation. The hon. gentleman wants beer and wine allowed and the breweries exempted from the Act. Why? Because of the confiscation of property. Are there no others who have property in like businesses. Why are the distillers, who have millions of capital invested, not to be excepted? Yet my hon. friend makes such a talk about the confiscation of the property of brewers. He is willing to sweep away the distilleries and give them no chance of obtaining any business in the country; yet he is opposed to the Scott Act because it implies confiscation. He believes all that would be cured if wine and beer were allowed to be sold. The hon. gentleman's fourth reason is that you cannot make men sober by Act of Parliament. Sir, I say that no prohibitory law proposes to do that, but if there is anything proved in the experience and observation of men now living in any country of the world, it is that facilities for drunkenness, and drunkenness itself go hand in hand, and it is quite possible for legislation to increase the one as it is possible for legislation to decrease the other. That is all that legislation proposes to do. He spoke of Father Matthew, the eminent apostle of temperance, and of that bright era in the history of Ireland when that great apostle of temperance drew, by his strong, magnetic qualities, and his earnest, eloquent powers of persuasion—drew the Irish people to him on their knees, and pinned on the breasts of millions of them, the medal with his name upon it, and which there are Irishmen who yet wear, and wear proudly as a memento of Father Matthew. But where is Ireland to-day? Where was Ireland then, within ten years after his magnetic influence was over? Ireland has not the same bright record for sobriety it had then. Father Matthew, before he died, placed on record his unalterable opinion that he believed in the principle of prohibition, and if he had that at the back of his great moral suasion, if the work of keeping the whiskey out of Ireland had gone hand in hand with the work of getting the people to give up using it, his great reform would have been better, more effective, more permanent. The hon. gentleman says: Leave the morals of the people to the clergy, and stop making laws. That proposition will carry him to the abrogation of nearly every law we have on the

Statute Book. If it is right that we should not have a law on the Statute Book, prohibiting the liquor traffic, it is equally right that we should not have laws passed against the various vices which become crimes when they are carried out to the detriment of society. I give the clergy the highest place; I honor them for their work and for their office, but I say the morals of the country are not to be left to the clergy alone; I say that in the homes of the country, is the strongest and best moral teaching that the future citizenship of any country can get; where the home influence is sweetened and purified, where the father and mother reflect their virtues on their children, and instil into the young hearts principles which will never leave them. But I say that these homes, too many of them in this country, have over against them the dram shop, which takes away the purity and sweetness of home, which reduces its educative influence to a minimum for good; nay, makes it, in hundreds and thousands of cases, an educative influence for worse instead of better. Next we had the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), who gave us a most astounding argument in favor of beer and wine being introduced into this country. He read from the *Cincinnati Inquirer* an extract from the *London Times*, which stated that the Swiss Government had formed a Commission. And what did it form a Commission for? To inquire into drunkenness, into drinking, and the drinking system of Switzerland and what made it do that? Because the evils of drink were becoming intolerable, because there was a great increase in the consumption of liquors, strong as well as light, and particularly in absinthe, strongest and most dangerous of all, and this was going on so rapidly that a Government Commission was appointed. He read to us that wine was decreasing as to its consumption and import, that spirits had increased, and that cider has suffered a still further diminution than wine. What does this prove but that in the native home of light wines, where light wines are produced in the country, spirits and strong drinks have invaded the country and are driving wine and the lighter drinks out, and are increasing in greater proportions. But if in that country, where wines are native to it, a country which has been the home of the vine for centuries, strong drinks and spirits can come in and drive them out in an increasing ratio, how can we expect to engraft in a country, where spirits have had a dominant influence for years, facilities for light wines and beer which will cause them to overcome these rougher drinks? If that is an argument that we should undertake here legislation which has failed in Switzerland, I fail to see the point of it. He then read an extract from some paper—I do not know what paper it was—a wonderful argument in favor of his proposition. The brewers held a convention in New York; the men who make the beer which they wish to force upon the people willy-nilly, in sixty or seventy counties and cities of this country; the brewers who make the beer and who know what it is, who have their living from it, who crack up its good qualities—and when they met in convention, what did they drink? Their own beer? No, Sir, not their beer but sparkling water, the cup which cheers and does not inebriate. They knew too well the quality of their own beer, and they drank water, and that forsooth is a reason why we should have a wine and beer clause introduced into this Act. I like to see physicians willing to take a dose of their own medicine. But I think the fact that the brewers, at their New York convention, instead of drinking beer, drank water, is an argument, not that we should have less prohibition in this country, but that we should have more. They had a temperance oration there, after the style of Gough—almost, not quite; and the difference between the “almost” and the “not quite” was in this: that while Gough does not crack up the splendors and beauties of wine and beer, this orator was here for the purpose of cracking up the wares of a con-

Mr. FOSTER.

vention which would not drink its own product. Now, my hon. friend wishes at last that the duties should be taken off wine and beer. This is entering the wedge. To-day emasculate the Canada Temperance Act and force on those counties beer and light wine, and then take off the duties on beer and wine, and its friends will be perfectly satisfied until something else is wanted. I say the proposition sent us by the Senate is a proposition which is so tyrannical in its nature, which is so opposed to the principles of free representative government, which is such a relic of that Toryism which I had supposed was long since buried in the grave, never to arise again—it is the manifestation of such a spirit as the people of this country will not submit to for a long time, whether this House of Commons—as I do not believe it will—carries out the proposition of the Senate or not. Sir, I have but a few words to add, and they are these: I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the difference in legislation by the men who advocated prohibition and these men who are advocating the insertion of the wine and beer clause. The men who ask for prohibition sustained the agitation for ten or twelve years, until the Canada Temperance Act was obtained. They did not come in by any side window. They agitated it before the country; from every pulpit almost, from every platform, they put forth their views; they leavened the public sentiment; they brought petitions before this Parliament; they asked for an investigation. They said to this Parliament: If you do not believe us, investigate the workings of prohibition and we will abide by the result. This Parliament investigated it; they appointed their own commission; that commission reported; and upon the recommendation of this commission the Senate passed a prohibitory resolution, and this House also passed a similar resolution in Committee of the Whole. That was the mode of procedure that the friends of prohibition took to obtain what they have now in the Canada Temperance Act. Contrast that with what has been done in this case. A proposition that has never touched the heart of the country, that has never been discussed on the platforms of the country, is, in the dying days of the Session, in a hidden way, sprung upon the other branch of the Legislature, put through it, and brought down to this House; and when it is brought down here there is not a gentleman who will get up and give a fair and square reason why this beer and wine provision should be introduced into the Act. I give a challenge to gentlemen of that way of thinking, that they cannot prove that it is the genius of beer and wine to drive out drunkenness or the use of stronger liquor. In Switzerland, in France, in Germany, in England—in all those countries, for the last twenty-five years, there has been an increasing ratio in the consumption of spirits, although these are the native countries of wine and beer. My hon. friend says he has travelled through Italy and other countries in Europe, and did not see a drunken man, and he therefore inferred that there was no drunkenness. I remember a few years ago George Jacob Holyoake passed through Canada and the United States, and at a farewell dinner given to him in New York, when congratulating the gentlemen who had assembled to do him honor on the country and its characteristics, he said that he had travelled through the United States, from one end to the other, and had not met a drunken man, and he therefore thought there was no drunkenness in the country. It is possible in well regulated countries for the casual traveller, who goes from the railroad to his hotel, and upon the public streets, to pass through and see little evidences of their hidden and secret vices; but it is a fact that there is drunkenness in all these countries, that it is on the increase, with the evil results that are becoming more and more apparent, and that strong drinks in the very homes of wine and beer are driving out the consumption of these, and are themselves increasing in consumption. Suppose this amendment is made to the Canada Temperance Act, I want

to ask hon. members of this House four or five questions. Will there be any restraining hand upon these beer and wine shops in the counties where the Canada Temperance Act is in force? Here are the statutes of Ontario, and they expressly declare that no licenses for the retailing of alcoholic liquors of any kind shall be granted by the Provincial Government of Ontario, in any of the counties where the Scott Act has passed; that Assembly has adjourned and will not meet for another year; therefore, you pass this amendment, and in every one of the counties of Ontario where the Scott Act is in force there will be the free use and the free sale of wine and beer. This Parliament has not power to regulate that sale, and there can be no licenses issued for its sale. When this difficulty was brought to the mind of the Minister of Justice of the Government, in another place, the only way he could get around it was by promising that if that was correct he would bring in a Bill to provide for that contingency. Further, I want to ask who will see that only 12 per cent. of alcohol is in the wine and beer that is sold? Are you going to have an analyst at the door of every beer and wine shop, at every hour of the day that the sale is going on? Is there any machinery in this country by which, when you open your beer shop, you can make it even approximately certain, or have the least idea of certainty, what percentage of alcohol there is in the wine and beer sold in that shop? Is there any one who will see that they are pure? There is no person who will do it. Is there any one who will see that spirits are not sold? If you open up these places you will do what was done in England years ago, when the experiment was thoroughly tried of removing the intoxication of the people of Great Britain by giving them beer shops, and two-guinea licenses were issued—when honest and good men, in the belief that it would do away with drunkenness, introduced that measure and carried it through, and a few years afterwards publicly recanted their opinion, and a commission of the House declared, that it had been a failure in reference to the object aimed at, in its being placed on the Statute Book. Sir, I have to put one or two other considerations. One of them has been alluded to by my hon. friend from Stanstead in the manly and able speech he made here to-night; it is this: Last year, by a majority of 122 to 40, what did this House of Commons say? It said that whenever the people show that they are ready for prohibition we will grant them a prohibitory law. Did we mean that, or were we simply pulling the wool over the eyes of the people of Canada? We meant it, certainly; we cannot take any other position; we do not wish to take any other position; and now we are asked to go back on that declaration. When the people show by their majorities in favor of the Canada Temperance Act, that they want prohibition, shall we go back on that profession, tear it to shreds and say to the people: Even when you have declared that you want prohibition, we shall step in and say: Whether you want it or not, we will not let you have prohibition? Hon. members have talked of petitions. They have brought in petitions in favor of this wine and beer clause, the genuineness of which I am not going to impugn for a single moment; I take it that they are genuine and have been fairly obtained; but we have brought into this House equally good petitions, as fairly and genuinely obtained, having nearly twice as many signatures as those petitions brought in by the other side. We have had petitions from the Niagara Conference of the Methodist Church, representing 23,000 members; from the West End Christian Temperance Society of Toronto, numbering 500 members; from the Yarmouth Temperance Convention, numbering 300 members; from the Grand Division Sons of Temperance of Nova Scotia, representing 17,000 members; from the Manitoba Branch of the Dominion Alliance, and from the Synod of Montreal

and Ottawa of the Presbyterian Church—2 petitions, representing 41,800 members; we have had every Methodist Conference that has assembled within the month of June; we have the great Presbyterian Assembly, which is now in session in Montreal; and we have the Church Diocesan Synod of Montreal, making declarations in the same way. These things ought to appeal to us; they ought to say to us: Preserve the compact you have entered into with us; give us the chance of expressing our opinion on this matter; and if there be any gentlemen present who wishes to give the counties of this country a chance to try an Act which will prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors of a distilled kind, I see no objection to their doing that; but I ask them to put it in a separate Act, and give the people an opportunity to have their choice of prohibition, as the Scott Act would give it to them, or as the beer Act would give it to them. For prohibitory legislation is, in Canada, an experiment; and we can only find out whether it is good or not by results, and we can only get a fair average of results when we give an Act which is good in its provisions, and has machinery for its own enforcement.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My hon. friend who has just sat down has at last delivered himself of that oration in which he was cut short at an earlier period of the evening, and cut short by his own free will, because he chose to take his seat after saying a few words. It is an oration I have no doubt he has often delivered before. There is a ring about the manner in which it has been delivered that sounds amazingly like a platform utterance or a set speech. In fact, his political opponents and mine have accused him of being what I may call a professional temperance orator, speaking for pay, and I should judge, from the fluency with which he has addressed the House, that he is well accustomed, at any rate, to deliver orations of that kind. He, however, in reference to my observations this evening, has with more ingenuity than candor misstated what I have said completely, and misrepresented the point of view from which I addressed the House. I did not profess to enter for one moment into the discussion of the general scope of the Senate's amendment. What was before the House, when I spoke, as my hon. friend well knows, was simply the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), and I merely pointed out to the House that the object of it was to prevent that amendment being retroactive, and simply to give it operation in the future, and I added some observations of a personal character, in reply to observations which I hold were uncalled for on the part of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I did not profess to enter into a general discussion of the subject, of the merits or the demerits of the Senate amendment; but because I did not do so, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) has perverted my position, by saying I did not because I had no other arguments than those I advanced to bring forward. I brought forward no arguments on the subject; I did not profess to go into a general discussion of the subject at all, and I do not profess to do so now, because I think it is unnecessary and useless. I rise only for the purpose of moving an amendment which will have the effect of removing some of the objections which he has pointed out, and one or two of the objections which are referred to in the reasons the hon. member for Lanark gave by his motion for the rejection of this amendment. The hon. member for King's says we want to thrust upon those counties in which the people have expressed their will in favor of the Scott Act this amendment, whether they like it or not; and that is given as one of the objections to the Senate amendment. I do not think it is proper that in those counties which have voted upon the Scott Act, as it stood, the provisions of the Act should be altered in such material respect, without an opportunity being given the people

of expressing their opinion as to whether that alteration should take place or not; and I propose to move that in all the counties in which the Scott Act has been adopted the vote of the people may be taken to decide whether the amendment of the Senate shall apply to those counties or not. I believe some hon. gentleman has it in contemplation to move a still larger amendment, an amendment to provide that also in counties in which it may hereafter be voted upon, the same question may be put to the electors. But in the meantime, the amendment I propose is intended to remove the objection that we are altering the Scott Act in respect to counties in which that Act has been adopted. I beg to move:

That all the words after "that" be left out, and the following words inserted instead thereof: "Provided, always, that in all counties or cities in which the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, may have been heretofore adopted, and after the same has been in operation for one year, the question shall be submitted to a vote of the duly qualified electors, under a proclamation to be issued by the Governor in Council, whether this amendment to the said Act shall apply and be in force in any such county or city, and the vote upon the said question shall be taken in the manner by the said Act provided; and the form of ballot in such voting shall be according to schedule A to this Act, and all the provisions of the said Act, as to the proceedings in reference to voting thereunder, the qualification of voters, the powers to be exercised and the offences that may be committed, and the penalties that may be incurred in the course of, and in connection with, such proceedings, shall apply to a voting under this Act; and if a majority of the electors voting on the said question, to be ascertained as provided by the said Act, shall be in favor of applying and bringing the said amendment into force in said county or city, the same shall be in force therein from and after the passing of an Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette* declaring the same.

That amendment will cure some of the objections, at any rate, which my hon. friends have urged. As I said, I do not purpose on this special amendment to go into a general discussion of the question as to whether the Senate amendment is a proper one. Much might be said about that question. I believe I could, with advantage, if it were necessary or proper to go into the subject at much length, occupy a very considerable portion of the time of the House in answering my hon. friend, but I do not think it desirable or necessary to do so. The subject has been discussed over and over again elsewhere *ad nauseam*, and I have no wish to make a speech for sensation sake, or for the purpose of making a speech. I have no desire to ingratiate myself with any class of the community or to say one word more than my duty as a legislator requires me to say. All I can say is, that ample and many arguments can be advanced in favor of the Senate amendment. Personally, I have always taken the position that the Scott Act is not an Act that ought to be passed at all; and, personally, I would vote in favor of the Senate amendment as being a modification of what I consider to be an improper Act, an Act which, if I could not cause it to be repealed *in toto*, I would wish to see repealed in part. It is idle to attempt to say for a moment there are no reasons why ale and light wines should not be prohibited when the use of spirituous liquors is prohibited. No doubt the evils of intemperance arise almost wholly from the use of spirituous liquors, and by allowing the use of beer and light wines you tend to diminish those evils and mitigate the intemperance that exists in the country, although it is undoubted that there is much less intemperance than there was some years ago. And the decrease is not, in my opinion, attributable to the introduction of the Scott Act, or the efforts made in that direction, but to the improved state of feeling in the country, the improved morals of the people, so that it is now considered a disgrace to indulge in liquor to excess, and to be seen in a state of drunkenness, while years ago that general feeling did not exist and public opinion was not as it is now on that point. There are other reasons for the improvement of public morals, as regards the temperance question. No doubt much of it is due to the application of the License Act, which has been in force some years. The more we improve that Act the more effectually will we restrain,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

in a proper, constitutional way, the excessive use of spirituous liquor. As to this particular amendment, I touch briefly in that way on the reasons in its favor. There is one other reason in favor of that amendment and that is this: It is the ruinous and, in my opinion, most improper sacrifice of property and injury to the interests of a large class of the community, people who have invested money on the faith of existing legislation, which the introduction of the Scott Act has worked. My hon. friend reproaches my hon. friend from Montreal for advocating this amendment and leaving the distillers out in the cold. We need not discuss the case of the distillers now, because it is not before the House, but can it be doubted that the men who have invested large sums of money in the brewing business, which, at the time, was a legitimate and proper investment, and whose property is rendered valueless by this legislation, in fact, is confiscated, have a grievance, and that that is a reason why this ought not to be passed? I believe that every member in this House knows many honest and upright men in his own constituency whose property is sacrificed and who will be ruined by the introduction of the Scott Act into their counties, and yet these extremists say that this is honest and proper legislation, and that these men are not entitled to any compensation. At this late hour, however, I only touch upon these questions. It is useless now to go into them. It is not pertinent to the particular amendment I have moved. I only say that my hon. friend and those who think with him must not suppose that their utterances are the expressions of the will of the people. Because they have succeeded in a certain number of counties in carrying the Scott Act that is no proof that they are expressing the will of the people or of the majority of the people. I defy them to point to a single county in the length and breadth of the Dominion of Canada in which the Scott Act has been carried by a majority of the people entitled to vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. Middlesex went by 3,000 to-day. That is an absolute majority of all the votes.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not know the circumstances of that county, or when the vote was taken.

Mr. CHARLTON. To-day.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Well, that is news to me, and very probably, if the circumstances were investigated, a perfectly satisfactory explanation could be given. I admit that the opponents of the Act have been apathetic; they have not exerted themselves to oppose it as strongly as they should. However, in reference to that county, and any other county in which it has been carried, my amendment would only place them in a proper position, and would prevent any alteration of the Act, making the law different to what it was when they voted, and only coming into force after they had an opportunity of voting upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. Just for the information of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who seems to know less about the affairs of the day than he does about the state of my private accounts and my private diary, I will read the following telegram:—

"Middlesex majority 3,753. More places to hear from. Regard this as an emphatic protest against Senate alterations to Scott Act."

Mr. IRVINE. I do not intend to speak more than five minutes, and I hope I shall have the same toleration as others. After the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) had spoken, I felt that he ought to have been answered, but as the House desired to take a vote at once, I did not attempt to answer him. Since that, the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has given a better answer than I could; but there is one aspect of the case which I wish to look at for a

moment. There was one sentiment the member for Montreal uttered in reference to the good qualities of our people, their religious and temperance sentiments, which I endorse, and I have always great pleasure in listening to any hon. gentleman who speaks well of this country. I am pained sometimes to hear one hon. gentleman accuse another, or one portion of this Dominion accuse another portion, of being unpatriotic or disloyal. I am, I think, a loyal man, I may say an Irish Canadian, proud of the land of my adoption. I never like to hear anybody run down our institutions and our people, and when I hear hon. gentlemen speaking of the greatness of our territory, the length of our rivers, the miles of railway we have constructed, and even the height of our mountains, I feel proud; and when I hear statements in reference to the temperance and religious sentiments of our people I feel still more proud. When I hear people speak of our educational institutions and our schools of learning and our institutions of trade, I feel rather proud; but there are other institutions which we do not feel so proud of. We have the gaols and the lunatic asylums and the penitentiaries, and they are filled with inmates, and if we enquire as to the prolific source which supplies those inmates, we find one fruitful source whereby those places are supplied with inmates; and when we think it our duty to stop the supply, we wish the same right to judge for ourselves that we accord to others. We only ask for a spirit of fair play, a spirit of tolerance. We do not wish to enforce our views upon others, nor do we wish others to enforce their views upon us. I say that a very large proportion of the people of this country, and they are not the worst people of the country either, believe that the most prolific source of crime, of poverty and of degradation, is the drinking and gambling saloons in our country—is the liquor traffic, in one word. These people have spent their money to build educational institutions, they have spent their money to send missionaries to teach people better, to teach people habits of temperance. They have been led by the clergymen of this country, by the praying fathers and the praying mothers, to persuade men and women to be better, and they believe that the only means that yet remains to be tried is to close up the rum saloon. They believe that when they cannot persuade the rum seller to close his saloon, the strong arm of the law should come to their assistance, and compel him to close it. A few years ago there were laid upon the Table of this House petitions from half a million of the Canadian people, praying that Parliament would step in and close up the liquor traffic. In addition to these petitions we had the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, and also the Provincial Government of New Brunswick, petitioning Parliament to legislate against the liquor traffic, and in answer to these petitions this Parliament gave the country what is known as the Scott Act. And I am very much mistaken—and if I am mistaken, the hon. gentleman will set me right; but I believe the First Minister boasted that he supported that Act, although he was then sitting in the cold shades of Opposition. That Act was passed in the Upper Chamber, composed of a majority of Conservatives, and when it came down to this House and became law, the right hon. gentleman boasted that he voted for it. On more than one occasion since, when it was found that the law was inoperative in some respects, the right hon. gentleman declared to those who approached him on the subject that it was the duty of Parliament and the duty of the Government to make the law workable. If I am not mistaken, he promised the same thing this year. But to his shame and his discredit—humble a man as I am, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that it is a discredit to the people of this country that that hon. gentleman should stand up in the House this year and vote against a proposition to give precedence to the consideration of a Bill amending the Canada Temperance Act. He has voted against it to-night again. I ask him

what reason he has to believe that the people of this country, by any act of theirs, have changed their minds upon that point? On every occasion when the people of this country have been appealed to, have they not declared in favor of the Act? Has the hon. gentleman any reason to give for assisting the passage of these Senate amendments, which virtually destroy the Act? For with this amendment the Scott Act is valueless. The spirit and the principle of the Act are destroyed, and the right hon. gentleman has led his hosts in the attempt to destroy it. But there is more than that. I have always taken a great pride in thinking that Parliament placed that law upon the Statute Book. It was a great credit to the people and the Parliament of that day. When the Finance Minister was in England, a few years ago, and addressing a temperance meeting, he referred to the Canada Temperance Act as an Act of which the Canadian people ought to be proud. Well, Sir, who placed that Act upon the Statute Book of which the Canadian people ought to be proud?

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to keep to the amendment?

Mr. IRVINE. I regret very much if I am out of order. But I say, Sir, that I feel proud when I reflect that the hon. gentleman who led the Government of that day, who is now bowed down with years, and perhaps with sorrow, at the treatment inflicted upon him by a base and ungrateful people—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. IRVINE. I am confining myself to the amendment; I am confining myself to the law of the land.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order unless he confines himself to the amendment before the House. The question is on the amendment made by the Senate respecting beer and light wines, and the amendment thereto of the hon. member for Victoria. It is not the general Act at all; it is not the general principle of the Act that is under discussion.

Mr. IRVINE. Very well; I will abide by your decision. I have less ground to work upon, of course, Sir.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Very coarse.

Mr. IRVINE. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is very coarse, I can say the same of the assemblage. The assemblage is certainly coarse enough. Well, Sir, I cannot say that I care very much upon this point as to whether beer and light wines are to be excepted or not from the Canada Temperance Act, and for this reason, that we have practically destroyed the law already by the amendment we have passed to-night. There will be no scarcity of alcohol in beer and light wines. It will not make much difference now whether we tack on beer and light wines or not. It will not make the Act any worse than it is now that the druggists and physicians of this country have liberty to sell; this amendment will not make much difference. So far as I am personally concerned, I care but very little whether it passes this House or not. Then, Sir, there is another thing that I want to say—and I may as well be hung for stealing a sheep as for stealing a lamb—I do not think it is a very edifying spectacle to see a Government in the place of the old Government, with seven members of it voting to destroy the law. I do not think that it is to the credit of the people of this country that a bar should be in this House without a license.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Victoria) negatived

Motion (Mr. Jamieson) agreed to.

Mr. JAMIESON moved that the said amendment be disagreed to for the following reason:—

Because the House has reinstated the clause providing schedules.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:55, Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 19th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ADJOURNMENT TO SATURDAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when this House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Saturday at 1:30 p. m., and that Government measures shall take precedence next after routine.

Motion agreed to.

### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that on the 11th June certain papers which had been very long promised were presented, with reference to North-West affairs. Most of those papers had been prepared on the 21st of April, and although the copying was said to be an obstacle, they were all re-copied in the space of 24 hours after they got into the possession of the copyists of the House. I enquired the following day, or within two days, as to whether these completed the information on the subject which the Government proposed to lay before the House this Session; and the First Minister said no, there were other papers to be presented, and there were also other papers coming down from the North-West, that would be presented from day to day. We are now arrived at the 19th June, and no further papers have been presented. It is quite obvious that all the papers of events which have occurred prior to the rising ought long before this to have been presented; as to the papers that are coming down from the North-West from day to day—of course, I do not complain of the non-presentation of papers which have not yet reached the Government; but certainly all the papers prior to March and April ought, long before now, to have been presented. I therefore press very earnestly on the hon. gentlemen opposite, they having declared they would present the papers in time for us to exercise our judgment on this subject this Session, it being now far advanced, that they ought no longer to delay in bringing those papers down. I may say that the papers which are brought down contain in themselves the evidence—and I have also been furnished with similar evidence from other quarters—that very great gaps exist, and that the most important papers have not been presented. While I am on my feet I may call the attention of the Government, formally, to the fact that the 30th June is approaching, and the condition of Supply is of such a character as it seems to me will lead to great public inconvenience unless the ancient and customary rule of Parliament, which has been departed from already in a most extraordinary manner this Session, of going frequently into Supply, be at once resumed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to remind the First Minister that some weeks ago certain returns with regard to timber licenses were promised, and the only return which has yet been brought down is a return of the applications.

Mr. IRVINE.

The returns of the licenses granted, which have been asked for, have not yet been brought down, although they might have been laid on the Table before this time.

### VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to invite the attention of the Minister of Public Works, as I suppose he has more to do with it than anybody else, to the fact that frequently, within the last few days, the condition of the atmosphere of this House has been very unwholesome for all of us, and especially for himself, who is so much in his place here. Of course, I know it is very difficult, in a building so constructed as this, which is practically nothing better than a well, to ensure ventilation, but it has been exceedingly defective within the last few days, and it seems to me that we might contrive some means of getting ventilation better than that afforded through the half dozen panes in our windows, which are all that can be opened. I think it would be highly desirable if at least the superior windows in this House were made so that they could be opened. I may say that from my own recollection of the Session of 1866—which was the only Session we ever spent here in hot months—serious results to the health of many members, and especially those who are most attentive in their attendance here, will result, if the condition of the atmosphere cannot be improved.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. member for South Huron, I may say that I agree with him that the atmosphere is not always very good in this House, especially during this hot weather. I am sorry I have nothing to do with the atmosphere. The heat must be borne, no doubt, though we are doing all we can to bring fresh air into the building. If it is to be customary for Parliament to sit five or six, or seven months of the year, of course we will have to improve the ventilation of the building, not only in winter but in summer. I have called the attention of the chief architect to the state of the atmosphere here, to see whether we could not, by these windows opposite me, obtain an additional supply of fresh air, and I think he will be able to report to-morrow how the case stands.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest that an opening or two in the ceiling would enable the foul air to escape that rises to the top, and would undoubtedly very much improve the ventilation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would allow the gas to escape.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Pope, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and the motion of Mr. Cameron (Huron) in amendment thereto.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am conscious that it is almost an act of presumption on my part or on the part of any member of the Opposition to continue the discussion of this question after the speech made by the leader of the Opposition, which was as able, exhaustive, indictment of the Government as to its policy, which was comprehensive and conclusive, and which leaves very little to be said, and whoever follows that hon. gentleman must necessarily speak under most unfavorable circumstances. The utmost I may hope to be able to do, in the brief time I shall detain the House, will be possibly to present a few facts that may have escaped the attention of the hon. gentleman, and present, from a different standpoint and possibly in a different light, some o

the facts he has presented, and reiterate, as it is necessary to do, some of the more important statements presented by that hon. gentleman to this House.

I shall first review or attempt to review a few of the statements made by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. The Acting Minister of Railways, in introducing this resolution, sought to create a favorable impression by making a comparison between the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the various American Pacific Railways. But such a comparison is not a fair one, because the cost of the American Pacific lines is the nominal cost, is not the actual cost, and a large amount of fictitious capital is represented in the capital account of those railways. We have first the Union Pacific; and anyone acquainted with the history of the construction of that railway must be aware of the fact that the nominal cost is a very large sum in excess of the actual cost of the road. Those of us who are familiar with the operations of the Credit Mobilier, the company that was the construction company; that made a contract with itself as the railway company, and took from the pockets of itself, the railway company, vast sums of money, and put it in its own pocket, as the construction company; the company which paid dividends on its stock, in some instances it is reported at the rate of 40 per cent. per month; the company by which the cost of the road was increased to three times the amount of the actual cost—I say it is unfair to institute a comparison between a road such as the Union Pacific, constructed under those circumstances, and the capital account of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The cost of constructing railways at that time was necessarily greater than at the present time. This road, the Union Pacific, was constructed while the finances of the United States were in an inflated condition; currency was inflated and everything had a nominal price much above its value in gold. We have also the Central Pacific, another portion of the trunk line, built by a company which, by its manipulations of the affairs it has had in charge, has placed itself in a position where to-day, starting with an actual paid up capital of \$12,500 that company has an inventory of clear profit of \$187,000,000, this immense sum of money having been made by manipulations such as are best known to railway men, and representing as the portion of invested capital, the watered stock of the company. Then, with respect to the statement made by the hon. gentlemen, that the subsidy and land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway were smaller than were given to those American roads, I have to state that such is incorrect. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with its subsidy of 25,000,000 of acres of selected land within the fertile belt, and not extending to the ends of the railway and taking in mountain and desert, with its land grant amounting to about 12,500 acres per mile of selected lands, has a better, larger, more favorable land subsidy than any of the American Pacific Railways, with the possible exception of the Northern Pacific. The land grant is much more favorable than that of the Union Pacific, or the Central Pacific, or the Southern Pacific, and probably better than the land grant of the Northern Pacific, which includes the sage plains of Montana and districts of the Rocky Mountains, and comparatively barren land extending along probably one half of the road. With respect to the subsidy in cash: No American railway received any bonus in cash. The United States Government did subsidise the Union Pacific and Central Pacific, in order to aid in the construction of these roads at the time that the United States was in dire extremity, and required, as the price of the retention of the Pacific States, railway communication with those States—I say that, under these circumstances, the United States Government loaned to this railway a certain amount of money per mile, and for that loan the Government took a first mortgage. Afterwards, the necessities of these

railways led the Government to substitute a second for a first mortgage, but it still retained its security on these roads, and to-day they are actually redeeming that debt, paying the interest and paying instalments on the principle. The security of a second mortgage is ample for the Government, and the result is, therefore, that it was not a bonus but a loan, which will be repaid. So that the comparison in this respect between these roads and our own does not hold good, because in our case it is a gift and in theirs it is a loan. Sir, speaking of the American railway system in this connection, and instituting comparisons between the costs of those roads and the cost of any road honestly built will be misleading, in the case of almost any railway corporation in the United States. I believe there is but one of the great seaboard trunk lines of the United States which has an honestly-built railway, which is honestly managed, and whose statement of affairs represents truthfully the actual condition of the road. I refer to the Baltimore and Ohio, which, with its trunk line and extensions, has 1,646 miles of road, with a capital stock of \$14,792,000—a capital stock which has not been increased since the organisation of the road, a capital stock which was paid up at 100 cents on the dollar, a road which, under the management of Mr. Garrett and his successors, has been extended until it had paid, in 1883, net dividends to the amount of \$8,705,000, and had a rest or surplus account amounting to \$45,763,000; a road which has gone on paying 10 per cent. dividends on stocks, and using its surplus revenues to increase its business and extend its road—a road whose stock never has been on the market, which could not be bought to-day for 400 cents on dollar—that is a road well and honestly managed, and one which defies competition with the trunk lines, because it has no watered stock on which to pay dividends. I believe that, with that one exception, none of the great railway corporations I have indicated is in a position to institute a fair comparison between its capital stock and that of any honestly-constructed road.

So much for the comparisons of the Acting Minister of Railways. Next, we had an eloquent essay from the Secretary of State, and I am most happy to return the compliment which he was good enough to bestow on me, on the occasion when he congratulated me on having given an essay to this House on the subject of Sabbath observance. His essay was an elegant production, and I would not venture to compare mine with his. It smelt of midnight oil and ink, and nothing more elegant or polished has been delivered in this House, for its language was choice, and every period was properly turned. The only objection I had to it was that he saw fit to introduce in it a vast amount of irrelevant matter, information which might be valuable enough in its place, but information which had no practical connection, that I could see, with the question under discussion. I was much pleased with one feature of that essay. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to take us into—what shall I call it—an imagination hall. He was kind enough to invite us to go in the spirit to the contemplation of the scenes of other days. He brought us back to the early history of Canada, and he pictured the condition of things when the Chevalier de la Salle, with the iron determination which characterised him, was pushing his journeys into the interior wildernesses of this continent. He spoke of the times which were made memorable by the deeds of such men as Frontenac, Champlain and Montcalm —

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not speak of them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not say you did; I said you brought us back into the period made memorable by the achievements of these men, and I could almost hear, in imagination, the roar of the rapids of Lachine awakening the echoes of the wilderness. I could almost imagine that I was there, and saw these tribes of savages, the Ottawas,

the Algonquins, the Chippewas and the Hurons, with their loads of fur, assembled at Montreal from the depths of the northwestern wilderness; and I was only recalled from the imaginative scene which, with his power of word-painting, he pictured so vividly, by the cry of "All aboard for Winnipeg, Fort Moody, Yokohama, and Shanghai;" and I could almost imagine I saw the hon. gentleman with a gold band around his cap and a lantern on his arm about to start his train for the west. The hon. gentleman came down from the region of fancy, and one of the first things that he professed to be unable to understand—for evidently there are some things in nature, as well as in politics, which he does not understand—was why the Liberals were unwilling to build the section of the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior, and why they were shut up to a scheme which would cut them off in winter from access to the North-West. Well, Sir, that question has often been debated, and I do not think it is worth devoting much time to it to-day; but perhaps it might be as well to explain to the hon. gentleman, from a Liberal standpoint, why the Liberals were in favor, as a temporary measure, of building a road to Sault Ste. Marie, to connect with an American line south of Lake Superior, and there to connect with lines in the North-West at the boundary. The Liberals thought that by saving the expense of some \$20,000,000 and securing, practically, the same results that would follow from the construction of a line north of Lake Superior, temporarily, that it would be wise to adopt this course; they believed that, as a temporary measure, the construction of a line to Sault Ste. Marie, connecting with an American line, running to the boundary between Minnesota and Manitoba, would answer practically all the purposes of a line to the north of Lake Superior; and, foreseeing the strain upon the finances of the country, which we are now feeling so severely—foreseeing that we were about to plunge ourselves into financial difficulties, by proceeding with this mad scheme of building a line north of Lake Superior, they thought it was worth while to save the expenditure of \$20,000,000 if they could reach the same practical results that would be secured by the expenditure of that money. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman descanted on the advantages of branch lines. He informed us that all the American Pacific lines had branch roads striking out in various directions, developing the country, serving as feeders to the trunk lines, bringing a vast amount of business to them, and the hon. gentleman was kind enough to inform us—and I am glad he did so, because it rests on his authority—of the small percentage of the through business that these American lines possessed. He informed us that the Atchison, Topoka and Santa Fe and its connections, does a through business amounting to only 6 per cent. of its gross business, and that the through business of other lines was very small. That argument is one we have often presented against pushing the road through vast stretches of wilderness for the purpose of securing a through trade, which he says amounts to a mere bagatelle, in the case of these American roads. Well, Sir, these roads all have branches, and it is a wise policy for roads of this kind to have branch lines. The Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as the portion in the prairie section is concerned, needs numerous branch lines, leading off in various directions, but I would ask the hon. gentleman how much money has that company expended for the construction of branches in the North-West. Of the sum of \$40,000,000 diverted from the original purposes of building the main line from Callander to the Pacific, how much has been used in the construction of branches in the North-West. Only enough, Sir, enough to build 134 miles, at an expense of some \$2,000,000, out of a total of \$40,000,000 and more, which were diverted by that company from the purpose for which it was organised. The hon. Secretary of State, in the

Mr. CHARLTON,

course of his speech, informed us that he had fallen in with one of the American railway potentates, in a journey to California—no doubt a kindred spirit; and in conversation with that railway potentate he was informed that in the war for the control of transcontinental trade, the victory would belong to the company that could protect its local traffic from intrusion. Well, Sir, that is sound. It is a very great thing for a railway company to be able to control its local business and protect it from intrusion; and in that respect I am ready to admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does occupy a vantage ground, for, by virtue of its monopoly clause, it is able to protect its local business from intrusion in the North-West. But why is it necessary that a railway company should have control of its local business in order to compete successfully for transcontinental trade? It is because the profits of the company are derived from the local business, because the wars of rates between trunk lines from one terminus to another often result in loss, and these companies must have control of their local business and derive from that the profit necessary to enable them to bear the losses incurred by the through competition. There is an admission on the part of that railway magnate that the through business we are aiming for has to be done at such rates that the company must have a source of profit to fall back upon in order to enable it to sustain the losses incurred in retaining that through business from its competitors. The hon. gentleman then alluded to the member who advocates American supremacy, and wishes he could approve of a scheme characterised by American energy and push. It was a general allusion; I am at a loss to know whether he referred to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who is accused or taking a term or two in an American university, or to my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank), who, I believe, had the misfortune to be born among the Adirondacs of New York, or whether he alluded to myself. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us to whom he alluded in that general statement.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman may see for himself; he may see whom it suits.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I will challenge the hon. gentleman to find in our debates one word uttered by me since I entered Parliament in August, 1872, that will bear out that assertion. I give the hon. gentleman that challenge, and I leave the matter there until he has shown some ground for such a statement. The hon. gentleman went on to exhort the party on this side in very fervid tones. He said: Do not try to pull down; we are grieved to see you always defame the good name of the country; strive to elevate and unite and strengthen. Well, that is the very thing we have been doing for years. We have often fainted by the way; the task has often seemed difficult, well nigh an impossible one; but we have been striving to elevate by condemning that which drags this country down; we have been striving to unite by deploring the policy which was separating the Provinces of this Dominion and sowing the seeds of future discord; we have been striving to strengthen by urging the adoption of a policy more in consonance with the needs and resources of the country; we have labored to elevate, to unite and to strengthen, and in every effort we have made in this direction we have been opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Then the hon. gentleman tells us that he was in the United States during an election, and he saw there a model of what the conduct of public men and the people should be. This gentleman who accuses members of this House with advocating American supremacy saw there a model for us to imitate—saw there perfect political institutions—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I infer that. He saw there that nothing was said to belittle the country, but

everything was said in glorification of it. True, there might have been some personalities; one of the candidates for the presidency might have been accused of a base act and of great immorality; but nothing was said against the country. I ask him if he did not hear every act of the Government keenly criticised; did he not hear any Democratic orator accuse the United States Government of corruption of the funds, of failure to deal with the Mormon question, of allowing the navy to decay, of allowing the foreign commerce of the United States to become almost obliterated. In no country on the face of the earth will you hear keener criticism of the conduct of the Government and of its management of public affairs than in the United States; never in this country have we had the conduct of parties more keenly criticised than in the daily criticisms in that country. Then, the hon. gentleman came to his peroration; and he said that notwithstanding the prophecies of evil he had heard, he had lived to see this country progress, to see the North-West settled, to see Canada become great. Yes, Sir, and we grieve to say he had lived to see some other things; he had lived to see 1,000,000 Canadians leave this country; he had lived to see the settlement of the North-West retarded in consequence of a policy inimical to that country; he had lived to see Canada attaining development, great it is true, but much less than it should and would have attained under a proper administration of affairs; and he had lived to see piled upon this country a debt of \$250,000,000, a large portion of which has been incurred for purposes that confer no benefit on the country.

So much for the the remarks of the hon. Secretary of State. And now, a few words in reference to the speech of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). That hon. gentleman gave us some information which was not correct. He told us that the statement that the Union Pacific road and the Central Pacific road were separate corporations was incorrect—that there was no such road as the Central Pacific except as a portion of the Union Pacific. Well, Sir, here is Poor's Manual for 1884. We have seventeen of these manuals, and since the year 1869 the Union and the Central Pacific have been given by this authority as separate corporations under separate and distinct management. They connect with each other, it is true; they are sometimes hostile to each other; the Central Pacific at present diverts all the traffic it can to its southern route, and that is against the Union Pacific and works against the interests of the Union Pacific. There are no two corporations in America more distinct, or that have been more distinct, than these two. Possibly the hon. gentleman may have been misled by the fact that the Union Pacific has a branch 300 miles long, called the Central Pacific branch. Then he told us the Union Pacific does not pass through mountains, that it is a level and easy road. The authorities of the United States must have been very much misinformed. The authorities of the United States assumed that 517 miles west of Omaha, at Cheyenne, the Union Pacific commenced ascending the mountains, and upon that assumption they granted the company \$48,000 per mile for 150 miles, three times the subsidy granted for the level portion, and beyond that, for the balance of the road, they assumed it was sufficiently mountainous to entitle the company to \$32,000 a mile, twice the subsidy of the level portion. The Union Pacific passes over the Rocky Mountains, over the Wasatch range of mountains, and enters the basin of the Great Salt Lake. Then, the Central Pacific continues on its course through the Humboldt Valley, and across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, there are three ranges of mountains on the lines of the Union and the Central Pacific, two of which the Union Pacific crosses. With regard to the standard, judging by the letter of Mr. Stephen, the standard of the Union Pacific in 1873 was to be the standard of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The standard of the Union

Pacific, according to Poor's Manual, in 1872-73, was 80 feet to the mile, whether correct or not I will not venture to say. My impression is that the maximum standard of the Union Pacific, 116 feet to the mile when first opened, was reduced to 90 feet to the mile, which was the maximum grade in 1873. So much for the question of the Union Pacific passing through the mountains and the standard. Then the hon. gentleman informs us we cannot object to the Brockville connection and the Montreal extension. We do object to that. We hold that the Canadian Pacific Railway had no necessity to extend their line; we hold there was no necessity for them to invest money east of Callander. Their business was first to complete the main line and open the necessary branches in the North-West, before investing money east of what was fixed as the eastern terminus. The hon. gentleman told us the Sault Ste. Marie branch will tap Chicago trade. That is the assertion we have always made. We have always asserted that if the proposal had been carried out to build the road to Sault Ste. Marie, connecting with the lines passing south of Lake Superior, we would not only have afforded all the facilities necessary for an outlet for the North-West, but would have secured control of a large proportion of the traffic of the American North-West. We would have given to St. Paul a route to an ocean port 430 miles shorter than the route it has now. The hon. gentleman's assertion fortifies the position that was taken by the Opposition in 1881, when we pointed out that that route should be adopted as a temporary expedient for the purpose of saving \$20,000,000, the cost of building the section north of Lake Superior; and in addition to the saving of money, the reason was urged that it would make tributary to Canadian roads the trade of the vast connections in the United States.

Mr. IVES. They would have tapped our trade and the trade of the North-West as well.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not more than at present, for they have lines at present reaching to Emerson and various points on the border. The hon. gentleman says the Canadian Pacific Railway required two or three connections with the seaboard. What necessity existed for those connections, when they had not even located the line they were to construct north of Lake Superior, when they had no cars and no trade? The necessity would not become apparent until the road was built and had trade, and then an outlet would be furnished by other roads only too willing to make connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman says the company paid for \$20,000,000 of stock 40 cents on the dollar, and that that is more than its present value, and that no objection was made. But objection was made. The watering of the stock at this great discount was objected to from the very commencement, on the ground that it would increase the capital account, the dividend paying account of the road, enormously and improperly. The company, he says, needed this money for extensions and so forth. Well, about the only extension to which they have applied this money, is the extension of their dividend account. The greater part of it, instead of being invested in extensions and in construction account, has been placed in the hands of the Government to secure a series of dividends covering a period of ten years. Then the hon. gentleman informs us that the leader of the Opposition asked that the money in reserve for dividends be taken by the Government, and the money paid on dividends also. The hon. leader of the Opposition made no proposal that the money already paid on dividends should be taken, under any circumstances, and the proposal he made with reference to the amount of money in the hands of the Government as security for dividends, was that the company should consent to use their own money to relieve their own difficulties instead of asking the country to lend them money, while they were paying this amount into the hands of the

Government for another purpose. Then, and it is the last allusion I shall make to the speech of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, he says the hon. member for North Norfolk, who always justifies the Yankees, should talk of their stock watering. I have taken notice of that to-day, and I took notice of it one year ago, on the discussion of the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions, perhaps in language rather severe; and I have always pointed out, in connection with American railway monopolies, the fact that their railway management has been in the last degree dishonest and in the interest of speculators rather than the public.

I now proceed to the discussion of a few points in reference to this measure before the House, which are not directly in the line of the criticisms I have been making on the speeches of the Acting Minister of Railways, the Secretary of State, and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. We will look at this question from two standpoints. First, from the standpoint of the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Like all corporations, it is in their interest to take what they can get, and to keep what they can, and I do not know that they have gone far beyond what may be called a proper attempt to look to their own interests. They made, in the first place, the best bargain they could with the Government, and they made an exceedingly good one. Since then they have looked sharply after their interests, and in every case their interests have been properly attended to; and so far as the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway are concerned, they are perhaps less reprehensible than the operation of nine-tenths of the railway corporations of the United States. I am not dealing with that question from that standpoint particularly. They are looking after their own interests, and are abundantly capable of doing so. Another standpoint is that of the people's interest, and by the people's interest I mean all the varied interests of the great Dominion, all the business interest and social interests—the interests of all the people. The hon. gentlemen occupying the Government benches are the custodians of the interests of the people. They are managing this Government. This Government is instituted, as all civil governments are, for the protection of the people, for maintaining law and order, for guaranteeing the liberty and rights of the people, and it has been and is to-day the duty of the Government to look after the interests of the people. If we look at this matter from that standpoint, I hold the Government have failed in their duty, I hold they have not looked after the interests of the people as they should. The interests of the people have been sacrificed, whether wittingly or unwittingly it is not for me to say, by the Government of the day in their dealings with this company. That being the case, the duty of the Government in these premises has not been performed. The Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate has looked after its interests, the Government has failed to look after the interests of the people, and the failure of the Government to perform its duty and the extent of their failure I shall proceed to show. But before doing that, it is perhaps quite pertinent to the discussion to ask whether this Canadian Pacific Railway is a solvent corporation, whether it will prove a remunerative investment. That is a matter of interest to us all. There are two questions to be answered before this can properly be decided. The first is: Is the North-West a good country? Very much depends upon the answer. If the North-West is not a good country, of course a railway there is not likely to prove a remunerative investment. If it is a good country, as I believe it is, then the business will be developed in such a way as to sustain a railway there. The next question to be answered is: Will the management of the road be prudent? That is a question I am not capable of answering. I should hope that the management will be prudent. Judging from the astuteness of these gentlemen in looking after their own interests, they certainly possess the ability

Mr. CHARLTON.

to have a good management of that road. I answer these questions, then, by saying that, if the country is a good one and the management is to be a prudent management, then the company is solvent, and it will prove a remunerative investment. If we look at the road and its sources of business, I think we shall be satisfied that it has a fair future before it. I see in the report of the company issued yesterday that, in their summary of business, they give various items of the business of their road during the past year. They have transported nearly 1,000,000 barrels of flour, 6,500,000 bushels of wheat, 244,000,000 feet of lumber, 367,000 tons of manufactured goods, and 375,000 tons of other articles. This road penetrates what we are led to believe is the best wheat belt of this continent. In that case that amount of 6,500,000 bushels will be indefinitely increased. It penetrates a great lumber section on the east, and a great lumber section on the west in British Columbia, and it must be expected that the lumber will be carried from the east to the prairies and to the eastern Provinces, and that it will be carried from British Columbia to the prairies of the fertile belt. Then, when our difficulties in the North-West are at an end, when our Indian troubles are settled and the various difficulties that the country now labors under are arranged, we must necessarily have a large immigration into the North-West. The very country that is a rival to it to-day—Dakota and the newer Territories of the United States—are being filled up, and soon will be filled up, and the immigration that is now passing to those Territories must pass over them and come into our North-West; so that, whatever may be the policy of the Government, we are to have an immigration into that section, an immigration which may be accelerated by the adoption of a liberal policy. If that is the case, I think we may assume that the Canadian Pacific Railway is not a bankrupt concern, and has no need to appear here as a mendicant, but that, if properly managed, it will be a remunerative investment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, the hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." I say that, in all probability, as I have always asserted, it will be a speculation which will exceed in the magnitude of its returns any railway speculation which has ever been entered into.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman one question? If he has a rich neighbor and a poor neighbor, which would he rather lend money to? To the rich man? If the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be a very rich company, why should we not lend them the money?

Mr. CHARLTON. If I had a rich neighbor who had a surplus of \$14,288, and he applied for a loan of \$5,000 to carry out a certain work, and it was not convenient for me to loan it, I would say that I would rather he should draw on that amount of \$14,288.

Having made these admissions, which I freely do, with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I ask why is the road in difficulties? There are four palpable reasons for the condition which that road is in at present, and the first of those is that the road has been pushed too rapidly, rapidity of construction, pushing the road through the wilderness far in advance of settlement and of that business which a railway must have in order to make it remunerative. If the population that is scattered along a line of 1,000 miles of railway has sufficient room along 200 miles of railway, then, if the business that 1,000 miles does could have been concentrated upon 200 miles, it could have been done at one-fifth the expense, and for that reason the construction of the road so rapidly through a great

stretch of wilderness has not only led to an increased cost in its construction, but has deprived the company of the business which should have grown up as the road progressed and should have been tributary to it as it progressed towards the west. That is one reason why the road is in difficulties. Another reason is the investments made by this company which were not warranted by its resources and were not contemplated by the conditions of its contract with this Government. That road was subsidised for a specific purpose, for the purpose of building a line of railway from Callander to the waters of the Pacific, with as many branches as the company might be able to build, but no condition was made as to branches. The specific condition of that contract was the construction of a main line from Callander to the Pacific. The resources were provided for this work, and to a great extent they have been diverted from that purpose, and the company has made investments of those resources for purposes not contemplated by the original contract. That is the second of the four reasons for the difficulties in which the road is involved. The third reason is that the company issued \$25,000,000 of stock under the conditions of its contract, and the Government, without consulting Parliament, permitted the company to increase that stock to \$100,000,000, and permitted the issue of \$40,000,000 at prices ranging from 51cts. down to 42cts. on the dollar, and the Government held the balance of that stock in order to enable the company to manipulate the rest of it in any way it chose. In consequence of this watering of the stock, public confidence was shaken in the concern, because, as I will show in a moment, the people of this country and the people of Great Britain and of the United States were just awakening to the mode of manipulation in vogue among railway men with the purpose of increasing their share capital and their bonded capital beyond the amount actually invested in the road. Then, to cap the climax and to increase the difficulties under which the company labored at this particular juncture, it confessed its want of confidence in itself, confessed its inability to earn dividends for years to come, by taking a large sum of money out of its capital, out of the money derived from the sale of its stock at these ruinous prices and by placing it in the hands of the Government to secure dividends upon its capital for ten years to come. This, above all other things, shook the confidence of the public in this concern, and that measure, taken, in the belief of the company, for the purpose of placing its finances on a secure basis, destroyed all confidence in it, and the result was that it was unable to sell any stock at all. These are the four reasons for the difficulties in which the company is involved. But there were other reasons over which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had no control whatever. I have referred to one, that general distrust which existed in the public mind with regard to railway securities, and I will take the liberty, in connection with that matter, to read a page from a standard authority on railway matters—*Poor's Manual*—with reference to the extent to which railway stock-watering had been carried on, and, when this discovery was made, the effect upon the public mind as to the value of railway securities. Mr. Poor, after giving a statement as to the number of miles of railway in the New England States, the Middle States, the Southern States, the Western States, and the Pacific group, and the cost of the roads in each group, proceeds to say:

"The preceding statement is an abridgement of the much more extended one, embracing in detail all the railroads of the country. It shows that since 1880, a period of three years, there have been opened in the United States 28,405 miles of railroad, and that 6,091 miles were opened the past year up to the close of the fiscal years of the several companies.

"The increases of share capital and indebtedness of all the companies for the three years ending December 31st, 1883, was \$2,093,433,054, the cost of the new mileage as represented by share capital and debt

being about \$70,000 per mile. The increase in the three years of the funded debts of all the companies was \$924,165,440; of their floating debts, \$169,880,406; of the two \$1,094,045,846. It is not probable that the cost of the mileage constructed in the three years equalled the funded and floating debts by at least the sum of \$200,000,000. The cost of the mileage constructed certainly did not exceed \$30,000 to the mile. The whole increase of the share capital, \$999,387,203, and a portion of the funded debt, was in excess of the cost of construction."

He goes on to say, and this is worthy the attention of every member in this House:

"It is in this immense increase of fictitious capital that is to be found the cause of the general distrust which prevails, and the enormous decline in the price of railroad securities. From 1879 to near the close of 1883, a most singular delusion reared upon the public as to their value, and this delusion was taken advantage of on a vast scale by able and unscrupulous adventurers. Whatever was manufactured and put afloat was seized with avidity by an eager and uninformed public. The delusion was increased and prolonged by payments on a very large scale of interest and dividends from capital. In this delusion the most loud mouthed and unscrupulous promoters usually had the greatest success. The delusion culminated about the time of the opening of the Northern Pacific, in connection with which visionary schemes of immense magnitude had been put upon the market. Their worthlessness and the rapid decline of their securities, exerted a powerful influence over the public mind, which continues unchecked to the time of writing this. The distrust extends alike to good and bad, so that prices at the present time have as little reference to values as they had at the beginning of 1883. The distrust will probably continue until time shall show what securities are really well based. One cause of the great decline in the shares of lines which were dividend-paying, is the competition resulting from the construction of rival lines. The result of this competition is particularly shown in the two great Pacific roads, the Union and Central, both of which, for many years have regularly paid dividends, but both of which have now been compelled to forego them. A few years ago there was, in public estimation, no more inviting field for railroad enterprises than the State of Colorado. A vast system of railroads, covering the whole State, was constructed with very great rapidity, involving a nominal expenditure of nearly \$100,000,000, almost the whole of which is unproductive."

And further down he says:

"If it be assumed that the cost in money of all the roads in operation in the United States in 1883 did not exceed, as it certainly did not, the amount of their funded and floating debts, \$3,787,410,728, the actual investment was a most profitable one. The net earnings for the year were \$336,911,884, a sum equalling about 9 per cent. on that cost. If the fictitious capital could be eliminated from their accounts, their success, as investments, would have no parallel. If to net income be added the advantages that flow from them, the result would be a matter of especial wonder."

Here, then, is the reason why railway securities have declined, why they are unsaleable in England, in the United States, in Canada. It is the loss of confidence in the roads, it is the lack of ability on the part of the public to discern between the good and the bad, and for that reason distrust extends to all, and that state of things affected the Canadian Pacific Railway. That state of things, with other difficulties, placed them in an embarrassed position, for which they were not to blame except to the extent that they themselves had engaged in the same class of manipulation—stock watering. According to *Poor's Manual*, in 1883, there were 121,000 miles of railway in the United States, with a share capital of \$3,708,000,000, and a funded and floating debt of \$3,787,000,000. According to that manual the actual cash cost was within the amount of the funded and floated debt, was but 51 per cent. of the share capital and funded and floating debt of these companies. According to that manual 49 per cent. of the entire nominal cost of the railways in the United States was water and stealings; according to that manual, for the period from 1880 to 1883, 28,000 miles of road were built with a share capital of \$999,000,000, and with a debt of \$1,094,000,000, and the actual cost of these roads was \$200,000,000 less than their funded and floating debt, and the whole share capital of \$999,000,000, with \$200,000,000 of the funded and floating debt comprised the stealings of the manipulators who had organised to build these roads. So it will be seen that, bad as matters were before, these matters were growing worse. During this period the roads, which had nominally cost \$70,000 a mile, had actually cost but \$30,000 a mile; and the manipulators

of these roads had about \$40,000, out of over \$70,000 of the nominal investment, to put into their own pockets. For this reason mistrust was cast upon railway securities, and the Canadian Pacific Railway shared in the disaster that fell upon all enterprises of this kind. With regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway stock operations, the company itself has not been innocent. It is the very fact that the company was not innocent that visited upon its head the consequences of these developments that were made with reference to American railway securities. What were these developments with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway? They placed upon the market, after the first \$5,000,000 was taken up, \$20,000,000 that was sold at 25 cents on the dollar. They then placed on the market \$30,000,000 of stock which was sold at 51 cents, and they afterwards sold \$10,000,000 at 42 cents. Now, Sir, when this company deposited this dividend guarantee with the hon. gentlemen opposite, they provided for the payment of 3 per cent. dividend for the next ten years. That amounts to 3 per cent. on the first \$5,000,000 sold at par, and it amounts to 12 per cent. per annum on the next \$20,000,000 sold at 25 cents on the dollar; it amounts to 6 per cent., within a fraction, of the \$30,000,000 sold at 51 cents on the dollar; it amounts to 7 per cent. per annum on the \$10,000,000 sold at 42 cents on the dollar; or it yields an investment on the whole \$65,000,000, on the actual money invested in that share capital, of 6·87 per cent., within a fraction of 7 per cent. per annum is to be yielded upon the actual money invested in this road from that dividend security deposited with the Government to pay a nominal interest of 3 per cent on \$65,000,000.

Now, Sir, I proceed to show that the first endowment of the Canadian Pacific Railway was ample for the purposes contemplated in this contract with the Government, when that company applied for a loan in 1884 of \$22,500,000, and an extension of time on the sum of \$7,500,000. According to the showing of Mr. Stephen's letter, published on 15th January, 1884, the company had spent on the main line up to that time \$23,563,564, less \$484,614 paid to the Government to release its security deposited for \$1,000,000 included in the construction account; or a net sum of \$23,078,950 expended on the main line. The amount expended for equipment was \$8,638,306, \$697,369 of this comprising the cost of three steamers; and I charge one-fourth of the cost of that equipment to the account of its leased lines and branches upon the basis of mileage, making a further deduction of \$1,984,734. These amounts make the construction account, including equipment of the main line on the date of Mr. Stephen's letter, \$29,033,153. That was the expenditure made by the company on the contract with the Government. We have nothing to do with other enterprises entered into by those gentlemen, whether they were imprudent or reckless speculations or not, they were not covered by the contract, and the Government and the country did not furnish millions of money to this company to do with it what they pleased. What have they received from the Government towards this expenditure of \$29,000,000 odd made on the main line? They received a subsidy in money of \$12,289,211. They sold land grant bonds and from the amount sold they obtained \$8,876,000 covered by land sales. From town sites and bonuses they obtained \$730,000 more; or a total of \$21,895,711, against an expenditure on the main line and equipment of \$29,033,000; or they had received from the people within \$7,137,442 of the total amount they expended; and the company received other sums of money. They received from the sale of \$55,000,000 of stock \$25,281,754, they received from the pledge of \$10,000,000 \$4,950,000, and, according to the company's own statement, the net earnings to January 15th, nine months, were \$978,000; the sale of land grant bonds of \$10,000,000, not covered in the land sales, amounted to \$1,123,500; or a total from these

Mr. CHARLTON.

sources of \$32,333,254. They received directly from the Government and from all other sources in cash \$25,195,812 more than they had expended on the main line with its equipment. And at that very moment, under those conditions, with receipts \$25,000,000 in excess of the expenditure, they came here to ask for a further loan. They had other resources besides these. They had earned in addition to this 10,000,000 acres of land valued at \$2 per acre amounting to \$20,000,000 if you deduct from that \$1,223,000 to provide for land bonds issued and not covered by land sales. The total assets, cash and land, at the time they applied for this loan amounted to \$44,072,312 in excess of the sum they had expended on the main line. At that time, according to their own statement, the estimated cost of completing the road was \$27,000,000 and the general manager stated that that amount would be reduced by several millions, \$4,000,000 I think. At this time, in addition to the estimated cost of completing the road of \$27,000,000, there was a further sum of \$2,000,000 required to complete its equipment; and the company would have had \$25,000,000 of cash resources in prospect if it had confined its operations to the main line; and with its cash resources and land, in all amounting to \$37,905,802, the company would have been able to have completed the road for \$29,000,000. And yet the company was an applicant for a loan. They were to receive further aid. They were to receive, when the road was completed, \$12,710,000 of subsidy. That was in addition to \$25,195,802. If you deduct \$29,000,000, the cost of completion and equipment, the company with proper management would have had the main line completed and equipped for \$8,905,802 less than the company received from bonds, sales of land, town sites and other items. There should be added 21,246,000 acres of land at \$2, amounting to \$42,492,000, less unprovided land bonds \$1,123,500. Thus, the total resources in cash and land, in excess of the cost of the main line, counting the \$10,000,000 of stock pledged at \$4,950,000, and not counting the issue of \$35,000,000 additional stock, would be \$41,368,500. In addition to this the company would have power to issue preferential stock to the extent of \$26,000,000, power to borrow \$26,000,000; or further resources to the extent of \$52,000,000 in excess of the \$46,000,000 which the company should have had when the main line was completed.

What does Mr. Stephen's letter of the 15th of January, 1884, show that the company had expended on contracts outside the contract with the Government? That letter shows that the company had expended on branch lines \$3,827,000; Callander to Brockville and Montreal, \$3,203,000; equipment outside of main line, as estimated, \$2,682,000; interest on capital stock, \$2,128,000; lines to the sea board, &c., \$3,482,000; acquiring a terminus at Montreal, 345 miles east of its proper terminus, \$390,000; paid to the Government for dividends, \$8,710,000—making in all \$24,422,000 expended outside of the contract. In addition, they had created a preferential charge to secure ten years' dividends on \$8,250,000 securities. This involved a further sum of \$7,380,912, which, added to \$24,422,000, makes \$31,802,912 spent by the company outside of the contract entered into by the Government with the company. This state of things was enough to embarrass any company; this state of things was enough to create difficulties in any corporation; this reaching out prematurely for fruits not yet ripe was the cause of the company's embarrassment. The company should have been content with completing its main line, with constructing the necessary branches in the North-West, and, finding that the construction of this great work would give the backing it required, it could then have reached out for the acquisition of those lines—the line to Montreal and in various other directions, and its approach to the sea through the United

States. It should have been content to have refrained from entering upon those vast projects until the main line had been completed, instead of prematurely undertaking the construction of vast works which they were not in a condition to assume, and when its finances were not in a proper condition to accomplish such a work. It was perfectly feasible that this should have been done by the company, if it had not attempted to perform the task prematurely. The Central Pacific Railway Company after starting on a capital of \$12,500, with its Government subsidies, and its land grant credit, first built the line from Promontory Point to Sacramento. It did not attempt to acquire branch lines and western extension until it built the main line. With the main line built as a basis of credit, it reached out to San Francisco, and after accomplishing that it built its extensions to Southern California, then it constructed the Southern Pacific, and step by step, starting with that meagre amount of capital, it has placed itself in a position where its assets are \$187,000,000, and it had nothing like the vantage ground that the Canadian Pacific Railway has. But it conducted its business prudently; it did not attempt to seize on all advantages it saw, in view at once, but it waited and took one step after another as its resources would warrant. The fault of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not that they could not secure all that they saw in view, but they wanted to get it immediately, they wanted to secure their connections before they made the main line. The calculations made by the company in 1883, I have no doubt could have been carried out successfully, with all the enterprises that the company has undertaken, if they had been attempted two years earlier. I have no doubt that any time between 1879 and 1882, the Canadian Pacific Railway could have floated the whole of its \$100,000,000 of stock, and could have carried out all the enterprises it has engaged in triumphantly. But when the crash came and railway securities were unsaleable, the company found itself loaded up with too many enterprises, and its difficulties were not in consequence of the lack of a proper amount of subvention for the purpose of constructing the main line, but in consequence of its outside speculation.

We have here the annual report to the shareholders of this company, made at the meeting of the 13th of June, which was received yesterday, and if we are to credit this report, and the statements made in it with regard to liabilities and assets of this company, it certainly is very far from being in the position of a company in a state of insolvency. This report claims that the railway company on the 31st of December last was the possessor of assets consisting of railway line, steamships, telegraph lines, dividends reserved, etc., to the extent of \$216,711,000; that its liabilities, consisting of capital stock, bonded debt, land bonds, Government loan, and floating debt, amounted to \$106,914,000; and that its net assets on that date were \$109,797,000. In the same report, casting the horoscope of the future, the company estimate the prospective condition of the road, on the 1st of June, 1886, as follows: Assets consisting of railway system, 3,371 miles, besides leased lines, steamships, telegraphs, land at \$2 an acre, dividend reserved, outside assets, cash balances, etc, \$230,960,000; liabilities, capital stock, mortgage bonds, Government loans, land grant bonds, &c., \$118,892,000. The net prospective assets of the company on the 1st of June, 1886, \$116,068,000. Now, how much of those net assets have been furnished by the people of Canada? In this statement of the company, the estimated value of Government roads is put at \$35,000,000, which will warrant us in stating that they are worth \$33,500,000, the cost of surveys included; and in summing up the assets, or the portion of them given to them by the Government of Canada, we have first the cost of 713 miles of railway, \$33,500,000; next we have the cash

subsidy, \$25,000,000; then 25,000,000 acres of land, valued by themselves at \$2 an acre, making \$50,000,000, or a total of \$108,500,000, or of that professed surplus of \$112,000,000, the sum of \$108,500,000 was given by the company to the people of Canada, or a balance remaining of \$3,500,000 after what was furnished by the people of Canada as a free gift. The proceeds of the lands may be exceeded largely, because the company profess to have sold those lands during last year, at an average of more than \$3 an acre, and if you take that basis, and add \$1 an acre to the value of the lands, we have subsidy paid by the people of Canada amounting to \$133,500,000, instead of \$108,500,000.

Now, Sir, a few words with regard to the main line account at the present time. I pointed out what, according to Mr. Stephen's letter, was the condition of the main line account last year, when the loan was applied for. I have pointed out how large a proportion of the resources of the company, according to his own statement, had been diverted from the original purpose for which those resources were granted by the people of Canada. Now let us have a summary of the main line account according to Mr. Stephen's letter of January 15th, 1885. There was expended according to this statement on January 1st, 1884, \$23,078,000; estimated cost of completion \$27,000,000; proportion of equipment due to main line \$5,954,000; additional equipment necessary, in round numbers, \$2,000,000; cost of the road built and thoroughly equipped, \$58,000,000; furnished by the Government \$108,508,000, or in other words, the Government furnished to the company more than was necessary to build the main line from Callander to the Pacific, and to equip the same, by \$50,500,000.

And now, Sir, for the diversion of the resources of this company up to the recent time, according to the latest statement. According to the letter of Mr. Stephen, of 13th March, 1885, and this report of 13th June, 1885, the acquired lines have cost the company \$8,981,000; the branch lines \$4,605,000; steamers \$697,000; Montreal real estate \$408,000; to leased lines and access to the seaboard, \$5,857,000, of which \$1,312,000 is chargeable to advances made to American lines; in the hands of the Government to secure nine years' dividend \$14,288,000; dividends paid previously to that, \$5,378,000—less net earnings according to their statement, \$1,191,000, leaving a balance of dividends, \$4,187,000; payment on capital stock as per letter of 15th January, 1884, \$2,128,000, less net earnings as per same letter, \$978,000; net balance of capital stock \$1,150,000; equipment of line east of Callander, of branches, and leased lines, including share of machine shops on the basis of mileage \$2,920,000; total diversion of resources of the company from the original purpose that company was created for \$43,093,000. I have given the proportion of the value of workshops and other property, chargeable to diverted resources, according to the mileage of the branch lines and leased lines, as compared with the main line, at one-third. Now, we should include in this portion other large sums, for general equipment, for maintaining the staff, for tools, etc., as money diverted from the original purposes for which the company was chartered. Now, I wish to draw your attention to a point of very great importance in connection with this diversion of capital. If the company were to divert capital at all from their contract for the construction of the main line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, that diversion should certainly have been for the construction of branch lines in the North-West. That company was chartered for the purpose of affording access to the North-West and connection with British Columbia; it was not chartered for the purpose of creating rival lines in Ontario or for extending its lines to the seaboard. Those roads were in existence already; the Grand Trunk was serving the west; the St. Lawrence and Ottawa and the Canada Central were performing their respective functions. It was not necessary

for the Canadian Pacific Company to own these roads. I repeat that we could forgive the company if a very large portion of this \$43,000,000 which was diverted from the original purposes of their contract, had been expended for the construction of branch lines where they were needed in the valleys of the Saskatchewan, the Assiniboine and the Red River; but how much was expended for this purpose? Of that \$43,000,000, the company have probably used \$2,000,000 for the construction of 134 $\frac{1}{2}$  miles of branch lines in the North West, while \$41,000,000 was devoted to other purposes never contemplated by the contract. Of course, Sir, the company could wait for the development of the North-West; that was their preserve; they could bide their time; they were not compelled to consult the wishes and interests of the people of that country, so far as they might conflict with their own interests; the Government had taken abundant care that that preserve should not be interfered with. The company had, as the hon. Secretary of State has said, absolute control of their local business; they had a monopoly clause in their contract, and if they did not choose to build lines of railway in the North-West, other people could not do so without the consent of their friends the members of the Government. But it was different in the east; there was an empire to grasp, and they thought it best to grasp it soon. They acquired 345 miles of railway, reaching from Callander to Montreal, the road from Carleton Place to Brockville, the road from Carleton to Perth, and the St. Lawrence and Ottawa; they secured the construction of a road from Perth to Toronto; they acquired the line from Toronto to St. Thomas, and the line from Toronto to Owen Sound; they made provision to secure an outlet to the seaboard through American territory; they expended millions for these purposes, because they wished to grasp an empire, because they wished to establish themselves as the great monopoly railway corporation of Canada. It was a far seeing scheme; and but for untoward circumstances, they would have carried it out triumphantly; they would have sold their \$100,000,000 of stock but for the breakdown of railway securities in the financial world. Under the circumstances, we have a right to criticise severely perhaps not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but the Government that permitted these things, that paid out this money for the purpose for which it was being used, that permitted the issue of this stock, knowing the prices at which it was being sold, that allowed this company to hold in its hands a reserve of \$45,000,000 to be subscribed for as they might think proper, and that permitted the investment of these large sums in schemes not involved in their contract, knowing by the development and signs we had, that these schemes were embarrassing the company and placing them in a position where, to carry out their original contract, they would be obliged to appeal to the Government for additional aid. We have a right to criticise and to condemn the Government for permitting these things on the part of the company, although we may have nothing to do with the affairs of the company itself. Now, the ultimate solvency of the company seems to be a matter that admits of no doubt. I see by its report, the company estimates its fixed charges at \$3,000,000 for the future, 4 per cent. on the Government loan, 5 per cent. on \$15,000,000 of first mortgage bonds; the interest on the sum owed to the Government of Quebec; the interest on the Canada Central bonds, &c., and the interest on \$9,800,000 of the Government loan, making up that sum. These are the fixed charges of the company; and with its unrealised assets in lands at \$2 per acre of \$42,799,000, and with the fact that on the 31st of December last it had in the hands of the Government the sum of \$14,288,000, it does not seem to me that this company is in such desperate straits; it does not really seem to me that there is any necessity for its calling upon

Mr. CHARLTON.

the Government of this country for an additional \$5,000,000, when its credit is already so badly strained; it does not seem to me that it should require to ask for a change in the security on which the Government loan is based. According to their own statement, they have available assets in cash of \$14,288,000 now in the hands of the Government, placed there to secure dividends on their capital stock. Now, I will tell you what I think they had better do. The position reminds me of a story of an insolvent who had failed several times. A friend who had not seen him for a long while, called to see him, and after conversing with him a while, he said, "I suppose you have heard of my misfortune." "No," said his friend, "what is the matter?" "Well," he said, "I have failed again." "That is too bad," said his friend; "What do you propose to do?" "Well," he said, "I have made a proposition to my creditors; I propose to pay them 25 cents on the dollar." "Well, Smith," said his friend, "you know that when men fail they are very apt to over-estimate their resources; I have known a great many cases of compromises at a certain number of cents on the dollar, that men have failed to meet. Now, you want to be careful not offer more than you can possibly pay; you want to think this thing over, before you offer to pay 25 cents on the dollar." "Well," he said, "I have thought it over, and if the assets come short, I will pay the balance out of my own pocket." That is what this company had better do; they had better pay out of their own pockets this money they are now asking from the Government. I think they had better do that. It would relieve the country of a great deal of difficulty, it would be greatly in the interests of the First Minister, it would relieve him from difficulty; and if the company is at all generous to the Government who have seen them through so many difficulties, they had better put their hand in their own pockets and pay this money, as they have it in hand. Now, this is merely a matter of advice on my part.

Of course we do not deal with this company; in one sense Parliament does not deal with it. It is the Government that deals with the company, and we have to deal with the Government, and that is what we are attempting to do. I am not arraigning the Canadian Pacific Railway, although I have set forth very fully, I think, their mistakes; although I have shown that they have not proceeded in a business like way, but have involved themselves in difficulties, when their resources were ample for the purposes of the contract they made with the Government. But these very mistakes made by the company are largely due to the faults of the Government, and the Government, throughout all this transaction, from its very inception down to the present, has deserved the condemnation of the House and the country. It is to the Government that we direct our attention. The very first step they took was an unfortunate step; the subvention granted to the company was too large. The Government proceeded to make this contract in an improper manner. They should have taken the public into their confidence; they should have asked the capitalists of the world for proposals; they should not have made a contract in secret. They should have published to the world for months their intention to build the Canadian Pacific Railway by contract, and they should have invited the capitalists of the world to tender for the construction of that great road. The law required it, common sense required it; but in place of complying with the requirements of the law, in place of complying with the dictates of common sense, they proceeded to make a contract in secret, and for the doing of that they are worthy of condemnation and have been from that day worthy of the condemnation of the people. If their political existence be dependent upon that, and that alone, that fact would furnish sufficient reason for withdrawing from the Government the confidence of Parliament and the people. Then, when a better offer was made as

soon as the terms of the contract became known—as soon as its conditions became known, conditions which could scarcely be credited by their supporters, when this offer was made public and a better offer received, it was their duty to retrace their false step; and not having done that, it was the duty of the House to refuse to sanction the contract made in these circumstances. And when the contract was consummated, bad as it was, it was the duty of the Government to keep that company within proper limits, to insist that that company should use the land and the money subvention granted to them for the purposes for which they were granted, to see that the money was judiciously expended in securing the very thing that the country needed and that the company was chartered to do. Talk about eastern connections and extensions of the line and the necessities resting upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to expend a portion of its subvention in the extension of the main line from Callander east. Why, that was unnecessary. Favorable connections could have been made at Callander whenever the road was completed to that point, as other railways would have been only too glad to extend their roads to that point for the purpose of sharing in the traffic created by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Not one of the American Pacific lines constructed has found it necessary to seek seaboard connections. The Union Pacific and the Central Pacific, the latter terminating in the valley of the Sacramento, over 100 miles from San Francisco, the former at Omaha, on the Missouri, 1,500 miles from the sea coast, did not deem it necessary to extend their lines to the Atlantic; for before the Union Pacific was completed three lines were pointing towards Omaha to make connections with it—the Chicago and Rock Island Railway, the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy road, and the Chicago and North-West line, all three converging upon Omaha, and making connection with the Union Pacific, and creating competition from Omaha to the seaboard. The same was the case with the Northern Pacific. The Northern Pacific reaches Duluth and St. Paul's, and it was unnecessary, for the purposes of that company, to extend its line further, as it has ample connections with the Chicago and St. Paul's route, the Chicago and Rock Island Railway, and the Chicago and North-Western. The same with the Southern Pacific. It does not find it necessary to waste its resources in extending its trunk line to the sea coast, for numerous roads are glad to make connections with it. So it would have been with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was entirely unnecessary for the Canadian Pacific Railway to build one mile east of Callander, for ample facilities would have been furnished by the Canada Central and other companies for the purpose of carrying forward all its traffic, and consolidation could have been effected, without the expenditure of one dollar of capital, with the lines reaching towards it for the express purpose of doing the business that it created. Now the Government knew, for I will not charge them with that degree of stupidity that would be inferred if I claimed they did not know, that to undertake other works on the part of this company would weaken its resources, and the Government should have held the company to the construction of the main line at first with the branches in the west. In failing to do so, the Government have failed to perform their duty to the people. In permitting that company to divert \$43,000,000 from the construction of the main line, at least \$40,000,000 of which have been diverted to purposes east of Callander and not on the main line, the Government has done that which, in the interests of the people, whether of the company or not, it should not have done. The Government, in its whole course throughout this matter, has aided directly the creation of a great railway monopoly, the very thing we do not want. It was not in the interests of the people that the Canadian Pacific Railway should control lines east of Callander at all,

that they should control a railway system from ocean to ocean. It would have been better to divide that up among different companies, so that competition could be secured; and the Government, in permitting the company to acquire all these leased lines and branch lines in the east, in allowing it to monopolise these different lines, have played into the hands of the company, and have betrayed the interests of the people. The Government furnished the credit, the country furnished the money for the carrying out of these gigantic schemes, for carrying out this rivalry in railway lines, this cutting up the business of lines already established, this rivalry in steamship lines, this cutting up the business of steamship lines already established. The Government have acted the part of a partner with the company, from the beginning to the end, in all these transactions. They have upheld the company in all these transactions, acting as a partner and furnishing the money. Why, now, should the Government strain its credit for the purpose of furnishing this company a loan at 4 per cent., when the company can borrow nowhere else at less than 5 or 6 per cent.? Why should the Government furnish the company at the very price the Government have to pay for it and assume all the risk without receiving any of the emoluments or having any margin?

Another thing the Government is chargeable with in this matter is the incidental difficulties incurred in connection with this scheme. The Government has been obliged to purchase support for the measures it has offered to this House in connection with relief to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Last year, we had the caucuses in No. 8, we had the credit of this country pledged to the extent of \$9,000,000 to subsidise railway lines to the east. We have the same trouble on a smaller scale repeated this Session. We have that dangerous precedent set of the subsidising of railway lines which will place the Government of Canada at all times in a position of danger, the danger being that whenever they are in a tight place, the promoters of certain railway schemes will take them by the throat and say: Come down with your aid or we will withdraw our support; a most dangerous precedent, a most dangerous course for the Government to pursue, one of the incidental punishments which are to be inflicted upon the country for the sins of the Government in connection with this scheme.

I would like to point out to the Government at this late day what was pointed out to them in 1831; I would like to point out to them a scheme by which a very large portion of this outlay might have been saved, and at the same time railway facilities might have been afforded to the west fully as good as those which they have obtained by this scheme. In 1831, when the syndicate contract was under discussion, I pointed out to the Government what, if the policy that was then being pursued, the policy that the Mackenzie Government had adopted, the policy of building a line from Lake Superior into the west and extending that line as the wants of the country required, would probably be the result of the continuance of that policy; and I desire to call the attention of the Government to it to day, when we have so much added experience with regard to this matter, as to what would probably have been the outcome of the continuance of that policy. We will suppose that the line from Port Arthur to the Red River has cost \$16,500,000; we will suppose that the Government had continued the construction of that line and had completed it to the base of the Rocky Mountains at an expense of \$12,000,000, the estimate was \$10,000,000; we will suppose that, during the construction of the main trunk line from Port Arthur to the Rocky Mountains, the Government had constructed 500 miles of branches, at \$10,000 a mile, making \$5,000,000; and we will suppose that they had equipped the whole of this railway at a cost of \$6,500,000. What would have been the result? The Government would have had the line from

Port Arthur to the base of the Rocky Mountains, 1,413 miles in length, and 500 miles of branches, and the whole of this system, with an equipment at a cost of \$6,500,000, would have cost \$40,000,000, and the North-West would have been placed in a better position, so far as railway facilities are concerned, than it is to-day, because it would have had about 400 miles more of branch railways than it has to-day. That being the position, the Government would have expended \$10,000,000 less than it has already given as a gift; it would have had this road for \$10,000,000 less than the money which has been actually given out of hand; and, when this road had been completed—and it was not necessary to build it faster than the country developed—does any man in this House suppose that that would not have been a bonus large enough to have secured the completion of the line in its eastern and western sections? It would have been more than sufficient for that purpose, and the grand result would have been that we would have saved by this scheme \$15,000,000 in money and 25,000,000 acres of land, if we had continued to build that road to the Rocky Mountains, had built 500 miles of branches in addition, had expended \$40,000,000 for that purpose, and had taken that system when it was doing a paying business, and offered it as a bonus for the construction of the balance of the road. The cost of the portion we have given to the company, without surveys, is \$30,000,000, and we have given a subsidy in cash of \$25,000,000, making \$55,000,000, so that the saving would have been \$15,000,000, and the entire land grant. In addition to that, we would have saved the necessity of making the loan of \$30,000,000 in 1884, and the necessity of making the loan to-day of \$5,000,000; we should not have had the necessity of sending a sick Minister and his Deputy to England in consequence of the pressing financial difficulties of the country to raise a loan, when he ought to have been here attending to the Estimates that we are waiting to have him come back to attend to. We were proceeding in that direction. It was the natural result of the policy which had been pursued for years, a policy which it is most unfortunate that we did not continue, a policy the advantages of which were pointed out to the Government when the syndicate contract was made, a policy the pursuance of which would have saved us, I repeat, \$15,000,000 in money and the entire land grant.

I have detained the House longer than I anticipated, and I must draw to a close; but this is a subject of great importance, and I trust I shall not be charged with wasting time or with introducing the discussion of irrelevant matters. Feeling its importance, I have entered somewhat fully into some of these calculations, perhaps more fully than I am justified in doing. I repeat what I have said with relation to this matter, that the syndicate, in its management of its affairs with the Government, has shown ability, that it has shown astuteness, that it has promoted its own interests ably, and that its chief purpose, which is the chief purpose of all corporations, to make money for its members, has been carried out most effectually. It has moreover shown energy. It is useless to deny that great energy has been displayed by that company in the opening and in the prosecution of its work; but, above all things, it has shown its astuteness, its ability, its comprehensive ability, in the management of this Government. It has taken this Government and moulded it like clay in the hands of the potter, and it has moulded it to a vessel of dishonor. It has taken this Government and used it for its own purposes and has taken from it millions upon millions more than it would have required if the Government had held it to the terms of its contract. It has, in short, done with the Government what it pleased, and has made the Government of this country an appendage to the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate. But, whatever the company has done, the Government has failed in its duty, because its first and primary

Mr. CHARLTON.

duty was to the people. It has failed in that duty and has betrayed the interests of the people. It is open to the charge of having sold its client. I do not charge that it has, but it is open to the charge. One of the most prominent supporters of the Government, when the syndicate contract was under discussion, declared that he could only account for the contract which has been entered into on the supposition that the Government was drunk, or mad, or bought.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no question of order; that was the statement. I do not profess to explain how it was that that hon. gentleman finally swallowed the thing himself, but that was a declaration warranted by the conditions of that contract and by the conduct of the Government, first in making the contract in secret, and subsequently in refusing to retrace its steps when it found that it could save \$3,000,000 of the people's money and 3,000,000 acres of land by accepting an offer from another company. If the Government has acted honestly in this matter, as I presume it has, it has shown incapacity unequalled and almost incomprehensible.

I wish to refer to the dividend paying basis that is about to be established by the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, a dividend paying basis which the Government is consenting to, and has taken no steps to prevent. We know that the nominal capital of that company is \$65,000,000. The cost of the stock is \$29,493,000. Now, the fixed charges, we are told, of the company are about \$3,006,000 a year. The company estimates its net earnings for the year commencing 1st June, 1886, at \$3,600,000, and it states that the net earnings have been: for 1883, \$561,000; 1884, \$1,191,000; the first four months of 1885, \$604,000; and in the same proportion for the whole year of 1885 the earnings will be \$1,113,000. But the company estimates its net earnings will increase, and that at the end of the year they will be found to be \$2,400,000. This shows a gain from 1884 to 1885 of 107 per cent., from 1885 to 1886 50 per cent., and a corresponding gain between 1886 and 1887 would make the net earnings \$5,400,000, or \$2,400,000 more than the fixed charges. If the company can reach that position at this early stage in its history, it is certainly not in a position to demand more aid from this country. If it can reach the position that its own estimates warrant, all it will have to do is to take this fund deposited with the Government as security for dividends and use that, instead of paying dividends out of its surplus earnings. Now, with regard to the basis it is establishing for dividend payments. If we take this balance sheet contained in the report of the 13th June, we find it estimates its main line to cost \$88,000,000 although it will cost, probably, only \$50,000,000; rolling stock, \$7,350,000; steamers, \$697,000; shops and machinery, \$903,000; construction plant, &c., \$208,000, or \$97,167,000 chargeable to the main line. Real estate at Montreal, \$408,000; Government lines, \$35,000,000, making a total of \$132,575,000. Acquired lines, \$3,981,000; branch lines, \$4,605,000; or a grand total of \$146,161,000 as a basis for paying dividends at the present moment. In this balance sheet they estimate that the value of their property on the 1st of June, 1886, will be 2,658 miles of railway and appurtenances—\$128,850,000; 713 miles of Government road, \$35,000,000, or a sum of \$163,850,000 as the capital of this company upon which it will be entitled to a dividend of 10 per cent. before the Government can meddle with it. Deduct from that its fixed charges of \$3,006,000 and the company will be entitled to divide dividends of \$13,385,000. This will pay very well on a nominal capital of \$65,000,000 for it will be a dividend of 20½ per cent. But on the actual cash value or cost of that nominal capital of \$65,000,000, on the \$29,495,000, it is a cash dividend of 45⅓ per cent. per annum, and there is nothing to

prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway Company paying a dividend upon the actual cost of its stock of 43 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. per annum if it can earn the money. Now can this limit be reached? If the company's estimates of their future are correct it can be reached. Recollect, Sir, they will have 3,994 miles of line, of which 695 miles will be leased lines. Now, if we take, for purposes of comparison with regard to dividend earnings, the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific, what do we find? We find that, in 1883, the Union Pacific, 1,834 miles of railway, earned as a net dividend \$10,648,000; that the Central Pacific, with 1,215 miles of railway, earned \$8,094,000; that these two roads, with 3,049 miles of railway and branches, earned \$18,743,000 of net dividends. Now, if this was done with 3,000 miles of road, then I hold that 4,000 miles of road, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the country is developed, is quite likely to earn \$5,000,000 less than these two roads earn. If we take their calculation as correct, we may assume that that company will be ultimately in a position to pay 45 per cent. dividend on the actual cash cost of its stock.

Now, if that is the case, I think we may say that the company is solvent, that it is able to put its hands into its own pocket, where the money is, instead of asking us to furnish it; that it is able to take its own \$14,288,000 laid by as a nest egg to pay dividends with, instead of requiring us to re-arrange the terms of our security, and to furnish \$5,000,000 additional. What is this dividend deposit? It is money, cash, the proceeds, really, of the sale of stock. It is a part of the capital of this company. The truth is, that this company has taken more than one-half of the cash capital of the actual cost of its capital stock, and stored that away as a reserve—not to complete the road, not to create property, to earn dividends, but stored that away for the purpose of paying dividends out of capital. What is the proper use of that? Why, the proper use of that money was to build the railway with. The proper use of that money, the proceeds of the sale of that \$65,000,000 of stock, was to build the road with. It was not a proper use of that money to call on the people to complete the road, and allow the stockholders to put the money away and pay dividends upon their stock with it. Who put that money into the hands of the Government? The stockholders. Did the Government know where it came from? They did. Did they know for what purpose it was put there? They did. Did they know what was the proper use to make of that money? They did. Are they not, then, participators in this act, this fraud upon the people of Canada? They are. Now, will they ask these friends of theirs to take this money they hold as a nest egg to pay dividends with, and to pay these sums their friends ask them to pay? These same parties who put the money there can take it out. I dare say they will do it if the Government asks them to. Now, Mr. Speaker, investors usually wait for dividends until they get the road built; they usually wait till they have earned some money to pay dividends. It is not customary for a railway company to take its capital and put it away in some secure place, to be doled out to them in small sums of 3 per cent. on the nominal amount to pay dividends with. That is an unusual proceeding among railway corporations, even among the worst of them. The trick that is performed with this money is a very curious one indeed. It pays a dividend upon itself, and it leaves a void that is to be filled up in some way. It leaves a void that the people are to fill up, to such an extent that after you use two-thirds of this money in paying dividends upon itself, the void filled up by the people is to go on and pay 45 per cent. on that whole sum that the company paid out in the shape of dividends, instead of using its capital. Now, paying interest from capital is always unsound and always wrong. Whether in the business of a corporation or in the business of a private individual, the payment of dividends from capital is an unsound and improper proceeding. Mr. Speaker, if you were embark-

ing in business and investing \$20,000, and paying interest amounting to \$1,400 per annum out of capital, in about fourteen years your \$20,000 would be gone, and you would have no more reserve to pay dividends with; and unless you had some good friend like the Canadian Government to supplement the amount and put you in a shape to continue drawing dividends at their expense, you would be in a tight place. And so with the railway company. Such action would bring any railway company to grief.

In summing up, and taking a view of the whole situation, I say that, taking the Canadian Pacific Railway matter from the commencement, the Government may be charged with four great sins, and small sins without number, and of which I shall not attempt to furnish the category. They may be charged with making a secret contract in violation of the law, a contract which they might have known, and did know before it was ratified, was not in the interests of the people of Canada. They may be charged with violating the law by having refused to ask for tenders. They may be charged with having refused a better offer. They may be charged with having inserted in the contract special clauses exempting the company from taxation and taxes on their materials imported, which has enabled the company to import material and steel rails from the United States to the detriment of the Canadian manufacturers. We find this company, with its huge subventions from the Government, which should have been a Canadian company, it being a company existing upon Canadian funds, is a company officered by men who are largely Americans, with an American general superintendent, an American general manager, American bosses, American contractors, a great proportion of the engineers Americans, a company which seems, other things being equal, to prefer to discharge a Canadian and put an American in his place.

The Government is chargeable with the sin, in consequence of the management of its affairs with this company, of having driven this country into desperate financial straits, driven this country into those straits for the purpose of furnishing money for the extravagant and mad speculation into which those gentlemen have plunged. And we propose now, as a last act, to do what no business man would do, to impair the security we have and to exchange good security for poorer security, to add \$5,000,000 to the present loan, and we propose to do that in face of the fact that the company making this application, asking for this rearrangement of securities and this additional loan, is a company with \$14,500,000 of its own money which it can use. The people of Canada will condemn this act of the Government, and insist that the company shall use its own money for the purpose of extricating itself from its own difficulties before it calls on the people of Canada to furnish money for that purpose.

In the past 20 years the keen observer of public events will have noticed many remarkable things in connection with the railway development and the railway history of America. Anyone who has followed the events of the last 20 years will have noticed the operations of the Credit Mobilier in connection with the Union Pacific Railway. He will have noticed, on looking over the field in the United States, that the enormous sum of \$3,700,000,000 in that time have been abstracted by railway monopolies, equivalent to over \$70 per head for every man, woman and child in the United States. He will see that Vanderbilt has secured of this amount \$100,000,000, that Jay Gould has secured \$80,000,000, and he will be able to run all the way down to the small fry, who have taken \$1,000,000 apiece. He will see all these things; but this is the first instance in railway history of a Government being chained to the chariot wheels of a triumphant and unscrupulous corporation, and robbing the people of money for its masters to spend. The people of Canada have a right to demand that the Government shall answer why they have not called upon the com-

pany to expend its own money, why this country has been asked to furnish \$5,000,000 and to impair the value of their securities, when the company has \$14,288,000 laid away, to be paid to itself from time to time as dividends. I shall support the motion of the hon. member for West Huron.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not propose to follow the arguments of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, or to travel very much outside of the record, which appears to me as quite sufficient to engage the attention of any hon. member who desires to address the House. The building of the road, the original contract, the various matters which have been dealt with by the hon. gentlemen who have addressed us from the other side of the House, have all been discussed before, and some of them have been passed upon by the people. The original contract was made in the Session of 1880-81. All the charges which can be formulated against that contract were argued, and argued with great ability, by hon. gentlemen opposite. Public meetings were held shortly afterwards, and we had the general election, in 1882, with a result which I need not state and which we all know, that the Government that made that contract was returned here with a majority as large as it had in the preceding Parliament. It would be absurd, therefore, to follow the lead the hon. gentleman has offered, as to the propriety of making that contract. It would be absurd to follow into many matters which have been discussed since 1882, and last year especially, when the loan was made, and the Act was passed by which that loan was secured. At present we have to deal with this matter: that the company have come down and have announced that they require more assistance; that their calculations have failed; that in order to carry out the work they have undertaken they will need from us, or need to obtain elsewhere, more money than was anticipated. And the Government of this country—they have had the alternative presented to them of saying that we will close the security we hold upon you, we will go into possession of your road, we will exact the terms of our mortgage; or they have had the option, which they have adopted, of giving to this company power to raise other \$15,000,000, by which it is hoped and believed the company will be able to carry to a conclusion the great work of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with its branches and connections, and with those branches and connections, together with the main line, fully and completely equipped. Well, I need not discuss, Sir, which of these alternatives would have been the proper one to adopt, because on deliberation hon. gentlemen opposite, in a resolution which was no doubt well considered, have placed before us their alternative scheme. That scheme relieves members of this House from addressing it on the subject of other matters outside the proposition of the Government and the one presented by the Opposition. On the part of the Government, holding as we do a lien upon all this property, it is proposed to divide our security. They propose a limit as to one portion of the loan; they propose to say that it shall be on the railway itself, and as to the other they are willing to trust to the security of the lands. And so far as the railway is concerned and its various branches and connections, they are willing that, in addition to the security which we hold upon it to the extent of our loan, that they should invite others to come in and participate with us, and, in point of fact, to become sharers with us in the security, provided they advance the other \$15,000,000. Now, that is the proposition, and it is one which I think the House and the country will accept in preference to the one proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, which is as follows:—

"Canada, in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, gave the company vast aids, which were declared to be ample and final; Canada, in 1884, gave the company great additional aids, which were again declared to be ample and final; the shareholders of the com-

Mr. CHARLTON.

pany have already divided among themselves about \$7,000,000 in dividends, and have on deposit with the Government about \$14,000,000 more, to provide future dividends for themselves for over eight years to come, while they affirm that the railway will be profitable from the day of its opening; in the opinion of this House, the shareholders, if they desire more money for their operations, should propose to utilise their deposit for future dividends instead of asking Canada to impair its existing securities to make large further advances, and to allow the enterprise to be charged with \$15,000,000 additional capital, the interest upon which must be borne by the trade of this country."

I shall confine myself, in the few observations I propose offering, to these two different propositions. It is, Sir, I admit, but proper and fair and right, when the company has come again to the Government to ask for assistance, that we should scrutinise and see that the money that they have already received—the vast and great sums, as no doubt they have been, which the country has given to the road—have been properly, fairly and reasonably expended. And it would be a good ground for refusing further relief, further extension, if we became satisfied, from the papers which have been laid before us and the enquiries which have been made on behalf of the Government, that those moneys have not been properly and fairly allocated. I will deal very briefly with that part of the subject. I find, Sir, that upon what is called the main line, what may be termed, to use the language of the leader of the Opposition, the contract line, there has been an expenditure, according to the return made to us by Mr. Miall,—and, of course, I am speaking of the expenditure up to the end of the year—of over \$53,000,000. East of that main line, on what is known as the Canada Central, the Occidental Road to Montreal, which is no doubt a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, there has been an expenditure in acquisition and in keeping the road in repair and renewal of \$4,213,758, while to the east and west I suppose, mostly, however, to the east, there has been an expenditure in the acquisition of branches and connections of \$5,857,224. Equipment on the main line, and I suppose that also covers equipment on the branch lines—it is needless, in the view I take, to divide them—\$9,168,755. Now, these are the sums which we find have been expended, and the cost, according to the enquiry which was made, and which satisfied the officer sent on behalf of the Government, that that sum of money had been actually expended in the construction of the road. To aid in that they have received from the Government \$20,240,317 on the subsidy, and they have received on the loan the sum of \$18,626,600. Then in addition to that, they have realised by the sale of land grant bonds \$8,702,080. Altogether in round numbers from public sources, \$20,000,000 on account of subsidy, and \$18,000,000 from the loan made last Session, and \$8,750,000 out of the proceeds of the public lands, or altogether \$47,569,000. If we take the money that they have expended, and which I have stated to you, except the one sum of interest, you find they have expended \$68,083,580, to which has to be added the \$5,057,000 which I spoke of a moment ago as being laid out in the acquisition of branch lines and connections—altogether, something over \$35,075,887. In excess of the moneys they have received from the Government. Now, if these expenditures have been wisely made, if they have been made with due regard to the interest of a great transcontinental line, although we may criticise them, we have no right to refuse further assistance, because those expenditures have not exactly been made as we expected when the contract was first given. Speaking for myself, I supposed that the company would have confined their building operations to what is called the main line, that they would have done, as the hon. gentleman who last addressed us said they ought to have done, expended the money in building the road from Callander, westward. The company, however, preferred the other course, and I believe their course was the better one. They preferred not to end the line at Callander, not to build a Canadian Pacific Railway terminating in the wilderness, but to acquire at the

earliest possible moment, the means by which the seaboard could be reached, and at an early day, and I believe with the concurrence of the great majority of the members of this House, they acquired the Canada Central, and ultimately that part of the Quebec railway terminating in Montreal. And but for unforeseen circumstances, they would long since have reached the city of Quebec. Now, it is possible for us to say that that was not a wise expenditure. It is possible to say that the expenditures in acquiring these other feeders, which help so much to insure the success of the Canadian Pacific Railway were not proper and wise expenditures. The choice to make, as it appears, was this: If this great trunk line is built without feeders or assistance, it must be operated for several years at a very great loss; and we have only to refer to the report made by the Government during the period my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leading the Administration, to show that it was then assumed that the road must be operated at a great loss, and that loss would have to be charged to the capital account. The company said: We will connect the line to reach the seaboard, so that the moment the road is opened up it will be operated on a paying basis; and I venture to say that between these courses, the one adopted by the company has been the more prudent one. I am quite willing, and I believe the people of this country are quite willing to assume that was a wise and prudent expenditure. It is useless, then, to separate the money expended east of Callander or west of Callander, or in connections here or there. I do not mean to say that those expenditures should be endorsed in every respect; but taken as a whole, I venture to say that the course taken by the company was the best in the interest of the company itself; it was taken by wise and prudent men anxious to make this company a success. But it is said—and this is the gravamen of the charge which I principally rise to answer—that may be so; but that the money has come out of the pockets of the people, and these speculators, while spending the public money, while nominally complying with the terms of the contract, while nominally paying in \$5,000,000, while raising their capital, first to \$25,000,000, and afterwards to \$100,000,000, have taken good care that what they gave to the company with one hand they took back from the company with the other. It has been said, and almost demonstrated—because figures can be made to show almost anything, as they are used, as some are inserted and some omitted—that the \$24,500,000 odd, which the company had subscribed over and above the original \$5,000,000, had been actually taken back by the company and kept to secure high dividends. That was a grave charge to make, and if true, it should cause this House to pause before granting aid to a company which had dealt in this manner; and if the further charge was proved, that they had \$14,000,000 on hand, it would certainly be the height of absurdity for a company in that position to come to the people of Canada and say: Notwithstanding all the aid you have given us, notwithstanding the loan of last year, and notwithstanding that we have \$14,000,000 to our credit, we want you to lend us \$5,000,000 now, and permit us to borrow on equal terms with you another \$10,000,000, while in the meantime we retain in our own hands \$14,000,000 for the purpose of securing our future dividends. Let us look at the figures and see how far this charge is correct, and what the proper answer is to make to it, if answer there be. In the first place, the amount advanced for the acquisition of stock has been correctly stated by the officers of the company, and is not at all in controversy by any one. It is in the neighborhood of \$29,500,000. That money is represented, it is quite true, in the sum of \$65,000,000 of stock, as paid-up capital; and that is a matter I propose to deal with later on. Well, what has become of that \$29,500,000? According to the representations made by hon. gentlemen opposite, \$24-

000,000 of that amount has been actually swallowed up in dividends, past, present, and to come. Is that really so? I think I shall be able to show that that is not an accurate statement, to say the least of it. The dividends which have been paid up to the 31st of December, as shown by the returns, amount to the sum—a very considerable sum, I admit—of \$5,378,000. The money intended to secure dividends for the future is properly stated at \$14,288,288. But, Sir, here is just where the main point comes in. That \$14,000,000 did not come out of the money of the company—the money that had been provided by the company—or, all of it did not. Of that sum, there was the sum of \$7,380,912 advanced by the Government, which forms a part of the debt of the company, which is a charge upon the undertaking, and which is to that extent a burden on the stockholders interest in the road. If it is to be taken on one side of the account, it must be taken on the other. If you treat it as capital, you will add it to the \$29,500,000; if you do not treat it as capital, but just as it is, then it is an indebtedness of the road to the Government at present, charged on the security of the undertaking, which diminishes the value of the stock and the property of the road to the stockholders. The result is that of that \$14,000,000, the company really advanced out of their own funds the sum of \$6,907,376, making a total of \$12,285,376 appropriated to the payment of dividends already earned or to be earned during the next eight or nine years. To make this statement perfectly clear and complete, I add \$650,000 paid as a supplementary dividend on the 1st of February last, in addition to the 1½ per cent. paid by the Government out of the moneys deposited in their hands, and out of which they agreed to pay 3 per cent. per annum. But from this statement there is in fairness to be deducted the net earnings of the company during the period, which no person will say are not fairly applicable to the payment of dividends. These net earnings during the period amounted to \$1,626,064. So that out of the \$29,568,123, there have been appropriated in the way I have stated to dividends—not, as was stated on the other side of the House, or, as proved by figures which were certainly delusive, 24 per cent.—amounting to \$11,309,312. The other \$18,000,000, the balance of the \$29,500,000, has gone into the road, every dollar of it, and in addition to that the company have borrowed, and at the end of the year had a floating debt of nearly \$7,000,000 more. Now this transaction is an extraordinary one. I do not at all pretend to say it is not an unusual and an extraordinary one, but there can be no object in exaggeration. Let us know the facts just as they are, let us deal with those facts as they are, for there is no object in misrepresenting or distorting them. If this company had deliberately and for the purpose of securing to themselves the payment of this dividend for a given term of years, if they had stored that money away in the hands of the Government as they did, there would be no language too strong for their condemnation. But I do not think any person has asserted that when Mr. Stephens, in 1883, upon the advice, as I have understood, of the most able financial men, not merely in this country but in New York and elsewhere, resorted, in order to float the stock, to this plan of putting money in the hands of the Government. I do not think there is an hon. member in this House who will say he did not do it in the most complete good faith. Whether it was a wise scheme or not is another question, but that he did it honestly and with the desire of floating the securities, in order to carry out the scheme which he had undertaken and build the road without coming back to Parliament, I think is beyond all question and doubt. How was it done? The stock had been floated, as the House will remember, at that time, to the amount of \$55,000,000. \$25,000,000 had been taken by the original promoters, the other \$30,000,000 had been

floated by a syndicate in New-York at \$10,000,000 at a time, and at prices varying a trifle over—I do not remember the exact figures—50 per cent. Well, the stock was selling at these dates at prices something over the amount at which the syndicate had undertaken to float it; and it is not unknown to us all that in a large operation of that kind, the stock, taken by the syndicate in vast quantities must be taken at a sum which will allow some margin to the gentlemen who are speculating or endeavoring to float it, and that it is not taken at the actual prices at which it can be sold at retail in the market. But the stock began rapidly to decline. The impossibilities of floating another dollar of it became apparent. It was down to 50½ somewhere about the day that Mr. Stephen approached the Government with this scheme. It had been put upon the market by these gentlemen as is shown in one of the returns here, some at 50, some 52½ and another lot, I think, at 51. But it could be acquired in open market in any quantity, no matter how small, for somewhere about 50½. Now what was to be done? Let us understand the scheme of finance which the company had started with. They had paid their \$5,000,000 according to their contract. I do not know whether it was anticipated at that time that that \$5,000,000, with the Government assistance, would be sufficient for the work; but if that was the anticipation, the company were soon disturbed from any such pleasing delusion, and they had then to do one of two things. They could not, and no person acquainted with financial matters will suppose it was possible, to sell the stock at par. There is not any financial man who will pretend to say, upon his standing, that the balance of the stock to raise this money could have been floated at anything like par. Then they might have done what is usually done and what later was proposed. They might have bonded the road and placed their bonds at the head of their stock, and sold them for what they could realise. Now, after what we know, seeing that with all these great advantages of which we hear so much, and of which hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired of telling us, we find the stock was down the other day to 35 or 36 per cent, is it possible to suppose that, if they had bonded the road, they could have bonded it on any terms better than those on which they afterwards floated the stock? And there would have been this difference: If they had bonded the road, they would have been virtually wiping themselves out and allowing the bondholders to step in and become the contractors of the Government instead of those who originally undertook to build the road. Their argument was this: We cannot float the stock in this way, that is perfectly certain, at par; we cannot bond our road and sell our bonds for anything like the par value. If we do bond it, we run the risk, at an early day, of having ourselves wiped out, because the bonds will be in default. The other scheme is this. We will place no bonds on the road, but keep it as a stock transaction and sell the stock on the best terms we can, and the new stock holders and we will stand on an equal footing. I do not know there is very much fault to be found with that; I do not know that it made any very great difference in the matter of finance; I do not know whether there was very much choice except the one that they desired, to keep control of the enterprise in which they had so great an interest. They floated of their stock \$30,000,000 for about half its par value, realising \$15,750,000, and they were done; but the road was not built. Something else had to be tried. What was the scheme that was formed? They said: We will make this stock, \$45,000,000 of which we have yet to dispose of, such a security that there will be no difficulty in disposing of it for a fair sum, and we will deposit in the hands of the Government, in order to do that, enough to guarantee a minimum dividend of three per cent. for the next ten years. That will enable us to go into the market and float our stock, and what will be the result?

Mr. McCARTHY.

Here they were holding \$55,000,000 of stock. They desired to bring in as partners with them, as stock holders upon an equal footing, in the building of the road, the holders of \$45,000,000 more of stock, and they said: We will hypothecate, in order that you, coming in and representing \$45,000,000 of stock will have a certainty for a limited period, at all events, of a reasonable dividend, the whole concern, our own as well as yours, which will guarantee to you, during that period, a minimum dividend of three per cent. But although for 10 years you are guaranteed this dividend you as business men, understand perfectly well that when the 10 years will be up, you will find that sum which has gone to pay your dividends ahead of you; you will find it a charge upon your concern; you will find it a sum that you will have to meet out of the future earnings, if there are any; in point of fact, you have merely anticipated the earnings of the road for the first 10 years and trusted to luck for the period that will come afterwards. That was the plan, and it did not succeed. And why? Because people saw very clearly that that was after all really paying themselves out of their own money, paying themselves dividends out of their own capital, and that, at the end of 10 years, they would be met with the difficulties which ordinary stock-holders would have to meet in the inception of a transaction, as to whether there will be sufficient not merely to pay dividends in the future, but to recoup to the capital what had been in the meantime drawn upon in order to make the security available. Well, it failed, and the result was the application to the Government made immediately afterwards for the loan which was granted by the Act of last Session. But how was the transaction carried out? I may as well mention it here, although I will have to refer to it later. It was carried out by a solemn agreement made between the Government of the one part, the bank of Montreal on the second part, and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the third part, in which the Government undertook to pay the bank enough to put the bank in funds to pay this 3 per cent. during these 10 years to all the stock-holders; by which the credit of the bank, the highest financial institution of the country, became pledged to see that that was done and that the very highest possible security was therefore accorded to the stock-holders who might embark in the enterprise. I mention that now, though it is not very pertinent to my present line, but I will come to it by-and-bye, when it becomes a most important matter in the consideration presented to us in the resolution moved on the opposite side. Let me for a moment deal with the figures which I find presented to the House as bringing about the other result. As I understand the argument of the leader of the Opposition—I have since read it and I think I correctly understand it, I listened to it with much attention, and it was of course put before us in a very striking manner, and was calculated to arouse and did undoubtedly engage the attention of us all—the hon. gentleman spoke of those \$14,000,000 as having come out of the capital of the company, whereas, as I have demonstrated, something less than \$7,000,000 was the amount. It is true that there are \$14,000,000 in the hands of the Government, but, if you are to charge this \$14,000,000 as against the capital, so as to reduce the balance of that capital, you must, as a fair book-keeper, add to the \$29,500,000 the \$7,000,000. You cannot charge it on one side of the account without taking it into consideration on the other, and, if you do that, then the result is just what I have indicated. It is said that this system of watering stocks is abominable. It is stated that the result will be, to us or to those whom we represent, an increase in their burdens for all time to come. It is stated that these results have followed from like causes on the other side. I do see that there is much analogy in watering the stock of a company which has been already established, which, as has been stated correctly is

frequently done on the other side of the line, to the destruction of the value of this kind of securities, and this particular case. In this case there is no misunderstanding. All the facts are before us as clear as daylight. What the proper construction of law is, may be a matter of doubt. The facts, however, are perfectly well-known to us all, and those facts are that that \$65,000,000 of capital is in reality represented by only \$29,500,000. Then, in the settling of the rates which this railway company is to be permitted to earn, if the question of capital comes into account at all,—and of course it must come into account at some stage or other—the Administration of the day, whoever they may be, when that time arrives, will be negligent in their duty, will fail in their duty, if they calculate that the company are to realise profits on that \$65,000,000, when, as the whole country knows, that only represents \$29,500,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Why does the company pay the dividends on the full face value of the stock?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think my hon. friend misunderstands me. I have passed from that question of dividends and am now speaking about the earnings they would be entitled to get, not on the \$65,000,000, but, as we know, on the \$29,500,000. How are the rates fixed? They are fixed, as we know, by by-law. No toll can be levied until the by-law is in force, and the by-law does not come in force until the Governor General sanctions it. The rates are fixed from time to time, as we were promised they would be, because we know that a rate which may be fair to-day, with a small traffic, would be unreasonable and excessive in a few years when the traffic increases; and it would be the duty of the Government—nay, I trust it will be the duty of a railway commissioner before that day comes—to see that these rates are fixed upon a fair scale, not in regard to the watered stock or the watered capital of which we hear so much, but in regard to the money which has gone into the building of the line, and which has been \$29,500,000 and not \$65,000,000. It may be that, by-and-bye, some other administration—possibly the hon. gentlemen or their successors in a direct line—may at a distant day occupy seats on this side of the House, but, if so, I trust they will so regard the true meaning of the Statute, the true meaning of the law and the intention of Parliament, that the dividends will be regulated, not upon what is presented as the nominal sum, but upon the real actual sum which has been raised and paid into the coffers of the company by the various shareholders. That is a matter which, of course, it is important for us to consider with reference to this proposition, but after all, we find ourselves in this position: We find that we have to assist the company. I take it that the resolution proposed on the other side is an admission of that.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. They do not propose, of course, that it shall be done in this manner.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will deal with that presently, but I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman saying "Hear, hear."

Mr. BLAKE. I say "Hear, hear," to that dissentingly.

Mr. McCARTHY. You admit that we ought to assist the company, though you do not agree as to the mode?

Mr. BLAKE. No, I dissent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, we will say that you dissent *sub modo*.

Mr. BLAKE. I dissent in all ways.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not proposed—

Mr. BLAKE. It is opposed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not proposed that we should foreclose our security.

Mr. BLAKE. The Secretary of State said so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had not the pleasure of hearing the Secretary of State, but I am speaking from my own knowledge of this transaction. That was not proposed; it is not proposed here and it is not proposed on the other side. What is proposed to be done? We say you want \$15,000,000 more; is it reasonable that you should have it? What do you require it for? You have a floating debt of \$7,000,000. If we took over the road, these section men of whom the leader of the Opposition spoke in such feeling terms the other day, will not be allowed to go without their wages. We know that the honor and good name of this country would require that, if we took over this road, we should take over the honest debts, and should provide for the pay of the laborer whose labor has helped to build the road. That \$7,000,000 is a proper expenditure. Then there is \$5,000,000 more, as shown either in the report or in Mr. Stephen's observations, which are required for the better and more complete equipment of the road. Amidst all that we have heard of the history of railways in the United States, ending at Omaha and elsewhere, we have heard no objection to our Pacific railway being equipped in a manner second to none on the continent. This \$5,000,000, added to the \$7,000,000, makes \$12,000,000. You want a little more to come and go upon. We think, therefore, that it is not unreasonable that you should be permitted to borrow \$15,000,000 more or to float bonds to that extent, and we hope you will get as much as you can. In that case, where are they to get the money? I suppose they will obtain it if this scheme does not wholly collapse, if the hon. gentlemen will for once be patriotic, if they will not decry the securities the road has to offer, if they will confine their remarks to a criticism of the manner and the means, and will not run down the country and ruin the road and enable those who are opposed to the road—and the history of this railway shows that there are opponents on both sides of the Atlantic—to take the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in their hands in order to prove that, because of the curves and gradients and double curves, and the difficulties of the snow-slides, and all the rest, this road must be a failure and no one should lend the money. If the hon. gentleman will only merge the partisan and remember that Canada has some interest in this transaction, he will see that there will be no difficulty in the railway company floating this security and obtaining this \$5,000,000 we are loaning to them as a temporary loan. But what is the alternative he has offered us? Why, if it had not been in the very phraseology of the leader of the Opposition, although it had been faintly hinted at by that hon. gentleman in his address, I would have thought that my hon. friend was incapable of asking this House or this country to accept such a proposition as that. What does it say? It is pretended on the face of this resolution that there are \$14,000,000 belonging to this company in the hands of the Government but controlled by the company; that they have only to come to us and say: We want money to go on with the construction of our road and to pay our floating debt, and we ask you to release that \$14,000,000 that we have, and we will pay our \$7,000,000 of floating debt, we will pay the \$5,000,000 we want for the equipment of the road, and we will require no more assistance. Was that an honest statement to present to this House, or to the people of this country? Is it possible—will any gentleman who has any reputation as a member of the profession to

which I have the honor to belong, rise in his place here or anywhere else, and pretend that such a thing could possibly be done by the company in any shape or form? This money was placed in the hands of the Government and the contract was made with the Bank of Montreal, and the shares were sold upon the faith of it, as we know ten millions of it were, and we do not know how many shares changed hands between that time and this, how many people are interested in these shares, who have invested their money upon the good faith of Canada, with 3 per cent. in hand to pay them for the next ten years to come. Why, it was a proposal of repudiation, and in which the Bank of Montreal, the great financial institution of Canada, was also to be dragged down and disgraced. Sir, it is utterly impossible. A man who holds a share in that concern has a right to his dividend of 3 per cent., has an individual right and interest to that which not everyone of the other shareholders, if they were all united, could deprive him of. It is his individual property. It is not a matter which can be decided or dealt with by the stock-holders in meeting assembled, or by any number of stock-holders, but it is the individual property of men who have acquired that stock, either directly or indirectly, and on which they have the Government guarantee, backed up by the bank of Montreal, and they cannot be deprived of it by any person or by any means less than an Act of Parliament, which would be spoliation and depriving people of their private rights. Now, that is the alternative offered to us. Can we hesitate which we will accept? We may have been wise or unwise in undertaking the building of a Canadian Pacific Railway, but the most that can be said of us is, that we, a young country, are undertaking to build a great public work which in the whole history of nations has never been equalled by a country of resources so limited. But it cannot be said of Canada that its fair fame has yet been stained, as is proposed to be done by the leader of the Opposition, backed up by all his followers, and formally proposed here as the policy of a great party. Sir, one word more as to this dividend and I am done. I have stated and indicated that to some extent this was an unusual transaction. I have stated the justification of the railway company, but, whether that justification is a good one or a bad one, at all events it was an honest one. But I would ask these hon. gentlemen who are so careful of the interests of this country, who care little for its fair fame but are anxious for its dollars, I would ask them for one moment to say: Did they expect that the men who are building the Canadian Pacific Railway were to do it as an act of grace to the people of Canada? Did they expect that these men were to be remunerated and were to have a reasonable profit upon the investment which they made? Why, we know the law sanctions the payment, during construction, of a dividend not exceeding 6 per cent; we know that on the Statute Book that is deemed to be a reasonable dividend. My hon. friend from West Durham stated that, looking at this contract, looking at all that had taken place, that that dividend would not be exacted. The contract has adopted the general provisions of the Railway Act, but he says that that particular clause is not applicable to this company. If my memory does not fail me there never was a suggestion made that during the period of construction they could not get a reasonable and proper dividend. Now let us see what these dividends are going to be. I have shown you that there is \$11,000,000 of the company's capital paid or hypothecated for that purpose. I have to add to that that they have borrowed and the company is mortgaged for another some of over \$7,000,000 which was advanced by the Government for a certain period. When that period has expired, when the 10 years are up, instead of that coming into their hands, as the hon. member represented, free and clear, that great road, with all its prospects and great future,

Mr. McCARTHY

will be burdened to the extent of that sum of over \$7,000,000 that it has not in point of fact received, but that is due to them in the ordinary course. And what would they have earned during the same period? What would have been the amount during the same period. My hon. friend who last addressed the House has made a calculation. He tells us that taking the stock of the original contractors, the \$5,000,000 first deposited, and the \$5,000,000 afterward paid, and the whole stock transactions together, spread over a period of years, it yields an interest of something less than 7 per cent. I accept the statement. And, Sir, is 7 per cent. such an unusual profit? Is it so unusual a profit that we are all to stand aghast here at the hon. gentleman's statement?

Mr. CHARLTON. In addition to that are the net earnings of the road.

Mr. McCARTHY. The net earnings of the road, but the first thing the net earnings of the road have to do will be to pay back this money which is a burden on the road, the seven millions which have been anticipated. The company in their last statement have announced that from this time out the last dividend of 5 per cent has been paid, and the stock-holders must be satisfied with the 3 per cent. dividend which is provided for them in the hands of the Government. Well, we know, if we know anything about railways, what will happen; we know that will happen which has happened with other lines, and I think we may say it has already happened to some extent. A road is built, the Government engineer and the Governor in Council permit trains to run upon it; to that extent it is open. But by no means is the capital account closed. There are the sidings, the transportation facilities and other matters to be provided for, which are not needed in the first five or six years of the road. I am glad to know that the hon. member for North Norfolk has told us that it is undoubtedly good security, that this is a paying road, that there are millions in it, that there is more in it than there has been in anything of the kind ever known. We accept that. We are glad to know that not merely the \$15,000,000, and this \$5,000,000 we are about to advance temporarily, will come back, but we are also glad to know that the balance of the whole sum advanced last year will be restored to us, and restored with interest, and if it is restored to us with interest, if the people of this country do not pay more than \$25,000,000 of money and 25,000,000 acres of land, which was valueless until this road pierced the prairie, and which is estimated by some at \$1 and by others at \$2 per acre and which has been sold in some places at an average of over \$3 per acre—the people will be perfectly satisfied with the result of the contract. Taking it all in all I think I have shown that the scheme which is proposed is a fair one. Although the financial transaction of 1883 was an unusual one, it was an honest one. If it has damaged any person it has damaged the company, because it is a charge on the undertaking, and the company and the share-holders are one in that, and the interest not coming up to quite 7 per cent. is not so extravagant as will alarm the people. I think I have said enough to induce this House on the simple question of repudiation, and bearing in mind that the good faith of Canada has been for the first time deliberately proposed to be bargained away for a money consideration, to reject with indignation the proposal made from the other side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman should have lent the weight of his distinguished name and reputation to the charge which has been made against the proposition made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). The hon. gentleman has not scrupled to use language which, coming from his lips, is somewhat

extraordinary. He has not scrupled to charge hon. gentlemen who have made a proposition which to my mind seems a very simple one and one very easily understood, with desiring to repudiate the solemn contract made by this country and to be guilty of the crime of spoliation of widows and orphans. He has been cheered by hon. gentlemen behind him, and I am willing to credit those hon. gentlemen who cheered him with having cheered in utter ignorance of the meaning of the resolution. I cannot express the same opinion with respect to the hon. gentleman who made the statement. I believe that hon. gentleman did understand the meaning of the resolution, and I very much regret that he should have lent the weight of his acute intellect to an attempt to mislead this House, to draw the wool over the eyes of hon. members, as it were, and to try and lead the country to believe that there has been a proposition submitted from this side of the House, of spoliation and repudiation, involving the dishonor of the country of which we are all so proud. In dealing with a few of the arguments presented by the hon. gentleman, I will call attention to his opening statement. The hon. gentleman asked the House to recollect that if the money which has been received had been expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, we had no cause to complain. The hon. gentleman went on to say that the company, preferring not to confine their operations to the contract, but to enter upon projects of their own, went outside of the contract with the Government. That they entered into large speculations in other parts of the country, and some of them for different objects, and it was useless to confine the discussion to the subject matter of the contract entered into between this country and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and that he did not propose to address his argument on that line at all, but to discuss this question as between all the contracts, all the undertakings which the company have entered into, and if he could show the House and the country that in any operation the company got into deep water, and are in debt, whether with the object of carrying out the Canadian Pacific Railway, or of putting millions into their own individual pockets—if he could show they have lost money and are in need of money, then he had proved the proposition that it is right for the country to come to their assistance. That is the statement with which the hon. gentleman started, and it is on that line that all his argument has proceeded. I call the attention of the House to that fact, because we have to watch his specious arguments, in order to see if they have any application whatever to the contract, which alone we have a right to discuss, and which alone we have a right to imply that the company intended to carry out. I find it very difficult to discuss this question calmly and coolly with hon. gentlemen opposite, for this reason: that the ground they take one day is changed the next. I remember when we discussed this question last year, or a question akin to this one, one involving the advance of a large number of millions to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they found the country stood aghast at the proposition they then made, were quick to come to the front and say it must be remembered that our proposition was to be discussed simply upon the basis of the contract we have entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and on no other basis. I find the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) laid it down in black and white. He said we must not go outside of the contract. Here are his words:

"It should never be forgotten that the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the people of Canada is for the construction of a railway west from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. Everything they do east of that is done simply as an ordinary business corporation, and Parliament has, in fact, little or nothing to do with it."

Mr. DAVIES.

Now, when it suits the purpose of the spokesman of the Government, he comes forward and says that we have everything to do with the operations of the company east of Callander. I shall have very little to say, he says, with the operations west of Callander; but I will confine my argument to the operations they have entered upon east of Callander, in which they have sunk money, which they now ask the country to come forward and supply. The hon. gentleman remarked, and I think he remarked very fairly and honestly, that when the contract was entered into between the company and the Dominion it was understood by both parties that for many years the running of the road would be a losing operation. He said it was so stated by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He might have gone further, and remarked that the statement of the hon. member for East York had been endorsed by the late Minister of Railways and by leading members on his own side, and by the Prime Minister of the country. But does the hon. gentlemen forget, or can any hon. gentleman who has read the debates of that day forget the fact, which the hon. gentleman states to-day, that the running of the road would be a losing operation for some years to come, and that that very fact was made the reason for granting to the company subventions largely in excess of what otherwise would have been granted, magnificent subventions, exceeding those ever granted to any railway corporation in the world, and that it was necessary to put the company in that position, so that they should not be absolutely ruined in operating the road during its early history.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES. I therefore say that the great subventions, the large grants of land, the grants of millions of money, the monopolies, hateful in themselves and adverse to the interests of the people, and which, in the future, will be a curse to the land, were attempted to be justified by the fact that this company were said to be entering into a contract the carrying out of which would involve them in much loss. I am not surprised at the jeering allusions with which my references to monopolies have been received by a certain class on the other side, and by the Acting Minister of Railways himself. Monopolies which are odious to the people are not odious to railway corporators. Monopolies which are hateful and injurious to the people are not hateful or injurious to those whose interests are not with the people, but opposed to the people; and therefore I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman should jeer and sneer at any allusion to the monopolies which were given to that company, and which his distinguished predecessor promised this House, only twelve months ago, were to be surrendered by that company—a promise which he, a few weeks ago, took care to repudiate.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. DAVIES. "No," says the hon. gentleman. I intend to call the attention of the House to that matter a little further on, and I leave it now, while I refer to two or three other remarks which were made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. gentleman stated that the remarkable speech made by the leader of the Opposition in this House contained statements so serious in their character that unless they were refuted there could be but one conclusion remaining in the minds of the House and the country. The hon. gentleman essayed the task of exposing the misrepresentations, as he terms them, of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman did not scruple to say that his task was to show the House and the country that the statements made by the leader of the Opposition regarding that road, the building of that road, the location of that road, the grades and curves of that road, the money expended on that road, the manner in which the road was financed by its corporators, were incorrect in themselves, I leave

it to the House to say; I leave it to the country, after it has read my hon. friend's speech; I leave it to the gentlemen, who are about to invest in stock, and whom he feared would be frightened from their investment after reading the speech of the leader of the Opposition; I leave it to them to say whether my hon. friend, with the exception of one statement, has even made an attempt to answer any one of the serious and grave charges made by the leader of the Opposition. I say, deliberately, at the outset, that the learned and able man put forward by the Government of this country to answer the serious charges of the leader of the Opposition never attempted, never dared to refer to one of those charges, excepting the one with reference to the depositing of the money for the purpose of paying interest to the stockholders. I want that emphasised and remembered; I want the country to remember that the charges made by the leader of the Opposition in that remarkably able and brilliant speech, which, up to this moment, has not been answered, which he rose to answer, was not attempted to be answered by him, except with reference to one particular charge to which I shall refer. Now, my hon. friend stated that if the charge made, that they had repaid themselves the capital which they invested in that company, was true, it was a very serious charge, so serious as, in his opinion, to destroy all confidence in the company. The hon. gentleman stated that the total receipts from capital stock were \$29,000,000. He went on to say that the \$14,000,000 deposited to secure dividends, and the \$5,000,000 already paid out of previous deposits, were not paid out of the proceeds of stock, but out of something else. That was the hon. gentleman's statement; it was that, or nothing at all.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. That was the very language he used. Sir, I want to ask that hon. gentleman what money were they paid out of? You say that money came from another source. Did it come from a source provided by the company? That is the point. Was the money which was deposited by the company in the hands of its trustees for the purpose of paying interest on their stock the company's own money? If it was their own money, it matters not 10 cents whether it came from the sales of stock or from other sources provided by them. The proposition is this, that they have taken money capital of their own, raised by them, either from the sale of stock or other some source, and have placed that money in the hands of a trustee on trust, and repaid it out to themselves and others as stockholders, year by year, in the form of dividends, and they have taken care that in the repayment out of that money in the form of dividends, they themselves, the originators of the company, the corporators of the company, shall be repaid at the rate of 24 per cent. on the \$5,000,000 they have invested. Now, Sir, that is the proposition. The money is theirs. The hon. gentleman says we propose a policy of repudiation, a policy of spoliation. I deny it. We do not propose to touch the money, and the hon. gentleman knows it. There never was a proposition from this side to lay violent legislative or other hands on the money. The money is there on trust, and we propose that it shall remain there. We do not propose, we do not suggest, that it shall be touched, but we say this: We say, if you gentlemen, the shareholders of this company, are in want of money, if you come to us and ask us to give you this money which you have deposited with us to pay your interest, then we are willing to yield to you, and to pay this money out. Sir, what is the proposition? I do not know that I would have spent any time upon this subject if the learned gentleman, who has a character in this country for honor and probity, the reputation of having an acute intellect—had not waxed wroth and strong in his denunciation of this side for doing what he must know they never proposed to do. What is the

Mr. DAVIES.

proposition moved by the hon. member from West Huron (Mr. Cameron):

"Canada, in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, gave the company vast aids, which were declared to be ample and final."

Is that true? Was it not only said, when the aid were first proposed, that they were ample and final, but was it not heard from every gentleman on that side who spoke last year, that when the supplemental aid was given it was to be ample and final beyond all question?

"Canada, in 1884, gave the company fresh additional aids, which were again declared to be ample and final."

That is true. The hon. gentleman does not deny it.

"The shareholders of the company have already divided among themselves about seven millions in dividends, and have on deposit with the Government about fourteen millions more to provide future dividends for themselves for over eight years to come, while they affirm that the railway will be profitable from the day of its opening."

Is that proposition true? Is it true that at the present moment, in the coffers of this Government, held by them as trustees for the shareholders, those shareholders have on deposit to their credit \$14,000,000 of money, and that the Government are bound to dispose of that year by year in the payment of dividends? Is that true? Does the hon. gentleman deny it? He does not; he admits it. The money is there for the purpose of being repaid in the form of dividends. It was capital money put there for that purpose, which they should have applied in the prosecution of the work. They had other objects in view, I acknowledge—objects which the hon. gentleman sought to justify; but the facts are, that it was capital, that it is the capital, that it is lying there now, that it is upon these trusts I have mentioned that the Government are bound to pay it out, if it is ever paid, to these men. Ah, says the hon. gentleman, the securities of the president and the other corporators, for the payment of interest upon the money they have invested, are known. They are secured, come weal or come woe. The railway may fail; the North-West may fill up with immigrants, or it may not; riots and rebellions may come; Canada may become crippled in her resources; she may become almost bankrupt; but one thing we have secured beyond peradventure, that for the next five or six years we shall get 24 per cent. on five millions of money. With these facts staring us in the face, what does the proposition of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) declare? I want to ask calmly and coolly hon. gentlemen opposite, and my hon. friend who has just sat down, whether he has given a fair explanation of this resolution:

"In the opinion of this House, the shareholders—"

Shall be spoiled of their money? Canada shall repudiate her obligation, if it be an obligation, for the payment of dividends? No:

"The shareholders, if they desire more money for their operations, should propose to utilise their deposits for future dividends instead of asking Canada to impair its existing securities to make large further advances."

How can the hon. gentleman, in the face of that resolution, so plain and distinct, justify his serious charge. We do not propose any repudiation, any spoliation of the widow or orphan, or even of the millionaire. We propose that these gentlemen, having got into deep water in their financial and railway operations, shall not get \$15,000,000 more money to carry on their financial operations in the future; but having that \$15,000,000 in their own hands, ready to be paid by us at any time they ask for it, we say: If your desire more money take this \$15,000,000; we will hand it over to you whenever you want it; but do not come upon the tax-burdened people of Canada, whose backs already bear sufficient burdens, and ask them to take the \$15,000,000 in their coffers and dispense it to you at the rate of 24 per cent. upon \$5,000,000 of the capital you invested in the enterprise, as well as to put their hands in their pockets and give you \$5,000,000 more as a loan,

Sir, a more impudent proposition was never made to any Government. Only a Government who felt themselves absolutely secure from the people, because they have a majority that will vote anything they ask, would allow such a proposition to be submitted to them. Common sense, common justice, every consideration that should weigh with these gentlemen, who have the fortunes of Canada in their charge, should induce them, at the time this syndicate came to ask for more money, to reply: Of course, gentlemen of the syndicate, you can have the money; we have lots of it; there are \$15,000,000 lying to your credit there in the bank; call your shareholders together; let them express their desire to have \$10,000,000, or even the whole of this money, and you can get it without any hesitation on our part, and use it to implement the contract which you have entered into with the people of Canada, and which you say you are unable to carry out without more money. Now, I think I have answered the hon. gentleman upon the only serious point on which he challenged the statement of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. But the hon. gentleman goes on to say: You must remember that large numbers of these shareholders have been induced to take the stock because of this deposit being made. Does anybody deny it? Nobody is seeking to take that money from them; the Opposition are not asking that; they are only saying that if these men, who have invested their money on the faith of that deposit being made, now see that it is necessary in their own interest to withdraw the money, in order that they may do better with it, let them come forward and express their desire. It is not for the injury of the widow and orphan. Oh, how these hon. gentlemen's hearts bleed for the widow and orphan. I have heard a good deal about millionaires in this country and in the old country; if I have heard it once I have heard it fifty times *ad nauseam*, that this company is composed, not of widows and orphans, but of rich men, millionaires, any one of whom could build the railway without the assistance of the Government; and now, when it suits their purpose, the millionaire is dropped and the widow and the orphan come to the surface. Who are they? Let us hear their names. The president of the company is not a widow, nor an orphan either. We were told, only two days ago, I think, by the hon. Secretary of State, that he is a man possessed of untold millions. What about the other gentlemen who compose the syndicate? Have we not been told—has it not been thundered in our ears, Session after Session—that they are millionaires, and that in that fact we have the best guarantee that they will carry the railway to completion, and that we shall secure the running of it afterwards? But it turns out now that they have all been transformed into widows and orphans. But, says my hon. friend, nobody can deny that Mr. Stephen, when he took the \$15,000,000 from the capital and deposited it with the Government, for the purpose of guaranteeing the dividends on the stock, did it in good faith. Perhaps he did; but I will take his own statement in the month of May, last, and according to that statement, whatever may have been his good faith, his object was to boom the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway from 40 per cent., the average price at which it was issued to him and the rest of the syndicate, up to 80, which he hoped it would reach, and thereby put into the pockets of himself and his coadjutors \$10,000,000 of cash. Sir, we have the statement here, not made haphazard, in the heat of debate, but the written statement, over the signature of George Stephen himself, that his object in doing that was to send the stock of the company up; and neither he nor any other financial man could understand why that stock did not go up to 80, and why he did not pocket his \$10,000,000. I doubt very much if the scheme he had in view had succeeded—if the stock had boomed up to 80 and had then been disposed of—whether you would have had the same gentleman applying

for aid to-day. Recollect, there is no personal responsibility on the part of these gentlemen. If they could have realised \$10,000,000 profit on \$10,000,000 invested, shrewd financial men as they are, they would have pocketed their \$20,000,000 and walked out of the undertaking, and said: Let you, people of Canada, finish the contract as you please. No matter what his good faith was, look to his object, and I say it was personal gain for himself and those associated with him. There is nothing wrong in his desire to make money; he has a right to make it in every honest and legitimate way; but when his schemes "gang all a-glee," when they go to rack and ruin, when he cannot raise the money to carry out his contract, and will not put his hand into his own pocket in order to get it, it is pretty hard lines that he will leave the \$15,000,000 in the Bank of Montreal to his credit, and ask the people of Canada to supply him with an additional advance of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000. But, says my hon. friend, he had no personal object in view. He was going to put a large amount of other stock on the market, which had not already been taken up, and his object was to secure the dividends to his new shareholders. I like my hon. friend's ingenuousness; it was refreshing in the extreme. Everything that was done was done for the benefit of the new shareholders, for whom this little bait was set to induce them to take stock in the company. It was not at all for the benefit of the gentlemen who put in the first \$5,000,000 and the second the \$5,000,000, in order to hold \$25,000,000 of stock. Oh, no. What is the fact? Did Mr. Stephen deposit money in the hands of the trustees simply to secure to the new stockholders the payment of their dividends? I say that is not true. He deposited the capital of the company for the purpose of diverting it to the payment of interest on his stock, which he held himself—to the \$5,000,000 he and his associates have put in and the other \$5,000,000 for which he and they took \$20,000,000 of stock out of the company; and it was not simply or solely, not even largely, for the purpose of securing to these new stockholders the payment of their dividends, but for the purpose of making a sure nest egg, an investment which cannot be touched or impaired, an investment which will bring him 24 per cent. interest on a part of the money he and his friends invested, and 8 per cent. on the balance, for the next eight and a half years, the unexpired portion of the ten years. I was astonished that my hon. friend should have adopted the *role* which has been adopted for the last few years by one or two of the gentlemen on the front benches opposite; I was astonished that he should have added himself to those who claim the monopoly of honesty and patriotism. The hon. gentleman lectured the leader of the Opposition because, forsooth, he was devoid of patriotism, because he had no love for his country, because, in his career, heretofore, he had shown nothing but a desire to injure the country and the people. But I will place the record of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition against the record of the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), or any gentleman on that side they can produce, and I will ask the people of the country who has shown the most self-abnegation? Who has shown the most patriotism? Who, at all times, has been most ready to sacrifice himself and his material interests on behalf of his country? My hon. friend asked him to become patriotic—and do what? Patriotism, in his eyes, consists in the suppression of the truth. My hon. friend asked him: Do not tell these awful stories about the curves, these dreadful stories about the gradients, do not tell the fact that the company have not yet got a line located through the Kicking Horse Pass and over the Selkirk hills, because, if you do, you may prevent the syndicate selling their stock in the English money market. I want to ask my hon. friend a solemn question. Was one, or were all of the facts stated by the leader of the Opposition, in the connection to which I have referred, untrue. Sir, we have had those statements made

now for two or three days. We know that, if true, they are most damaging, if not ruinous, to our great transcontinental railway, to the great enterprise that we are now being called on to vote more millions of the people's money to sustain. If they are not true, patriotism calls upon my hon. friend to deny them. He was prompted; he had his brief from the Canadian Pacific Railway; I have no doubt he had his instructions and information. I do not say this in an insulting way at all. He had, when he took the responsibility of replying to statements carefully weighed and accurately made by the leader of the Opposition, to ascertain whether he could deny them or not; and if my hon. friend, with his heart bursting with patriotism, overwhelmed with love of country, not having any selfish interests to serve, but simply and solely desiring to advance the interests of the country to which he belongs, and at the same time to give a push to the Canadian Pacific Railway; if the hon. gentleman, standing in that position, and determined and desirous, and justly so, to deny any serious misstatement made by the leader of the Opposition, was not able, after a consultation with the solicitor of the company and with its vice-president, after consultation with all those who manage the Canadian Pacific Railway—if he was not able to deny any one of those serious statements, I say that this House has arrived at a more serious state of the debate than it has arrived at heretofore. I must say that when those statements were made by the leader of the Opposition I stood aghast at them. I hoped my hon. leader had been in some way or other misled in his estimates of the grades and the curves, and the total repudiation of the standard which the company had adopted a few years ago; and when I saw my hon. friend opposite calmly and coolly rise in his place and make the promises he made in opening, of what he was going to do, I hoped that some of the statements of the leader of the Opposition were going to be denied.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman, as he has repeated this several times, that I thought I had made it perfectly clear, when I opened, that I did not propose to discuss any except the one matter which I deemed pertinent to the subject in hand.

Mr. DAVIES. I took down the hon. gentleman's language, and I heard him say: "If the leader of the Opposition can, only for once, become patriotic, and sink his desire to injure the Canadian Pacific Railway, and cease making these statements about curves and grades, I will then respect him more than I do." I want to press that home. Are those statements true or untrue? If they are true, it is the highest patriotism to declare them, and I say the man who has the industry to find them out, in the first place, and the ability and moral courage to present them afterwards, is the man who has true patriotism. It is neither honest or patriotic to suppress the truth. I say, to go home to the monied men of England with a statement in your hand which is a suppression of the truth is tantamount to telling a lie; and I say that the man who is patriotic, is honest, because he desires to place his country in a true light. I am sick and tired of those men who are never satisfied except when they are indulging in wild exaggeration as to the present condition and future prospects of Canada. Our present condition is good enough and our future prospects are good enough, if fairly told, to justify us in claiming a share of the emigration of the old world, and in asking the monied people of the world to place a share of their investment in Canada, without telling a lie; and I say, if it is necessary, in order to obtain money from our English friends, to tell a lie, the sooner Canada's name is blotted out from the list of nations the better for her. Dishonesty and patriotism never have been associated, heretofore. They are inconsistent the one with the other. The true patriot must be an honest man, and he

Mr. DAVIES.

who tells the truth, not only to the foreigners but to his own people, is a patriotic as well as an honest man.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. DAVIES. When the House rose I was endeavoring to reply to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), as to the impropriety or injustice of the proposition of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). I contended then, as I contend now, that we have knocking at the doors of this Dominion the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have them coming here in their corporate capacity, asking Parliament to advance them, in addition to the moneys we gave them last year, further sums of money, and to rearrange and readjust the securities we then took upon their property, so that they may be able to go into the money markets and place first mortgage bonds on those markets, and raise thereby \$15,000,000 extra; and I said it was perfectly just and proper that we should reply to these shareholders, so knocking at our doors, that we had no money of our own to give them, but that we had a large sum of money belonging to themselves, which we held in trust, and which we were perfectly willing, at any time when their work required it, to hand over to them. I shall deal no further with that branch of the case, because it seems to me that the proposition is a just one, and the contention of my hon. friend was not tenable. I wish to refer shortly to the remarks made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), when he replied to the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman, with a modesty which was becoming to him, said at once that he would not attempt to reply to the great mass of figures which had been presented to the House by the leader of the Opposition. It could not have been expected that he would. He acknowledged the terrible force of the argument contained in the speech of my hon. friend. He acknowledged that, unless it could be replied to, it was irresistible, but he expressed the hope—nay, he went so far as to express the almost certain belief—that some gentleman who was to follow him would completely answer this financial argument and refute the conclusions drawn from the presentation of the figures which the hon. the leader of the Opposition presented. When he referred to the enthusiastic reception which the conclusion of that hon. gentleman's remarks met with on this side of the House, he said he was not surprised at it, because, for the first time in this Parliament, the leader of the Opposition had announced a policy, and it was something so very novel and so very strange that he was not surprised at his followers cheering him. I am not going into the general political history of the country; I am not going to refer to the numerous prominent points or disputes between the parties, wherein a policy has been formulated by the leader of the Opposition, a clear, a distinct and a definite policy; I am going to confine myself to the special question now before the House—the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I am going to ask the House whether there is any truth whatever in the charge. I will recall the attention of hon. members to the facts as they are to be found in *Hansard*, in the year 1880, when the proposition of the present Government to construct this road by means of this syndicate was first presented. It is within the knowledge of everybody who heard or who read the debate that the proposition was denounced by this side of House, and notably by the leader of the Opposition; but he did not stop at mere denunciation. It is known, it must be known to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, it is known to the country, that at that time the hon. gentleman not only denounced the proposition then presented as unfair and unjust to the people of this country, but he presented a

proposition of his own, a policy of his own, for the construction of that road, a policy worthy of a statesman, a policy which, I venture to assert, if it had been adopted when it was proposed by him, this country would not be in the difficulty and trouble it is now, and we would not be paying out the millions and millions of money we are asked to pay year by year in support of this syndicate. That policy was—instead of entering, upon the mad, the insane attempt to construct a Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean in the manner it has been attempted as fast as money can be obtained, by borrowing on the credit of this country; instead of rushing it into the Rocky Mountains and into a pass not previously surveyed, changing it from one place to another, before it is even ascertained that the latter route is passable at all; instead of rushing it through with an unprecedented haste, and boasting of that haste, when the result of it is injury instead of good—that proposed policy was that this road should be built as Parliament originally pledged itself to build it, as quickly as the resources of the country permitted, without unduly over burdening the tax payer; that it should be pushed through the prairie with energy; that it should be pushed through so as to be kept ahead of settlement and ahead of immigration; that it should be pushed through so that, when people flocked into that great country and settled it, branch lines might be built north and south; that it should be pushed through so that, when that country filled up, and we had a population there numbering millions, and the population of this Dominion, instead of numbering three or four millions, numbered six or seven, then we would be in a position, having our surveys completed, having a better knowledge of that country, having a better development of that country, having more money at our command and greater credit in the markets of the world, to push through the hitherto inaccessible mountains, the Rocky Mountains and the mountains beyond them. What is the result of the policy which has been adopted? It is that hundreds of miles of railway exist to-day, with hardly a settler upon them, and that the line has been pushed with such haste that, while it created a boom for a time, the pendulum swung, and swung with such a crash that it left hundreds of our best men in financial ruin, and spread disaster and dismay throughout the North-West; and that, instead of that country progressing as we expected it would, such has been the mismanagement and the reckless haste and the extravagance which has marked the course of the company, and of the Government, in regard to it, that we find them unable to complete the contract, and that year after year they are coming back and asking for more money. No policy? What hon. gentleman opposite will dare to get up and say that the policy of prudence and economy, the statesmanlike policy proposed in 1880 by my hon. friend, was not a policy to make that country prosperous, a policy which to-day would meet the approval of the best men in Canada? They dare not say so. They laughed at it then, and they laughed at it the next year, when my hon. friend said that the company were rushing much too fast, when he told them what the results were going to be, when he told them, with a prescience which they should commend instead of decrying, that the results would be ruin and disaster, and that if they rushed it through the Rocky Mountains without proper surveys, without knowing the grades and curves, they would be sure to meet with results such as he depicted in his speech the other day, which remains unanswered. Yet, in the face of this, we have the hon. gentleman saying that, for the first time in the history of this party, a policy has been announced. That is the usual course. One makes a ridiculous statement, another takes it up, and then, parrot-like, it is repeated through the press and by the *claqueurs* throughout the country, and on every platform, until the people almost believe it is true. I say that from the first an honest, prudent, statesman like railway policy has been propounded

on this side of the House, which, if adopted, would have made this a happy day for the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman, as usual, of course had to have his little shy or fling at the want of patriotism. Those hon. gentlemen cannot get through any speech without shouting want of patriotism. As I made some remarks upon that subject before dinner, I will not repeat them now; but the hon. gentleman went on to say, and he evidently thought his argument a very strong one, that we were not free, as a Parliament, to refuse this money; that we had entered into a compact with British Columbia to build that line in a certain time and in a certain way; and with the grandiloquence becoming a man of his position and expectations, he declared that every man who had voted in favor of that compact was bound to spend the country's last dollar to carry out this Canadian Pacific Railway undertaking, irrespective of the prudence or the propriety of granting this five millions; irrespective of the justice of the propositions made to us, we were bound to spend every dollar we could beg, borrow or—I was going to say steal—in order to carry this out. Sir, the hon. gentleman puts me in mind of Artemus Ward, who, during the late rebellion in the United States, announced that he was prepared to sacrifice all his wife's relations to maintain the honor of the stars and stripes. So the hon. gentleman himself, while declaring that he is ready to sacrifice the last dollar of the finances of this country, and every dollar we can lay hands upon, has taken care to remove some of his own dollars into the State of Texas, where they shall not be appropriated for the purposes of completing the Canadian Pacific Railway. Wonderful patriotism! I wonder if he thinks it is worthy of imitation. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman should know that this proposed loan, which we are now discussing, has nothing to do with carrying out the compact with British Columbia. That is not the proposition before us. I have heard it stated, time and again, and I have not heard it denied—it comes from the other side of the House—that the company are perfectly able to carry out their contract. Did we not hear it asserted and re-asserted last year by every leading light on the other side, that the money then voted to them was not needed to enable them to carry out the contract? It is to enable them to do something wonderful, that never was known before—I hardly know what it is myself. But they pledged themselves two years ago that, with these resources at their command, they could finish this contract by 1883, and they now want more money. They do not want to carry out the compact with British Columbia. They previously stated that the company could finish the construction of this road by 1886 without money. What do they want money now for? They want money because they have taken the money which they bound themselves to use for the construction of this contracted line and have appropriated it to their financial operations in other outside objects, with which the people of this country have nothing to do, and which it would have been better for the company if they had left entirely alone. Now, the hon. gentleman went on to complain that while we heard a great deal last year against monopolies, against the manner in which the contract was being carried out, this year, he said, we heard nothing from the hon. leader of the Opposition against the monopoly clauses, we heard nothing from him against the character of the work. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) was evidently in the position of a man who had prepared his speech beforehand. He thought he knew what the leader of the Opposition was going to say, and he made his speech ready to answer it, and it was such a good speech, that although it was not an answer, he could not resist the temptation to deliver it. If he had been in his place and had listened to the leader of the Opposition, or if he reads the *Hansard* now, he will find that page after page is taken in proving, to a demonstration,

by evidence taken from their own papers, mark you, not from newspaper reports, not from outside reports, but from the official papers made by these gentlemen themselves, and filed by these gentlemen themselves, in the office of the Minister of Railways, and laid upon the Table of this House, that the contract running through the Rocky Mountains, over the Selkirk Range, is not up to the standard, is not nearly up to the standard; it is not pretended to come within a mile of the standard; that both as regards grades and curves, and as regards other points in the standard which was selected, namely, the Union Pacific road, this road does not pretend to come up to it. He would find, further, that the leader of the Opposition denounced the monopolies in the most scathing terms, not only as being unjust in themselves—nay, he went further—as being unconstitutional; he denounced the monopolies and the manner in which the Government continued them in Manitoba. But he went further, and he denounced, as a breach of faith on the part of this Government with the people of Manitoba, their refusal to carry out the promises made by Sir Charles Tupper last year, when he applied for the loan of thirty millions, and stated that if we gave that loan the Government would see their way clear to relieve the people of Manitoba from this monopoly. So, Sir, I maintain that the very points which the hon. gentleman complained had been ignored by the leader of the Opposition were the points that received very great attention at his hands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this process of re-arranging securities and of advancing more money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is becoming an annual treat. In 1880, when the contract was entered into, it was contended that the people should accept it, because, in the first place, the men who composed the syndicate were men of great financial ability, were millionaires, were men possessing unbounded wealth, were men whose possession of wealth gave a guarantee to the country that the contract they entered into would be carried out faithfully; and secondly, that by letting the contract in this way we would be relieved from all the uncertainty and doubts which surrounded the construction of the road by ourselves; that we knew exactly what we were going to spend. We were asked to give them a princely subvention; we were asked not to withhold our hands, but to deal fairly, even lavishly, with these men, because in doing so we would have the best guarantee in the world that they would carry out their contract, and the company would not come back knocking at our doors for more help. We were to have an absolute guarantee, and to be relieved from all uncertainty. The House supported the proposition made by the First Minister, and these gentlemen got this contract. Last year, when we met here, the first thing we were called upon to do was to discuss this marvellous financial operation which they had entered into with the Government in the previous November, 1883, a scheme by which, by depositing a large amount of capital in the hands of the Government, they hoped to float their bonds, to boom their bonds, up to a figure in the market which would enable some of them to realise large fortunes. They hoped to realise such enormous sums of money by this financial operation that not only would they enrich themselves, but they were to have a large surplus with which to carry on all the operations connected with the contracted line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other outside enterprises in which they had engaged. We discussed that proposition, and we were told by the then Minister of Railways that that scheme had met with a great disaster. It had proved disastrous in every sense. Instead of booming the stock, the public had lost confidence in it; the stock had gone down, and they were obliged to come to Parliament and ask us for a loan of thirty millions more. Well, Sir, that proposition scattered

Mr. DAVIES.

to the winds every argument they had used when they proposed this scheme first to the House. The finality part of the scheme was gone. And, Sir, when he made that statement, and was obliged to tell us the condition in which that road then was, the manner in which those gentlemen had carried on their operations up to that date, it was evident that the operations had been carried on with an absence of all prudence and foresight, and we were again launched upon a wide sea of uncertainty and doubt. We were asked then to give the thirty millions, and we were told that this would end the difficulty. We were asked in the first place, to give up the million dollars of money they had deposited as a guarantee for the completion of the contract. We gave that up. We were asked afterwards to alter the mode of payment, so that they might have a more favorable mode of receiving their money than they had before; and we were asked, thirdly, to give them thirty millions of money. So the security which we had previously supposed we derived from the fixity of our obligations was gone. We replied, that in the absence of more reliable information, in view of the impossibility of reconciling the discrepancies existing between the different statements of this company, which they have put forward from time to time, we ought to decline to give this money. We had no guarantee that if we would give the money it would be final; and we had not sufficient information before us to justify reasonable and prudent men in giving the money. What information had we? The president of the road had made two or three authoritative statements as to the cost of the road. In December, 1882, he had published a statement, in which he was asking the capitalists of the world to take stock in the road, and he estimated the cost at \$99,000,000. In May, 1883, he published a manifesto to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway, and he repeated the same statements and made the same estimate. He pointed out that the subsidy was \$25,000,000, land grant bonds \$20,000,000, and the proceeds of \$90,000,000 of stock to realise \$54,000,000, which items would cover the \$99,000,000 which he had given as an estimate to the world; and a sum for which, after long consideration and consultation with his engineers and sub-engineers, he had come to the conclusion the road could be built. When the company came down to this House, instead of keeping to that statement, instead of continuing to abide by the calculations the president had made in that regard, they say: No; if you will give us \$30,000,000 it would be sufficient with which to build the road, being \$22,000,000 less than the sum the president told the public the company could build the road for, only six months before. The first estimate the company submitted was for \$99,000,000, as I have said. The last one, submitted last year, was \$85,000,000, being a difference of \$14,000,000. When we come to examine the estimate of 1885 we find it is composed in part of three items that do not appear in the first estimate: \$5,000,000 deposited in the hands of the Government for the payment of future dividends; \$3,500,000 to secure an extension to the seaboard; \$500,000 which had been paid for Credit Valley bonds, making \$9,000,000, not included in the previous estimate of \$99,000,000. And those \$9,000,000 added to \$13,000,000 makes a difference on the face of the estimate of \$22,000,000, that is, a difference in the estimate submitted in 1882, and repeated in May, 1883, and the one submitted for the loan in 1884. We said that unless we had something clearer and more definite it was not proper for the people and their representatives to vote the money asked. The House voted the money. What was said when the discrepancies were pointed out, when we showed there was a decided possibility that, as the company was going into large outside speculations, they would come back at a future time and demand additional money. We pointed out that in the case of the Grand Trunk similar subventions had been given, and time after time they had come back for aid. We pointed out that the circumstances of the two cases were parallel, and there was a

danger that before long the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would again be knocking at our door? What reply did we receive from hon. gentlemen opposite? They laughed our fears to scorn. They told us that although we might assume the role of prophets there was nothing in our prophecies—no ground or data to go on; and they did so, although we had pointed out the discrepancies in the figures, that the case was parallel with that of the Grand Trunk, and that we were voting money in the dark; although we showed that the line had not been properly surveyed, and that, as regards the new line proposed to run through the Kicking Horse Pass, the company did not yet know what it would cost. I remember, when I had the temerity to express my fear that the country would be called upon at a future day to pay more money, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) was very facetious on the point. He represented how utterly absurd it was; he knew more of the future; he had considered the whole question and determined that this application would be final. He could afford to laugh to scorn the fears of those who, having examined the question, thought it very probable that the company would be back again asking for more. I will read a few remarks from the hon. gentleman's speech, as he referred to me at that time. Referring to me, the hon. gentleman said:

"The hon. gentleman delights in representing this amount as a drain upon the Treasury, and not having the fear of many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in his eyes, he indulges in precise prophecies. Sir, the preciseness of Vennor's prophecies amounts to nothing beside his; Wiggins' snow storm fame has no business to light a candle beside the hon. member for Queen's, comparing the preciseness, the earnestness and the certainty with which they respectively predict. And he is equally precise as to the time; he does not leave himself much of a margin. He does not say, at some future time, or in a number of years, but in two years. In two years he says the company will be—where? They will be here; they will not be importuning the Government somewhere else, but before this House, this Parliament, and for what? Asking them for a sum of money."

"And with what delightful precision the hon. gentleman states that sum of money; it will be exactly twenty-two and a-half millions, not a dollar less or a dollar more. Now, Sir, let me hold up before the eyes of the gentlemen present this prophecy. Let me ask my hon. friend from Queen's, especially, to jot it down in his note book, for fear he may forget, and if he and I live just two years from this day of February, 1884, we will meet some place, and compare notes with reference to this prophecy. If I am not greatly mistaken, if I had a reputation to lose, I would not care to risk it in such a reckless way as the hon. gentleman has risked his reputation to-day."

He was sure on the point. He needed no more guarantees because he had the assurance of the Minister of Railways and of Mr. Stephen, president of the company, that \$30,000,000 would place the matter beyond all doubt. Then he had the assurance of the member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who said it was an absolute certainty. With such a magnificent trio as the hon. member for Cardwell, Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Stephen, the idea of a member of the Opposition daring to insinuate the possibility of another application was monstrous; and the hon. gentleman had his joke for a little time. We are here now. I have got my note book. But we are a little in advance of the time. The gentlemen are knocking at the door of this House again, before the two years are up. The hon. gentleman's friends could not wait for the two years to pass without making another grab at the Treasury. Equally is the hon. gentleman ready to vote more money and proclaim that they will not come again. He will be perfectly certain, as he was before, that this arrangement will carry them through. Has he not the assurance of a greater man than Sir Charles Tupper—the Acting Minister of Railways, and then there is the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) to back him up. There is no need to examine figures, to look at the returns, in order to see that the company have not to this day got their line located through the Kicking Horse Pass. There is no need to tell him that the company have thrown up a location through the Rocky Mountains which was fixed and practicable, and where the grades and

curves were within the standard, in order to go on a wild goose chase in search of a location through the unsurveyed Kicking Horse Pass. The hon. gentleman knows everything. I am told, with a preciseness, with an assurance which no other gentleman can rival, that they will never be here any more. All you have to do is to vote this money; and if they ever come again, the hon. gentleman will be equal to the occasion. I hope now, that hereafter, when a fear is expressed, which is not a mere prophecy, but is based on ascertained facts, he will devote himself to answering those facts, and not laughing at the prophecy, which is the result of them. Now, Sir, I said that we had the assurance of the hon. member for Cardwell that there was to be no doubt about this. Other men might have doubts, but he had fathomed and probed the thing to the bottom. He would not allow that there was any doubt.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. DAVIES. I guess you can hear. At present I am interested in letting the hon. member for Cardwell hear, and I notice by the smile on his face that he does hear.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVIES. I always admire his speaking; he speaks very fluently, and he generally manages to master his facts before he speaks. But he is a dangerous man, because, if it happens, as it often does, that his conclusions do not agree with the facts, then it is so much the worse for the facts. What did he say on that occasion last year:

"What we know is this, that we have the statement of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways as to what the cost will be of the completion of this railway. What we know, further, is this, that the money which is to be paid for it, the money which we are voting, is to be paid *pro rata* as the work proceeds, having regard to the amount required for the absolute completion of the road"—

Mark you, there was no risk about it. It was not to be paid in a lump sum, but as the work proceeded, so that there would be no hazard. Everything was to be arranged to be paid *pro rata* as the work proceeded; we had, in the certificate of the engineer, a guarantee of absolute certainty that for this money the road would be completed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So it will.

Mr. DAVIES. Why, then, do they ask us to give them \$5,000,000 more for nothing, and ask us so to rearrange the security that they can go to the money market and get \$15,000,000 more, we becoming second instead of first mortgagees.

"and that therefore, we have, in these arrangements—first, in the report of the chief engineer, which confirms the reports of the engineers of the company itself, and next in the fact that the money is only to be paid out as the work proceeds—a sufficient guarantee that at any rate the money will complete the railway as is proposed. But we have further than that. I believe that the difficulties which the company have had up to this time in selling their stock upon the open market have been due very largely to the determination on the part of rival companies to prevent the completion of this railway. The moment you prove to these rival companies, and to all interested in these rival companies, that this railway is going to be built, the moment you prove to them that the company have been able to make arrangements by which they are practically independent of the stock market altogether in the completion of the railway"—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear hear.

Mr. DAVIES. They were to be practically independent of the stock market altogether, but now they want to put \$15,000,000 more on the market:

"that motive, at least, is gone for the depreciation of the stock, and that being the case, the investing public will have the opportunity, quietly, without influences of that kind surrounding them, of investigating the character of this enterprise, its commercial value, the probability of its paying dividends upon the stock it has issued, how it stands in relation to other transcontinental railways of this continent; and I believe that, before the two years are up within which this road is to be built, the stock will be at such a rate that it will be a question for the Government whether they will allow the \$25,000,000 to be sold on condition of the \$22,500,000 being repaid to the Government. But, independent of that, the assurance we have from the chief engineer of the company, and the assurance we have had to-night from the hon.

Minister, that there is to be proper supervision in the expenditure of this money, in such a way that it shall only be spent having regard to the completion of the railway within the amount voted, affords to us the most perfect guarantee that can be afforded in any business transactions, that the railway will be completed within that time, and for no further sum of money than is here proposed to be voted."

That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. We had an hon. gentleman laughing and sneering at the prophecy, at the fear expressed that they might come here for more money, but the hon. member for Cardwell expressed his absolute certainty, his firm conviction, that by no possibility could they come here again; that they had enough money and they would have the road finished within the time, and for that amount and no more. Sir, where are we to-day? Where is the hon. gentleman to-day? The same hon. gentleman, with the same silvery tongue that persuaded the House to vote \$30,000,000 more, is here to-day asking that we should give up the security we took at that time, and advance \$5,000,000 more; and I have no doubt, I fear very much, that the same influence which secured the majority before will secure the majority again. Sir, I believe the country are beginning to be awake on this question. I believe that these annually recurring demands, enforced as they may be with all the eloquence and power of the hon. gentleman, are beginning to be seen through by the country, and that the country are now arousing themselves to the fact that no reliance is to be placed on the statements made by these gentlemen, on which they obtained the money before, and that as no reliance could be placed on them then the presumption is that no reliance can be placed on their statements now. They are in no better position now than they were then; they had not located the line then, and they have not located it now; there is the same doubt and uncertainty, and we are in a worse position, because we know now what we only feared then, that the grades and curves are such as to make it almost impossible for this railroad to compete with the roads to the south.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the grades?

Mr. DAVIES. I will come to them in a moment. I intend to read them. I had almost persuaded myself not to read them, but as the hon. gentleman does not know, I will quote them again, from the speech of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. You said, a moment ago, that I knew everything.

Mr. DAVIES. If you don't, I am much surprised, because you always pretend to know everything. Now, Sir, I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friend, and he had better let me get through with my argument. I want to submit to the House that there were three grounds upon which the loan was carried last year. First, there was the finality clause. It was to be absolutely final, and there were to be no demands afterwards. In the second place, the loan was to be absolutely secured—secured beyond peradventure; and third, that loan, if granted, was to secure the abolition of the railway monopoly in Manitoba. In what position do we stand to-day, with reference to those three grounds? Their presence here to-day shows that the loan is not final; their presence here, asking that the security be given up, and your consent to their request, shows that your security, which you said then was absolutely good, is now to be made insecure. You propose to become partners with the public for \$15,000,000 of the \$30,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Mixed.

Mr. DAVIES. No; there is no mixing about it, but you are going to mix the security. You submitted that the arrangement last year made the security beyond a doubt, and you propose to-day to alter that security, so as to take in \$15,000,000 of the bondholders as co-mortgagees with

Mr. DAVIES.

yourself, and thus become second mortgagees to that extent. Then, Sir, as to the third promise, it was more than a promise. I contend that it was a compact. I contend that the official statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, in submitting that proposition to the House last year, with reference to the abolition of the railway monopoly in Manitoba, amounted to a compact. He said, in distinct terms, that if the House would vote that \$30,000,000, such was his confidence in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in their ability to carry out the road, such was his confidence in the success of their undertaking, such was the absolute certainty they had that their undertaking would be a great success, and that they would be able to compete with other lines, that we would be able to do away with this monopoly and throw the country open for the building of other roads to compete with them. Where are you to-day? A month has not passed by since we heard, in the Railway Committee Room, that pledge which was given by Sir Charles Tupper repudiated by the Acting Minister of Railways, who told us there that the Government had changed their policy.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear:

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for Cardwell may laugh as long as he likes. I challenge him to deny it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do deny it.

Mr. DAVIES. Every member who was in that committee room heard the Acting Minister of Railways say that he did not propose that that pledge should be carried out, heard him say that the monopoly clause would not be interfered with for some time to come, and that he could not give any guarantee that it would be interfered with until the road became a thoroughly paying road. Therefore, I say that the pledge given by Sir Charles Tupper has been violated, that the grounds on which you justified the granting of the \$30,000,000 last year are now proved to be worthless, that your security is being tampered with, your contract is being broken, and the company are here asking that a new loan may be given. What is the arrangement asked to be made to-day? We are asked to reduce the rate of interest from 5 to 4 per cent., to begin with. We are asked to share the security with the public, so that while we shall have first mortgage bonds for \$20,000,000, \$15,000,000 of the same kind of stock will be held by the outside public. Every one knows that if you come to foreclose your mortgage you will have to buy up and pay for every dollar of that \$15,000,000 of outstanding stock. The Government will have to pay that \$15,000,000, and you might as well pledge your credit for it fairly and squarely at once as to do it in this roundabout way. More than that; we had the guarantee given us last year that the money then granted would be repaid in a short time. Remember, a number of gentlemen on this side of the House, who thought the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not be able to pay the money back, were told there was not a doubt of it. What position do we stand in to-day? Are we assured that the money payable in 1886 or that payable in 1891 shall be paid at those dates? No, Sir; the payment has been postponed indefinitely; there is no time fixed; the bonds may be issued for fifty years, and even the bald promise of payment in any definite time that was made last year is taken away from you; you are lending your money indefinitely, without any fixity of time, and you are at the same time sharing your security with the outside public. I want to know how this transaction can be defended. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said he had no doubt others would come forward and challenge and refute the accuracy of the statements made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I will wait, and the country will wait, with great interest, to hear—not a fine, eloquent speech, not a grand display of declamation, not a lot of nonsense about patriot-

ism—but an answer to the statement of facts prepared with great care by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and as to the accuracy of which he pledged himself he had no serious doubt. He said he had gone carefully over them; and I suppose he has mastered the papers in a way that no other hon. member of this House has done. The papers are there. The Minister of Railways knows that the statements are true; and the country are bound to believe that they are true, unless some hon. gentleman can rise in his place and refute them. If default takes place in the payment of this money, if we are obliged to take over this road, what position shall we be in?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Have the road.

Mr. DAVIES. And what shall we have paid for it? Anything like the sum hon. members were last year so fond of declaring we should have to pay for it? Look at the figures. First of all, the country will have to pay the cash subsidy of \$25,000,000; the cash received by the company from the sale of lands we gave them, \$11,000,000; the money we lent them, secured by railway mortgage, \$20,000,000; the money we lent them, secured by land mortgage, \$10,000,000; the cost of the portion of the road constructed by the Government, \$30,000,000; the cash paid for surveys, \$3,500,000; and the money we shall have to pay the bondholders, \$15,000,000; and you will have to pay, outside of the remaining lands at all, more than \$114,000,000 in cash before you can get possession of that road; \$114,000,000, I suppose, will be laughed at as a flea bite; but that is going to strain the resources of this country to the utmost, taxed, as they are, by the extravagance and the mismanagement of the present Administration; I question very much if it is not going to overtax them, and if, in the near future, you will not find that you have paid ten times too dear for your whistle. What is the character of the road, so far as the Rocky Mountain section is concerned? The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) asked me if I would read something as to its character. I will do so, but before I read a very short extract from the statement of the leader of the Opposition, compiled, not from his own private information or on his own responsibility, but from official returns, let me give you a statement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves, and we shall see if the official declarations they make are consistent with the official documents filed. In the report of the company, which was only published yesterday or the day before, we have this statement:

"The directors, therefore, can confidently assure the shareholders that by the early spring of next year the through line from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean (a distance of 2,895 miles) will be finished and in perfect condition, thoroughly equipped, possessing every requisite facility for doing its work economically and efficiently, and at least equal to the best of its competitors in all respects, particularly as to the curves and gradients, permanent way and rolling stock, the quality and character of the railway being far above the standard fixed in the contract with the Government."

Well, Sir, is that correct or not? Hon. gentlemen will see that they pledged themselves, in this statement which they sent forth to the public, that, particularly as to curves and gradients, etc., the railway is far above the standard; they are not satisfied with its being up to the standard, but they claim that it is far above the standard fixed in the contract. What was the standard fixed in the contract? I hope that this House will not have the statement repeated again, which was made here the other day, that the standard up to which they were to build their road was not the Union Pacific, but a branch or portion of that road, called the Central Pacific. When we turn to Sir Charles Tupper's statements, based upon the company's own written guarantee, we find that not only last year, but the year before, he declared that the standard was to be the Union Pacific; and, for the first time, we find now an attempt made to shield this company from keeping up to the standard of the Union Pacific, by the statement that they kept up to the standard of another line,

called the Central Pacific, the curves and gradients of which are not up to those of the Union Pacific. Let me read what the leader of the Opposition said. It was in reference to an interpolation of the Acting Minister of Railways, who said that the Central Pacific was part of the Union Pacific:

"Mr. BLAKE. It is not part of the Union Pacific. It was not part of the Union Pacific at the time the Canadian Pacific contract was made. Their standards are different, and it was the standard of the Union Pacific and not the standard of the Central we adopted. Compare the grades. You have a maximum grade on the Union Pacific of only 90, and there are only 16-32 miles of that maximum grade. On the Canadian Pacific there is a maximum grade, on the intended permanent line, of 116 or 117, and over 52 miles of that. On the Union Pacific there is a maximum curve of 6 degrees, and on the intended permanent line of the Canadian Pacific Railway the curves are even in excess of 10 degrees, for there is one 10-40 on the intended permanent line. But you have got also, on the temporary line, to be used for a long time, a maximum grade of 237 as against a maximum grade of 90, or under 90, on the standard line. What is the curvature? On the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway there is, apart from the temporary line, and leaving out the 11-30 curve, 142 curves of 10 degrees, 69 of 9 degrees, 338 of 8 degrees, 114 of 7 degrees, 39 over 6 degrees, or 687 curve sin excess of the maximum curve on the standard line. What as to the number of curves? There are no less than 4,258 curves at 10 degrees, or no less than 4,945 curves. The total curvature of the line is 900 miles, or 35 per cent. of the whole length of the line."

Is the hon. gentleman satisfied? I have given him the curves, the figures of the leader of the Opposition, extracted from the reports. Will he deny their accuracy? Will he dare to assert, after this, that the standard has been kept up in the matter of grades and curves? Will he dare to assert that they have gone far beyond the standard in the contract which they promised to keep up? They have gone beyond it, but in the wrong direction. They have fallen off and given us a line which is impracticable as a transcontinental line. Those curves and grades, I am assured by those who know, will make the line impossible as a transcontinental line. Yet to-day you are asked to rearrange the securities, to give up your security, to reduce your interest and advance \$5,000,000 more, in order to do what? In order to enable this company to do what they have asserted, not once but twenty times, they had sufficient money and resources to do without additional aid. A serious charge against the Canadian Pacific Railway is, that when they made their contract they found a line surveyed and located, they found a practicable line, with curves and grades within the contract, which they could have adopted. They chose, however, to deflect their line away to the south, to run the risk of running their line through a pass in the mountains which had never been surveyed, to run a risk no sane man would run. They ask you to take all the risk, because they ask you to give the money to carry their enterprise out; and doing this, they are reprehensible in the highest degree, and instead of being fondled and petted and advanced money by this Parliament, year after year, at the expense of the people, they should be told that this Parliament intends to keep them up to the contract, to exact from them something like a compliance with the contract they made, and their repeated promises to carry it out. I will not weary the House with any more figures upon this point. I had intended to do so; I had prepared some schedules; but until those which have already been given by my hon. friends have been answered, it is only wearisome to have them repeated, either in the same or a different form. They lead to the same conclusion, and until they are repudiated or challenged, their accuracy must be accepted by this side and the other side, too, if they want to act honestly. I will not occupy the attention of the House any longer. I think I have satisfied the House that the argument of the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is untenable. I think I have shown that we have no guarantee, if we make this new arrangement, that it will be final. I think I have shown that the company have no line located which they can carry through the mountains; I think I have shown that they have made statements in their reports on most important

points which are not strictly accurate; and I believe I may fairly challenge the House that, at this period, and after the statements that have been made on this side, we might have a cessation of the claim to a monopoly of patriotism, which hon. gentlemen opposite constantly put forth. The Liberal party stands here as representatives of at least one-half of Canada, as men who have as much at stake in the country as hon. gentlemen opposite, and whose patriotism is as great as theirs. When they charge the Liberal party with being unpatriotic, they are making a most unpatriotic statement, because, in charging the Liberal party with being unpatriotic, they charge more than half the people with being unpatriotic. It must be remembered that, although the numbers on the opposite side are very much larger than on this, the numbers we represent are not in the same proportion. We claim to represent, and we do represent, at least one-half of the people; and I think I may be pardoned, from a party point of view, when I say that we represent fairly the better half. But whether that is so or not, I contend this House is tired, and this country is tired, of the constant claim these gentlemen put forward to a monopoly of patriotism. Of patriotism in its highest sense they seem to know little. They confound their party with their country, and as allegiance to the former generally brings large spoils in its train, they flatter themselves when the spoils are the largest the patriotism is the deepest. Experience has shown that with them, at any rate, the plant only flourishes in times of party prosperity, and that its depth can at any time be gauged by the amount of the spoils they are allowed to appropriate for themselves and their friends.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened, as I am sure all must have listened, with a great deal of interest and a great deal of amusement to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. If I may venture upon a little mild and not ill-natured criticism of my hon. friend, I might say that he, in my opinion, in a very susceptible gentleman, and when I say that I do not say anything to his discredit, for that is not at all an unamiable quality in any man. I might go a little further, and say he is somewhat excitable in temperament, and even in that I do not blame him; and when his susceptibility comes to be played upon by the exciting plaudits which he received from his friends who are about him, he runs a very great risk of becoming somewhat reckless in his statements, and as the more reckless the statement, generally, the greater amount of applause it receives on that side the applause acts upon and heightens the recklessness, which reacts upon and heightens the excitability, and the effect is to make his speaking, picturesque indeed, but not as effective as it might be. Now, the hon. gentleman does himself an injustice. Being a lawyer, I suppose, he begins, as sometimes lawyers are apt to do, by depreciating the qualities of the opposing counsel. The hon. gentleman did an injustice to himself at the very beginning of his speech, in trying to make it appear that the principal part of his auditors, those on this side of the House, were a very ignorant set of people. Now, no man of intelligence, no man of great breadth of mind and great scope of intellect, wishes to speak to an ignorant audience, to an audience the ignorance of which is so gross that it cannot by any means serve as a draw to the powers within him; and I almost came to the conclusion, when I hear my hon. friend beginning in that way, that he feels a little misgiving in himself, as if he had not the mental power or the facts at his command that he ought to have, and therefore he feels he is in a better position if his audience are imagined in a similar situation. Then he goes on, in true lawyer-like style, to depreciate the good faith and the honest purpose of the person whose arguments he is attacking; so he says, of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that he was put up to speak by the Government. That

Mr. DAVIES.

immediately minimises the effect of my hon. friend's remarks, for no one should be put up to speak; not even my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) should be put up to reply, and that, of course, takes away, in the eyes of his friends, from the force and reliability of the arguments to be replied to. Not only that, however; but he goes further, and says my hon. friend is been put up and has a brief placed into his hands by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself. That is still worse, to have a brief in Parliament, to have a brief at the hands of a company, and at the hands of a company which is asking for a certain loan. If he could once put that insinuation out, as far as it went, it would carry this with it, that the arguments coming from a gentleman in that position were arguments which deserved no reply and should have no weight at all. Then he goes on to talk of the press, which does not agree with him, as being parrot-like, and of all who repeat any ideas which swell up from this great fountain of ideas the Parliament of Canada, on our side of the House, at least, as *claqueurs*; and then the hon. gentleman has everything fixed to his own liking; his audience is an ignorant one, his opponent is just put up as a sort of spokesman for some person, and whatever is said against him in the press opposed to him is a parrot-like repetition, and whatever is said outside by others is merely the echo of the *claqueurs*; so the hon. gentleman, having fortified himself so far, thinks himself justified in making the most extravagant statements I have ever heard any man make. He is very cross, too, in his very mild and gentle manner, because every person who speaks on this side does not make a line-for-line, word-for-word answer to the speech delivered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I rather suspect my friend of a little sinister motive in this. There has been so much of what some gentlemen have called obstruction this year, and it is said in some of the papers that it is going to be carried on a little further, that I almost suspect that the taunts of my hon. friend are intended to goad all on this side to attempt an eight-hour answer to the eight-hour speech of the member for Durham, to the end and purpose that this Session shall be indefinitely prolonged. I almost fear that that is his motive. But life is short, and you must give us the poor satisfaction of speaking for a moderate length of time, and allow four or five of us, in point of time, at least, to take the task of answering the elaborate and lengthened speech of the hon. member for West Durham. My hon. friend, after his susceptibility had been excited and his reckless mood had come full upon him, gave utterance to a number of statements, some few of which I will very briefly review. He spoke, in the first place, of this demand for a loan of \$5,000,000 as for money which had been recklessly sunk in the building of the road to the east of Callander. Now, that is not quite true, for this \$5,000,000, so far as we can judge, from the statement put before us, is money which has already been expended by the company in providing the equipment which is necessary for the operation of this great road, and I have as yet heard nothing said against the quality and kind of that equipment, so that this \$5,000,000 has not been sunk in the construction of the road east of Callander; it is money which has been placed in the equipment of the road, without which the road could not be operated, which equipment, if we can judge from what we have seen and heard of it, is an ample and good equipment for the purposes of the road, so far as it goes. My hon. friend then spoke of the railway monopoly, and grew eloquent, and denominated it a curse to this land for all future years. Now, this railway monopoly which is so much talked about ought to be somewhat analysed by my hon. friend before he characterises it by such strong statements. It cannot be such a great monopoly in the matter of prices, for I think the leader of the Opposition stated here that the Northern Pacific road itself,

owing to circumstances peculiar somewhat to it, charged more unreasonable rates by far, and was in a position to do so, than the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. It cannot be such a terrible and fatal monopoly, as far as rates are concerned, if it bears that good comparison with the road built nearly contemporaneously with itself, and an equally good comparison relatively with older and longer constructed roads than itself. The Farmers' Union, which could not be supposed to be very much affected in favor of the railway company, has borne testimony, over and over again, to the fairness of its rates and to the great benefit which has come to the country in the treatment this company has given it in the matter of rates. It cannot be proved to be a monopoly in the sense of grinding upon the people, in the way of the rates which it fixed and the tariff it placed upon the movement of passengers and freights. Of course, it is a monopoly in one sense of the word, because it is the only line which runs through a large section of the country, but it will have to be first proved that it does not give fair treatment, in the way of fair rates and tariffs, to the country through which it passes, before you can show that that monopoly is a dangerous one. My hon. friend then said that some of the original investors in this guarantee fund were getting 24 per cent., were being paid that upon the original investment. Now, if he takes a certain small portion and carries out the investigation upon it alone, he may find sufficient to justify a statement something like that, but he has not put the whole truth before the country, and he ought, in fairness—that hon. gentleman who said he would not even tell a lie to get money from England—to put the whole truth with reference to this matter before the House and before the country. The impression I took from his speech is that these bloated monopolists had prepared for themselves a 24 per cent. interest on their capital, and were then coming to this heavily-burdened country for more aid. Sir, that is not the whole truth. I have had placed in my hands a statement of the accountant of that road, which I believe will be found to be correct, and I will read it to the House, so that the whole truth may be known with reference to the interest on those investments:

Interest on first \$10,000,000, to 17th, February 1883, say two years, average...	9½ per cent.
From 17th August, 1883, to 17th August, 1885, these shareholders received 5 per cent on \$25,000,000, say for two years, average .....	12½ "
From 17th August, 1885, to 17th February, 1893, inclusive, say 8 years, these shareholders will receive 3 per cent on \$25,000,000, say, per annum.....	7½ "
Average of the whole period.....	8½ "
Average of the whole stock, say....	7 "

After August, 1883, guarantee ceases.

Sir, this is the truthful statement, and when you place that before the country, an investment of money running over that period, and all the reasons involved, with the guarantee to stop at that time, with, if hon. gentlemen opposite are to be believed, little prospect for net earnings above the fixed charges, I say no fair minded jury of our people would hold that that is an excessive rate as an investment upon money which they have put into the enterprise. The average that the whole number of shareholders receive out of this guarantee fund until the time it ceases is somewhere, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, in the region of 7 per cent. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman stated that we were so liable to change on this side of the House that it was impossible to argue with us. He said that in the early inception of the work we argued that large subventions were necessary, because there would probably be a period of years of indefinite duration during which the receipts from the road would be very small. Now, he says we contend that the running expenses, taken in connection

with the receipts, will give a good net earning, and so there is a prospect for the payment of the interest on our loan. Well, Sir, I think if there has been any good reason why large subventions were necessary for this railway, in order to get a company to take hold of it, those reasons have been supplied by the hon. gentlemen opposite. From 1870 up to 1880 it was constantly held by them that even though you built this railway through from Callander to the Pacific Ocean it must be run at an enormous expense, amounting up, as had been calculated by prominent gentlemen on that side of the House, to \$8,000,000 a year; while others stated that it must be run at a loss for an indefinite period. Those statements being spread throughout the country, created the impression that before a company could take hold of that road enormous subventions must be given it, in order to guarantee it against alleged loss; so that if large subventions had to be given in 1880 it was a direct consequence of the multiplied arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman disclaims the idea that they have an intention of repudiation upon that side. He says: No, we do not intend to repudiate; we simply say to you that you have \$14,000,000 of your own money, and we want you to use it before coming back and asking us for more. Now, I wish the hon. gentleman had taken the time to explain to this House just what that resolution means. Does it mean anything? If it means anything, what else does it mean but practical repudiation? When Mr. Stephen comes here and places the case of the company before this House, the hon. gentleman says to him: There is your \$14,000,000; it is your own money; use it; and not until it is used up do you come here asking for more. Now, is that the money of Mr. Stephen and the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is it money that they can take hold of and do as they please with it? Or is it capital placed there for the benefit of every individual shareholder, whether he be in Canada, the United States, in Europe or in Asia? I want to ask that hon. gentleman to give us a practical way by which we can get the consent of everyone of those shareholders to the conversion of that sum of money in the way he indicates. I say that, though not a lawyer, I believe that we cannot find a practical way. He simply says: Do thus and so; knowing, at the time, that it is impracticable and impossible. Not until you can get the unanimous consent of the shareholders who have subscribed can you have that conversion made, as the hon. gentleman seemed to assert that this resolution aims at. But what does that amount to after all? We, as a Parliament, have given our faith, have passed a solemn Act, by which we state that we hold in trust sufficient to pay 3 per cent. to all who invest in these stocks. That goes forth to the public. Men see that. They read it over, and they say this Dominion is solvent; this Dominion has pledged that guarantee, and on the strength of that pledge we will make the investment. The hon. gentleman's proposal is to withdraw that guarantee; it is to deal unfairly by the shareholders, who have subscribed on the faith of that guarantee, and who look to it as providing them for a certainty with 3 per cent. until the time expires. Grant that no other money must be asked for until this is exhausted. The company needs now for its equipment and its floating debt somewhere in the vicinity of twelve millions in a short time, and that would almost totally exhaust the guarantee fund. So that after a single year had passed, instead of having a guarantee of 3 per cent. upon their investment for eight years and a-half, they would have the cessation of that guarantee, and they would lose what they supposed had been a permanent investment for that time. But, Sir, it is an impossible thing to do; it is impracticable. You cannot get the shareholders, widely scattered over this country, even if they were willing, to submit to that scheme.

Mr. DAVIES. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the compact was made between the Government and the individual shareholders, or between the Government and a corporate body?

Mr. FOSTER. The person who, with his money in his hands, looked about for investments, simply read this, and upon that he made his investment. The Government of this country had fourteen or fifteen million dollars in its possession, and had guaranteed to pay into the trustees' hands, the Bank of Montreal, every half year, a sufficient amount of money, so long as that guarantee lasted, to pay the 3 per cent. upon the sum which was invested. The element of faith ought to be maintained in that transaction, and in such a way it would be neither for the credit of the country nor for the future good of the company which may run the road, that it should be interfered with. The hon. gentleman then declared that the request of this company for \$5,000,000 as a short loan for one year was one of the most impudent applications that had ever been made to any Parliament; and it must be made to a Government which had lost all wholesome fear of the people to be entertained at all. So far as that is concerned, it is a simple matter of business arrangement—a loan upon certain securities. Taking into account the nature of the company's transactions, the road which it has in charge and the vast national interests which centre around it, it is on a different basis as regards the Government, and is entitled to greater consideration than would a smaller business arrangement. The company comes to this House and says: We have undoubted security to offer you; we want a short loan of \$5,000,000, until we can convert our bonds, which are being arranged for, into money; we will pay you interest, and return you the principal at the end of one year. If it is impudent for one man to go to another and propose to borrow money on approved security, then it is impudent for the company to ask the House for an advance of money on good security and payment of interest. If not, this cannot come under the denomination of an impudent transaction. The hon. gentleman has the most unbounded faith in his leader, and I commend him for that. But the hon. gentleman has also an almost obtrusive way of expressing his admiration of his leader's wonderful brilliancy and power, whenever he gets upon his feet. Seldom does he rise to address the House that he does not shower on his leader, if he happens to be in the House, and sitting just in front of him, a great many high flown and often well deserved compliments, until I almost imagine that it excites the jealousy of some hon. gentlemen near him, lest he may have an ulterior end in view, and hope that, when the day of reconstruction comes, he may, by a judicious use of judicious compliments, stand a chance of promotion to the Cabinets which are to be.

An hon. MEMBER. We do not do that over here.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman said his leader was worth half a dozen members on this side, in point of patriotism.

Mr. CASEY. Three dozen.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for West Elgin says three dozen, and the House has always unlimited respect for his opinion. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., stated that his leader is worth a dozen men on this side, and that he is most self-sacrificing in his labor. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the leader of the Opposition does an immense amount of very hard and earnest work. I believe he deserves credit from both sides of the House for that ability which he possesses and that industry which he displays. I am willing, as one on this side, to pay that compliment to him, which is as hearty as I think it is well deserved. But I imagine the hon. member for West Durham has to exercise a good deal of self-sacrifice in other ways. He had to exercise a good deal of self-sacrifice,

Mr. FOSTER.

not long ago, in being obliged to remain two months while a very long and dreary discussion was taking place on the Franchise Bill; and no doubt his patience was tested when thus called upon to learn a lesson of resignation to evil, which, though he would like to have cured, yet he did not seem, at the time, to have the power to cure. But I was amused at the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who said that when the member for West Durham was making his eight hours' speech, and bringing forward those awful facts, dragging them out of the limbo of past years, where they had lain, after having been brought out and stored away again and again, that he sat there and hoped that his leader was wrong in the statements he was making. I can imagine the hon. gentleman sitting in alternate hope and fear, hoping, when his better nature got the upper hand, that the statements were wrong, for the sake of the country, and fearing, sometimes, when his other nature gained the ascendancy, that these hopes might prove to be false, and that he would not lose a very splendid and efficient instrument with which to triumph over his opponents. But there was this fact to be noticed: Although he stood up to-day and stated that he hoped that those statements were not true, I looked straight at the hon. gentleman, and I did not see one sign of the deep grief that was gnawing out his heart. I did not hear any tremor in the tones of his voice, or any sign of melancholy in the eye which generally denotes heart-felt grief; and I almost think the hon. gentleman would be glad if those statements should prove true, so that he might have a weapon with which to belabor his political adversaries. Passing over some other remarks made by that hon. gentleman, I may remark that the hon. gentleman stated, as he came to an honest moment in his speech, that he would not tell a lie—under certain conditions—not even to get money from England. I thought the hon. gentleman would have had more consideration for a very able and earnest member of his party, who sat not very far from him, and who is said to have gone to England, once upon a time, and to have made certain statements which he wrote on the silver side of the shield, in order to obtain a loan of money, and when he came back he stated, and has stated often, propositions quite different from the statements he made in order to obtain a loan in England. Now, I come to the hon. gentleman's prophecy business. It is amusing to see the hon. gentleman in his quest for real eggs, and to notice that he finds, in almost every respect and on every occasion, nothing in the nest—a mere mare's nest. He has rather spoken against my power of prophecy, and has stated his own powers, and has declared that he made certain prophetic declarations last year, after he had carefully looked into and investigated the matter. What was the prophecy? If the hon. gentleman wants to be called a prophet no one will more gladly grant him those powers than myself: but if not, I shall feel it a public duty to expose his claims to prophecy if they have not a good foundation. What foundation have they? He went over the same statement last year as he went over to-night. He made two calculations. He put \$77,000,000 in one estimate and \$99,000,000 in the other, and then he said:

"There is a discrepancy of \$22,000,000. I can never satisfy my mind that there can be any finality in this measure, with that discrepancy existing. I have no doubt, in my own mind, that I may be wrong, but I form my conclusions from what I have stated to the House, and it seems to me the argument is a good one—I have not the shadow of a doubt—"

At first the hon. gentleman had no doubt. Then he gets a little stronger, owing to his susceptible and excitable temperament, and he states there is not a shadow of doubt:

"that before two years roll over the heads of the people of this country, an application will be made here to advance that \$22,000,000 additional."

That is the hon. gentleman's prophecy, that before two years were passed \$22,000,000 will be asked for at the

hands of this Parliament, and will be asked for—for what purpose? For the purpose of the construction of the road. He makes the declaration that before two years roll round \$22,000,000 will be asked for by the company for construction purposes. Well, before the two years have passed away the hon. gentleman hastens ahead of time to reap the results of his prophetic declaration. Better wait, my good friend, until the two years roll round; it will be time enough then. At present, there is not even a beginning of the dawn of the fulfilment of that policy. In the first place, the money granted last year for construction purposes is sufficient for construction purposes. We have the statements of the company, of the Minister of Railways; we have the statements of the Department; we have the calculations to show that there is sufficient of the money granted last year for construction purposes, every dollar of which is to go into construction purposes; and what the company asks for this year is not for construction purposes, but simply for the equipment of the road. Now, then, if the right to be considered a true prophet, if the proof of that reputation can be established by a representation like that—by his foretelling, in his prophecy, \$22,000,000 for construction purposes, when not a dollar has been asked for construction purposes—if that can be a foundation sufficient upon which to claim a prophetic reputation, then any of us can be a prophet. In the first place, I suppose there is no difference between \$5,000,000 and \$22,000,000, and there is no difference between \$22,000,000 for construction purposes and \$5,000,000 for the equipment of the road. It is only a small matter, that; it would not interfere with the hon. gentleman's claims to be considered a prophet. Now, in speaking with reference to that, I stated that we would meet in two years after that time, and the hon. gentleman would see whether it happened or not. It is not begun to happen, and next year we will be able to compare notes, but before that time I beg him not to leave the category of ordinary, fallible mortals and enshrine himself among the prophets. What was the policy of the parties in the matter of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? I do not intend to go back into a long-past history. I do not intend to take up this matter from the year 1870, and follow it to the present time. That has been done over and over again; and, Sir, we have had the same matters brought before us, year after year, and in the same year the same matters gone over again, and again, and again, with reference to these things. I merely wish to put the broad points of difference between the policy of the two parties since the year 1880. I say that in the year 1870, in those first years, it was impossible to have done, with reference to a railway policy or railway construction, what it was possible to do after 1880, because the conditions of the country were not known, the surveys had not been approximately completed, the resources of the country were not even dreamed of, and it was impossible to have that faith or confidence, that intelligent power of direction which could be obtained under the conditions of past years. But in 1880 the surveys had been fairly well completed, the resources of the country had been pretty thoroughly studied, and that faith and confidence and intelligent direction in these matters might well have assumed to shape themselves into a policy. What, then, was the policy of the leader of the Opposition, and I suppose of my hon. friend who took his seat a little time ago? The first point was this: that it was a policy of indefinite postponement of the building of the far west section of this trans-continental railway. That was the policy of the hon. gentleman, as enunciated over and over again, and enunciated particularly in his famous railway speech in this House in 1880. He proceeded to consider the western section as extending from the longitude of Edmonton to the Pacific coast, and he proposed the indefinite postponement of the

building of that road. Here are his statements, with reference to it:

"It is because, in our opinion, it is desirable that a postponement of the western section of the Pacific Railway should take place, that I propose to place my amendment in your hands.

That amendment was this:

"That the public interests require that the work of constructing the Pacific Railway in British Columbia should be postponed—"

Mr. DAVIES. Is the word "indefinite" there?

Mr. FOSTER. Now, my hon. friend was away ahead of time in his prophecy, so I hope he will have patience this time, and I will come to that. That proves that his policy was a policy for the postponement of building the western section. My hon. friend asks where the indefinite part comes in. If he will listen, I will prove it to him. The hon. gentleman made many calculations as to what would be the cost of that road. The lowest of these calculations was the sum of \$45,000,000, as the sum necessary for the construction of that road; and the hon. gentleman laid down the platform that it should not be built until a sufficient fund for the building of it had been gained out of the sale of lands in the North-West. And when you come to read over what he says about the sales of the lands in the North-West, you will find that the postponement, if the theory was to be carried out, must be an indefinite postponement, for he proposed to put on the sales of land in the North-West these charges—the charge of all expenses connected with the survey of the lands and the sale of them:

"Indeed, he says, I may go further, and say that the cost of payments for Indians, of over \$550,000 a year, and for the Mounted police force about \$300,000 a year, in all \$850,000 a year, and other local charges, are prior charges on the price of the land."

He states elsewhere that not until these lands are sold, and there are purchasers of them, and a fund is raised for the building of the road, did he propose to build the western section. We had before the postponement idea, and this added to it makes the policy one of indefinite postponement. Well, the other feature of his policy was that of the prolonged postponement of the building of the eastern section of the road. The eastern section might be built at some future time, and the period was an indefinite period. In speaking about that, he states that the eastern section may be begun in 1891, and it is possible it may be finished in 1897, and he says to his Quebec friends: I hope you may all live to see it completed at that distant date. He looked upon these two things as essential parts of his policy; but he believed in another thing, and that was the building, as my hon. friend has said to-night, of the prairie and central sections—the building of the road from Lake Superior to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg out into the prairie. Gradually go as far as the longitude of Edmonton, and there stop, until a purchase fund was obtained from the sale of lands sufficient to build westward to the Pacific Ocean. There was another feature in this railway policy, and it was this: Connection of the central and prairie railroad system of the North-West with the United States system of railways, not at one point only, but at all available points. That must be true, because he and the gentlemen associated with him have been continually talking, since the charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was granted, against the terrible wrong inflicted on the North-West, in having the monopoly clause in it, and the disallowance power exercised by this Government. Therefore we must infer, if he and those thinking with him are earnest and honest in their position towards disallowance, that if they had been in power there would have been no disallowance, and this central and prairie railroad system of the North-West would have connected with the United States railroad system at all convenient points. Another feature of the hon.

gentleman's policy was to subordinate the trade of the eastern portion of Canada to the trade of the United States, so far as the North-West is concerned. Hon. gentlemen inveigh against the national policy, which they say bears upon the people of the North-West specially hard; their natural market is just to the south of them; and here you raise a barrier between them and that natural market. What is the supposition we must draw from that? That if the hon. gentleman was in power we should have no such barrier, but that there would be as free trade between the North-West and the great centres of population of the western States as there is between the North-West and eastern Canada. The result of that would be to have thrown the trade and the thoughts and sympathies of the North-West with the trade and thoughts and sympathies of the United States of America; and it would have cut off from Eastern Canada, by the very nearness of the competition, the increasingly profitable trade that is growing up between the eastern Provinces of Canada and our great North-West, which they have bought and upon which they have expended so much money. Another feature of the hon. gentleman's policy was a generally expressed distrust of the resources and capabilities of Canada for the completion of this road. In this speech he states, over and over again, that it will beggar the country. That everything we can borrow or beg will be absorbed; that the resources of the country are not sufficient for the undertaking; that it will tax the country so greatly as to bring it to ruin; so that he had not that firm faith in the resources and capabilities of Canada for completing this great transcontinental railroad which should have been held by a statesman believing in the future of that great country. These were the lines of the railway policy of my hon. friend opposite. Let us contrast them with the lines of the railway policy of the present Administration, which meant, in the first place, the speedy union of all the Provinces. They said: As speedily as the country's resources will permit we will build the railway through all the Provinces and join British Columbia; we will build around Lake Superior and join that part of the country with Eastern Canada; and so we shall have an all-Canadian route, a bond of union between the Provinces, which will carry our trade and be the chief factor in the development of the country. This, together with the preservation of Canadian trade for the Canadians, a hopeful appreciation of the credit and resources of Canada for the building of this railway, and its successful accomplishment, were the broad features of the policy of the present Government. I am willing to let those two policies go to the country in their broad features and in the results which flow from them, and let the country, in the present and the future, decide between them. The hon. gentleman in his speech the other day made considerable sport of the hon. Secretary of State for calling "All aboard for the West." Well, if the policy of the hon. gentleman had prevailed, no man in the city of Montreal or in the city of Quebec could have called out, all aboard for the West and the Pacific Ocean over a railroad of our own, in territory of our own, for many and many a year to come, and perhaps never; but just because, not his policy but an opposite policy is carried out, we are enabled, in all truth and reality, if not to-day, yet within a very short period of time, to stand in the city of Montreal and hear the conductors cry out, all aboard for the west and the Pacific Ocean, on a railroad which runs through Canadian territory, and which has been built by the pluck and indomitable energy and enterprise of the Canadian people.

Mr. MILLS. Not by a short line.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bothwell is anxious to get ahead of time. He wants to know what about the short line. I will yet say a word on that, to accommodate my hon. friend. But while I speak of these two lines of policy,

Mr. FOSTER.

I want to read a short extract, to show you how the hon. leader of the Opposition, and hon. gentlemen associated with him, have gone down from that high ideal which animated the fathers of Confederation on the Liberal side, when Confederation was young, in the year 1870 or 1872. The *Globe*, over which George Brown presided, and which was the organ *par excellence* of the Liberal party of that time, took a view in direct opposition to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and in direct accord with the policy which has been carried out by the Government. It says:

"Apart from all other considerations, the very fact that the line under consideration is through American territory would be a fatal objection to its being made the Grand Trunk line for the Canadian North-West. Those who had the command of it would in a very few years command the country. All the intercourse, both social and commercial, of the people of the North-West region, would be directly with and through a foreign people, and what might at any moment become a hostile country. By a mere stroke of his pen the foreign ruler might lay an embargo upon the whole intercourse of that part of Canada with what lies to the east. The bonding system, as we have lately had hinted at, in connection with a region nearer hand, might stop capriciously, and on very short notice; the tide of immigration might be turned away from our border, to a certain extent, at any rate, while everything would conduce to make the absorption of the whole territory by the States a mere question of time, and of time very shortest at the longest. The connection of all that region with the more eastern parts of the Dominion would be merely nominal, and when the year would be ripe it would naturally fall, as from the first had been desired, into the lap of our very astute and enterprising cousins over the way. \* \* \* Instead of the fact that the Northern Pacific is under construction being an argument for allowing the Canadian project to lie in the meanwhile in abeyance, it affords the strongest reason possible for its being pushed through without delay. Politically, it is a manifest and pressing necessity, while commercially it is as evidently of the very highest importance for Canada. In this way alone can this country have any chance for her fair share in the lucrative trade of the North-West which will assuredly spring up, and in the varied traffic with the Pacific world, which, to a great extent, will pass through Canadian territory, if once what will be the shortest and easiest route from ocean to ocean is in working order."

These were the sentiments of the organ of the Liberal party at that time, and they are in accord with the railroad policy as it has been worked out by the present Government. It has been stated that the extensions of the Canadian Pacific Railway eastward from Callander ought not to have been undertaken, and that they have been burdensome rather than otherwise. I am one of those who consider that one of the best points in this whole matter has been the fact of the extension of that great system of development from Callander eastward, through its branch lines, its acquired lines, and the lines which it has leased. For the same expenditure of money, \$54,000,000 in cash, and railway worth cash of \$25,000,000, we have not only got a complete line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, but have that line extended from Callander to Montreal and Brockville. We have 345 miles from Callander to Montreal, 432 miles of branch lines in Ontario, and 695 miles of leased lines—in all, nearly 4,000 miles of line which are under the control of the company, and which go to make up a vast system of development which this country will feel in after times in the way of its growth and progress. And, to-day, we see this system creeping down towards Quebec for its summer port and down towards the Maritime Provinces ports of St. John and Halifax, and, it may be, Cape Breton ports. We see this idea gradually approaching its completion; an idea which, I feel, would never have approached its completion if it had not been for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the working out of the idea which is embodied in that scheme. So I say, I hope that within a very few years, working on in the expansion of this idea, we shall not only be able to say "All aboard for the West," but for the East as well, and reach the great cities which lie on the Atlantic seaboard, and have a system of railway extension from ocean to ocean, under one continuous management. One of the strongest advantages in getting the eastern branch lines extension is that, while they pay a revenue, as they do, according to the report put before us, they also serve to

attract and to control the traffic which must be had for the successful operation of the road and the development of the country. Having thus contrasted briefly the two broad lines of policy on this matter, as between the two parties, I have a few more words to state, and with reference to the matter in hand. It did not seem to me, at first, to be necessary, in order that we might discuss and come to a conclusion upon a question before us, to take up the whole history of the railway management as it has been taken up. It would seem to me that after certain issues had been settled they might remain settled, and that it ought not to be necessary to spend days and nights in going over questions which cannot be unsettled, in referring to policies which cannot be changed, and in discussing roads and lines, selected and built, which cannot now be altered. When these things are once settled they might be allowed to remain settled, and we ought to address ourselves simply to the investigation and conclusion of the question directly before us. That question is simply this: Whether, after the policy has been settled, the line surveyed and the road built, after the country has approved of that, and of the subventions necessary for that, after a loan has been granted for a number of years, as settled by Parliament a year ago—whether, when the simple question comes up for the rearrangement of the security and an additional loan of \$5,000,000, we might not let the past be and devote our energies to the settlement of that question alone. The mere going over battles already fought and decided will not hurt or help anything. The question to consider is whether we shall or not make this loan and re-arrange the securities as set down in the resolution. It has been proved that it is necessary the company shall have money for equipment, that they will require a certain time to convert the bonds placed in their hands into cash, and the question is, whether we can, profitably to the company and the country, give the company a short loan of \$5,000,000 for a year, on undoubted security. If the security is sufficient, as I believe it is, I am in favor of making the loan. If the loan of last year was well secured it cannot be denied that the additional loan of this year is still better secured. Last year we gave a loan of \$30,000,000 in all, and we took security in roads and equipment and lands to the value, in round numbers, of \$90,000,000. To-day we add \$5,000,000 additional of lands, and we get the security enhanced by at least \$25,000,000 in hard cash put into the construction of the line. While our loan appreciates \$5,000,000, the security has appreciated \$25,000,000. If that is not a sufficient appreciation of the security in comparison with the appreciation of the amount of the loan, then we cannot come to any conclusion based upon fact. Having satisfied my mind, last year, that the security then given was sufficient for the loan then given, I have no hesitation in approving of an additional loan of \$5,000,000 for a year, seeing that the security has been greatly enhanced. We have, as security for the additional \$5,000,000 added to last year's loan, a main line, or will have, when the amount unexpended and remaining for construction is expended, with \$56,097,723 of actual cash placed in it as the cost of construction. We will have the extension from Montreal to Brockville, \$9,357,091; branch lines, \$4,607,172; steamers, \$697,369; real estate, \$408,207; equipment, \$8,471,386; making a total of \$79,816,948, deducting from which charges on the Quebec road and the Canada Central, \$5,323,333, leaves \$74,493,615 net railway security on which we have a first lien for the loan made. Then, the lands have depreciated but little in quantity, being now 21,399,737 acres, which, calculated at \$2 an acre, gives \$42,799,474, and subtracting from that the outstanding land grant bonds, leaves a balance of \$41,189,760. Adding this to the railway security, we have a total of \$115,683,375 in railway constructed at cost and lands valued at \$2 per acre. I believe that security is amply sufficient.

Some hon. gentlemen have taken exception to the terms of the security. Let us see what they are: \$20,000,000 of that loan is secured by \$20,000,000 of bonds, and that \$20,000,000 of bonds is the first mortgage on the road, the branches, the steamers and the equipment, and is the second lien on the lands after the first lien has expired, for the \$10,000,000 of indebtedness, and this is worth, in cost, \$74,493,615. Surely, for \$20,000,000 of loan a security of \$74,493,615, is an amply sufficient security. For the other loan of \$9,880,912 we have the 21,399,737 acres of land, which give us a value, taking out the land grant bonds outstanding, of \$41,189,760. Surely, that amount of land, at \$2 an acre—a sufficiently small valuation—is a security amply sufficient for the \$10,000,000. Then we have the added \$5,000,000 of loan, for which we hold \$8,000,000 of bonds, which, along with the \$20,000,000 of bonds, are the first mortgage upon the railway security of \$74,493,615. Now, we must argue upon one of two bases. Either this is a *bond fide* loan, and will be repaid to us, and in that case the country loses nothing, getting the same percentage which it pays and getting the road at the original subvention of \$54,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land, or it will not be paid, and we shall have to go to the securities; and, looking at them as I have stated them, I think they are amply sufficient, and there is no risk, and there is no burden put upon the country if there is no risk, for the interest paid to us by the company is almost exactly the same as that which would be paid by the Government on the money loaned. Just a moment, to show that this security is still further enhanced than I have stated it. The lands to-day are certainly not a whit less valuable than they were a year ago. It must be in the very nature of things that, with the railway being built there, with certain lands being sold and settled up, the remaining quantities of land must be appreciating in value, and cannot be becoming worth less than they were in the past. The road has been bettered by the increase of \$25,000,000 applied in construction alone, and by equipment to an appreciable degree; but, more than that, the current of traffic which is necessary to the sustenance of a road has begun to be set in the direction of this road, and that is one of the most important features. Build a railroad wherever you please, through the most thickly settled portions of country, where other roads run side by side with it, and before that railroad can come to its best, you have to get the ingenuity and the energy of the management directed towards attracting traffic to the road; and, during the year past, the management of this road, with its leased lines and branches, have been devoting their energy to that with remarkable success, and the current of traffic is setting in favor of this road, and the commercial public are beginning to know that there is such a road, and that it has advantages of which they may have the use. Then there is greater confidence in the public with reference to this road. The enterprise commenced under a load of disability, with one-half of the people of this country having no great faith in its fulfilment; it commenced without any great confidence in the commercial world outside of Canada, and it has had, not only in the money markets but in the commercial world, and amongst people generally, to battle its way up to something like confidence and security; and it has made in the past year a large stride in this direction. The security is becoming more undoubted, men are beginning to feel that it is not a road which is to be thrown up as soon as the construction money is exhausted, but is there for great purposes, and has a future before it which warrants the confidence they are placing in it; and the fairness of treatment, the good running, and the equipment of the road, have drawn to it a great deal of sympathy as well as a great deal of traffic during the past year. There have also been added considerations of national and Imperial importance. The

disturbance in the North-West, unfortunate as it has been in many respects, has not been without some lines lighter than the darker shades of the picture which we have looked upon, and one of these is the effect which it has had in raising the Canadian Pacific Railway into national importance as a line along which the sentiment of this country may run and the power of this country may be exerted whenever it is necessary to exert it at any point. Alongside of that, the road has taken, within the last year, even within the last two months, a large place in the estimation of the people and the Government in the old country as to the Imperial importance which attaches to it. They see that this road, stretching from ocean to ocean, communicating on shorter lines of latitude, and having the shortest route across the continent, is of Imperial importance in case of complications which no statesman can foresee, and no man can say will not sometime happen. And then there is an increased amount of traffic on this road. In 1883, deducting the expenses from the earnings of the road, and so leaving the net earnings, we find that they amounted to \$561,143; in 1884 the net earnings were \$1,191,890, or more than 100 per cent. of increase in the earnings. But, when you compare the four months of 1885 with the four corresponding months of 1884, you find this difference more plainly set forth. The month of January, 1885, showed an increase over the same month in 1884 of \$211,975; the month of February an increase of \$206,472; March, \$204,227; April, \$309,237; so that the four months of the year 1885 show an increase in net earnings over the corresponding four months of 1884 of nearly a million dollars, and those who have the management of the road and who should know more about its traffic prospects than others, estimate that the net receipts for 1885 will be \$2,400,000, and for 1886 \$3,600,000. That is a calculation based upon the last two years and four months, and I set that against the cry that there is not sufficient trade to carry on this road which we are building, and that its operating expenses will not be paid. The Northern Pacific, which runs nearest on the American side to our line, has increased in its net earnings very largely, and the line to the north of it possesses advantages which in some respects are not possessed by the Northern Pacific. As to the climatic and other difficulties, the report laid upon the Table shows that the operation of the road during the last year has been freer from climatic difficulties, from snows and frosts, than other roads in Canada, and that there is no fear that this will operate injuriously to the carrying on the road and the transportation of its traffic. So that we have this one road, controlling its own traffic from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with its large network of leased lines and branches, with its immense line of immigration to take into that great country, and with its immense yield of cereals and other products which will be taken from it; and, taking all these things into consideration, it is a fair conclusion that its earnings will be fairly able to maintain the fixed charges, including those placed upon it within the last year. There is a fair probability that the traffic will be sufficient to pay what is necessary to carry on the road and to pay these fixed charges. The hon. gentleman who spoke before me said something with reference to a promise which had been made by the Minister of Railways last year, to take off the disallowance clauses, and he found fault because they had not been taken off. I think it but fair to read what was really stated by the Minister of Railways on that occasion, and which will scarcely bear out the construction put upon it by the hon. gentleman. He said:

"But I am glad to be able to state to the House that, although true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American railways to the south, such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line so far as it has gone, such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and by the

Mr. FOSTER.

inherent power of its own advantages to maintain its position, notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected—although we have no power, under the contract, to touch any portion of the country in the North-West Territories, we are now in a position to review and to re-consider the policy of the late Government, and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any longer period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition."

It was his statement that this year, either at its commencement or now, or during any of these years, which was to take place, but the statement bears a different interpretation than the hon. gentleman has put upon it. It goes on to say:

"I am glad to be able to state to the House that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon themselves to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing the consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting with American railways to the south."

The statement is that the Government will be in a position to review the necessity of any longer continuance of that policy which had been taken with reference to the railway. Sir, I am in favor of granting a short loan for one year upon the conditions laid down in the resolution, for the reasons I have given, believing that the security is undoubted, and that it will be for the benefit as well of the country as of the company that the short loan be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is necessary that any additional argument should be made on this side of the House in opposition to this proposition, from the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition has presented the whole case so conclusively that no hon. member opposite has succeeded in answering a single point that he made. The speeches of hon. gentleman opposite remind me of a man shooting with a pop-gun at Gibraltar. Feeble efforts have been made to reply to the masterly speech of the leader of the Opposition, but not a single point that he dealt with, not a single conclusion that he submitted, has been successfully assailed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried by some side issue to get round the solid facts he has presented, and they find it impossible. Now, I contend that from the commencement of this road to the present time there has been a continuous repetition of blunders. In the first place, it was exceedingly imprudent on the part of the Government to enter into a contract to build that road in ten years. They committed the country to the expenditure of a large amount of money without the slightest evidence as to the probable cost of the work. That was the first unfortunate blunder. Then there was an effort to form a company, of which Sir Hugh Allan was to be the head, and that ended in political disgrace. That was the second unfortunate blunder. The third blunder they made was when they made the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company now existing, and gave them such enormous powers. I think it is quite evident, from the course of that company, that they went into the arrangement with a determination not to lose one dollar in the transaction, and I think that has been clearly shown by the arguments of the leader of the Opposition. It has been shown that the whole question has been made the basis of a railway speculation, and that an amount of money has been extracted out of the pockets of the people of his country altogether in excess of what was necessary. If the Government had stuck to the first arrangement made with that company we would not be in the unfortunate position we are in to-day. It appears to me there have been favors granted by the company to the Government, and the Government in return are asked to grant favors to the company. They appear to be linked together in the relation as exists between man and wife. The life of the one depends largely on the life of the other. They have got so closely intimate that one cannot do without the other.

The Government of the day have been granting favors to the company, and the company will be expected to grant favors to the Government. In the first place, if the Government had carried out the arrangement in regard to the manner in which the money was to be paid, which was that the company would be entitled to receive a proportionate share for every 20 miles completed, we would not be in the unfortunate position we are to-day. Now, that was a wholesome course for the Government to adopt, and they ought to have held the company to the arrangement. It would have protected them against the necessity of advancing more money upon different occasions; because, under that arrangement, they would only have advanced money when the company were justly entitled to it, after each 20 miles had been constructed, and the balance of the first grant of \$25,000,000 would yet be in the Treasury, for the purpose of carrying out the construction of the line. But they broke a way from that arrangement and they advanced money on progress estimates. Sir Charles Tupper stated last year that they found it necessary to do that. He said it was so hard to make an accurate calculation of the exact cost of each 20 miles that it was necessary to take the other course, and to advance the money to them on progress estimates. Well, Sir, anyone who knows anything about the construction of railways is aware that to advance money on progress estimates is a dangerous course for any Government to pursue. I know it is done in some cases, but is a very risky procedure; for it very much depends upon the way the engineer makes his monthly estimate of the work done, and if he happens to make errors, or is disposed to favor the contractor, you may find yourselves in the position of advancing far more money than the actual value of the work performed. The estimates returned to the Government of work done have no doubt been far in excess of the actual work performed, and the resources of the Government have been drawn upon in excess of the amount to which the company were entitled, and the Government have found themselves in the position of having less money than required to complete the work as a result of the change of policy. Under the system followed by the Ontario Government, no railway company can draw anything until 20-mile sections are completed and in running operation. I suppose this proposition with respect to 20 miles, applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway, was copied from the Ontario Government. In fact, I notice that many of the actions of Mr. Mowat's Government are followed here. It is unfortunate that the arrangement made between the Government and the company has been broken. Last year the company came to Parliament and asked for \$22,500,000. There was, however, a distinct understanding entered into by the Government with the company that for \$25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land, and the Government constructing certain portions of the railway, the company would build the road, and no other demand would be made on the country. We are told that the company were subjected to such enormous opposition by the Grand Trunk and Northern Pacific in the money markets of the world that they were driven to desperation, that they could not sell their bonds or borrow money. Nothing of that kind was anticipated when the company was formed. The people were told that the princely financiers of the Dominion had undertaken to build the road. The offer of another syndicate was rejected because it was feared they had not sufficient financial backing to carry out the undertaking. The Government threw away millions in order to get hold of this particular company to do the work. We were told the country did not want to pay a second time, and we will let the contract to this company, in order to have the work completed. That was all a delusion, because the company have since made additional demands. Nothing that was put forward by the Grand Trunk and Northern Pacific so seriously injured the com-

pany as did the connection that existed between the construction company and the railway company of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That construction company was composed of several members of the syndicate, and there might have been some other people in it. It drew a very large amount of money. We have the fact that the construction company drew \$600,000 more than they were entitled to, and there is no evidence that that company has returned the money to the Canadian Pacific Railway. They were one and the same company. No doubt, when that fact was pointed out to investors in London, they would hesitate before purchasing their securities. Mr. Stephen, as president of the railway company, let certain work to Mr. Stephen as president of the construction company. He drew payment as president of the construction company, and they thus kept the profits to themselves. Those transactions did more to depress and discredit the company than any acts of rival companies. It was understood the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were to build a line from Callander to Port Moody, and their efforts were to be directed to that work; but we find them speculating all through the country, and making an effort to grasp other lines. It is not to be wondered at that the Grand Trunk were driven into opposing them. That company had built the pioneer line, and rendered very desirable and admirable service. Look at the position of the railways in this city. The lines to Prescott and Brockville are controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the only exit of the Grand Trunk is by the Canada Atlantic. The public money has gone into those speculations. The company have been guilty of the most outlandish extravagance. I have it from a man who travelled on foot from Callander to Algoma Mills, that on that section of 80 or 90 miles there are over \$500,000 worth of supplies actually going to waste. That road is useless, and \$2,000,000 have been sunk in it. That is evidence of haste and lack of knowledge on the part of the company. These men, who made a successful speculation in Dakota, seem to think they are fit to build a railway round the world. As a rule, wholesale merchants are very good men to go out and advocate a by-law for the granting of a bonus, but when they come to the practical carrying out of railway construction they utterly fail. And, Sir, we have been educating a lot of men in this country at the expense of the country, to understand railway building, and it is evident that they know nothing about it when they started, and in place of taking into their employ a number of our men fit for the position, they went across the line and brought over a number of Americans; and I believe that half the money earned on the road went into the pockets of these Americans. The policy of hon. gentlemen, as they professed, was to keep Canada for the Canadians, that Canadian money should go into the pockets of Canadian people; but in this case Canadian money has gone out of the country altogether. With regard to the tolls to be charged on the road when it is constructed, it is understood that the Government, after the actual cost of construction is summed up, and after the company has received 10 per cent. of their cost, will have the right to interfere in the way of saying what shall be the tolls that shall be collected. It is difficult to see how the Government will ever arrive at an idea of what the actual cost of construction is unless the figures of the company are nearer the facts as to the cost of construction than those they have submitted in their annual statements, which have been shown to be grossly wrong. I think the Government will have hard work in coming to a correct conclusion on that point. The company will consider themselves entitled to add to the cost of the road every item, directly or indirectly, and the cost will increase continually as the earnings increase, and thus prevent the Government from interfering to limit their rates. The hon. member for King's said that no person

could complain of the present rates. I have no doubt that at present they are reasonable, more particularly when they are trying to cultivate the good feelings of the people and of this House, in order to get this money, and that they might expect, if their rates were not reasonable, they might meet with a refusal. But, Sir, I venture to predict that as soon as they have extracted out of the pockets of the people all the money that they expect to get, their rates will go up to the highest notch that the law will permit. The hon. member for King's made some comparisons with regard to the securities we are getting, but his figures compare very ridiculously with some he gave us last year. Last year he told us that they offered a security worth \$141,247,953, and now he says that all the security, with the lands and everything else, is only \$115,000,000, or, with all their vast assets, \$28,000,000 less than their assets of the last year. That, however, is on a par with all the rest of his calculation. These hon. gentlemen have tried to go back on the calculations in the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on this side, but if they look into their own calculations they will find that they are more ridiculous than any made on this side. I wish to refer now to the Government engineer's report, with regard to the actual value of the work and its cost. I have no doubt that the Government engineer is a thoroughly capable man, although I doubt very much if he does not take the calculations on which the monthly payments are made from his subordinates. On this point I may say that a contractor informed me that last summer, when they made the monthly estimate with regard to the amount of money the company would be entitled to, they were told that they would have to go back again, because they could not draw within a million of the amount, and they actually went over the entire work a second time, and increased the sum to about the amount required. This shows plainly how easy it is to increase or lessen the monthly estimates made by the engineers, and how unreliable these estimates are, unless they are carefully made. With regard to the statement of the Government engineer, he says, in his report of 1st October last:

"At the time I made my estimate, during last winter, of the amount which would probably be required to complete the contract, and of the earliest date at which railway communication could be effected between Montreal and Port Moody, the information at my disposal was neither so full or so complete as I could have desired. I have, therefore, all the greater pleasure in being able to state that the knowledge acquired during my official tour has convinced me that the funds at the company's command are fully adequate to the completion of the contract, and also, that connection from ocean to ocean will be effected by the autumn of next year, if the prosecution of the work proceeds with the same vigor as hitherto."

He says that he believes the company have ample means at their disposal to complete the work; and after the very short period, from the 1st of October last down to the present time, something over six months, we are asked to make an additional loan of \$5,000,000. Now, I care not what security is offered; before making that loan of money belonging to the people of this country, we should have had laid on the Table of this House an estimate from the Government engineer, showing the true position of affairs as they now stand, where that money is going, and what is going to be accomplished by it. We have not a single vestige of information of that kind; we have nothing to show that the engineer has been over the road, or that the report he made last October was incorrect, or that he has had any reason to change his views from what they were then. But the company simply come to us, without any certificate from the engineer, and say, we want \$5,000,000 more. They want it for a year, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) says. I wish we were certain that they wanted it for no longer; but I am afraid it will meet with the same fate as other loans which have been given to the railway companies of this country, and perhaps become worthless to the people of this Dominion. In connection with this amount which

Mr. McMULLEN.

has been set aside for the purpose of securing dividends on the bonds held by the stockholders, we find that \$3,000,000 of a postal subsidy has also been set aside, which will reduce the earnings of the line that would otherwise form part of the receipts of the company. Even if that road should come into the hands of the Government, they will have to pay over to the bondholders the amount of money earned by the postal service, in order to provide for the dividends on these bonds. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) also referred to a prediction that had been made by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, that before two years the company would be asking for \$22,000,000 more. Well, we are not aware what they first asked; we do not know but that they asked the Government for \$20,000,000 when they first waited upon them; possibly it may have been \$10,000,000; but they have figured it down definitely to \$5,000,000. Now, I cannot understand, if the stockholders have confidence in the line, and in their investment, as one likely to be profitable, why they cannot place bonds in the hands of the manufacturers of rolling stock for the purpose of equipping their line. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) tells us that they have money enough to construct the line, and that now they want rolling stock. If rolling stock is all that is wanted, and if they are able to make as excellent a showing as the president says in his last letter, we must certainly come to the conclusion that they must be idiots or fools, or the public would not believe him, and would not take bonds for rolling stock, if he offered them, instead of asking the people of this country to contribute their money for that purpose. But the secret of the whole thing is this: The earnings of the road will regulate the value of the security, just in proportion as that road earns a certain percentage on its actual cost above the necessary expenses for operating the line. In that proportion must you measure the security which this country will hold for the money it is advancing. Suppose we had constructed the Intercolonial Railway in the same way in which we are constructing this road; suppose a syndicate had been formed, and this country had given that syndicate \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 to enable them to build that road; and suppose the country were asked by the same syndicate to advance \$15,000,000 more and to take bonds on the road, and the country had agreed to do that. What would be the value of those bonds to-day? The Intercolonial Railway has not shown a profit in a single year; it just about pays running expenses, and if every item were charged in the proper way, it would not do that; but year after year the Government have added to the capital account, until it is now something like \$43,000,000, against \$38,000,000, which it was in the time of the Mackenzie Government, and I say that to-day it is not paying running expenses. If we held a mortgage on the Intercolonial Railway for \$15,000,000, what would its value be? It would not be worth a cent on the dollar, because the only security is the net earnings over running expenses, and the railway is not earning running expenses to-day. Now, I say that our mortgage on the Canadian Pacific will just have to be measured in the same way; just in proportion as the earnings exceed the actual annual cost of running the railway, just in that proportion will it be a valuable security, and in no other proportion. The Grand Trunk Railway was running some eight or ten years before it earned anything above running expenses. If the Canadian Pacific runs for eight or ten years without paying anything beyond running expenses, what will be the position of this country? It will hold a mortgage on a property that is not more than self-sustaining. No man would pretend to say that that is a good security. I would rather to-day, in the interests of the country, say that the \$10,000,000 of the money granted last year should be made an absolute present to the company; the country would be in better condition to-day, because our experience of all

the railroads in this country shows that once the Dominion has invested money in them, it never gets back a dollar. That is the case with the Grand Trunk and the Great Western. I admit that these lines are a great advantage to the country, and I admit that the Canadian Pacific is going to be of great advantage; I think we are going to have a great country opened up, and a great future before us; but at the same time we must not blind ourselves to the fact, when we are talking about \$100,000,000 as a security for the paltry sum of \$20,000,000, that that is putting the matter in a wrong light, because the only basis on which we can value the security is the amount the railway will earn beyond running expenses. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) tried to show this House that the stockholders were not in a position to deal with this money; he said the stock had been issued to the public on the distinct understanding that a guarantee of 3 per cent. was in the hands of the Government for the next ten years to come, on the strength of that deposit with the Government that the public had accepted that stock, and in order to get that money released it would be necessary to have the sanction of every stockholder. I am not going to challenge the statement of the hon. gentleman. He is a man of very high legal mind, and I do not wish to challenge him, but I will make a proposition. We know, according to the last showing of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that there is \$15,000,000 of stock held by the company themselves in Montreal. We say to the company: If you cannot reach all the stockholders, we want you to endorse on the back of the stock you hold that you cancel this right to your share of the deposit. If you do that we will give up \$3,500,000 of the money now deposited with the Government. The directors themselves hold that stock. It is but fair to ask those directors: If, as you say, you have every confidence in the road, show us your confidence, by bringing your bonds here and endorsing on the back that you forego your right to ask the guarantee of the Government, and release them from \$3,500,000 of that guarantee of \$15,000,000, and then you will be entitled to get \$1,500,000 of the loan of \$5,000,000. That is a fair proposition, if they say the road is what they claim it to be. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) made some reference to the fact that the statute provided for the payment of 6 per cent. on the stock during construction. I believe that is the law. I believe, however, that the company have violated the law. The law, if closely looked into, will bear no other interpretation than this, that the company are entitled to only 6 per cent. on the money actually expended in construction. But they have paid this 6 per cent. on the face value of the stock, and that is how the directors have extracted a very large amount out of the funds of the company. I say that is a fraud upon the country. In looking over the report of the engineer, last October, we find that he reports that on the Lake Superior section there were 90 miles on which no work was done; that there were 180 miles graded and half completed, and 438 miles to ballast. That was the work remaining to be done on the Lake Superior section. We find that on the Rocky Mountain section there were 34 miles cleared and graded, almost completed, 100 miles on which no work was done, 20 miles on which work was just commenced, and 55 miles of grading partly done. That was the entire work to be done on the 1st October last, and the company said they had ample money to complete that. Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to escape from the statement, proved to be inaccurate, that the money is wanted for the construction of the line, and they now put forward the plea that it is wanted for the purpose of getting rolling stock. I do not think it is necessary that I should discuss this question in detail, from the simple fact that the statements made by the leader of the Opposition have not been successfully confronted by hon. gentlemen opposite.

men opposite can successfully assail the position the hon. leader of the Opposition has taken and the statement he has made, it is unjust to the people to vote the very large amount of money the company are asking. We should carefully husband the resources of the country. As has been shown during the Budget debate, the amount of taxation *per capita* is increasing very rapidly, and we should hesitate before increasing it, by adding to our burdens sums of this kind, year after year. At the inception of this scheme it was declared that the people would never be asked to pay one dollar towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but notwithstanding that, it has been successfully proven by the leader of the Opposition that some \$26,000,000 of the people's money has actually gone into the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and year after year the amount is increasing. I say that is not right. I say that the Government of the day, if they are prepared to hold to the policy of yielding to the demands of the company, should manfully endeavor to point out where the statements of the leader of the Opposition are incorrect; but in place of doing this they urge their supporters to make speeches in their behalf, which, as far as argument is concerned, are as effective as would be a pop-gun firing against Gibraltar. They have not successfully assailed one single point the leader of the Opposition has made. There has been an enormous amount of blundering in connection with this whole affair. It has been a continuous repetition of blunders, not only with regard to the building of the road and the transactions of the company, but with regard to the disposal of the land. It is unfortunate that the Government should have permitted an enormous amount of land to fall into the hands of speculators and, in that way, retard the settlement of the country. Instead of giving the land to the actual settlers they allowed a number of companies to be formed; they allowed advantages to be taken in securing large tracts of land; and when settlers came here, for the purpose of taking up homes in the North-West, they found that instead of what was represented in the agricultural pamphlets issued in the old country—and particularly in one we had under consideration here, and in which there are photographs of the Ministers of the Crown—instead of the glowing accounts of free grants and the advantages given settlers in taking up homesteads being verified, they were confronted with a different state of things. I believe a large amount of money expended on immigration has been lost, owing to the policy of the Government. When a settler finds out he is deceived he sends letters home to his friends; he informs his friends, who possibly intended to come there, of the unfortunate disappointment he met with and the fact that lands cannot be got as easily as they were led to suppose, and the result of that will do more to scare emigrants from coming to this country than the spending of thousands of dollars on immigration on the other side. Serious mistakes have been made in that way, and had it not been for the policy the Government adopted in regard to the handling of the lands, we would have had far more settlers than we have now. They should certainly have controlled the price of the lands that they gave to the company, instead of allowing the company to make their own terms and exact prices in excess of what they led people to believe they would get lands for. I shall not detain the House, but hon. gentlemen should present some arguments in opposition to those of our leader. I demand that they shall get up and present those arguments; I demand that Ministers of the Crown shall give reasons against the arguments which have been presented, and until they do, it is a fallacy to ask members of this House to vote \$5,000,000, which they have no right to be asked to vote until the figures submitted by the hon. Mr. Blake are shown to be incorrect. I have carefully examined all those figures, and I think they are correct.

to the letter, and the leader of the Opposition can honestly challenge their criticism, and if they are criticised they will be found to be unassailable in any point whatever.

Mr. ROSS. In rising to speak upon these resolutions, I do not do so with the object of defending the policy of the Government with regard to the North-West country and the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but I wish to point out some misstatements and some misapprehensions as to the true position of affairs in the North-West, and also to point out what, in my opinion, is the future of that great country, the future prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway and hence the future of Canada. When the charter was granted to the present company, and was ratified in this Parliament, we in the North-West never imagined that the line was to be built north of Lake Superior, nor were we, in Manitoba, very anxious that it should be built, because we thought it was not so important that that part of the line should be constructed; but recent events have shown us, and we are now convinced, that that line is not only important, but is—in a political sense—the most important part of the line in the whole chain of the Pacific Railway, because it is a link that cannot otherwise be bridged on important occasions. We thought, too, that the road would now be constructed very rapidly by the company. In the past we had seen the action of both Governments, and considered that while they were pledged to push the road on, they had not built as rapidly as we wished, and we congratulated ourselves on the especially rapid construction of the road by this company when they commenced work; but, unfortunately for ourselves, in Winnipeg, and in the vicinity of Winnipeg, we did not anticipate the dire results that would follow from this rapid construction. But the road has been built west of Winnipeg to the mountains, and now we believe that it is all-important that it should be constructed across the Rocky Mountains, and completed from ocean to ocean. Recent events have further shown that the rapid construction of the road has been of immense service to that country and the whole Dominion. The following statement has been made, which I read in the *Globe* of 2nd April:—

“The events of the past few days in the North-West prove unhappily too well how great was the folly of hastening the construction of the railroad, and thus causing the people to form scattered settlements along its whole length. If to-day the settlements extended only a few hundred miles from Winnipeg, there would probably be no rebellion; or if there were, it would not be so formidable.”

I simply say that the rapid construction has had as much to do with the war in the Soudan as it has had to do with the rebellion in the North-West, and that the settlements on the Saskatchewan were formed some years before a mile of railway was built west of Winnipeg. Some of my own constituents, when I was a member in the Local House, left my constituency and, contrary to my advice, went to settle upon the North Saskatchewan, and these settlements were formed, not because of the rapid construction of the railway, because the line had been built away to the south, and a thin line of settlement had been formed there, several hundreds of miles south of this district in which the rebellion took place. If this rapid construction had not taken place, how would the volunteers have got off from Fort Qu'Appelle to Fish Creek; how would they have been able to go to Swift Current, in order to reach Battleford, and to Calgary in order to get to Edmonton to the relief of the various settlements? The settlers on the North Saskatchewan would have been unassisted, as, in order to reach them, the volunteers would have had to march across the prairies from Winnipeg, or to wait for the ice to be removed from Lake Winnipeg, which would mean about five or six weeks' longer delay. The rapid construction, while it has brought financial ruin to many of us in Winnipeg, has been of immense service to the North-West in the light of recent events.

Mr. McMULLEN.

It is unfortunate that this company has to come here and ask for more money, but they are here, and now, shall we say that we will not grant it? Some gentlemen say that the Government should take over this road, but I think it would be one of the most disastrous things for Canada if that were to take place. The red tapeism and the patronage which would result from such a measure would destroy the successful operation of any road with such a length as this. Another question is, how have the company conducted their affairs since they obtained the loan of last Session? Have they managed the road in the interest of the settler of the North-West, in such a way as to entitle them to the consideration of this House and of the country? I think they have. Notwithstanding their monopoly clause, their freight charges are so low to the settlers that I think they do merit the consideration of this House and of the country. In 1868, when the railways easterly from Chicago had been in construction for years, the charges for wheat to New York, by the all-rail route, were 42.60 cents a bushel, while the charges, to-day, from Winnipeg to Montreal, are only 25 cents a bushel, showing the relative positions of an Illinois farmer then and a Manitoba farmer now. The Farmers' Union, through their officers, have expressed time and again that the company have dealt fairly with the settlers in the North-West. That being the case, the question arises: Will this railway ever pay, and, if it will pay, have we got security for the loan? The question whether it will pay or not depends entirely upon the character of the country through which the road runs, and its speed of development. Let us look at the United States and see what was done there. Between 1852 and 1856, the four great trunk lines from New York to Chicago were completed, and afterwards connections made from Chicago to Louisville, Cincinnati and St. Louis. In 1856, when the connection was made with Chicago to New York, the total exports of breadstuffs from the United States were only \$73,664,431, while in 1880 they were \$430,526,483. In 1866 the total exports of wheat from the United States only amounted to 10,827,721 bushels, only four years before the first Riel rebellion in the North-West. But in 1883 the amount of those exports has risen to 147,098,885 bushels. This was largely due to the development, by railway construction, of their Great West. More important still is the increase in the internal commerce of that country, and especially of the eight wheat-growing States. Let us take five of the eight wheat-growing States, California, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri and Dakota, and see what railway development has done for them. In 1866 they had, unitedly, only 465 miles of railway. In 1884 they had 19,105 miles, and what were the results? They had last year 181,500,000 bushels of grain, or 33,801,315 bushels over the total exports of the whole country in 1866. That is what has been done by rapid railway developments in the United States, and hence the rapid development of the western prairies. Out of the total amount of exports, in 1883, coming into the ports of Boston, New York, Baltimore and Philadelphia, for foreign shipment, 95 per cent. of the grain, 95 per cent. of the beef, 93 per cent. of the pork, 85 per cent. of the live animals, came entirely from the western and north-western States of the Union. All this was done since the rapid railway construction in those western States. Can we expect to receive similar results from our own North-West? Look at our soil. That soil is not only equal to the best in the United States, but it is superior in extent to that of any part of the American continent, there being more good land found in one solid block. Last year I made some remarks on this point, and in answer to that some statements were made that were not exactly true. I will read a few remarks I made last year about the soil of the North-West. I said:

“There is no line of railway in America of the same length as this 900 miles, from Winnipeg west, which passes through such uniform good

land as that through which this line passes. For any 300 miles west of Moose Jaw there is better soil to be found than along any 300 miles over any line of railway in Canada. The soil, Sir, is excellent. But here comes the question about the dryness of the climate. I examined the grass in the North-West country, and I came to the conclusion that, where such grass as that can be grown, though it does not compare with the grass in the east part of that vast plain, there is moisture enough in the soil to produce any quantities of crops we wish. People in travelling across that country came to the conclusion that, because the grass is short the country must be poor. It does not follow. The grass which grows in the North-West plains is peculiar, and it does not follow that because the grass is short and apparently withered, the soil is poor. When people travelling over that country in August or September, or even in July, see the grass brown and colored, they come to the conclusion that the country is withered up and good for nothing, whereas the grass is hay, with its roots attached to the soil, undergoing a curing process."

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) challenged my statements. He said :

"I must differ a little from some hon. gentlemen as to the character of the land west of Moose Jaw. From all I have learned I believe those lands are of very little consequence for the purpose of cultivation. I have not been over that section myself west of Moose Jaw, but from all I can learn—and I think I have as good sources of information as any other hon. gentleman—that country is almost a barren wilderness. I had information long before the Canadian Pacific Railway was built in that western country, and that information was that from about 12 miles west of Moose Jaw for many miles west it was a barren country."

The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) also spoke :

"I do think without egotism I know as much about that country as any hon. member in this House. After leaving Regina and more particularly Moose Jaw, the country is not adapted for successful settlement. It may, in course of time, but it is my impression that it is barren. It is denuded of its timber. As to the member for Lisgar, his vocation in life did not lead him to travel much through the country. He was principally in the city of Winnipeg. He may speak of the city and its surroundings, but he does not know as much about that country as the member for Marquette."

Now, I do not wish to compare what I know about the country with the knowledge of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) or the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). But I am satisfied to leave to time and its developments the fulfilment of all I said about that country in comparison with any remarks made by both hon. members. Now, Sir, I have two evidences this year for the truth of last years statements about the country. The one was given by the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright), who last year thought that if we said anything in favor of the North-West we were veritable Baron Munchausens, that we spoke in such flowery terms that there could be no such country in existence as we described. That hon. gentleman has been to the North-West country and has seen it for himself. He went up a doubting Thomas, and he comes back no longer a doubter but one of the greatest enthusiasts with regard to our vast prairies. I have another authority, one of the highest, if not the highest in the country, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), a man whose honesty of purpose and clearness of judgment are believed in and accepted by every man in this country. He has gone up to the North-West. He was not biased in favor of that road south because it followed another route than the one he had chosen. He went into that country and examined it carefully. Some gentlemen who go up to the North-West have various ways of examining the country. Some go in a Pullman car, and while having good wine and enjoying themselves, they find that everything is all right. Other gentlemen form their opinions from what they learn at a dinner table, or in a club room; while others derive their opinion from their own superior inner consciousness. Some gentlemen go there with their theories of the country already formed, and if the facts do not bear out the theory and exactly coincide with it, so much the worse for the facts. Some men go to that country who are strong political partisans, and who endeavor to make the country bear some relation to their politics and still more strongly confirm them in their political opinion. If they find four facts, three of which do not bear out their political opinions, they reject the three facts and keep the one that does. The

hon. gentleman from East York did not adopt any of the courses. He went over the line of railway and examined it carefully and took information from all the farmers that he came in contact with. Here is his testimony, as given by a reporter of the *Globe*. And I would say further, with regard to that published interview, that I consider his statement a true representation of the North-West and matters there, and I only wish the people of Canada would read and digest it more fully. I have read it over and over again, and in my opinion it is the ablest and truest representation of that country that has ever appeared in print from any of our public men. He was asked :

"Did you observe particularly the capabilities for farming farther east, between Calgary and Manitoba?"

To which he replied :

"I arranged to visit 7 out of 10 excellent farms. I observed throughout the whole length of the road that there was scarcely any poor soil to be seen. In quarters between Medicine Hat and Moose Jaw there was an appearance of dryness in the general aspect of the prairie visible, which was not apparent where the land was ploughed. There is a sort of crispness in the grass in some places that would seem to indicate a prevailing dryness. \* \* \* What is known as buffalo grass, where it has a dry appearance, still continues to preserve its nutritious qualities and cures as well standing as if cut. Generally speaking, the soil is deep and good. As to climate, I am convinced that sowing early and properly taking care of the land will almost invariably ensure a good early crop."

On being asked his opinion on immigration he replied :

"Immigration has been stopped largely from Ontario by reports of complaints coming from the west, and also, I fear, by the action of some portion of the Ontario press in dwelling too persistently upon unfavorable aspects, though, no doubt, largely based upon former official reports. I found a general impression to this effect prevailing among intelligent men in the North-West, the general effect of which was prejudicial to the best interest of the settlement."

After his evidence, I think the hon. member for South Perth should throw aside his native modesty and become egotistical. We have another test, and a still higher one in proof of my statements of last year, in the ten experimental farms started west of Moose Jaw for the production of grain. On the whole the average yield was 21½ bushels of wheat to the acre; oats 44½ to the acre; barley, 23½; peas 12½. How many counties in Ontario can show better results; and yet the above results were from first sowing on the sod, not even broken in the proper season, viz, June, but late in September and first week in October. With such a magnificent soil and such produce raised in a portion of the country which has been described in the past as a barren desert, and in the *Globe* of 13th June, 1884, described as being such that 400 miles of this part of the line can never earn enough to pay for locomotive tallow, unless "alkali" should become of great commercial value, what may we not hope from other portions of the country, and what may not the future of the country turn out to be. With respect to climate; Though we may not have the variety of climate they possess in the United States, yet we have a climate which produces a vigorous, hardy, intelligent and enterprising race, samples of which, and in endurance and bravery, have been furnished in the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan and the 90th Battalion of Winnipeg. With respect to the capacity of the soil for wheat growing, the following describes fully the capabilities of soil and climate for growing No. 1 hard wheat:—

"The qualities of climate which bear on wheat raising in the North-West, and contribute more regularly, uniformly and efficiently to the growth of the crop than any found in more southerly climes, are: more daily sunshine—the days, by reason of the higher latitude, being longer.—cool nights, which always favor the cereal crops; deep frosts, which gradually melt and supply moisture to the growing plant; less intense heat during the maturing months, fewer injurious caprices of weather at the critical period of growth, and natural climatic conditions, which render possible the production of hard spring wheat—a cheap crop, by reason of its being a quick crop of only about 100 days from seeding to maturity."

This No. 1 hard wheat cannot be produced except in the North-West and in northern Dakota and in northern Minnesota. South of latitude 46, efforts have been made time

and again to grow this wheat. Northern seed has been brought south, but it has always failed and turned into soft wheat. Another advantage which our North-West possesses in common with Dakota and Minnesota, is that it is not subject to tornadoes and cyclones, which prevail further south. In Kansas they have had two or three annually for the last 20 years, and they are also subject to them in Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana and Ohio, while in the North-West we have not been subject to them. Our grazing lands are also going to prove most valuable in future years. Experience is showing that these lands are going to be of large dimensions, especially in southern Assiniboia, which has not been looked upon as a grazing country, owing to the roughness of its surface; but owing to this very character and its climate it is going to prove among the most important grazing lands in the North-West. The future of our country entirely depends, however, upon the outlook of the wheat crop of the world. Is there any other country where wheat can be raised cheaper and of better quality than in the North-West? If the answer be in the affirmative, then the future of the North-West is not assured, the future of the Canadian Pacific Railway is certainly not assured, and the future of Canada is undoubtedly not assured. In looking at the wheat crop of the world I find the number of bushels required for Europe 1,375,000,000, and the production 1,100,000,000 bushels, and the number required for England alone is 210,000,000; the average number of bushels England has grown annually is 60,000,000, so there is a shortage of 150,000,000 of bushels. Last year this deficiency was supplied principally by the United States, Russia, India, Germany, Australia, Canada, Chili, Egypt and Turkey, and in the order mentioned according to amounts furnished. Our only two rivals are the United States and India. The former furnished England last year with 75,833,720 bushels, India with 20,988,864 bushels. In looking at the wheat crop of the United States, the first State of the Union as regards wheat is California. Last year she grew about 45,500,000 bushels; but this year her wheat crop will not exceed from 18,000,000 to 25,000,000 bushels. The farmers of California are abandoning wheat growing and are entering more into fruit, because they are enabled to make \$100 per acre from fruit instead of \$10 per acre from wheat, and the fruit crop is a much surer crop than is wheat. In the future, therefore, California will drop out entirely as a wheat competitor, and grow principally fruit and the vine. Kansas last year raised 43,500,000 bushels; this year 15,500,000 bushels, and the prices received last year by Kansas farmers were from 19 cents to 50 cents per bushel. In all the wheat growing States where winter wheat was sown the wheat crop is almost an entire failure, and the estimated shortage of the wheat crop of the United States is 150,000,000 bushels. Only two States may be considered as our competitors, northern Minnesota and northern Dakota. Do they possess superior advantages to our North-West, or are our advantages equal to theirs. In the matter of climate and in soil and in other respects they are very much equal. A great deal has been said about our farmers deserting Manitoba and the North-West and going into Dakota. I find the hon. member for South Huron the other day said:

"But hon. gentlemen opposite, by their sympathy, aid and assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so hampered the Winnipeg and South-Western Railway that the latter was never able to extend their line beyond 58 miles of Winnipeg. What has been the result of this policy? It is apparent to every body in the country that of the large number of immigrants settled in Manitoba, 50 per cent., I venture to say, have left the country. Why have they left the country?"

"Mr. WHITE (Hastings). No; they have not.

"Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman says no. I make no statement on the floor of Parliament that I am not prepared to prove, and I am prepared to prove it out of the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the organ published in the city of Winnipeg."

Mr. ROSS.

He referred to the paper in Winnipeg supporting the Government. I do not care whether he brings up all the papers supporting the Government and all his friends—I know the statement is not true. I have looked up the report of Mr. Nimmo, a report showing, according to nationality and Province, the number of immigrants for ten years going into the United States, up to 30th June, 1884. I find by that report that the number of persons who went from Manitoba into the whole of the United States in that period was: Males, 2,726; females, 2,041; total 4,767. During the same time I am satisfied that more than this number came and settled in the North-West from the United States. That is not 10 per cent. nor 5 per cent. of the people who have gone into our country. No doubt, some have left it and come back to Ontario. To satisfy myself still further on this point, I sent a telegram to the chief of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington. I wanted to get the numbers for the last four years, because I knew that the numbers during those years of the people who had left Manitoba were larger than in the previous years, and contained nearly the whole amount. In reply, I got this answer: "Immigration from Manitoba for following years: 1881, 1,163; 1882, 1,398; 1883, 1,143; 1884, 924." Those are the figures furnished by the Washington authorities of the number of people who left Manitoba and went into the United States during those four years. This number is not anything like 50 per cent. The hon. member thus shows his gratitude to that country by furnishing its enemies with such a weapon to fight it. Here is another telegram. It is from Mr. J. H. Mactavish, dated June 18th, 1885, and is as follows:—

"Crops on experimental farms looking excellent, considerably ahead of last year, same date. Prospects for good crops throughout, from Winnipeg to Calgary, never so good as at present. Confidence of settlers in Regina and Moose Jaw thoroughly restored. Farmers and business men generally throughout North-West very hopeful."

I am very sorry that any people had to leave the North-West, and that any went into Dakota; but I strongly object to this exaggeration of the facts to the injury of the country. There was one mistake which was committed, and it was continued for a year's season of immigration, and that was the reserves south of the railway belt, and their not being open for settlement. Some settlers have, no doubt, gone into Dakota on account of such statements as have been made by the hon. member for South Huron, published all over—that Dakota offers superior advantages to our North-West, and the people went directly from Canada to Dakota, on account of a misapprehension of facts, and never went to the North-West at all. There has never, however, been any moment when sufficient land for settlement could not be got in the country—not south of the railway belt during one year and a few months—but north and north-west of Winnipeg there have always been lands enough for settlers. In my opinion, in seven years from to-day the great volume of immigration to the North-West is going to be from the United States. I am satisfied as to that. The wheat lands of the United States are being rapidly taken up, and those in the future who want to go into grain-growing will enter our North-West, and they in the adjoining Republic are beginning to appreciate our country, as they will do more fully at no distant date. Our great source of immigration, I repeat, will be the United States, in seven years. Seventy-five per cent. of the wheat lands of the continent lie north of latitude 49. I am backed in this opinion by the United States consul in Winnipeg, than whom there is no higher authority on the American continent. The United States has reached the limit of its wheat production and its non-wheat producing class is increasing, hence year by year its wheat export is going to diminish and become less and less our competitor in the English wheat market. The other day a statement was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) which I regretted, because

that hon. gentleman has always shown a fair knowledge of the land laws of the United States and Canada. The statement he made is not according to the actual facts. It was as follows :—

“The difficulty with the North-West is not the criticisms of the Opposition, not that the Opposition has decried that country, but the policy of the Government with regard to the land regulations, the holding lands at a higher rate than they were held in the United States, the placing of inducements for immigrants to go there on a lower scale than in the United States. While the United States offered him a homestead wherever he could find public land, the homestead grants in the North-West were restricted to only a portion of the public domain, while the whole public domain of the United States was open to the settler.”

Now, what are the facts? In the railway belts of the United States every alternate section is held for homesteads and pre-emptions, just as with us; and the price of pre-emptions is the same, namely, \$2.50 per acre. Outside the railway belts there is this difference and this much to back up the statements of the hon. member for Norfolk: Outside of the railway belts all the public lands of the United States can be taken for homesteads or pre-emptions, but inside the railway belts they are the same as with us. Now, what is the railway belt of the Northern Pacific? Going through Dakota, it is 50 miles on each side, or a belt 100 miles wide.

Mr. CHARLTON. There are very few.

Mr. ROSS. In the railway lands they are just the same as with us. Inside the railway belt—the alternate sections can be taken as homesteads or pre-emptions, and the other sections are railway sections. Outside the railway belt every section can be taken, but in our country the Government have reserved every odd-numbered section for railway purposes, to be given for future railways, but every alternate section is public domain.

Mr. CHARLTON. My assertion was absolutely correct: that all the public lands in the United States are open for homestead settlement, while in Canada they are not. Outside the railway grants, in the townships where there are no railway lands, the homesteads are laid off only in certain sections, in some townships, but not in all.

Mr. ROSS. But all sections taken for homesteads and pre-emptions belong to the public domain, and if the settler goes to Dakota, does he want to go 50 miles away from the railway? He wants to get within marketable distance of the railway, and 50 miles is too far for that purpose. That is the distance on the Northern Pacific, and on the St. Paul and Manitoba it is 20 miles on each side, which is too far for the farmer to reach a market. Then he goes on further:

“Then, lands were granted to colonisation companies at half the price of those same lands to the settler; they were sold on credit instead of cash, and this was another cause for discontent.”

Now, the pre-emption with us is also a sale on credit. In fact, a man can take a pre-emption and a homestead, and not pay for the pre-emption inside of four years, and I do not believe there is a case of a man in the North-West losing his pre-emption, simply because he does not pay for it in time. As to the colonisation companies, I do not defend them; I do not think they have done any good to the North-West, but I think too much has been made of them. All the odd-numbered sections held by colonisation companies in the North-West amount to little more than 1,000,000 of acres. They are simply as pin points on an elephant's hide; they amount to a very little in the whole extent of that country, and even in the lands granted to colonisation companies the alternate sections are open for homestead and pre-emptions, as well as any other lands in the North-West, and each company must settle two settlers on every section, odd and even, before getting title. He goes on to say:

“If the settler had a choice between Dakota, on the one side, and Manitoba and the North-West on the other, he found, on one side, that there was competition in railway rates to bring in supplies and take out the produce of his farm.”

Now, with regard to that, while on our side to the farmer shipping his grain there is a monopoly in name, on the other side there is a monopoly in reality, because the two roads on the other side, the Northern Pacific and the St. Paul and Manitoba, have only two points in North Minnesota or Dakota where they come in competition, those points being Fargo and Glyndon. The companies have arranged what shall be their respective fields in that country, and they do not come in competition at any other points. The St. Paul and Manitoba has one part of the State or Territory to itself, and the Northern Pacific has another part to itself. That is the competition which exists there, and does not bear out the statement of the hon. member. With regard to that point still further, I will read the following report from Robert A. Lynn, secretary of the Farmers' Alliance of Walsh county, Dakota, sent to the Chicago Board of Trade:

“At a meeting of the Acton district Farmers' Alliance, No. 138, Walsh county, Dakota, held April 13, 1885, a resolution was passed instructing the secretary to communicate with you, with a view of testing the feasibility of shipping wheat from points on the Red River *via* the Canadian Pacific Railway to Port Arthur, and thence by the lakes to Chicago, and to this end I would call attention to the following facts:—

“The expense of extra hauling and Custom dues by the proposed route would be more than compensated for by the cheapness of freight on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the slight cost of shipping by water, leaving a favorable margin of profit when compared with all-rail routes.

“The superior quality of the Red River wheat is well known, and in order to sustain this reputation it is necessary that it should reach the east without filtration through the Minneapolis market.

“The idea suggested above has been operated to some extent last season by the Canadian wheat buyers, who erected a bonded warehouse at Emerson, Manitoba, and bought wheat for export along the Red River at and near the international boundary line. All that is needed is an extension of the system, which would meet with the hearty co-operation of the Red River farmers.”

Here are the farmers of northern Dakota, where they have the competition which the hon. member for Norfolk speaks of as existing to the south—they are going to ship their wheat round by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the monopoly road, and then bring it to Chicago, cheaper than they can get it there now. Last winter the farmers of Dakota were actually bringing their wheat across the line, paying duty on it, selling it to Canadian buyers, and then making money by so doing. Now, I wish to repeat again, as I did last year, a comparison between the land laws of the United States and our own, because there is still a misapprehension on that subject:

“The laws of the United States provide that citizens of the United States, or persons who have declared their intention to become such, who are heads of families, or over the age of twenty-one years, can obtain lands as follows:”

Now, it appears that a man in the United States must be twenty-one years of age before he can take up his homestead or pre-emption. With us, he can take it up when he is eighteen, and by the time he is twenty-one years of age he has secured a homestead and pre-emption; he has 320 acres of land, paying all round \$1.25 per acre for the whole 320 acres, by the time he can begin to take up land in the United States. Now, as to pre-emptions:

“Heads of families, widows or single persons (male or female) over the age of twenty-one years, citizens of the United States, or who have declared their intention to become such, under the naturalisation laws, may enter upon any ‘offered’ or ‘unoffered’ lands, or any unreserved lands to which the Indian title has been extinguished, and purchase, not exceeding 160 acres, under pre-emption laws. A fee of \$3 is required within thirty days after making settlement, and within one year actual residence and cultivation of the tract must be shown, whereupon the pre-emptor is entitled to purchase the same at \$1.25 per acre, if outside of railroad land limits, and at \$2.50 per acre if within railroad land limits. At any time before the expiration of time allowed for proof and payment, the settler may convert his pre-emption claim into a homestead. No person who abandons his residence upon land of his own to reside upon public lands in the same States or Territory, or who owns 320 acres of land in the same State or Territory, is entitled to the benefits of the pre-emption laws.”

Now, under this, a man cannot take up a pre-emption and a homestead at the same time, because he has to live a certain

time on each, and he cannot live on both at the same time, and he must not be an owner of lands in the same State or Territory to the extent of 320 acres, in taking up a pre-emption. Such a thing as is known to us as a pre-emption in our North-West is unknown in the United States. What is termed a pre-emption in the United States is similar to our homestead, with one year's right of purchase—purchase after living on it for one year. Residence on a pre-emption in the United States must be commenced at once after entry. Now, take the homestead:

"Any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of twenty-one years, and is a citizen of the United States, or has filed his declaration of intention to become such, is entitled to enter one-quarter section, or less quantity of unappropriated public land, under the homestead laws. The applicant must make affidavit that he is entitled to the privileges of the Homestead Act, and that the entry is made for his exclusive use and benefit, and for actual settlement and cultivation. Within six months the homesteader must take up his residence upon the land, and reside thereupon, and cultivate the same for five years continuously."

With us, a settler must cultivate only three years, whereas in the United States he must live continuously on his homestead for five years. In our country he need not live on it at all, and only within a radius of two miles from it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman must confine himself to the railway resolutions.

Mr. HESSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite call my hon. friend to order simply because he is giving good information to this House—information that should go to the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. ROSS. Can I speak of the future?

Mr. SPEAKER. The land resolutions have nothing to do with the question.

Mr. ROSS. I think the advantages of our land laws are a very important feature in connection with the settlement of the North-West.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is too remote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, the House must yield to your decision; but the same question has been discussed at considerable length by hon. gentlemen on the other side, without their being called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not remember any hon. member discussing the land regulations, and even if they did, and I allowed it to pass, I was wrong.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Just the other night, when a matter under discussion had taken a very wide range, and I was closely following the remarks made by others, to which no exception had been taken, an hon. member rose and called me to order, when I had a strict ruling from you, and I had to submit to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think, when any hon. member calls my attention to the fact that a member is transgressing the rules, it is my duty to call him to order, and I hope the hon. gentleman will confine himself to the resolution.

Mr. ROSS. I would beg to ask the Speaker if I can speak of the future outlook of India as compared with the North-West.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think not.

Mr. ROSS. In 1869, England had under wheat 4,000,000 acres; in 1883, 270,000. In France there was a like shortage of acreage. The world's crop is about 2,065,000,000 bushels, and in time we in the North-West can grow one-half of this. While elsewhere the demand is increasing and supply diminishing, with us the supply is increasing much more rapidly, and we have the future wheat fields of the world. With regard to the carrying trade of this country

Mr. Ross.

in connection with the North-West, it is to be done almost wholly by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a similar work south is being done by a number of railways, and not one only. Even if the Hudson Bay railway is built, and proves a success, which I hope it will, there will be more than enough trade supplied by the future wheat fields of the North-West for both roads; and if other roads are built, there will be enough for them, because the carrying trade of the North-West is going to be immense, but its full extent will depend entirely on the railway development of that country. It has been stated that, in the western part of the North-West, we cannot grow wheat, because the distance from the markets and from the seaboard is so great that it cannot be shipped successfully; and that if we cannot grow wheat west of Moose Jaw or even Qu'Appelle, and carry it to the seaboard at such rates as to enable the farmers to live, then the value of the Pacific Railway and the future of the North-West will be very greatly affected. But there is a prospect that wheat can be grown there. In looking at the United States, we see that of all the grain receipts at Portland, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New Orleans, 183,689,576 bushels, or three-fourths of the total quantity, has been shipped by all-rail 44,946,146 by lake and canal, 16,058,892 by Mississippi river; even during the summer season only one-third of grain shipments from Minneapolis go *via* Duluth, balance goes by all-rail, and four years ago an attempt was made to ship wheat from St. Pauls, by Mississippi river, and only 30,000 bushels shipped, and effort was never repeated; thus showing that the all-rail routes of the United States are able to compete successfully, even where there is so much water carriage as is furnished by the Mississippi running through that whole region. And if that can be done in the United States, why cannot it be done in Canada? I believe it can, that farming is going to pay in the centre of the North-West, and that there will therefore be plenty of traffic for the Canadian Pacific Railway in that country. But there is one feature that is often lost sight of, which is going to be of great importance to the future development of the North-West and of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is, the inter-provincial trade of Canada. The internal commerce of the United States is of great magnitude. In Canada it is not yet a great question, and it is only in embryo here to-day. There are however, in Canada varied and distinct natural resources and our products and manufactures will be interchanged to advantage. The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway will give a new impetus to our internal intercourse, will stimulate the development of our latent resources, which we possess in so great a variety, and increase the home and foreign trade of our people. What is it that keeps men and women at work on the spindles and in the factories of the New England States but the demand of the farmers of the great west? What makes the railways in Massachusetts pay so well to-day but the internal commerce, and so with the other railways in the various States. So it will be in Canada; we, in the North-West, will send the products of our soil to the Eastern Provinces and the people of the East will be sending their manufactures to the North-West; and this is going to be an important matter, not only for the commerce of Canada, but for the development of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because no other railway can be so constructed in Canada as to carry the produce from one end of the country to the other. Whatever is going to develop the North-West will develop the Canadian Pacific Railway and all the other railroads in the country to the East. The people of British Columbia will be able to send their timber across the Rocky Mountains to the prairies of the North-West, and the people of the North-West will send to the people of British Columbia their wheat and flour. To-day the people of British Columbia import annually 448 car loads of wheat and flour from the United States; when the Pacific Railway is completed this amount of flour will be sent there

from the North-West. Last year the people of British Columbia shipped 577 car loads of salmon, some to the South and some to England; but when the Pacific Railway is built, that fish can also be sent over to the eastern part of Canada and England. The shipments on the Northern Pacific for British Columbia alone are three car loads of merchandise per day on an average from the merchants of Ontario and Quebec to the merchants of British Columbia. Here is a traffic that will be diverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway the moment it is completed. British Columbia will also supply the farmer of the North-West with fruit which he cannot successfully grow. The development of the minerals of British Columbia certain to follow railway completion, will be of immense value to Canada and a large source of revenue to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company traffic. The internal commerce of the United States is estimated to be \$1,000,000,000, or seven times its foreign commerce. In 1876 10,000,000 tons of goods were sent over the New York Central, Pennsylvania Railway and New York and Lake Erie and Western Railway, roads between the west and New York, which had increased, in 1883, to 46,000,000 tons. If our internal commerce bears the same proportion to our foreign trade, the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to be immense, and larger than most people, or even any of our people imagine to-day. We are also going to have a great through trade for the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the Central Pacific Railway, while the local trade increased between 1880 and 1883 from 15,780,000 to 16,442,000, the through trade had doubled in the same length of time, and in 1883 was one-third of their total receipts. These are the results, and they show that through traffic is increasing very rapidly on the Central Pacific, the earnings per mile on main line of which was \$10,804 for 1883. The statement was made by the leader of the Opposition that "from Callander to Port Moody, 2,500 or 2,600 miles, there is a population of 150,000, perhaps 2,000,000, white men. Therefore, when you look to those figures of a couple of hundred thousand white men, not all of whom have white souls"—I do not know what he meant by that; whether it is a reflection on the people of the North-West or not I cannot say, but if so I resent it—"But the Northern Pacific," he continued, "has about 2,000,000 of people tributary, more or less, to its road, while from Callander to Port Moody the Canadian Pacific Railway has about 200,000 people tributary to its road." What are the facts? Take the State of Minnesota, which is one of the largest States touched by the Northern Pacific line, and has over one-half of the whole population along the road. The hon. gentleman might as well connect Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because the road runs to Callander, as to connect Minnesota with the Northern Pacific. Why, in the State of Minnesota, out of a mileage of 4,442 miles, only one-eleventh is owned by the Northern Pacific; the rest of its mileage is owned by other roads. I am satisfied that State does not even give a twelfth of its traffic to that company. Take Dakota; the Northern Pacific owns only one-sixth of the total mileage of that State; and I am satisfied it does not get more than one-sixth of the carrying trade of that State. In Idaho, the Northern Pacific has one-ninth only of the mileage. It has the whole of Montana. In Oregon and Washington only one-third of the imports are carried by rail, and only one-tenth of its exports, the balance being carried by sail and steamers so that out of the total trade only one-fourth is carried by rail, and even that is divided between two roads, the Northern Pacific Railway and the Oregon Short Line Railway. The total population, therefore, that feeds the Northern Pacific, is but 374,095 souls, and even that is a large estimate for the number that directly feeds the Northern Pacific; while on our road the population is 200,000, and there is, besides, no other road running through our territory, over which the people can get their supplies or send out their produce. Our road is a monopoly, while the Nor-

thern Pacific has many roads to compete with for the carrying trade of the country. So that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has based his argument on false premises. With regard to through traffic, the trade with China and Japan and the Pacific Coast, principally San Francisco, for the year ending 30th June, 1884, was \$18,756,846. *Via* San Francisco, last year, there were shipped 3,080 car loads of flour to China and Japan, and about 1,200 car loads of tea shipped east by rail. It is only of late years that China and Japan have commence to use our wheat flour, and there is no doubt their consumption of it will increase largely, and it is also undoubted that their future supply they will have to get another from the North-West, because California is fast becoming a fruit-growing country as I have already stated. This will therefore give a large carrying trade to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and furnish another outlet to the people of our North-West for their grain. With regard to the traffic east: The people of Eastern Canada alone required 670 car loads of rice and 794 car loads of tea for last year, which in the past were brought from Great Britain and from the United States. In future, nearly all of it will come over the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is bound to largely come this way from China and Japan, because we have all the facilities and advantages in connection with our road by which we can secure the carrying trade from China and Japan. The shortest winter route from San Francisco to Yokohama is 5,250 miles; from Yokohama back to San Francisco it is 4,716 miles; and the summer route to and from Yokohama from San Francisco is 4,428 miles. From Port Moody to Yokohama the distance is 4,200 miles; from Port Moody to Montreal the distance is 2,895 miles; from Montreal to Liverpool it is 3,043 miles. Thus, from Yokohama to Liverpool *via* Port Moody the distance is 10,138 miles. From New York to Liverpool it is 3,431 miles; from New York to San Francisco, 3,331 miles; and from San Francisco and Yokohama, the average of the three routes between those two points is 4,650 miles. The total mileage, therefore, from Yokohama to Liverpool *via* the Canadian Pacific Railway is 10,138 miles; while *via* San Francisco it is 11,411 miles, making a difference in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway route of 1,273 miles. The figures I have given are from the office of the Pacific Mail Steamship Navigation Company. Even from New York, *via* the Canadian Pacific Railway to Port Moody, and thence to Yokohama, the distance is 623 miles in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway route. The exports China to England, 1883, were \$50,488,655; imports from England, \$21,124,270; exports, Japan to England, \$3,315,460; imports, \$11,382,865; total, \$86,511,200 and part of this trade we can secure. Some hon. gentlemen have stated it is no advantage to have through traffic, that it is no advantage to have a number of cars passing our doors. I hold it is a great advantage to have as many cars as we can get to pass over the road. They ask: What advantage is it to have a man go over our road from England to Australia or to India? But there are always advantages to be derived from men of means going over our road and seeing our country. What is the tendency of such travel? Many of these travellers will be men of means, inclined to make investments, or who may have friends in the old country with capital to invest; and I may say that a very large amount of the foreign capital that has been invested in the United States has been invested in the beginning, simply owing to the fact that people who were travelling for pleasure or health over the American railways, visiting Colorado and other States, and seeing what the country was like, began to put their money in it, or induced friends to do so. This was the beginning of some of the investments of the very large amount of foreign capital that is invested in the United States, and the same result will, no doubt, follow in our country, under similar circumstances, and we should, by every means possible, invite foreign

capital to develop our country, and it certainly cannot be done by hiding it or decrying it. It may be asked: If the North-West, which is to supply in the future the greater part of the carrying trade for the Canadian Pacific Railway, is as represented, how comes it to be in its present unfortunate condition? The following are the chief reasons: Over-trading and over-speculation amongst ourselves, producing dissatisfaction, discontentment and disappointed hopes; the prostitution of farmers' meetings, led by demagogues, to the basest of political purposes, that of villifying their country; visitation by Providence, in the shape of early frost and followed next season by a wet harvest; low prices for wheat in the markets of the world; mistakes made both by Government and Opposition as to the true character of the country and its requirements. Both political parties are to blame for the manner in which they obtain their information about that country. Only such information is sought for which comes filtered through partisan channels. It would seem that political refugees and partisan parasites have more influence in moulding the views of the two parties about the North-West than men with sound judgment and non-partisans, who know the country from years of actual experience, what its true position is, and what is required for it. The people of the North-West object to having their country being used as a foot-ball by the two parties, with the Treasury benches as the goal. The country has, therefore, been kept back and immense injury has been done to it, but its progress cannot entirely be retarded. There were two important factors which made the adjoining Republic advance so rapidly during the past eighteen years. They were, first, the sinking of the question of States' rights from its prominence, and the consequent obliteration of Dixie's line by their civil war. Then the immediate following of this by the people unitedly pushing forward railway construction through their great west, and thus securing its speedy development. Our country is too much divided and hedged in by sectional feelings. In fact, there is a Dixie line around each Province, and even we, in this House, are making these lines broader and deeper by the class of motions and amendments proposed. While believing fully in provincial rights, yet I consider it to be the duty of this House, as far as possible, to crush out all sectional feelings, and obliterate our various provincial lines, and to endeavor in every way to make our people united, by animating them with one common sentiment of Canadian unity and a great future destiny, and hence drive away some of our extreme pessimism. Our press is thoroughly sectional and provincial, and we have no papers that have yet been able to write for the whole Canadian people. Take the two leading papers in Canada, and along each column of their various editorials the water lines read: Ontario, Ontario. While we do not seem to be able to rise to our duty in this respect, our volunteers are unfortunately doing it for us in the west. The men of Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, are offering up their lives with patriotic devotion for their country, and, to maintain the integrity of Confederation, are cementing, with their blood, the various component parts of Canada; and while returning to their homes to do the work of immigration agents for our fertile prairies, they are also going to perform a higher and nobler duty. For in their baptism of fire, they have risen from the battle-field politically born again, animated with a stronger love and a new faith, that of their country and its future. They will then go forth into the benighted parts of Canada and with zeal and a worthy cause endeavor to instil into others the teachings of their new birth. May this present unfortunate trouble in the North-West perform for us what the civil war did for the United States. If we vigorously and unitedly take up the building of railways over our extensive prairies and develop our vast heritage there, then we may expect somewhat similar results. The first step in this work is the completion of the Canadian

Mr. Ross,

Pacific Railway, uniting our people by an iron band and developing our resources, which are so vast and varied. When the history of this country comes to be written and the part the right hon. the First Minister has acted in it, nothing will be placed higher to his credit than the part he took in Confederation and the construction and completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At the same time credit is due to the hon. member for East York for carrying on the work of construction undertaken by the right hon. the present First Minister. Believing in this road as a political and national necessity, also a commercial necessity for our people, and also knowing the country along the line of railway from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, and having unbounded confidence in its future successful development, and in the great part that the western country is to play in the material progress of our country, and from opportunities of observing and comparing our western country with countries to the south along all the similar lines of railway, and after seeing what has been done there in the development of those countries by railways, and what the countries in return are doing for the carrying trade of the railways, I have much pleasure in supporting these resolutions to secure the speedy completion of our national highway.

Mr. DAWSON. I am sure the House must have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech of an independent member, who took a clear and impartial view of the whole subject, and has thrown a great deal of light on the question as it affects the territories of the North-West. I congratulate the hon. member for Lisgar on his very able speech. On an occasion like this, when we are near the completion of the greatest work in which this country has ever been engaged, I think a little latitude may be allowed, and indeed it has been taken on both sides of the House. I think it is not out of place to have a little retrospect, and to see what the condition of that country formerly was. The hon. the Secretary of State, in his very eloquent and able speech, referred to the voyages of the French many years ago, but he might have gone a little further back. As early as 1666 we have clear evidence that the French had penetrated to Lake Winnipeg and had gone, a few years later, from Lake Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay. In a few years more they had explored the country, both by the Mississippi River and by the Saskatchewan to the Rocky Mountains. Following the French there came another race, the Scotch Highlanders who, after the cession of Quebec, came to this country, driven from their own land by political trouble, and they engaged in the fur trade of the North-West. They were men accustomed to lead an active life at home, men accustomed to wars and battle and strife, men of high position, many of them, in the old country; and in the wilds of the North-West they found they could still be chiefs, which they could not always be at home. They ascended the Saskatchewan to the Rocky Mountains; descended the Mackenzie to the Arctic seas; and crossed the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. It was on the discovery of these men that Great Britain was able to make good her claims to British Columbia. It may literally be said that the flag of Great Britain was carried to the Pacific Ocean and to the Arctic seas to the sound of the bagpipes and the pibroch of the Highlanders. They were the explorers, and it was they who established that great traffic in the North-West long carried on by the company known as the North-West Company. They had large vessels on the Pacific Ocean carrying the furs of the northern part of the continent to China, even in those early days. Then we have settlers coming into the North-West. We have the Earl of Selkirk endeavoring to establish a colony known as the Red River Settlement, now a part of the Province of Manitoba. That settlement, after a time, became firmly established, but in the first instance they had many difficulties to contend with; they had

rebellions among the natives, which drove the people from the settlement, some to Lake Winnipeg, and some to take shelter in Canada; so the rebellion which we have heard about of late is not the first that occurred, and the beautiful lamb-like people who were driven to rebellion by the bad management of the Government and all that, were accustomed to such things long ago. In 1816 they had another rebellion, when the Governor and many of his people were killed at the Frog Plains. Afterwards peace prevailed for a long time; but from 1840 to 1845 the people of the settlement became very unruly and troops had to be sent up by the Imperial Government. In 1846 Colonel Crofton brought out a wing of the 6th Regiment of Foot, by way of Hudsons Bay, and they were stationed in Manitoba for several years. It was the English half-breeds who were the rebels on that occasion, and not the French. The English were then very uncontrollable, and the French half-breeds, who have been subsequently in rebellion, were peaceable and loyal.

Mr. CASEY. I do not want to be unreasonable; but we are not discussing the North-West trouble.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; the North-West troubles will come up at a later period.

Mr. DAWSON. I said I thought that, as the Secretary of State and other hon. gentlemen had made allusion to the past, I might also be allowed to allude to it. The hon. leader of the Opposition referred at great length to everything connected with the North-West, to the rebellion, to land grants and many things besides.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will make it very short, so that we can get to concurrence.

Mr. DAWSON. I shall make it exceedingly short. I am not much in the habit of occupying the time of this House, and certainly I do not mean to treat the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches with the least discourtesy. Now, Sir, in 1846 Colonel Crofton came there with a regiment from England, and they remained for some years. In 1857 the Canadian Rifles were sent out from this country, on account of a then threatened rebellion in the North-West. In that year the Canadian Government sent out an expedition to explore the country to the Rocky Mountains. After that the country was for a long time neglected, but since 1869, when the first Riel rebellion occurred, it has become better known. In 1871 the explorations for this great railway commenced, and were carried on for eight years at an expense of no less than \$5,000,000, without any results. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company had great difficulties to contend with in going over the plains and through the Rocky Mountains. The hon. leader of the Opposition and several other members read from a description of the country in the Selkirk range, to show that the line was being carried through an impracticable country, which was dangerous from snow slides. A work was quoted from, written by the former engineer—I suppose it is he—of the road, from which I will read:

“Mountains of great height, in groups, tower above it (a bold, rocky bluff) to the right and left. Some of them have crater-shaped peaks filled with snow.”

“We cross the path of a great snow slide, an avalanche divided into two forks, one about fifty yards wide and the other about one hundred and fifty yards wide. Thousands of trees, two or three feet in diameter, have been broken into shreds by it, and roots, trunks and branches have been swept away, and, with a multitude of boulders of all dimensions, hurled into the lake to form a promontory, of which three or four hundred feet still remain. To the south, beyond the lake, the eye rests upon a mighty mountain, streaked with snow-filled crevices.”

He speaks of thousands of trees of 2 or 3 feet in diameter that have been broken up by avalanches. How, thousands of such trees are to grow in a little place 50 yards across, it would be difficult to say. It takes a tree from 300 to 500 years to grow from 2 to 3 feet in diameter; consequently, it is quite evident that there could not have been an avalanche there within many years, and the traveller will run but little risk in going over that line at any particular time, if avalanches only occur once in every 500 years. In the prosecution of this great work the Secretary of State has said that the president of the company imbued the men engaged on the road with the same spirit he had himself. There can be no doubt that the enterprise has been carried on with extraordinary energy, from the president downwards. Some of the officers in charge of particular sections have certainly distinguished themselves. I may refer to one section, which I know particularly well, and that is the north coast of Lake Superior. They had there many very able engineers, and they had a most able man over them, a Mr. Ross. They tunneled through mountains and built many fine bridges. We have heard a great deal about temporary trestle-work there. Well, Sir, in building a railway it is necessary, in the first instance, to put up temporary trestles, in order that the cars may pass over them in connection with the work beyond. Sometimes they are made sufficiently strong to last for a considerable period. At all events, on the north shore of Lake Superior these temporary trestles are being rapidly replaced with substantial works. They have bridges there across the Pic River, across the Nipigon River, and across many of the other streams, which are magnificent stone structures; and I believe similar stone structures are, in time, to span all the other streams. The whole section between Callander and Port Arthur was under the charge of two gentlemen, Mr. Harry Abbott and Mr. John Ross, and they certainly have both distinguished themselves in carrying out that immense work in one of the roughest parts of the whole continent; in fact, I believe, the section immediately north of Lake Superior will be found to have been more rough and difficult than the passage through the Rocky Mountains. I observe that the company have issued a statement of their affairs, and in it the president has expressed himself in these terms, with respect to a matter which has been of very great importance to the country. He says:

“In the recent unhappy disturbances in the North-West the company has been fortunate in being able to assist in the transport of troops and material to the field of action, and although, of necessity, some discomfort was experienced by the volunteers, in their passage north of Lake Superior, the speed with which that transport was effected contributed in no small degree to the suppression of the outbreak. This circumstance has drawn attention, both here and in Europe, to the probability that the railway may, upon its completion to the Pacific Ocean, bear a still more important part in the defence of the Empire, and that its usefulness in that respect will form an important adjunct to its value as a peaceful instrument in the consolidation and development of the resources of the Dominion.”

The president of the railway has expressed himself with respect to that matter with great modesty. There can be no doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have rendered a most important service to this Dominion in passing through the volunteers with the rapidity they did. If that road had not been available, what might not the consequences have been? I remember—for I had a good deal to do with sending forward troops on a former occasion—that when the first rebellion took place. The Sault St. Marie Canal was shut against us, and roads had to be built round the rapids on the Canadian side over which military stores were carried, and placed on board of steamers on Lake Superior. That occasioned a great deal of delay. When the American officials saw that we got the stores through and were quite independent of the canal they turned round and said: “We will open the canal and you need not send the troops

over the portage—we are perfectly willing that you should send troops and stores through the canal.” That permission came a little too late, and the excuse given was that the delay had been occasioned by the State authorities and not by the Federal Government. I give it as my opinion that if we had possessed no way of sending forward troops to our North-West Territory, which we would not have had but for the Canadian Pacific Railway, we would on the last occasion as on the first have been denied the right of sending them through the United States. This would not have been due to any hostility on the part of the Government or American authorities, for I believe they have the most friendly feelings towards Canada, but because pressure would have been brought to bear upon them by certain classes, who are very numerous in the United States, and who would have said that the Government were seeking to aid the Canadian Government in crushing patriots who had risen to defend their rights. The Government might have hesitated, under those circumstances, however willing it might have been otherwise, to grant permission to send forward troops through American territory. Suppose that had been the case, what would the result have been? Two months would have elapsed before the volunteers would have got forward, namely, from 26th March, when we first heard of the rebellion to 26th May, for it would have been impossible to have got a man into the territory in the meantime. As is evident from the extent of the dissatisfaction among the half-breeds and the influence they possess over the Indians, the result would have been that many of the Indian tribes near the Rocky Mountains would have been in arms, many of the half-breeds would have been in arms also, and we should have had to meet them far east of Qu’Appelle, probably on the borders of Winnipeg. All that was obviated by the speed with which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company pushed on the work, and by the energy and expedition they displayed in sending forward troops; and this country owes the company a debt of gratitude for saving us from a possible outlay of more value than this grant at present applied for. The Sault St. Marie line I hope will ultimately be carried out. It is a very important line, although the hon. member for West Wellington (Mr. McMullen) describes it as being in a very deplorable condition; but I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said it should be carried out. For my part I think the Sault St. Marie line should be carried out, so that it may connect with the American lines, and when it does so it will draw a good deal of traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will do more than that. It will be the means of developing a very important country along the north coast of Lake Huron. We have good land there, as good as in the North-West, and we have a climate on the shores of Lake Huron and Manitoulin Islands superior to the climate in the North-West, and along that shore we now raise large quantities of wheat. I am happy to say that settlement is fast flowing in. The leader of the Opposition has said that the road was built with insane haste. I do not think so, Sir. I think that rapidity of construction in a work of that kind leads to economy of construction, and that the work has been more economically conducted than if it had been spread over a long series of years. We have heard a great deal about traffic and curves, and all that sort of thing, but I believe the curves are as few and as easy as the character of the country admitted, and that the grades, even in the Rocky Mountains, will eventually be, when the road is completed, such as to enable an immense traffic going over it. I think a great deal too much has been said about the existing population and their wants. It is not the existing population which should be taken into account in considering the location of a great railway like this. This line is being built for future as well as for present

Mr. Dawson.

generations, and I think the future ought to be taken into consideration, and that the position of the millions who are to occupy that country hereafter is quite as much a matter of consideration as the position of those who occupy it now. The hon. member for North Norfolk commenced his speech by referring to the admirable speech made by the leader of the Opposition, and he said very truly that gentleman had gone so completely over the ground in every possible way that he had left very little for any person else to say. I sympathised with the hon. gentleman as he went on with his speech; I saw that he was a little constrained. As a usual thing, he speaks very fluently, and his perorations rise to a strain of great eloquence; but to-night I think he was embarrassed by finding that everything that could be said was said before. The hon. member for West Wellington appeared to be in the same position. The hon. member for West Huron took a great deal of delight in referring to some early frosts which had occurred. He accused the leader of the Government of decrying the country, by publishing reports in which the statement was made that frosts had occurred in that country. These were reports sent in by local officials; and the delight the hon. gentleman manifested in pointing to them, under the guise of accusing the First Minister, only showed his desire to run down the country. The hon. member for Queen’s, P. E. I., was exceedingly eloquent, and exceedingly loud; but, I think, after all the great demonstrations he made, he was really jubilant that the railway was going on, and I cannot really think that he was serious in his denunciations of it. But, supposing he were, I say that no great enterprise was ever carried out without some little things occurring to cavil at, and I think there have been fewer of them in this case than in the case of most other great enterprises.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have no desire to speak at any length, because I suppose there was an understanding arrived at last night that we should go into committee to-night, and it is not pleasant to speak under circumstances of that kind. The question before the Chair has been widely departed from. You have been kind enough to allow members to take a very wide range, unless your attention was called to the rules of order, and we have had dissertations on the greatness of the country, and sentiments uttered which we could all wish to be absolutely true, and to which we should find a great deal of pleasure in listening at another time. We are considering a matter of business, as I understand. Gentlemen on this side have not been able to agree to the resolutions submitted by the Government, with reference to a change in our relations with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they have placed in your hands another proposition, and these are really the two subjects for our consideration at the present time. It is necessary, I grant, in order to a proper appreciation of the subject, and also to guide us somewhat in the decision we should arrive at on this question, that we should have some little regard to the history of the previous transactions of this company with the Government. And, Sir, I must say, at the outset, that looking at the application by the Canadian Pacific Railway for a re-arrangement of the terms at this Session of Parliament, it does look to me to be a thing so extraordinary, a thing which ought to have been so entirely unlooked for, if not uncalled for, that you cannot be surprised if members should enquire why it is that this company are coming, year after year, to make fresh demands at the hands of the Parliament of Canada. If we had in our original bargain with them, made what might be termed a hard bargain, if they had been placed at a disadvantage, if we had imposed on them terms unfavorable to them and favorable to us, then Sir, we could with more equanimity regard this annual application for further grants and allowances. But,

Sir, when we remember the facts, that instead of driving hard bargains with them we were so liberal in the terms which were given to them, that the Ministry who made the bargain could only defend the extravagance of their terms by stating that there was a danger that the road would not pay working expenses for some years, and that it was through having regard to that fact that they were led to give them what they have themselves admitted to be unduly favorable terms for the amount of work they undertook to do. That being the nature of the original contract made with the company, it is but natural that there should be a feeling of something more than wonder that that company should, in the short space of three or four years, after they had entered upon the work, come to us, as they did last year, and ask for a loan of \$22,500,000, and for a postponement of a payment of a little over \$7,500,000 that they have agreed to pay in as part of the sum that was to secure to them their interest for some years; and to find them now, barely twelve months after we were told, for the second time, that the arrangement was a final one, coming here and asking that the whole terms should be re-opened. It is something that seemed to me would have justified a little longer discussion—would have justified hon. members on this side of the House anticipating the proposition of the First Minister, that at this early stage the House should go into committee on these resolutions; for, although there will be an opportunity of discussing them in committee, owing to our being confined to one clause, the discussion is not as free and easy as it can be on the motion for you to leave the Chair. The other night, when I was answering arguments that had been offered by some hon. gentlemen on the proposition to aid branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-West, and was called to order by some hon. gentlemen opposite, I said that there had been a mistake, to my mind, in the action of the Government towards this company, from the very first—that I never understood thoroughly the relations between the Government and the company—that I never had been able to comprehend how the Canadian Pacific Railway had got such a firm grip and hold on the Government of this country as to be able to compel from them almost any terms they saw fit to demand. That there is a mystery about it is very easily explained, because the original contract was so contrary to the announced policy of the Government that we cannot but be filled with wonder that they should have allowed that company to wring from them the terms of that contract. I have pointed out more than once to this House that the Government, when they made that original contract with the company, departed from the declared policy that they announced to Parliament, and that Parliament had sanctioned, for the construction of this road, and that they did it without the authority of Parliament, and in defiance of the expressed statements of the Ministers themselves, that they were about to build this road as a Government work, and not through the agency of a company. I have pointed out, as the official records bear testimony, that we had a statement in March, 1880, from the then Minister of Railways, in which he laid down a plan for the construction of this work as a Government work. He stated, in that speech, that when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) introduced his railway policy in 1874, proposing to construct this work as a Government work, he had felt a degree of alarm in connection with it. "But," said he, "I do not hesitate to say that my views have been entirely changed in that matter—that there is not a man in Canada who does not see that the whole position of things has been altered since then." He had, he said, opposed the road being constructed as a Government work in 1874, when the hon. member for East York proposed that it should be done in that way, but he now thought it was an eminently proper thing to do.

We had also the First Minister, within two or three days of the day the Minister of Railways expressed these sentiments, declaring that when his Government assumed office, after the fall of the Mackenzie Administration, they found that they had commenced some of the most difficult portions of the work as a Government work; "and having found," he said, "that the Government had undertaken the construction of the work north of Lake Superior, we determined to go on with it as a Government work, because the Government having constructed the most difficult portions, we thought we should go on and construct the easy portions." That was the policy of the Government, as declared by the First Minister and the Minister of Railways in this House in 1880, and Parliament assented to that proposition, and told the Government to go on and construct the road as a Government work. Within only eight months after that time, without the will of Parliament being expressed, without any intimation being given by Parliament of a desire to depart from that arrangement, the Government entered into a contract with this company to construct this work.

An hon. MEMBER. That's old.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; it is old, and old as it is, from that day to this no Minister has got up in his place and given reasons why they dared to depart from what they laid down as their policy in 1880. They did not do it when the Government contract was under consideration; nor have they done it on any occasion since. The hon. gentleman opposite, who says it is old, and who has voted, I suppose, for the Government, in all their different dealings and their immense grants and gifts to this corporation, will perhaps be able to say what induced him to support the Government in departing from their expressed plan of building this road, and giving the work to a syndicate. Will he say it is because they secured the construction of the road at a less cost to Canada through the intervention of a company? Will he affirm that? If he does, we have simply to enter into a calculation as to what the cost of this road will be as a Government work. Are we in the dark with reference to that? Not the slightest. In March, 1880, the Minister of Railways gave us the figures of the cost of the portions of the road this company contracted to build for us, for they did not contract to build the whole road; they simply contracted to build portions which, when completed, taken with other portions the Government were to complete, were to be the Canadian Pacific Railway. They were to build 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper, 335 miles from Jasper to Kamloops, and 600 miles from Thunder Bay to Lake Nipissing. Have we any estimate of the cost of the work, if the Government were to do it as a Government work? Yes; Sir Charles Tupper gave it to us. His estimate was \$13,000,000 for the 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper, \$15,500,000 for the 335 miles from Jasper to Kamloops, and \$20,000,000 from Thunder Bay to Lake Nipissing. These were the figures he gave us, and which he took from Mr. Sandford Fleming, the chief engineer. He said he thought the 600 miles from Thunder Bay to Lake Nipissing should be built for \$18,000,000, but that Mr. Fleming, whose ability was only exceeded by his caution, asked him to put it at \$20,000,000. What was the sum total of the cost of the portion of the road constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway? \$48,500,000 were the figures given to Parliament in 1880 and accepted by Parliament, and on these figures Parliament said to the Government: Go on and construct your road as fast as you desire; and the idea of the Government then was, not to construct the road at once. Sir Charles Tupper said it was not the intention of the Government to construct the section north of Lake Superior at once, but that circumstances would demand it in the course of time, and that then it would be constructed. What did we give the company in the original contract to build that \$48,500,000 worth of work? We

gave them 25,000,000 acres of land and \$25,000,000 cash, and then we were to spend \$16,000,000 in building the 413 miles from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, to be given them, when completed, as a free gift, and the 125 miles from Yale to Kamloops, to cost \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000, and the 90 miles from Yale to Port Moody, costing millions more, all to be handed over, completed and equipped, as free gifts. All these were given them, the 25,000,000 acres and the \$25,000,000 cash, and the \$35,000,000 required to complete the works that were to be constructed by the Government and given to them on completion—all these were given them to do what the Minister of Railways said would cost about \$48,500,000. In addition, we gave them the Pembina branch which cost \$1,750,000, and was running and paying dividends at the time; and we gave them a monopoly of the trade of the country for 20 years, exemption from taxation on their lands as long as the lands remained in their possession, exemption from duties on material used for the construction of the road. Yet, after giving them all that, and when the Ministers of that day and their supporters were unable to defend the bargain, but forced that proposition through the House, after sitting day, after day as they did, and when the excuse they attempted to offer was: We know the bargain is a very good bargain, but we want to give them a good bargain, so that we will not have them coming to us again, so that we will have finality in this. The Parliament of Canada assented to this, and having assented to it, under these conditions and for that purpose, it was perfectly natural that when this company, having received this immense amount over what was anticipated by the Government would be the actual cost of construction and equipment of the road, when this company comes back and asks for millions more of money by loans, and the money was given to them by Parliament, Parliament had the right to enquire into the circumstances, and Parliament would have acted rightly had it refused them any further assistance. But Parliament yielded to their request. A loan of \$22,500,000 was given to them, and the payment of \$7,500,000, which they were to pay, was deferred. A debt of \$30,000,000 was therefore incurred by the company last year, for which they gave us security upon the road and the quipment and the branch lines, and on their steamers and other property; and now we have the other proposition before us, barely twelve months later, after having been told last year that certainly then there was finality, we have the proposition to lend the company more money; and, besides that, instead of their offering to increase, they ask us to reduce the security we hold. That is the proposition before us, and hon. gentlemen opposite are apparently prepared to accede to this demand; they are prepared to tell us that it becomes us, as patriots, to grant this company what they ask. Will those hon. gentlemen tell us when we are to reach finality? Will they tell us whether this company will be back next year? There is an alternative proposition, which is a very simple one and a very good one. I will read it again, because hon. gentlemen opposite admit that if the statements of the hon. leader of the Opposition were correct, which he made with reference to the amount of money the company had raised by way of dividends, the question was a very serious one. What is the proposition?

That all after the word "that" be left out, and the following be inserted:—"Canada, in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, gave the company vast aids which were declared to be ample and final."

Who will deny that statement.

"Canada, in 1884, gave the company fresh additional aids, which were again declared to be ample and final."

Who denies that?

"The shareholders of the company have already divided among themselves about seven millions in dividends, and have on deposit with  
Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the Government about fourteen millions more, to provide future dividends for themselves for over eight years to come, while they affirm that the railway will be profitable from the day of its opening.

"In the opinion of this House, the shareholders, if they desire more money for their operations, should propose to utilise their deposit for future dividends, instead of asking Canada to impair its existing securities—to make large further advances, and to allow the enterprise to be charged with fifteen millions additional capital, the interest on which must be borne by the trade of this country."

Is not that a reasonable proposition? It is not a proposition to say that you will not give such aid as you may give to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is a proposition that ought to commend itself to business men, and which, I think, will commend itself to the business men of the country; and the only exception which has been taken to it has been—what? They say that it bears upon its face repudiation, and it seemed to be an idea that some one had devised, or some number of heads had come together and had devised, that it was to be the cry, there is nothing in it. Hon. gentlemen opposite must be conscious that there is nothing in it; but there must be something said; the proposition is such an obviously fair one, one that will commend itself to every man of any intelligence in the country, that there must be something said. Parliament, as conducted under this Government, at this time, Parliament conducted in secret caucus, has determined that this loan shall be granted, and therefore it is said that the taint of the repudiation is upon the amendment. If you adopt the resolution, where is the taint of repudiation, in saying that if the shareholders desire more money to carry on their operations they should not be allowed to use the amount they have deposited to meet future dividends. That is all. There is no compulsion whatever. We have no power to compel them to do this, but the resolution asks us to express the opinion that it would be a right and proper thing, and not such an impudent thing, if they would propose to do that, as it is to come and ask us them to lend them more money and to reduce our security, instead of their giving us more security. Oh, but, the hon. gentleman this afternoon said, the shareholders would have to be consenting parties. Well, the resolution proposes that. Is there anything impossible in getting the consent of the shareholders? Is there any difficulty in that? We do not propose to compel them to do anything, but it is the shareholders who are asking this Parliament to impair their own securities and lend them more money, but we say it would be more proper for you, if you require more money, to propose to utilise the money you have placed in our hands to secure future good dividends for themselves. That is all the resolution proposes, and if there is any difficulty in getting your consent to that, there must be a difficulty in regard to the proposals of the Government. How will this \$35,000,000 of mortgage bonds be issued? Will that be with the consent of the shareholders? Are these things to be done outside of the shareholders altogether? Are the shareholders not to be consenting parties at all? Do not the resolutions provide:

"That the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the authority of its shareholders, as provided by the 28th section of its charter, may issue and deliver to the Government first mortgage bonds to the extent of \$35,000,000, bearing 5 per cent. interest?"

That is the proposition of the Government, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may issue these mortgage bonds under the provisions of its charter, and the 28th section of the charter provides that this shall be done under the authority of a special general meeting of the shareholders called for the purpose. As I read the contract, there must be a special general meeting of the shareholders, called for a special purpose, the issuing of the bonds which you are proposing that they may issue, before that can be done; and yet the hon. gentlemen opposite see so much difficulty in the way of a simple resolution to utilise the money they have deposited with the Government to meet future dividends. They say: How are you going

to get the assent of the shareholders? How are you going to get them to sign your mortgage bonds? Your shareholders have to sanction them in a special general meeting. No one proposes to say they shall utilise this money. The motion of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) simply proposes that we should say to the shareholders: We think it would be more seemly if you proposed to utilise the moneys in our hands to accomplish what you desire, instead of coming with a proposition to issue first mortgage bonds in the way you suggest. All the talk that is thrust in about patriotism, all that is thrust in with reference to our magnificent country in the west, is beside the question. The country to the west is a grand country—there is no doubt about that; and this company had enough assistance given to them to build and finish their railway out of the public money of Canada. A mystery seems to hang over this transaction. It is a mystery that this company seem to have power enough, year after year, to compel the Government to yield to whatever terms they see fit to propose; but the people of the country will look at the propositions before the House now in a business light. They will naturally ask why those who have millions of money laid by in order to secure immense dividends for themselves in the future, money which ought to have gone into the construction of the road, can ask Parliament to impair its security and to give them further sums of money, and why Parliament should grant their demand, after its attention has been drawn to the fact that these millions are locked up in its Treasury. If you desire more aid, then utilise the money that is laid by for the purpose of securing your great dividends; put that into the construction of your road; there is enough to complete it, according to your own statement, and your road, when completed, you assure us over the signature of your own president, is sure to earn your dividends; your dividends are all safe. That being the case, what argument can be used, what justification can be offered for this Parliament deliberately to impair the security that it holds with the company, when it is not bound to do so by any sense of justice, or of right, or of equity; when there is no plea that the company can put forth in any direction that will warrant it in doing it. Take their own published statement, take their own reports, the flourishing condition of the company, the amount they are worth over and above their liabilities; read the statement issued the other day of their assets and liabilities; see the immense property they are possessed of; see the wealth they have there; and yet with all that wealth, with all that amount of assets over liabilities, this Parliament proposes, with millions of money lying in our hands for their own benefit, to let that money lay there, to be paid out to them to secure their future dividends, with the ample securities we took last year—which we were told were ample and that made us perfectly safe—and on top of that give to them five millions more money. I have no desire to go further into the matter, but I think it is an occasion when every hon. member in this House would have been perfectly justified in standing up and declaring that he is individually opposed to the propositions that are before the House and in favor of the reasonable suggestion contained in the proposition of the member for West Durham.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Cameron (Huron) p. 2643.

YEAH:

Messieurs

Auger,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Bernier,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,

Fleming,  
Forbes,  
Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Guay,

McIntyre,  
McIsaac,  
McMullen,  
Mills,  
Mulock,

Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
Charlton,  
Davies,  
Fairbank,  
Fisher,

Harley,  
Holton,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
King,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingston,  
McCraney,

Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,  
Rinfret,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Wilson—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Barnard,  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Bryson,  
Burns,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Cameron (Victoria),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (Maski'gé),  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,

Dupont,  
Farrow,  
Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.),  
Ferguson (Welland),  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Gagné,  
Gault,  
Gigault,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guilbault,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Hurteau,  
Ives,  
Jamieson,  
Jenkins,  
Kaulbach,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Montmagny),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Mackintosh,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McCarthy,  
McDougald (Pictou),

McDougall (C. Breton),  
McLelan,  
McNeill,  
Massue,  
Mitchell,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,  
Paint,  
Paterson (Essex),  
Pinsonneault,  
Pope,  
Pruyn,  
Riopel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Rykert,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Temple,  
Tupper,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Oardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westm'ld),  
Woodworth.—100.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to on a division, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that we could not go on with this resolution to-night. There will be a good deal of discussion upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Mr. BLAKE. What business does the hon. gentleman intend to take up to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These resolutions.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:05 a.m., Saturday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 20th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on certain proposed resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. BLAKE. By this resolution it is proposed to issue a set of mortgage bonds for \$35,000,000. It is very plain that \$20,000,000 are to replace bonds, and with respect to the other \$15,000,000 this would be a suitable place to have a general explanation as to the details of the scheme.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman knows that Sir Charles Tupper, in his explanation to the House last year with regard to the \$35,000,000 stock which the Government were to retain, said that would only be sold for the purpose of the road, or for the purpose of repaying the loan to the Government. Twenty millions of that is set apart for paying off the loan, as the hon. gentleman well knows, and when these bonds are sold the proceeds must go to pay off the loan. With respect to the other \$15,000,000, \$8,000,000 is taken as security for the \$5,000,000 loan of this Session. That \$5,000,000 loan is for the purpose of paying the floating debt. The other \$10,000,000 is for the purpose of completing the road, and it will make it a much better road than that contemplated by the contract. The contract will now be completed in such a way as to place the line in a position to compete with older rivals. It was believed to be necessary that, having a competing line, we should have a road which, when opened, would be able to compete with other transcontinental railways. That will involve considerable expenditure, and a portion of this money will be appropriated for rolling stock and other purposes, as the hon. gentleman has seen from the memorandum laid before the House. A portion of it will be devoted to improving the road so as to bring it up to a proper standard and enable the company to efficiently complete the road. That really is the destination of the \$15,000,000: First, to pay off their floating debt, and secondly to improve the road and to put it in a fair condition to compete with other roads.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the intended term of years for which the bonds are to be issued?

Mr. POPE. The bonds are 50 year bonds.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say why it is not provided in his proposed resolution what the intended term is, because under this you might make them thousand year bonds?

Mr. POPE. There is no objection in saying "a period not exceeding 50 years."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to become of the statement of the Finance Minister that he was going to pay off all the money borrowed at the end of seven years, by the repayment of this Canadian Pacific Railway money? This statement was made by the Finance Minister only two months ago.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it that you fix upon the term of 50 years as a maximum term?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. POPE. Of course that is an arbitrary arrangement, whether you fix it at 25, 30, 40 or 50 years, but 50 years is fixed upon as being probably the best way of arranging it.

Mr. BLAKE. In this connection, as we have borrowed and are borrowing large sums of money, in order to meet these loans we are giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is important that we should know exactly about the repayment of these loans. We have had from time to time statements as to the financial arrangements of the Administration, dependent as they were, to a considerable degree, on their obligations to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the obligations of the Canadian Pacific to them. During the Budget Speech, the Finance Minister told us he was going to issue a short loan in order that we might not be embarrassed by the riches we are to receive in 1891 from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now we find that the new loan is to be a fifty year loan.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that is exactly relevant to the subject. We will discuss that question when the Government loan comes up. As to these bonds, they are to mature at a period of not over 50 years. The question is what is the usual practice with regard to loans made by railways, and bonds and debentures issued by railways. Well, they vary; but the general practice is to have them from 25 to 50 years—generally 50—redeemable at the option of the railway at 25 or 30 years. It is desirable that we should make the arrangement as to the term of the bonds, according to the suggestion of the railway as much as possible, as they know which is the best way of making their bonds available. If the bonds are limited to 50 years, we know exactly when they will mature—perhaps at 30, perhaps at 35, but they will do that to suit their own ideas of what is the most advantageous period for the maturing of the bonds.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that this is an irrelevant consideration. Was it irrelevant for the Minister of Finance when he made his Budget Speech, to declare that he was about to arrange the loan, which he is now negotiating in England, as a short loan, because the Canadian Pacific Railway debt was about to mature in 1891, and he intended to have the money to meet that loan? That was certainly relevant. He was explaining his scheme of finance, which depended on the period of the railway debt. He was about to borrow at such dates that his new loan might be met by the railway debt. It is now proposed to arrange for the postponement of the railway debt from 1891 for a period of between 40 and 50 years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Therefore, it is quite relevant to the question. The hon. gentleman says no, and of course we know that the Canadian Pacific Railway has the option to pay earlier, but they are under no obligation to pay before the maturity of the bonds. What is going to happen if they do not pay? This is going to happen: 5 per cent. interest will be payable on the bonds. You take \$20,000,000 of 5 per cent. bonds as your security. You agree that from the railway company until 1891, provided they do not make default in interest, you will exact no more than 4 per cent. on the \$20,000,000, if they do not pay before 1891, they will pay 5 per cent. But the bonds will not mature earlier than the period of maturity—they will not mature earlier than the period of maturity to the public. If you intend to declare that there is to be a foreclosure some different proposition will have to be put in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the state of affairs as I understand. The credit of the company expires in 1891, and if they do not pay in 1891, they are in default.

If the Government does not choose to enforce this default then, after the period of default, the interest shall be 5 per cent., but the moment the company is in default; the Government have got all the remedies, and besides the value of the bonds does not depend on the length of time at which the notes mature. The bonds always have a saleable value at any given time before maturity. The moment the default takes place the Government can do with those bonds as they please, as with any other securities. The hon. gentleman says there is no means of enforcing them until the end of fifty years. That is not the case. For instance, consols are not redeemable at any time except at the option of the Government; they run forever; and people take them as securities because they are saleable at any time at the market price. So with the securities of the Canadian Government, no matter whether they are for 10 or 15 or 20 years, they have a market value. I take it that the Canadian Government has the power, the moment the default takes place, to enforce the security and to sell it at any time thereafter they please.

Mr. BLAKE. They are two very distinct propositions to say that the Canadian Government have the power to sell their bonds and to say they have the power to enforce the security. I was not considering at what period of time the Canadian Government might sell their bonds; I was considering what the consequences of default would be; and the hon. gentleman says they will have power to enforce their security. I say they will not have that power, at any rate so long as the interest is paid, until the maturity of the bonds. They might or might not have the right to sell the bonds after 1891; but up to that time I presume they will have no right to sell them. The general public may sell from the time they receive them. The Government would call on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to pay the \$20,000,000 which is represented by the security of the road. All that is to happen is that the general rate of interest on the bonds of 5 per cent. is to commence to run at the time of the so-called default, and possibly at that time the Government may be permitted, if they find purchasers, to sell their securities, but they cannot enforce them against the road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the 5th resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that to relate to default in the payment of interest.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not at all—the principal.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman says that word default refers to default in the payment of interest up to 1891?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Up to 1891.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is intended that the Government shall have what the public bondholders are not to have, a right to call in the security for the benefit of the bondholders generally after 1891.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that after 1891, if there is a default, the Government can use these bonds which are lodged with them as security. They are not substituted for the Government debt; they are security for the Government debt; and if, after 1891, there is a failure, or if, in the meantime, there is a failure in the payment of the interest, the Government can proceed for default, can sell the security they have at the market price, and can look to the road for the balance, or they can take the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing these \$15,000,000 of bonds are sold, what position will the holders of those bonds be in? Apparently the Government would have to be trustees for them as well as for themselves for their

\$20,000,000. The Government could not enforce their security for \$20,000,000; they would have to do it for the whole \$35,000,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have a claim on the whole road as a matter of mortgage; they take these bonds as collateral security. The holders of the \$15,000,000 are not in that position; they take the bonds, and they can only enforce them according to their terms. Their purchase of the bonds is not a security; it is an investment; if they choose at any time to sell the bonds before they mature, they sell them at the market price; it is their own affair. It is a different thing to take the bonds as a security. We can sell these bonds, in case of default in 1891, and if they do not sell at the market price, the balance will remain as a mortgage on the railway, or we can go into possession of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. The result of that is very curious. The balance is to remain as a mortgage on the railway but it is for the benefit of those to whom the hon. gentleman has sold the bonds, and the public bondholders as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says these bonds are only to be taken as collateral security, while the mortgage will secure the balance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I said so.

Mr. CASEY. According to the 3rd resolution, it is only the Algoma branch which will remain subject to the mortgage of the Government after the issue and delivery of the bonds.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I should like to know what construction the hon. gentleman puts on these words, if they do not say that the mortgage shall be released and discharged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The issue of bonds shall not apply to the Algoma branch, for a very good reason, because we want that road to be built; but the original statutory mortgage of the Government will still remain on the Algoma branch, but the bondholders have no claim upon that branch.

Mr. CASEY. That is quite clear; but as to the rest of the road, the mortgage is released and the bonds take its place?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. That is the statement of the clause, and that is exactly what we have been saying, that instead of these bonds being taken as collateral security, they are taken for the whole line, except the Algoma branch, in lieu of the mortgage. The right hon. gentleman said, a few minutes ago, that we have power in case of default to sell the road. That is not the power given by the clause in question. Clause 5 says that in the eventualities therein stated:

"Upon the company remaining in default in respect of either the principal or interest of the said \$20,000,000 for a period of 12 months, the trustees shall be authorised and empowered to take possession of the property mortgaged and to administer the same for the benefit of the bondholders generally."

So that the power is merely to administer the property, and the only means of repaying itself the Government will have will be what they can make on the operation of the road. That is taking a very great risk, in view of our experience of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. We will not have the road as security at all, but only the right of ordinary bondholders of having the road put into

the hands of a receiver and administered for the benefit of all bondholders, our share being in the proportion of 20 to 15, or  $\frac{4}{5}$ ths of the profits of the road.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman omitted one important point in this connection. Under these resolutions we will have \$35,000,000 of first mortgage bonds on the railway itself, exclusive of the land and the Algoma branch. Twenty millions of that is security for the repayment of the loan made last year to the extent of \$20,000,000. We stand in relation to the road precisely in the position of the other bondholders with this exception, that our right to foreclose comes sooner than it would to the ordinary bondholders.

Mr. BLAKE. No, we have no right to foreclose.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Under the 4th clause we have the statement that the time for repayment of the entire loan of the company shall be fixed the first May, 1891. That is the day the loan is payable under the loan Act of last Session, and that loan Act is perpetuated in that particular at present. We have the right therefore to the repayment of the loan at that time; and by the 5th section, the non-payment of it will be practically a default, which will enable us to do as we would be enabled to do if we were ordinary bondholders, and default were made on our bonds. If in 1891, therefore, the Canadian Pacific Railway has not paid back the amount borrowed, we will have the right to foreclose and to take possession of the road as ordinary bondholders, in virtue of our \$20,000,000 of bonds, but we will take possession of it on the same footing as the other \$15,000,000 bondholders. They will have the same rights in connection with the line that we have, but we have this advantage which they have not, that we have the security of the lands in addition to the security on the road for the payment of interests on our \$20,000,000 and the security of the Algoma Branch.

Mr. BLAKE. You have the Algoma Branch just so long as it is useless. When it begins to be useful by a line being constructed from Sault Ste. Marie, there will be a mortgage on it ahead of you.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not consider the Algoma Branch as a matter of serious consideration in connection with this matter at all. The great advantage of that line is this, that by its connection with the Sault Ste. Marie branch and the extension of lines on the American side, we will develop an important trade which will more than compensate the country for the loss of the security.

Mr. BLAKE. That is another question.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). But the lands we undoubtedly have, and if we take the statements of hon. gentlemen as to their value, when we gave the contract, in the first instance, we will derive from them a very considerable amount which will go against the interest of our bonds, supposing the road should not pay the interest. I hope that by that time it will, and eventually it must do so. We will then get the interest and have the sale of the lands to recoup us for the principal.

Mr. BLAKE. Our position to-day is this: That if, in regard to the last loan of \$29,820,000, default should occur in May, 1891, we have the road, we have the possession of this whole enterprise, the road with its extensions and lands all, and it is not simply the possession we will have, but the title of it. It will become ours. But if default is to be made under this arrangement in May, 1891, we will have the right, not to ownership, but to a joint possession of  $\frac{3}{5}$ ths of the road for our \$20,000,000. That is our position under the proposed arrangement. The existing ar-

Mr. CASEY.

angement it appears, according to Mr. Stephen's statement, was a severe arrangement against which the company remonstrated—an arrangement too exacting, to which they were subjected by the stern creditor who has dominated over them and compelled them to submit to such severe Jewish terms. The property was to be ours, if default were made in 1891, under that arrangement; but if default be made in 1891, under the proposed arrangement, the property will not be ours. Not merely will it not be ours, but we will not have an individual right to the possession of the property in 1891, but only the right to the possession of it by a trustee in trust for our  $\frac{1}{5}$ ths interest in the road. Therefore our remedy will not be what the hon. gentleman was understood to say a moment ago, that for the balance due us we could sell the road. Our position will only be that we will be able to appoint a trustee to take possession and get what profits are to be got out of the working of the road, during the earlier years when the company has failed to make a profit at all—that we will take the thing off their hands until the traffic becomes developed and the road becomes a paying one, and when that good time comes the road will revert to the company and they will reap the profits.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We will get back our interest.

Mr. BLAKE. You will get back your interest but you might have the possibility of getting back the security, if you had the power of selling the road to somebody else. The new consequence will be we will not have the road under the proposed arrangement. We are to have it now. We will not even have a joint interest in it, but a joint right to possession of it for an indefinite time, to be worked, I say, under circumstances in which the company has made default of working it properly; but there is yet the right to succession, there is yet their right to say, at some future day, if it should become profitable: Now, it is ours again. This is a most important change in two aspects. First, we are admitting others as privileged with us in our security in this enterprise. The practical result of that will be, in the end, if this security becomes necessary to be used, on that theory, and it is on that theory alone it is important to discuss it, we will have to buy off those other people. If the security is not to be used and everything turns out well, there will be no trouble about it; but if it is to be used, we will have to buy off the other stockholders. If you say no, take it as you say. We have joint bondholders with us in the concern. A trustee is to be appointed, and the power of that trustee is, in 1891, if we take possession, to see if he can make it pay, and if he does, it is for the benefit of us to the extent of our securities. But our powers to realise and get hold of the property, to sell it to the best advantage, to give a parliamentary title of it to some new corporation for the amount which will realise our securities, and keep us from the position of being but a mortgagee of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is to be gone altogether. That will arise, if at all, under the terms of this security. I do not know that it will arise at all, but, if it does, it will be under the terms, when the defaults are made, which are general to the whole body of bondholders, but, as to the special default which is made in our case and provided for in the 5th clause, the sole remedy is to take possession and administer for the benefit of the bondholders.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That depends entirely upon what may be the conditions in the deed of mortgage to be executed by the company.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the clause.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Take the second clause.

Mr. BLAKE. I see the second clause.

Mr. CASEY. We take the position of ordinary bondholders, with one very considerable difference, that, until

May, 1891, we get 1 per cent. less than the other bondholders.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is another question.

Mr. CASEY. We have no better position in regard to remedies than the other bondholders, and we take 1 per cent. less interest. As to the remedy, it has been by no means made clear what the meaning of clause 5 is.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Had you not better wait till we get to clause 5?

Mr. CASEY. The wording is :

"If the company makes default in the payment of the interest on the said sum of \$20,000,000 or of the principal thereof at the time when the same shall become due respectively, the rate of interest upon the whole loan shall thereafter be computed at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum; and such default shall be equivalent to a default in the payment of the interest on the said bonds, and shall entitle the Government to the same remedies as if default had been made in the payment of the interest or principal of the said bonds, and upon the company remaining in default in respect of either the principal or interest on the said \$20,000,000 for a period of 12 months, the trustees shall be authorised and empowered to take possession of the property mortgaged and to administer the same for the benefit of the bondholders generally."

The last paragraph of the clause seems to mean, and apparently the leader of this side of the House so understood it, that as long as the 5 per cent. interest was paid, as long as the extra interest due on the first default was paid without default, as long as it did not remain in default for a period of twelve months, the remedy of possession, such as it is, does not come in. If it is meant that the words should have a different meaning, and that the remedy should come into force as soon as default was made, either in the payment of the 4 per cent. up to 1891, or of the 5 per cent. afterwards, then the clause ought to state it in words that would be unmistakable. The hon. gentleman who leads this side of the House said we were admitting partners in our security. Not only so, but we are also reducing the security. We have now security on both the road and the lands for the whole sum, and we can make it out of whichever turns out to be the most solid security. Under the new arrangement, we are freeing the lands of all but this amount of \$9,880,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. CASEY. Not absolutely, but in the first instance we are taking the security for \$20,000,000 on the road and, in round numbers, for \$10,000,000 on the land. It is certainly the opinion of many of us that the land is the most solid security. The land is something that may be saleable in future, if the railway continues in operation, and we would get possession of it and be able to sell it, but, instead of keeping that as a reserve security for the capital sum, we are, as far as the capital amount is concerned, taking a doubtful security, taking the road of which we are only to enjoy the possession and profits for two-thirds of our entire debt, leaving one-third on the directly realisable security of the land. The hon. gentleman's point, when he interrupted me, was, I have no doubt, the same as that which he made when he was speaking, that the land was liable in the last resort for the \$20,000,000, but that is not as I read it. I read that :

"After payment out of the proceeds of such lands of the outstanding land grant bonds, and of the said sum of \$9,880,912 and interest, the remainder of such lands shall remain charged with a first lien and privilege in favor of the Government as additional security for the payment of the said sum of \$20,000,000 and interest."

It is not until \$10,000,000, in round numbers, has been paid off, that you have any lien for the \$20,000,000. The lands might remain on hand and sufficient might not be sold at the time when the \$20,000,000 become due to pay off the \$9,880,000, and therefore you could not depend on the lands to make up any deficit in the payment of the \$20,000,000.

You must first get your \$9,880,000 out before you can take any action on the \$20,000,000, so it could not be looked upon as being collateral security for the whole loan. The largest amount is put on the poorest security.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true that \$15,000,000 of bondholders are admitted on equal terms, so far as the bonds are concerned, with the Government loan of \$30,000,000. The Government considered, under the circumstances, that it would be well that this expansion should be allowed, in order to grant relief to the road, and the Government consider that the security is in no degree substantially affected by the change. The Government had a mortgage on the whole road and all its properties for the whole extent of the loan of \$30,000,000. It was considered that that property was of infinitely greater value than the amount of the mortgage, and that the letting in of \$15,000,000 more of bonds, with such a valuable security, did not really affect the Government security, or the means of enforcing the loan. It is exactly equivalent to this. If there is a property worth \$20,000, and you have a mortgage of \$5,000, and the mortgagor wishes to improve that property, you have a mortgage of \$5,000 on the property worth \$20,000, and you allow another party to come in with a mortgage of \$500, the amount of which is to be laid out on the improvement of the property, the property being of so much more value than your own security and the amount of the second mortgage, or the party who is allowed to come in with you on your own mortgage, in order to improve the property. That does not affect your security, because the property is certain to be a good security for your loan and the subsequent loan which is to be devoted to the improvement of the property on which you have the security. That is the way the Government looks at it. Now, by the terms of these resolutions, there is no doubt that the default has taken place if the principal and interest are not paid by 1891. Then the question arises: How are you going to enforce the security.

Mr. CASEY. But if there is a default of interest before then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the default in the terms of payment of that interest is equivalent to the default under any ordinary mortgage. The default takes place, say, in 1891. You can either take the ordinary proceedings on a mortgage and enforce it—but, if you do, you must do it for the benefit of the \$15,000,000 of bondholders as well as yourself—or, under the 5th clause, the trustee can take possession upon the company remaining in default, in respect of either the principal or interest on the \$20,000,000 :

"But if the company made default in the payment of the interest on the said sum of \$20,000,000"—

Not on the \$35,000,000 but on the \$20,000,000, the Government debt.—

"at the time when the same shall become due respectively for a period of 12 months"—

I may say that ought to be six months.—

"the trustees shall be authorised and empowered to take possession of the property mortgaged and to administer the same for the benefit of the bondholders generally."

That is to say, the trustees will take possession of the road. It must be administered for the benefit of the bondholders generally—I take it, according to their several interests. If it should happen with any of the bondholders, that there is a year's interest due from want of demand or otherwise, the coupons not being handed in, that bondholder would have a claim for his two coupons. I take it that those trustees must administer for the benefit of the bondholders generally, when they take possession it will be after default,

as the position of the Government will be that the trustees must deal with the debt or claim the Government holds for principal and interest, and in the case of the other bondholders for interest only. I think that is quite clear. And then still further the question is settled beyond doubt. If the hon. gentleman will look at the 2nd clause :

"That the company may secure the payment of the said bonds and of the interest thereon by a deed of mortgage executed by the Government the trustees to be approved by the Government with the authority and of tenor and purport, and containing the condition, remedies, provisions and powers authorised and provided for by the 28th section of the charter of the company, to such an extent and in a such a manner and form as shall be approved by the Governor in Council."

Now the 28th section simply proves that in default of payment—it speaks about securities—in cases of the issue of bonds by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the bonds :

"And may also contain, with the approval aforesaid"—

That is, the Governor in Council.

"authority to the trustee or trustees, on such default, as one of such remedies, to take possession of their property-mortgage and to hold and run the same for the benefit of the bondholders thereof for a time to be limited by such deed or to sell the said railway and property, after such delay, and upon such terms and conditions as may be stated, in such deed ; and with like approval any such deed may contain provision to the effect"—

And so on about voting. But here it says the Government may take possession, and it will be for the benefit of all the bondholders of the fifteen millions as well as of our twenty millions. They may take possession, and they can either hold it, or run it, or they can sell it. They have all these powers.

Mr. BLAKE. To simplify the matter it is much better to consider what is the position of the whole mass of bondholders in the first place; and then here is an exceptional position for that mass of bonds held by the Government. Now the whole mass of bondholders are in this position, including the Government's bonds: that in case of default they are secured by a mortgage under this 2nd clause, and that by consequence, in case of default, and under these terms and conditions of that mortgage, there may be either a possession taken or a sale, either then or subsequently, a sale out. That, however, is only the common position of all the bondholders, including the Government's bonds, and it is a common right and on common conditions. For instance the bonds are fifty years' bonds. That power would not enure to the Government's bonds in 1891. It is a common right to all. Then the question is, what special rights the Government has in respect to its bonds over the common mass—or in addition to. In the first place, it holds these bonds in a different character; it holds them as security simply, and not as owner, and I presume it would not be right for the Government, unless default were made in the payment of interest to 1891, to sell these bonds, as ordinary bondholders might, from day to day. They are hypothecated for the twenty millions. In the second place, it is entitled to only 4 per cent. instead of 5 per cent., during 1891. In the third place, at the end of 1891, that loan of twenty millions comes due, and therefore, at the same time presumably, the Government may sell its twenty millions of bonds. Now, if it sells these twenty millions of bonds, what right will the holders of those twenty millions have? Just the same right as the other bondholders, and no more. Now, suppose it does not sell those twenty millions, but proceeds to ask for special powers to be used on its behalf under clause 5, as on default. We have got now down to the special powers, not the powers under the mortgage deed, because the powers under the mortgage deed were for the common use of all the bondholders, under common conditions—but the special powers in case of default made in

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the payment of the twenty millions secured by the twenty millions of bonds—rather to take possession and to hold the property in the name of the trustees for the benefits of the bondholders generally, to administer it but not to sell it. There is no power to sell in 1891. The mortgage is only in case of general default with the whole mass of bonds. If you have the power of 5 per cent. interest on the whole mass of bonds, then there will be a power to sell in common for all, but as long as the 5 per cent. interest is paid, there is no power to sell at the end of 1891 in respect to this twenty million loan; and, therefore, we are placed in that regard in an entirely different position.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite agree with a good deal that has been said by the hon. member for West Durham. But the intention is, as the First Minister says, that in 1891 all the powers which are given by the mortgage deeds are to be security for the bonds, to be executed in 1891. It is only just altering the terms which we have at the conclusion of the 5th section. I agree that there is an ambiguity, but the intention is there. We have this clause: that the trustees shall be empowered to take possession of the property; and it may be that there would be a doubt. I am not at all saying that my hon. friend's construction is not correct,—whether that would not be the only power, the sole power, that could be used.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly we can amend it.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no use wasting time in discussing the exact meaning of this resolution. As I understand it to be the intention, we can easily put in the proper words to carry out that intention.

Mr. BLAKE. If it is intended to amend the resolution there is no use in discussing it; but of course we were discussing the resolutions as they stood.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I understood the only dispute to be as to the real meaning of these words. If the language includes leased lines, there is no necessity discussing the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. But I have not heard the Minister say that he did not intend to include the leased lines, and I wished to make it clear that the leased lines were included. I am still of opinion that this language is broad enough to include the leased lines, but I want that definitely settled.

Mr. MILLS. It will be remembered that this has not to be interpreted by the courts but by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that I do not find anything mentioned about the leased lines; but I take them to be included in the language. The language is wide enough to include those interests, and I am anxious that they should be included in the arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why did the hon. gentleman bring up this point?

Mr. BLAKE. It is desirable, in my opinion, that the mortgage should include the leased lines; and I wish to have it so understood. I have stated my view of the construction of the language.

Mr. POPE. I do not think it was ever contemplated that this clause should include leased lines.

Mr. MULOCK. Is not a lease personal property?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, a lease is personal property.

Mr. McCARTHY. The words are first put generally; then particularly, so as to show just what the words cover. I think they do not cover leased lines.

Mr. BLAKE. Shall we have any security on the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway?

Mr. McCARTHY. If it is a branch, we shall.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a company in which the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway has not been defined to us. It appears by the company's report that for 52 miles the company paid something like \$1,250,000; and it is put under leased lines. Is it intended that we shall have any security on the Manitoba South-Western or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not a branch line in any way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I remember aright the argument of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) the other afternoon, it was that we must consider all those extra acquisitions by the company and the large sum they had expended upon them. That would be a very good reason why, if there be any value in those leased lines, it should form part of our security.

Mr. BLAKE. We are paying for the leased lines. In the company's report it is shown that there was paid last year \$1,265,450 on account of leased lines in Ontario. As to the Manitoba and South-Western, which is entered as a leased line, we have not been able to ascertain what interest the company had in it; but it paid last year on that account \$1,254,978. On the Atlantic and North-Western, \$202,000. That is a portion of the scheme of the Montreal connection. On St. Lawrence and Ottawa, \$227,253. On the South-Eastern a certain sum, that being a leased line like the others. Are we to have security on any of these leased lines, and on which?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We cannot possibly have security on leased lines whose bonds are in existence and on which the company have agreed to pay interest. Instead of getting valid security, we might be getting an elephant. If we took possession of the roads afterwards, we would have to pay the interest on all the bonds.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member has made a statement which he will be sorry he made. He has professed great faith in the reports of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I find in the statement respecting leased lines, that the Ontario and Quebec Railway made a large profit over all costs and charges. They made a profit not merely over the fixed charges on the purchase money which yet remains to be paid, but on the amount which has been paid for the eastern extension. As to the leased lines themselves, they made a profit after paying all fixed charges and expenses. The hon. gentleman at one time was ready to argue that the leased lines were no burden; now, when it is suggested that we should include them in the security, he says we would get an elephant on our hands. Let us get at the bottom of the whole matter, and not argue one day on a certain set of facts and another day on a set of facts diametrically opposite. If they are profitable investments, and after paying their way, returned a large profit to the Canadian Pacific Railway, why is it that under these circumstances, whatever the circumstances of last year were, this country should not get the security of that profit?

Mr. CASEY. It is not only that, but the directors themselves express the following opinion:—

"The directors are convinced that without the control of tributary lines, reaching all the important centres of trade in the older Provinces of the Dominion, the company could have no adequate command of the traffic to and from the Canadian North-West, and the Pacific coast, and that the greater part of it would continue to be carried by the American lines as it has been in the past, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would fail to accomplish one of the main objects for which it was brought into existence."

It is this helpless trunk line without the necessary connections, of which it is proposed to give us possession, and not

to give us the franchises which that company has acquired in the necessary tributary lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is rather a barren discussion. It may be that the hon. member for West Durham is correct in his statements. It may be as my hon. friend near me says, that it will not have that effect, because the subsequent language specifies and limits the more general language at the beginning of the clause. But the language is precisely the language of last year. Whatever security the Government got on the loan of \$30,000,000, exists now on the \$20,000,000 and the \$15,000,000. If the hon. gentleman was right, on that loan of \$30,000,000 last year we had a claim on the leases. It may be so, and if so, we have that claim now. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman has any object—indeed, he says he has no object—in diminishing the security. If it is so, that is a matter to be settled hereafter, and it will be settled by the courts, if there is any row about it.

Mr. BLAKE. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to put in the resolution the words "securing the lease lines."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say we might do so, but then comes in the question of the policy of doing so which is quite a different affair. The intention of the Government was to let in \$15,000,000 of bondholders into the security we took last year, and not to increase that security or diminish it. It may be, and I think it is the case, that the Government could assume that as a matter of course—they could deal with those lines and encumber them to a great extent with all possible encumbrances. I do not think there is any necessity for raising that question now, or increasing the security we had last year. I think we should hold the security exactly as agreed upon under the Act of Parliament; that we should not ask to increase it or allow it to be diminished, the only alteration being that whatever security we have in the clauses of the Bill last year, we should hold the same security undiminished and unincreased for the benefit of the \$15,000,000 of bondholders as well as ourselves.

Mr. BLAKE. The idea of telling us that this thing will be settled afterwards by the courts, and that it is to be left in obscurity and uncertainty, seems to me to be one which the hon. gentleman would hardly seriously repeat. Anything that we can make clear ought not to be left obscure; whatever we can make plain, should be made plain now. And when I suggested that it was a matter that could be settled in a moment, the hon. gentleman saw the difficulty into which he had plunged himself, and he said: Yes, but then comes the question of policy. I say that the observations of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) are of the utmost cogency in this direction. If it be true that as part of a great transcontinental railway, and to accomplish the objects for which that railway was built, it was vital that the Ontario and Quebec, the Credit Valley, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and their connections at Detroit, should be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway, if it be true that the great object of a national highway would be largely defeated, that the traffic would still largely pass by the United States lines, if it be true that it was essential to the successful operation of the Canadian line, that these roads should be acquired—if all that be true, in what position are the public bondholders and others to be, when those lines have passed out of the control of the company? You are telling us that you expect to sell the bonds in the market, and to sell them well, and those to whom you are going to sell them will turn to the company's report and find that it is vital to the successful operation of the company that it should own the leased lines; and they find that the security you tender, does not embrace the leased lines, and therefore when they come to realise that which was vital to realise, the money will not be there. And you expect them to pay

you. You tell the people of Canada the same. You say: Place faith in this report; place faith in this policy which we have endorsed. And you propose to take a security which shall not embrace those lines which are vital to the successful operation of the company, and you propose to sever those interests in case default is made. Security is taken in case of default. Security is of little consequence as long as we contemplate the bright side, and assume payment. We have to look at the dark side; we have to look at things as they will be if a storm comes; and when we are considering security, we ought to consider whether it would be secure in the day of the storm. In the event of default, if this report be true, if the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway in acquiring those lines, be correct, how shall we stand then? Why, Sir, we will not be able to get the old traffic of the Province of Ontario; it will be all gone. The Canadian Pacific Railway corporators will be masters of the situation. They may lose the main line, but they will turn round and say, we have got the traffic of Ontario in our hands, if you want it back by the national line, and not by Chicago—and they have got connections with Chicago now—we will send the stuff by the United States unless you make terms with us. And so they get hold of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and you will have to buy at a high price the interest of the corporators in the leased lines. Now, these are certainties in case we want to enforce the securities; if an interest is to be created independently of the Canadian Pacific Railway interest, which we are to acquire afterwards, this is the other nest egg, in addition to the dividends—the other sheet anchor to windward, which these gentlemen are putting by, so that if the worst comes to the worst they can make good terms with the country in case of default.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to hear this speech from the hon. gentleman. It has been pointed out again and again by the hon. gentleman himself and others, that this company has been wasting money, diverting its funds, withdrawing them from the railway proper; that they have been untrue to their obligations and to their duty to this country, in laying out money in unprofitable and wild speculations. Now, there is no doubt that whether the company have expended their money in wild or in wise speculations, not a farthing of the money which the Government gave them has been expended on these side enterprises. The whole of it has been expended on the road proper. The whole of the money expended on these wild or wise speculations has been their own, got in some way or other. Hon. gentlemen have objected to them; they have thundered against them in the press and in the House, and now the hon. gentleman says these are most valuable; we must have them, although they should not have gone into them, although they have taken their own money and put into these enterprises, we must hold them. We must take the security that they have improperly and dishonestly—and some hon. gentlemen have gone so far as to say discreditably, they have taken their own funds, which ought to have been expended on the main line, for these enterprises, and the hon. gentleman will take the produce of all this dishonesty, the result of all this unwise expenditure—*non nolit*. The original act may have been wrong, but the hon. gentleman must take the security on these dishonest, these unwise, these improvident investments of the company. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can uphold that style of argument. He has given up the whole thing when he says we must have every one of those leases—when he says our security will be bad, will be prejudiced, will not be as good as it otherwise would be, unless we hold every one of the enterprises in which the company have invested, and keep them for our own use and benefit.

Mr. BLAKE. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman what this statement was, and what the statement of the company  
Mr. BLAKE.

was. I said the hon. gentleman had declared that those enterprises were important to the national highway; I said the company had declared the same thing; I said both of the contracting parties had declared that they were essential to the control by Canada of the national highway; and I asked how it was that they should make these statements, that they should justify these extensions and leases on that ground, and then come down to Parliament and propose that we should take a lame, halting, defective security, omitting that which they declared was vital. The hon. gentleman said I admitted all that. I did not and do not admit; but I contend that those who justified and applauded the conduct of the company, representing to the people of this country that it was justifiable because these were necessary links in the national highway, have no right, when they come down here and ask us to meet their desires for a loan, to omit those things which they themselves justified as securities. It is not my statement; it is the hon. gentleman's statement. The hon. gentleman has used stronger words than I ever used with reference to this—putting into my mouth the word dishonesty, which never fell from it. The hon. gentleman has declared other things which—with some added vehemence of expression as they were stated by him—I intimated. He says, because you said it was unwise in the company to do this, it is a pretty strong reason why you should not take the money. I never heard such a thing in my life. What is the reason I objected? I said this company had made a solemn contract with us, the spirit of which was that all their energy and resources would be applied to the construction and control of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I said it was a violation of the spirit of the contract to devote their energy and resources to the building of outside lines; and the hon. gentleman says that, when we come to repair the damages, we are not justified in saying that we should take security on those very things on which the capital we granted has been expended. I said: You take money which the country has granted for the main line and spend it here and there and everywhere, and I objected to that; and the hon. gentleman says that, when they come and ask us to help them out of their difficulty, we must not take security on these things to which they have misapplied funds which should have been devoted to the main line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman opposite has raised two or three points which are not very pertinent to the question. First of all, he alluded to an assumption of his own that the sum of money which has been given by the people of this country for the construction of the road has been fully accounted for. One of our contentions is that whether that money has been expended fairly or not, the \$70,000,000 that have been given, or will be given after these resolutions have passed, for the construction and equipment of the main line, has not been fully accounted for. But there are two or three other things we ought to know. I think—particularly since the Acting Minister of Railways has expressed himself on the point as differing from my hon. friend—that we ought to know authoritatively what we are granting and what security we are to get. I dissent in the strongest possible fashion from the opinion of the First Minister, that a question of this kind, after it is raised, ought to be put aside as being a question of dispute and litigation afterwards. I warn the Government that this matter having been brought up, it will undoubtedly injure the sale of these bonds to any ordinary parties unless the question is settled. If they are going to be put on the London market, or on any other market, there is not the slightest doubt that attention will be called to the point that has been raised to-day. That cannot be avoided, and it will seriously impair, as I acknowledge it ought, the value of these

bonds on the public market, unless those who are selling them are able to say distinctly whether or not the leased lines are included. There is another consideration which the House should take into account. We must suppose that the contingency may arise of the company deciding to throw back the property on our hands. If it turns out, by arrangements with the Government or otherwise, that the leased lines are not to come back to us, we may find that the secured work may be allowed to run down, whereas the property which reverts to these gentlemen may be retained in a high state of efficiency out of the funds which it is quite clear from the company's reports, they do not hesitate to use for their leased property. That is a reason why we should know distinctly where we stand in this matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I may add that the developments which are now taking place with reference to the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific roads throw a flood of light on this question. The most extraordinary diversion of traffic has been taking place since the United States Government commenced its work of honestly endeavoring to secure the adjustment of the debt of these corporations upon their main and leased lines. The result is that the leased lines are being made profitable to the main lines, and that is what may be done in this case. If you give the company two interests, one of which is free from your advantage, and one subject to it, you can depend on it that they will use all their powers to throw the control and the traffic on that which is to belong to them any way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government consider that we are quite safe in making this arrangement, and we did not think it necessary to ask for any further security. We did not think it advisable to ask any additional security. We asked the whole security whatever it was. We have got the whole of that security. The only difference is that the \$15,000,000 go in on that same security. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, and there is something in that argument, that it may affect the sale of those bonds in England. I take it that the bondholders will take advice in England, and if there is any doubt about it, all they will have to do is to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to give the necessary security over these leased lines. If that is necessary in order to increase the value, that they can do if they please; and if they do that, it will be for the benefit of all the bondholders including the Government. The Government did not think it was right to impose any harder or harsher or any other terms than were agreed upon by Parliament last Session, as being sufficient security for the \$30,000,000, and we think that asking the same security for the loan and for the \$15,000,000 was ample.

Mr. CHARLTON. We can readily credit the assertion of the First Minister that the Government are loath to ask any hard terms of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But there is one statement made by him a few minutes ago, of which I would like an explanation. He told us that the money of the Government has been spent on the main line, and that the company have spent their own money in the speculation, outside the main line. The company have placed \$65,000,000 of stock on the market, which realised \$29,500,000. That is their own money, I take it. They hold money in the hands of the Government, \$14,250,000; they have used for the purpose of paying dividends some \$7,000,000; and they have diverted from the construction of the main line, including the amount expended east of Callander, the sum of \$38,000,000 or \$40,000,000 out of their resources. If that is the case, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he can make his statement stand that the company have used all the funds furnished by the Government in the construction of the main line, and that in all the outside speculations they have used but their own money?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is opening again a question which I think was ably and learnedly discussed yesterday and the day before. If any portion of the money of the Government was expended for anything but the road itself, I can only say that if a single farthing has been expended otherwise, the Government are greatly to blame. I say that no such charge lies against us, whether it be as to the original subsidy of \$25,000,000 or the loan of \$30,000,000. Not one single farthing has been disbursed except on the certificate of the Chief Engineer who states that the money has been expended on the road under the original contract. The Government must depend on the report of the Chief Engineer. That report is precise, and not one single farthing has been paid except on the certificate of the Chief Engineer that the money has been laid out on the line of the contract between Callander and Port Moody.

Mr. MULOCK. What objection is there to asking security on the leased lines, now that we are rearranging the security and increasing the debt? The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated that the general words in clause 1 of the resolution are to be limited by the words that follow in which he argues the securities are especially named. If so, what is the object of introducing these general words at all? We have it stated now by the Acting Minister of Railways that it was never intended to take a lien on the leased lines. If so, the clause should be placed beyond doubt; and before we determine to abandon any security within our right, the Government is bound to show why. I can conceive that the security on the main line may be greatly impaired if the Canadian Pacific Railway are obliged to run a rival line. Even if the line comes under the control of the bondholders who take possession by means of a trustee, still the corporation itself will exist, the board of directors will continue to exist and the board of directors, representing the corporation, has the leases of the leased lines, and can still work those lines and run them in rivalry with the Government line. The Government may have possession of the main line as far as Port Arthur, but the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a corporation, goes on for ever. They own the leased line that extends to Detroit River; they own the leased line from Detroit to Toronto; they own the leased line from Owen Sound to Toronto, and the leased line from Toronto down through the heart of eastern Ontario with its connections down to the St. Lawrence. They will have in their power this leased line system, and could enter into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway for all its trade east of Port Arthur. Before we allow the company to continue in the management of those rival roads, it is due to the country that the Government should give most cogent reasons for making the advance and altering our security, and failing to take all the security they can acquire.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The security of last year is not at all lessened.

Mr. MULOCK. The money is increased.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This money is also secured. The whole of the security of last year is comprised in the security provided under the proposed arrangement, with the exception of the Algoma branch. I am not prepared to say that by the expression "all property real and personal of the company" is included the different lines leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would not venture to give an opinion upon that as a legal man. My own opinion would be that the personal property of the company included the rights of the company in the leases of those lines. We cannot say in the resolutions that the mortgage of the bond would cover the leased lines.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For the reason that they are not owned by the company. The lien might cover the right of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the leases of those lines. But is this included in the words "personal property of the company" now acquired or hereinafter to be acquired? The First Minister stated that those who have charge of the bonds will see to that, that they will see that the whole of the property which can be secured by these bonds is reserved. I think it does comprise the rights of the company to the leased lines, and I think the resolution, as it is, is extensive enough. I do not think it would be fair to the company to add to the expressions comprised in the last Act. What were those expressions? The Government shall have a first lien in charge upon the entire property of the company real and personal. I read here that this shall be:

"A first lien and charge upon the entire property of the company, real and personal, now owned or hereafter to be acquired or owned by them, including their main line of railway, the extensions thereof, their branch lines of railway, the whole of their equipment—"

And so on. The whole security held last year for the loan of \$30,000,000 is kept in these resolutions with the exception of the Algoma branch.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will please remember that this question has changed since last year. He says we ought not to ask anything more than we asked last year. Is not the company asking more than it asked last year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said the Premier had stated that the Government did not wish to ask for a greater security than it had last year.

Mr. BLAKE. I say that, when the company are asking for something, and we are giving the company something, we may well consider the conditions. Last year, after receiving the statement of the Minister of Railways that this did not include the leased lines, I moved that it should include them, but he answered that it would involve great risk and probable loss to include them, as the leased lines were unprofitable and the Government would be involved in the loss. The Government need not have been involved in the loss even if those lines were unprofitable, but now the company tell us that the leased lines are profitable, and because, when we were told that they formed an unprofitable security, we consented to omit them, we are now told that we must leave them out because they are a profitable security. The First Minister says he does not think these words include the leased lines, he does not intend that they shall, and he does not think, as a matter of policy, that they ought. The Secretary of State declares that he thinks they do include the leased lines, and that he thinks they ought to include them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said I did not wish to venture my opinion as a lawyer, but I think personally that the right to the property would include those rights of the leased lines.

Mr. BLAKE. And he thought they ought to include them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, I did not say that. The hon. gentleman need not do as he has done before, make me say things I have not said. I will not allow him to do that without protest. I was not allowed by the House to contradict him the other day, but was told to sit down, but I will not sit down now.

Mr. BLAKE. I ask the hon. gentleman to sit down; he has interrupted me.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has taken his seat, and I have the floor, and the hon. gentleman has no right to ask me to sit down, unless Mr. Chairman rules otherwise. We are in Committee and each member may speak as many times as he chooses. My hon. friend will answer me when I have done and not before.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have a right to speak, and I am not going to be told to sit down. I stated, and my hon. friend cannot be mistaken in my words, that the Premier had stated that the Government were not disposed to increase the lien of last year, and that the lien of last year was not increased by the wording or the spirit of the resolutions. I did not say that the Government ought to do it and would do it. The Government might do it, but I am not here to say so. I took great care to say that the Government would not increase the lien of last year.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had said that the Government thought it ought to increase the lien of last year, but I did say that the hon. gentleman said that he thought the lien of last year should be increased, that was the statement I made; that statement I now repeat.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say so; and I have explained that I could not have said so unless I said the contrary of what I meant.

Mr. BLAKE. That statement I now repeat. Then the hon. gentleman said that, if the intended takers of these bonds in London had any doubt, they would get some instrument drawn to settle it. But who are the majority of the intending takers of these bonds? They are the people of Canada, and we want to see, on their behalf, what security we are to have. It is with reference to them that we are principally interested, though of course we are also interested in the success of the operation generally, which will certainly be damaged by the contrast which will be drawn between the statement of Mr. Stephen the other day or the report of the company as to the importance of these lines, and the fact that Parliament declared that they are not intended to be included in the mortgage. Still, our chief interest is in regard to the people of Canada. Can it be said, after this discussion, that this can remain in this state? It should be settled one way or the other. Is the mortgage of last year a sacred instrument? Is the law of last year like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, that it cannot be altered? It has been altered in one way and another, in numerous particulars all round. Is this the only particular in which it is unalterable? Is this the only particular in which it is not to be made clear? Is it determined not to make clear what is doubtful? Are we going to leave an opening for a lawsuit? Do hon. gentlemen insist upon saying that they will leave something for the lawyers to do? Let us say either that it includes or excludes the leased lines, and that settles the whole question. I have said which way I think it ought to be. The Secretary of State has said that I was wrong in saying the Algoma branch was included in the mortgage only as long as it was useless. It is true that apparently it is included in the mortgage permanently, but it is also true that, as soon as it is determined to make it useful by extending it to the Sault Ste. Marie, power is given to have it mortgaged, and therefore to make it useless for the purposes of the security. I am in sympathy in that matter with the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). I have always been an advocate for the construction of the Sault line. I do not say what course should be taken to have the Sault line constructed, and this may be as proper a mode as it is possible to take, but you cannot say it is to be a security to you for the debt owing to the construction of the line. You may indirectly affect the main line by throwing the traffic of the Northern Pacific on the main line in consequence of the construction of the Sault line, and that may be a very important object, but you cannot say that the Algoma branch *per se* is to be a really available security for this debt. The First Minister said the Government would be to blame if a dollar had gone in any other direction than in the construction of the main line.

I do not know that anyone has accused the Government of paying out money to the company except on the certificate of the engineers that a dollar's worth of work has been done for each dollar which they paid out. But what does the company do with it? Where is your floating debt? Where are the contractors on the main line and the men under them, with millions owing to them? The money has not been paid on the work. The Government has paid it to the company, on proper certificates I have no doubt, and they are free from responsibility in that regard, but while I know that in February last hundreds of thousands of dollars were due to contractors for construction, and the estimates had been sent in to the Government, and the Government had paid the money to the company, less 10 per cent., and the company had received it, they had not paid it to the contractors, and therefore it had not gone into the work on account of which it was paid. Where has it gone? I believe \$650,000 of it went into the shareholders' pockets on the 17th February last.

Mr. POPE. In the first place it has been contended, and we contend now, that we had good solid security last year for our lien. Then the hon. gentleman says they are asking for more. If they are asking for more, we have got very much more security. We have every dollar we paid them as so much added to our security, and we have better security to-day for what they are asking than we had last year. The road is nearly complete, and we have got that as security, and we have got more rolling stock. I say this, that it would be better perhaps if we were to take security on the Grand Trunk Railway too; it would be better if we were to take security on all the roads of the country. But we have got security enough; enough is as good as a feast; and while there was no doubt about our position last year as to our security, there can be no doubt this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It really appears to me that there ought not to be so much difficulty. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not an inaccessible corporation. We have had the pleasure of seeing the majority of its directors here very often, and we can communicate with them at pleasure, I apprehend. Why cannot the Government ascertain definitely what the view of the company is as to this disputed question, and then let us know. Surely we ought to have some intimation of what the other party to this bargain thinks about this question of the leased lines. I think there are some gentlemen here who could give us an opinion without much trouble, if they pleased, and I think we ought to have it. As for the Acting Minister of Railways, I must just remind the House that apparently he is utterly at issue with his colleague, the Secretary of State, as to the point in question. I understood him to say a few moments ago that he did not think we had any claim on the leased lines, while the Secretary of State gave his opinion that we had a claim, as he construed the clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think really we have discussed the subject enough to have a vote. The hon. member for West Durham is not correct in saying that I expressed my opinion that the leased lines were not included in this clause. I simply stated that whether the hon. gentleman was right or whether the hon. member for North Simcoe was right, it was a matter of discussion. I discussed it afterwards without reference to the legal construction of the clause, but I expressed no opinion myself as to whether the clause included the leased lines.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman reminds me of a great lawyer, an ex-Lord Chancellor, Lord Mansfield, I think it was, who, when a very grave disputed question came up in the House of Lords some few years ago, declared that upon that question he had an opinion, but he kept it in his breast; and he kept it in his breast until he died. Now we have the leader of the House, an hon. gentleman whose powers and experience in construing Acts of Parliament

are superior to those of anyone else here, but he either has an opinion which he does not choose to announce, or he is not able to make up his mind what the meaning of the clause is. Now in that condition of things, is it convenient that a parcel of legislators should pass a law in this shape?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for comparing me with Lord Mansfield. I accept the censure for the sake of the compliment.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman keeps the opinion in his breast until he dies.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman is satisfied with the compliment of being compared with Lord Mansfield, which he considered as a balance to the censure he must bear for asking us to pass legislation which he does not know the meaning of. Now, on this question the Acting Minister of Railways thinks one way, the hon. member for North Simcoe thinks another way, the Secretary of State thinks still another way, and the Premier does not think at all; but they all agree with remarkable unanimity in refusing to make this clause mean something, in refusing to make it mean what the Secretary of State said it ought to mean, namely to include the leased lines. Evidently they do not wish this to be so construed as to include the leased lines. I can easily conceive that that was the intention of the person who drew up the resolutions, for they were doubtless drawn up by the company itself or its attorney. I can understand why the company should wish this clause to be ambiguous, but not why the Government, who are the trustees of the people, should take the position of counsel for the company and should insist upon leaving this clause lax. Their conduct is utterly inexplicable on any ground consistent with their duty as Ministers. If there was any doubt, as there was last year, about the expediency of including the leased lines, they might get out of it, but there is no pretence of a doubt this year as to the expediency. The hon. gentleman himself holds by the report of the company, which says that the leased lines are not only profitable but necessary; but yet, taking it for granted that those lines are not only profitable but necessary, they refuse to give us the additional security, and the only ghost of a reason that has been offered is that the First Minister says he does not think it necessary. He thinks the security is so enormously good that the addition of a paltry \$15,000,000 to the company's liabilities will not affect it in the slightest degree. If we take over the road we must take it as a running concern. Our security depends upon profits obtained from it. If it cannot be worked without the branch lines, then it is absurd to ask us to take the trunk without the branches which are essential to its operation. Hon. gentlemen opposite have declared that every dollar advanced by the Government has been spent on the line and put into the undertaking. But it cannot be pretended that the \$7,000,000 advanced for dividends and other amounts paid to shareholders have been put into the undertaking. Undoubtedly some of the money furnished by the company has been put into the road, some into the main line and some into the branches. But if the country had not paid the company this money, the company could not have paid any money on the leased lines. The whole property has been increased in value on account of these payments by the Government, and it is perfectly proper that the Government should obtain security on the whole property. In fact there is nothing to show that part of the present loan will not be devoted to improvements and equipment of leased lines. We are therefore advancing \$5,000,000 to improve property, which hon. gentlemen opposite do not propose to take as security. The position is one which no Government has ever taken before, and we would have hardly expected the Government to take it except for our knowledge of previous transactions. It is, in a parliamentary sense, indecent to adopt the resolu-

tion as submitted, of the meaning of which the Government are ignorant.

**Mr. FAIRBANK.** Emphasis has been laid by the First Minister on the statement that all the money obtained from the Government from bonus and loan has gone into the construction of the line. I will not dispute it. But the company has received money from land we have given it. In the December statement the president of the company gave these figures: Amount received in cash, loan, subsidy and Government lands 55½ million dollars; expenditure on main line and branches 52½ million dollars, leaving a balance of \$3,000,000. After allowing for construction of branches, some 2 millions which are not part of the contract. The company also received finished road built by us at a cost of 29½ millions and 20,000,000 acres of unsold land. The branch lines are not worked on temporary leases but are perpetual leases, and are to all intents and purposes owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, subject to certain annual charges. If I were taking a mortgage on a fiddle, I should want the mortgage to cover the bow as well, particularly if that article could not otherwise be supplied. The Government's proposition is to increase the loan, reduce the interest and lessen the security.

**Mr. BLAKE.** As I understand the interest of the company in the South-Eastern Railway it is this: The company are proprietors of a large quantity of bonds of that road and some rolling stock, for which they paid \$1,595,000. I presume that will be covered by the mortgage. It is personal property owned by the company.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** As I understand it, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company hold bonds of the South-Eastern as security for an advance of money. That is an arrangement between the South-Eastern and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Is it intended that that interest shall be covered by the mortgage or not?

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** That is personal property, of course, and those bonds will be part of the security.

**Mr. BLAKE.** With respect to the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway. I find this road stated among the assets of the Canadian Pacific Railway at \$227,153. Is that to be included in the mortgage?

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I am not able to explain exactly the nature of the securities taken over from the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, but I understand there is a debt due by that road to the Canadian Pacific Railway. However, we will ascertain that.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** That is put down as a leased line.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Yes, and so is the South-Eastern, which must be incorrect. My impression is from such scraps of information as I have been able to get, that by the operation of that road by the Canadian Pacific Railway, there has been a loss, because the St. Lawrence and Ottawa has been made a sort of side line and it has been almost stripped of rolling stock. This item of \$227,153 I believe to be the acquisition of the bonds of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, not from that company, but from the holders of those bonds, or the holders of the interest coupons.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** As I understand—and I have no very accurate acquaintance with the matter—that road became the property of the bondholders, and the shareholders ceased in fact, to have any interest in it. The interest or control of the Canadian Pacific Railway over that road must have been by lease from the bondholders, but as to the other point, I will ascertain that.

**Mr. BLAKE.** And also this money interest—this item in the report.

**Mr. CASEY.**

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Yes.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Then there is the Atlantic and North-Western Railway \$202,837. I do not know what is the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway in that, and whether it is to be covered by the mortgage.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** As I understand, this sum of money is advanced for the purpose of connection being had by the Canadian Pacific Railway with the bridge which is contemplated to be built—that is, by the road around the mountain at Montreal.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I was aware of the geography of the situation, but it was the financial part I was enquiring about. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway represent that they paid the procurers of this charter a small sum for the charter and the stock which was paid, and that then they paid the amount which was paid for grading and for rails, and so they seem to have become proprietors of the enterprise, probably the stock being held in the names of some of their friends.

**Mr. ABBOTT.** Although I do not wish to be considered a representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this House, perhaps I may facilitate the discussion of this item, though my information about it is only casual. This expenditure was made partly for what the hon. gentleman said, namely, the construction of this railway at the back of the mountain to connect it with the Grand Trunk, and also to get connection with this proposed bridge. There is also a small amount for some stock paid in on the charter, and a considerable sum—that is a sum of some tens of thousands of dollars—in making the survey and soundings and plans, all of which are completed, in connection with the bridge. The rights of property of the company in that amount are these: there are the preliminary steps towards the completion of the link between the projected Ontario and Quebec line, and the bridge; and this, with the bridge, will belong to the Ontario and Quebec system. The link between that line reaching Montreal west and the present Canadian Pacific Railway at Mile End, is proposed to belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The lease which was confirmed last year makes the section reaching the west end of Montreal, the contemplated property of the Ontario and Quebec. The titles by which the line between the Grand Trunk and Mile End are to be completely vested in the Canadian Pacific Railway are not made.

**Mr. BLAKE.** So far as I can understand, the stock being in fact bought and paid for by the money of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I suppose the company at present is controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, if portions of this expenditure belong to the Ontario and Quebec system, it is clear that there is a further expenditure on the leased lines than the sums stated in the report, because, if part of this money is to enure for the benefit of the Ontario and Quebec system, it is obvious that there is a displacement of amounts; so that I should judge, from what the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) has said, that the property represented by this amount—I think, speaking from memory, it was \$157,000 last year as against \$202,060 now—did not consist of grading and ironing the road, or preliminary expenses, so that a small portion would be for the line. It would be important to have this amount divided, so that we might see what part of this comes to us, and what part to the Quebec Government for the Quebec system. We are face to face here with the more important question of the eastern and seaboard connections of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because, according to the statement of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), the Lachine bridge will be independent of the portion embraced in the security. The First Minister will recollect that only a few days ago he said the Canadian Pacific Railway would carry freight at one-fourth of the cost of other railways,

because it was to be one railway from end to end; but if he is going to separate it into a number of links, I do not know what will become of us when we become the fortunate holders of the enterprise.

Mr. ABBOTT. I do not think I made myself quite clear as to the proportion appertaining to the Ontario and Quebec system. The portion on which we shall have a mortgage will be from Mile End to the extension of the Ontario and Quebec system; the other portion will belong to that system, and was actually leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway. But until the Ontario and Quebec line is laid out, it will have to be kept as a separate account.

Mr. BLAKE. Can we receive any information as to the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Manitoba South-Western Railway. A large amount of capital was expended on that railway last year.

Mr. ABBOTT. I am really assuming a rôle which will necessitate my not appearing in the House during these discussions. At the same time, I hope the House will understand that I am making an exception to the rule I have always observed, and that my present rôle is only a temporary one and will not be repeated. I understand that the interest of the company in the Manitoba South-Western is this: When the construction of the road at the end of fifty miles stopped, and it became clear that it could only proceed under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the interest of the company was bought, that interest consisting of the right to the lands which were to be granted in aid of the construction of those fifty miles of the road, the bonds of the company, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000, which had been previously issued, a certain amount of the stock, and some other interests which the company had—representing, in fact, the entire interest of the original Manitoba South-Western Company, and placing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or some persons connected with it, in possession of all the rights of the Manitoba South-Western Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. If that be the state of things, it is quite clear that this is a road owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. ABBOTT. One might say no, and one might say yes. The Manitoba South-Western Company was organised under a separate and distinct charter, and has been managed up to this time under that charter. The charter is, of course, controlled by the stock, which is held by friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but the title the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have to the line itself is a lease executed in its favor by the Manitoba South-Western Railway Company, the terms of which lease are that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall pay the entire interest on the bonded debt of the company—in fact all the cost of the line—for its use.

Mr. BLAKE. We know how these arrangements are made. I suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company acquired and paid for the stock of the company what they thought it was worth, and organised its board of directors. I see that Mr. Van Horne is the president of the company. Therefore, it is literally, as the hon. gentleman says, a leased line, comprised in the words, "one of the leased lines of the company." Of course, I admit that the Manitoba South-Western Railway may be subject to exceptional considerations. I think it would be fitting to consider the situation of that company, as to whether it ought to be embraced in the clause relating to leased lines, or whether it may not be exempt from this mortgage, just as the Algoma branch is. I should be sorry with one hand, having approved of a land grant to aid the construction of that railway, with the other to injure that security. Am I right in understanding from the hon. member for Argenteuil that

this sum of \$1,254,654 was actually paid in hard cash for 50 miles of the Manitoba South-Western Railway?

Mr. ABBOTT. I cannot say anything as to the accuracy of the figures. I have not the slightest doubt that that is the correct cost, because it is in the books of the company, and I have, perhaps, greater confidence in them than the hon. gentleman. But I presume this represents the sum which was necessary to be paid in order to acquire the control of this company and the right to the property, which, of course, consisted in the stock, which represented the corporate organisation, and the bonds which had been placed as a charge upon it, and which had been issued in one sense and not in another—they were on hand and ready to be issued, but subject to all charges in connection with the construction of the road. That sum was, so far as I understand, the actual disbursement of the company for the construction of those 50 miles of the road, its entrance into Winnipeg, and its expenditures otherwise during the period of its existence. These rights were acquired, I believe, by some parties in Minnesota. I was not a party to the transaction, but heard all about it as it went on, and I understand that no profit whatever was included in the price which was paid, whatever that was, but that the sum which was paid, represented the actual disbursement in connection with the organisation of the company and the construction of 50 miles of road.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me, if he supposed I imputed the charge or implied that false entries were made in the books. I did not intend to imply anything of the kind. I presume, and have always presumed, when I find figures stating certain cash was paid, that it was actually paid. I simply drew attention to this because we know there are methods of adjusting these things, by which friends of corporations buy in bonds at a price not quite equal to par, and the corporations acquire them at par. These moneys are paid, but the value of them is not received. In view of the desperate condition of the Manitoba and South-Western, that seemed to be a very large sum that was supposed to be actually received by the directors at that time.

Mr. ABBOTT. The hon. gentleman must perceive that the road was not bought from the Manitoba and South-Western itself, but from other people who had acquired the control of it in various ways—in such a way that it was controlled outside of Manitoba altogether. There might be some shareholders in Manitoba, but as a rule the entire road was controlled outside of Manitoba. As to the other point, I am aware that such things are done; but in this particular case the sum which is represented in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's books I am satisfied represents the precise sum paid by that Company, and by the persons who acquired it for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The amounts were paid and charged in the books as they were paid. Apart from the abstract confidence which I have in the gentlemen who control the road, I am satisfied there was no manipulation of that kind, from what I know of the circumstances.

Mr. BLAKE. That is very satisfactory. We find that a considerable portion of the capital has been expended on the leased lines. Is that represented by any mortgage or lien on the leased lines?

Mr. ABBOTT. I am unable to answer that, but my impression is that it is a kind of work which is usually done on a railway during the whole period of its existence, from time to time. The railway, up to within three or four months of last year, was not running in perfect form, and there were constantly expenditures being made in repairing it, in putting it to rights and ballasting it. My impression is, these expenditures were made to perfect the system in various ways.

Mr. BLAKE. It might be convenient, before the next stage is reached, to have fuller information on that subject, which, no doubt, the company can supply, as to what the real condition of the estate is. We are taking a mortgage on the property of the company, real and personal. Is this expenditure, which, under the Ontario and Quebec system, it is bound to make, an expenditure for which it is entitled to be recouped? If it is entitled to be recouped for this expenditure, the expenditure is an asset, but if bound to make the expenditure without return, it is sunken money.

Mr. MILLS. The information of the hon. member for Argenteuil is satisfactory, as far as it goes—no doubt satisfactory to the members of the Government as well as to other members of the House. I think the discussion we have had shows, at all events, it would have been very satisfactory to the House if we had a real Minister of Railways, or, at all events, some one who, under the law, was permanently appointed to take charge of the Department of Railways, and who would be responsible for its management. At present we have an Acting Minister of Railways, who is the permanent Minister of another Department, and has the charge of that devolving upon him. When my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in charge of the Department of Public Works he was also the Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that railways and canals should be a separate Department; but although he has by Act of Parliament solemnly provided that that rule should be adopted, he has seen proper to set the law at defiance for something like a year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. MILLS. I am in order. I want information the hon. gentleman is not willing to give, and I am trying to find out how it is neither he nor his colleagues have been able to give the committee the information it requires. I will not press that matter any further, at present, on the hon. gentleman's attention. We have before us a resolution, and the hon. gentleman has not told us what it means. He says he does not know, or, at all events, he is not inclined to say what he thinks it means; and although we are asked to vote upon it, he thinks it none of our business to know what it means. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has had correspondence with the company which has led up to these resolutions, whether he has entered into a compact or arrangement with the company that these resolutions shall be submitted to Parliament in this form, or whether he has provided in this matter, as he did in the original contract, that Parliament may approve or disapprove, or amend the resolutions. What reason is there that we should not exercise the functions that properly belong to us?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the slightest.

Mr. MILLS. Why does not the hon. gentleman seek to make perfectly clear the security he has taken? He has spoken of the provision of the Act of last year. What has that to do with the proposition now before us. He proposes to confer upon the company the power of incurring further liabilities, and he says he does not know what the meaning of one of the propositions is, and to what extent security will be obtained by this resolution. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has been making enquiries as to the nature of the relations existing between the Canadian Pacific Railway and certain lines. Well, the Government could not give the information; the Government did not know whether the security extended so as to embrace these other roads or not. Here we have an Administration proposing to make advances to a railway company and to diminish the securities the country has upon the line, and it has not taken the trouble to make itself sufficiently acquainted with the case to know the extent of the security it is to receive from the company. It

Mr. ABBOTT.

seems to me that the words "any other property of the company, real and personal, now or hereafter to be acquired," would cover all the property of the company, and that the word "included" would necessarily embrace all that is afterwards mentioned. But that does not mean all that is before mentioned, in general terms, and if the word "comprised" was used instead of "included," the meaning would be more clear. But it is not so stated, and I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman does not make perfectly plain what is now ambiguous. He says we are not bound to the company; there is no arrangement made with the company by which the Government are bound that these terms should be carried by Parliament. Why not make the matter perfectly clear, and alter the phraseology of the resolution, so as to make it plain whether these leased lines are to be embraced or not. If the lines are valuable, it is important that the country should have the additional security; if they are not, it increases in no sense our responsibility by taking them as additional security.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to have an answer from the Acting Minister of Railways to the question I put a few moments ago, whether the leased lines, or any of them, were, in his opinion, necessary to the efficient working of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or for carrying out the object of its incorporation?

Mr. POPE. I believe they are very useful.

Mr. MULOCK. Are they necessary?

Mr. POPE. Not absolutely necessary, but useful.

Mr. CASEY. The question which we have been discussing is only a small part of the question involved. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are going on to extend their connections. They say, in their report, that they have no reason to doubt the wisdom of going on to extend their connections. See what the laxity of this clause opens the way to in that connection. Do you suppose they are foolish enough to make their connections in future of such a nature as to be subjected to this mortgage? No; their future extensions will be put in the shape of what are called leased lines, although, practically, all the money that has gone to the construction of them may have been paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway out of Government subsidies or from some other source, so that they will have in that way a network of lines from the east to the west. Now it extends from here to Toronto and on to St. Thomas. They are proposing to make a connection with the Detroit River and so with Chicago. It is also intended to extend the Ontario and Quebec to Montreal, and the connections with the new bridge at Montreal are to be made by the Ontario and Quebec, so that there will be, practically, an independent line from Montreal to Chicago under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Premier does not intend that we shall have any lien on that independent line, because he will not amend the clause so as to give us that lien upon it. It will thus be possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make default and allow us to take the main line if we choose, which will not be as profitable as the lines over parallel distances. It cannot be contended that the line from here to the north of Lake Superior will be as valuable as the line from Montreal to Chicago. So they may let us take the main line and collect the profits or pay the deficits upon it, as the case may be, and they will have their complete rival through line to compete with us. We are told that the competition of the Grand Trunk is a very serious item in the estimates of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This series of so-called leased lines will be an infinitely worse rival to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when operated by the Government, than the Grand Trunk. It will be a better and shorter line, running through better districts, and will be altogether a better line for through traffic than the Grand Trunk; so con-

ceive what a rival it will be to the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, which will be in the hands of the Government under this mortgage. What a grand security we have for our \$20,000,000, the privilege of taking over the main trunk of a disabled railway, and perhaps having to pay a deficit every year on that line, instead of obtaining profits! They tell you that the greater part of their receipts this year come from the leased lines. It will be a long time before that state of things is reversed. We have to look to the future more than to the present.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. We know that under the charter of the company the Governor in Council is entitled to reduce the rates when the profits exceed 10 per cent., and the committee is also aware that the company only make tariffs by by-laws which are to be approved, and which, under the present system, are approved, from year to year, by the Governor in Council. Practically, that is the system which has been adopted, upon the view, which is not an unreasonable view at all, though I thought it was rather straining the powers of the Governor in Council, but was a very good thing if the Governor in Council had the power, that changing circumstances might make very unreasonable tariffs which might be less unreasonable at an earlier period. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, which is, to my mind, of vital consequence with reference to both these considerations; that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been in the habit of consolidating the working of its leased lines and its main line in such a way as, according to their own report, in answer to a return here, renders it difficult, if not impossible, to tell what are the earnings and what are the working expenses separately of the leased and of the main lines. My view is that it is very questionable whether the Canadian Pacific is entitled to build branches and acquire other extensions and throw the possible loss of operating those branches and extensions on the main line itself. For example, the branches they build in the North-West. Supposing they choose to enter into another profitable speculation in building branches, I doubt that they have the right to say: We are going to earn 10 per cent. upon those branches, because we are going to make the main line pay 10 per cent. dividend on the money we put into them, although they themselves pay nothing. It seems to me quite clear they are not entitled to charge upon the main line any losses there may be on the leased lines, and yet we cannot ascertain what the real operation of the main line has been, unless the accounts are kept in such a way as to show what the earnings are and what the expenses are, and to show what the working of the lines is. Now, early in the enterprise, of course, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company adopted what they called the Ontario and Quebec division, and they gave you the leased lines from a point near Ottawa to the west; but they have since then consolidated all their system within the Province of Ontario, including their extension east of Callander, the Algoma branch and the main line, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, up to Port Arthur, including the leased lines in one division, called the Ontario division. It is possible that they may complete the consolidation as soon as they begin to run the whole line. It would seem as if they intended to unify their receipts and expenditures. Once that is done, it is impossible to analyse the operations of the line that we are concerned in. This is a question independent of the mortgage altogether, but it is also embraced in the question of the mortgage; because, if we are not going to include the leased lines in the mortgage it is all the more important to see what the separate operations of the two systems are; but if we are going to include them in the mortgage, it is important that we should know what the result of the main line is, as distinct from the operations of the leased lines. If

the leased lines are not to be included in the mortgage it is very important, for the purposes of the mortgage, that what I suggest should be done. I maintain that they ought to keep the accounts in such a way that you can tell what are the earnings and expenses upon the main line of railway, with reference to which we have this special interest. Ordinarily speaking, we have no right to enquire into the particular affairs of a capital stock company, but of course it is conceded that we have a right to enquire as to the way the Canadian Pacific Railway Company deal with its capital stock, and we have a right to discriminate between the nominal and the real capital stock. We are, therefore, bound to see that no such system of account-keeping is adopted as obscures the necessary means of arriving at that conclusion, and I invite the hon. gentleman, before the next stage of this resolution, to consider this question, as to the mode of their keeping the accounts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is reasonable enough. I think we ought to have a separate account of the earnings and expenses of the main line, which now extends from Port Moody to Montreal, and I hope will be continued to Quebec. I think we ought to have a separate account of the expenditure on the main line. If the railway have power to build branches as distinct from the leased lines, or running arrangements with any combination of other railways, I think we can afford to consider the branches built expressly as branches and therefore a portion of the main line, as part of the unity, and that the earnings of the different lines may be embraced with the account of the east and the west lines. I think it is all one line. I quite agree, however, with the hon. gentleman, that as regards the branch lines, distinct accounts should be kept of the earnings and expenditures of each branch.

Mr. BLAKE. We gave the Canadian Pacific Railway Company power, unexampled in our history, of building branch lines, which they have exercised and will continue to exercise in the North-West. Now, are we going to require the traffic of the North-West to pay 10 per cent. dividends on all that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company chooses, without our authority, to call branches? That is the difficulty that I feel. I feel that in the general interest, having given up all control over the branches, it is a serious thing to say to them: Gentlemen, go straight ahead, because if you cannot bring enough out of the traffic on your main line to pay 10 per cent. dividend on all you choose to expend, however unprofitably, you can get it out of the branches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that. The remarks of the hon. gentleman are worthy of all consideration.

On resolution 3,

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe that a very important question arises on this clause. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when the original Act passed, was given power to create capital stock of five millions, with power to increase it to twenty-five millions; and in very lengthy discussions upon this subject it was never hinted by anyone that there was to be an implied or general power to increase it beyond twenty-five millions. I have a very serious doubt whether, in case of a statutory power to increase the capital stock to a definite amount, there could coincide with it the power which is given by the general Railway Act to increase the capital stock indefinitely. Under the general Railway Act the railway companies can increase their capital stock from time to time, but we gave power to the corporation to raise its capital to a definite sum. The company, and the Government which assented to the operations, by arranging for the guarantee, provided that under the Railway Act, a provision of which was inserted in their Act, to increase the capital stock to

\$100,000,000. This clause proposes to cancel \$35,000,000, being the unissued portion of \$100,000,000. There is nothing to prevent the company, if they choose, from afterwards increasing the stock to \$100,000,000. You cancel \$35,000,000, and the company may pass a resolution at its next meeting to increase the capital stock by a like amount.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it will be well to meet the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and insert a proviso that after the \$35,000,000 stock has been cancelled the stock shall not be increased over \$65,000,000, without the assent of Parliament.

Resolution amended by adding: "No further issue of stock shall be made without the special authority of Parliament."

On resolution 4,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say why the rate of interest has been reduced from 5 per cent. to 4.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a distinct assistance given to the company. The Government, as a general rule, obtains money at 4 per cent., and the reduction of 1 per cent. will be a substantial benefit to the company, and specially valuable at this present and early stage of its existence. As the company is only getting into the earning stage, it is of great importance that the fixed charges should be kept as low as possible. This is a substantial relief, and it is intended as such.

Mr. BLAKE. Although the hon. gentleman says the company is at an early stage of its career, it was at an earlier stage last Session, when the rate was fixed at 5 per cent. What has occurred since to make us change our decision? The company had then more than a year's work to complete construction. Now we hear that the road will be completed in a few weeks. Let the hon. gentleman remember the inviting statements made by his supporters to induce Parliament to grant the loan of last Session; how the Minister of Railways gloated over the transaction as a good commercial bargain, and how the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) pointed out that to borrow money at 4 and lend it at 5 was a good thing. Now it appears that we were wrong. Let the Government consider the credit of the company, as to whether, if Parliament reduces the interest to 4 per cent., it will not be saying to the public that the company is too poor to pay the rate originally fixed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman should ever happen to have a mortgage on his property, and it was at 6 per cent., and the charge was reduced to 4 per cent., he would not consider the reduction diminished the value of his property. I am quite satisfied that we exacted too severe terms from the company last Session; that from a laudable desire to obtain every possible security we locked up everything the company possessed. We have had one year's experience. We find that they want more money, or that they want credit, which is even better than money, in the position of a great railway. We want them to start clear and under as favorable circumstances as possible. We are playing the rôle of *pater familias*, sending the heir out, and we wish that he may have as few burdens as possible, and that he shall not have a shadow of impending debt hanging over him.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the second part requires some explanation, as I think it is a provision in effect for the floating of a large portion of these bonds. It is quite clear that under these circumstances any payment which would be made before 1891 will be made in respect of the \$30,000,000, because if it is made in respect to the lands, no such advantage will accrue to the company as the return of bonds. Now, I think it is a pity that that should be inserted. In this way, the bondholders and the company

Mr. BLAKE.

together might control a majority, and the Government have only a minority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only way by which the company can pay off the bonds is by selling them, as they will have no funds of their own out of which to pay them.

Mr. BLAKE. It is in effect a provision for allowing the company to negotiate their bonds, subject to the payment to us. In any case, whether we sell them in default, or the company sells them before default, the road will be chargeable with the \$30,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point which requires explanation. So long as we retain \$30,000,000 out of the \$35,000,000, we have a considerable amount of authority in our hands, but the contingency might arise in which it might be convenient for a syndicate holding the odd \$15,000,000 to utilise this provision, so as to buy a few millions more and thus get control of the road, which might be a serious matter.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state how many in number is required to put the trustee in motion on the mortgage? I am anxious that we should avoid any arrangement by which the \$15,000,000 outside, with the majority, would be able to control under the general conditions of the mortgage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be taken care of in the mortgage itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that in any case, no matter how you draw the mortgage, the majority of the bondholders would virtually have the control, and would choose the trustee.

Mr. McCARTHY. The trustees are appointed under a deed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We might put in the provision that the company may, at any time, with the consent of the Government, pay, etc.

Mr. MULOCK. As I understand the law in the Province of Ontario, any bondholder who holds a bond in respect of which there is a default is entitled as a receiver. It seems to me it would strengthen the position of the bonds if each bondholder had that right, because I can hardly conceive of the company being justified in paying one set of bondholders and not another. They ought to all be put on the same footing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The deed under which the bonds are put on the market will provide all that, and the bondholders will take the bonds on the terms of that deed.

On resolution 5,

Mr. BLAKE. The result of the discussion which took place on this clause, I understood, was that the hon. gentleman was about to propose that in case of default in 1891 some larger power should be given to the trustees to close the security, of course for the benefit of all the bondholders. What I want to be sure is, that if the principal of the loan comes into default in 1891, the trustees shall have power to act just as if the bonds come into default.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the words in the last line, "and to administer the same for the benefit of the bondholders generally," be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: "and shall exercise all or any of the powers conferred upon them by the terms of the mortgage deed in pursuance thereof, as if the principal of the bonds were in default."

On resolution 6,

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that the purchase money due on lands now sold is to be embraced in the scope of this resolution?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are about \$3,500,000 bonds outstanding, and about \$2,000,000 of sales not paid up. The whole proceeds of the lands sold enure to the benefit of the Government in payment of the \$10,000,000, after the payment of the \$2,000,000 outstanding.

Mr. BLAKE. There are \$3,600,000 land grant bonds outstanding in the hands of the public, and \$2,060,000 of purchase money due on land sold. It is impossible to reach any conclusion other than that the proceeds of those lands ought to be embraced within this. The hon. gentleman is hardly correct in saying that we have a charge for our \$10,000,000 immediately after the payment of the outstanding land grant bonds; because there are \$5,000,000, at any rate, of land grant bonds which are our security for the operation of the road, and of course it is not intended to disturb our lien upon them, not impliedly, at any rate; for if it was to be disturbed it would be disturbed expressly. You must recognise the fact, that as to the \$3,000,000 land grant bonds which are in the hands of the Government, they form a charge prior to our \$10,000,000. So that you have the \$3,600,000 of land grant bonds outstanding in the hands of the public, and these \$5,000,000 in the hands of the Government, or a total of \$8,600,000 land grant bonds, of which only \$3,600,000 bear interest, and which will be a charge upon the lands anterior to the debt we are now charging upon them. The lands, therefore, are now held as security for \$18,600,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under the Act of last Session, with respect to the \$10,000,000, it is provided that they shall be applied:

"Firstly, in extinction of the interest accrued and due upon the said loan, and upon the said sum of \$7,380,912; secondly, on account of the capital of the said sum of \$7,380,912; and thirdly, on account of the capital of the said loan. And the Government may make such arrangements as it shall deem expedient for securing the payment to it, after the redemption of the land grant bonds, of the proceeds of all sales of lands granted or to be granted to the company under the contract, to be applied to the purposes and in the order aforesaid. And the remaining \$5,000,000 of land grant bonds and money, received from the said trustees in redemption thereof, shall continue to be held on the condition and for the purposes mentioned in the said contract."

Mr. BLAKE. The operation has become very confused. In the first place, there were a very considerable number of land grant bonds issued which have been redeemed and cancelled. Then there are \$3,600,000 land grant bonds in the hands of the public, and \$5,000,000 of them in the hands of the Government, as security for the operation of the road. Under this provision you say, "subject to the payment of outstanding land grant bonds." You have all the land grant bonds, with the exception of \$3,600,000, in the hands of the Government. I would cancel every land grant bond which is in the hands of the Government, with the exception of the \$5,000,000 which is to be held for the operation of the line. The others are not issued, and they seem to be no use at all; they are not intended to be issued. Then you would have two blocks, \$3,600,000 land grant bonds in the hands of the public and \$5,000,000 of them in your own hands. Those are the two primary obligations on your land fund. The public has the first charge, your own \$5,000,000 is the second charge, and the third charge is the \$9,880,000. Thus, there is an aggregate of between \$18,000,000 and \$19,000,000. At present it is difficult to understand what issue is to be made of those bonds which are not issued, and which are in excess of the \$5,000,000 held as security for the operation of the road.

Mr. ABBOTT. By the enactment of last Session the land grant bonds were kept in force. Those in addition to the \$5,000,000 were, I think, as far as I understood it, for the purpose of keeping the machinery in operation, which has been carefully prepared. Under this arrangement, the trustees will be bound to distribute the money received

between the \$15,000,000 of land grant bonds, and the amount outstanding. Those outside would get their proportion and those in the hands of the Government would get their proportion. The outside proportion would go to the extinction of the outside bonds, and the inside would be applied in the manner pointed out by the Act of last Session; one portion amounting to \$10,000,000—or \$9,000,000, I think it is now—to the extinction of the Government debt, and the other \$5,000,000 to represent a fund for the security for the running of the road. As I understand the resolutions now, it is proposed to keep that machinery in operation, as provided in the Act of last year. Perhaps the language used is not sufficient to attain the result which is intended, but that result is clear, that the trustees will proceed with the realisation of these lands, and out of the proceeds will appropriate fourteen or fifteen millions to the Government, and the Government will apply the portion applicable to the \$5,000,000 to that fund, and the portion applicable to the \$9,000,000 to the Government debt. There is really an outside charge of one million and a-half of outside bonds, and then there is the charge of fourteen millions in the hands of the Government, of which  $\frac{1}{4}$  will go to the \$5,000,000 security for the running of the road, and  $\frac{1}{4}$  to the extinction of this debt.

Mr. BLAKE. You will see, however, that by the Act of last Session the outstanding land grant bonds were made a security for the payment of some \$7,310,000.

Mr. ABBOTT. Now it is about \$10,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, you no longer know any \$7,310,000. You are dealing now with \$9,880,000, and what you have to do to make this right is to provide that the outstanding land grant bonds should be really the security for that, and then they would come in, *pari passu*, for the portion of the security for the operation of the road. Now, however, a very complicated account would have to be kept.

Mr. ABBOTT. If the resolutions, as now framed, do not sufficiently indicate that the money would go to the \$9,880,000, instead of to the \$7,310,000, they should be amended in that direction. My impression is that they do, but it is better to make them clear.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the meaning of this 6th clause? As I understand, the Government intend to take the first mortgage or lien, as far as the \$9,000,000 are concerned, upon the lands, and that only; and the clause goes on to propose that the interest on that \$9,000,000 shall be raised out of these lands, and from no other source, and that until all the lands are sold and the proceeds realised, we shall have no claim or charge upon any other part of the company's property. If that is so, I want to know why it is so. Why should we throw up the ordinary liability of the company to pay the loan, in the first place, and the interest on the loan in the second place, and that out of any of the moneys they may have to pay it with?

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, that is an obvious objection. You have a security which is of an unproductive character, in the sense that there are no revenues derived from it. You expect to realise both interest and principal from the exhaustion of your capital, and it is actually provided that, until you have sold the whole of the 20,000,000 acres, you shall have no charge on anybody for that interest. If the Government finds it impossible to sell the lands, without selling them at a sacrifice, they will have to wait for their interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of this clause was to place the whole of the lands subject to the land grant bonds as a specific security against the \$9,880,000, or, in round numbers, \$10,000,000. It is provided that of the net proceeds the Government shall continue to retain the bonds now in their custody, the trustees shall go on and sell, as

they do now, and if the net proceeds shall be insufficient to pay the interest on the last mentioned amount as it shall fall due, if the ordinary sales by the trustees are insufficient to pay that interest or the principal when the principal becomes due, the Governor in Council may order the sale, by the trustees, of any part thereof to satisfy the interest. If the ordinary sales of the lands are not sufficient, the Government will make forced sales, and so we, for the purpose of getting the interest, and the principal when it becomes due, can make a forced sale. The Government can compel the sale of any part of the lands to satisfy the interest, and the whole of the remaining lands will be liable to be put into the market, in the same way, and sold for what they may fetch. I hope that will never occur. I do not suppose it will occur; but, after that is all done, after the \$10,000,000 are paid, the remainder of the land will be security, additional security, for any portion of the \$20,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman has not met my hon. friend's point at all. In the first place, you must remember that it is not the interest on these ten millions that these sales have to meet, but you have the question of the land grant bonds to deal with. You have got, first, to meet the land grant bonds which are outstanding, and you have also to meet the operation of the land grant bonds, unless you intend utterly to destroy that security. Then, having met them, you have got to meet \$400,000 a year on this debt. Then, in the year 1891 the whole of this debt becomes due. The difficulty is, that supposing there is some inadequacy in the receipts which are to pay the charges of administration—for they are to be paid out of the amount—the company is not to pay the expenses of administration—then to redeem the outstanding land grant bonds, then to complete the payment of that \$5,000,000 for operation, and lastly to pay the \$400,000 a year interest on your loan. All that you can do is to wait for more land to be sold, and that is for principal as well as interest; and it is not until after you have sold every acre of the 21,000,000 acres that you can look to anybody for either principal or interest. Therefore, if you should think that the interest of the North-West at large, or the interest of the railway companies, to whom you are giving grants there, or the interest of settlement, or the interest of the colonisation companies, render it imprudent, on your part, in the general interests, to make forced sales of land to meet the principal of this debt, you would be obliged to say: Now we have no security whatever for present payment of either principal or interest, for we cannot call upon the company or its revenues for one shilling of interest.

Mr. McCARTHY. It seems to me that that is not at all an unreasonable view. The scheme of the resolutions appears to be to divide properties into two parts, one part to be chargeable for the payment of the five millions and the other part to be chargeable for the payment of ten millions, or a sum somewhat less than ten millions. Now, the lands are hypothecated for the latter purpose. But the supposition which the hon. gentleman raises is, that there may be a time when there will not be sufficient sales made to pay the interest of this ten millions.

Mr. BLAKE. Or upon the principal, at the end of nine years.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are speaking first of the interest. I say that is a very improbable supposition. If it arises, however, the Government always have it in their power to force the hand of the company, by saying: We will sell the lands. That my hon. friend admits. I say they have the power to bring about a forced sale. My hon. friend says that the Government may not think it proper to do so, and they may have no other resource. The only resource they could possibly have would be the bonds and the coupons

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

for the thirty-five millions behind the bond debt. Now, if the company have means to pay anything beyond the bond debt, beyond the interest of the bond debt itself, and they are in the position that their land may be sacrificed, I fancy self-interest will require them to pay the debt that way, and it does not require any elaborate machinery to make them do it.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should there not be a liability on the part of the company?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a liability, because the moment they sell their lands, and the lands fail to realise the debt, then the liability will accrue.

Mr. BLAKE. After you have effected the sales?

Mr. McCARTHY. Precisely. Exhaust that particular security and then the liability accrues. Now, the hon. gentleman put the case of the security not being exhausted, the Government not desiring to enforce it, and the company having means over and above what enabled them to pay the interest on the bonds, but withholding these means, in order to save their lands. Now, surely, it does not require much foresight to tell us that under such circumstances the result would be that the Government can force the hand of the company. If they have means to pay the interest, and the interest is in default, the Government may say: You must sell your lands for whatever they will fetch, in order that we may be paid. I think the security will be safe enough, and the interest will be forthcoming.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. We were speaking about the propriety of making a new provision for the liability of the company to pay interest in case there should be a deficiency in the sale of the lands, and the hon. member for North Simcoe suggested that the Government could force the company, by pressure, to sell those lands. But that does not seem to be a satisfactory suggestion. It seems to me there ought to be an obligation on the part of the company to pay interest on that portion of the debt which has been advanced to the company. I cannot see why the Government should insist on its being satisfactory, that until they exhaust the sale of the 21,000,000 acres they shall not be able to force the company to pay interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, the lands are simply a security for the payment of the ten millions. On the 1st May, 1891, the money becomes due, the country being the creditor, and the Government the debtor, for that sum of ten millions, and proceedings can be taken for the collection of that sum. It is true, that for the purpose of enforcing the security certain provisions are laid down in the 6th clause. That clause does not in any way prevent the Government, on default being made, from taking the ordinary steps to enforce the payment of the \$10,000,000; and the effect of the whole of the 6th clause is this: That towards the \$20,000,000 it is a first mortgage, towards the \$10,000,000 it is a second mortgage; because, at the last part of the 6th clause, it will be found that no further or other charges shall be created on the property mortgaged as security for the said first mortgage bonds until the said \$9,000,000, and interest, and also the sum of \$20,000,000, and interest, shall have been paid in full. On default being made in 1891, the Government can proceed like any other creditor for the \$9,000,000, and so on. I believe they can force sales of the land to pay the interest. That is an additional security, besides the security they have, that no other charge can be put upon the property after the issue of the first mortgage bonds.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman can hardly argue fairly that the \$10,000,000 is a second mortgage on the property in the sense in which a mortgage is ordinarily understood.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not technically, but substantially.

Mr. DAVIES. The 6th clause expressly declares it shall be a charge on the lands. In the absence of that clause there might be something in the argument. Until the lands are sold no part of the \$10,000,000 can be a charge on the company's revenue. In 1891, if the company make default, you could not take proceedings to enforce payment, in the face of this clause, because the only reasonable reading of it is, that the Government cannot enforce payment of the \$10,000,000 as against other property until the whole lands have been disposed of, on which lands this forms a special charge. Circumstances may arise which will render it imprudent for the Government to force a sale of the lands. I therefore suggest that some provision should be inserted, so that the company shall be obliged to pay the principal as well as the interest out of ordinary earnings, if it is not paid out of lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Government or Parliament should think it to be inexpedient to enforce the sale of the lands, then the matter would stand over. But we have power to sell the lands to meet the interest from year to year, and to pay the principal when it becomes due. If a forced sale were postponed, the security would still remain intact.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should we not have an operative charge upon the company's resources at the end of nine years? The hon. gentleman points out that there is no charge superior to ours, and he is also quite satisfied that by 1891 there will be a large surplus revenue from the railway. In the case of the Northern Railway, the company found ways of spending the revenue instead of making payments to the Dominion. That might be done in this case. The 20,000,000 of acres will have to satisfy payments amounting to \$18,600,000 of principal, the charge of administration and interest, and why should we not say that until all the lands are sold we shall have no right to look to the ordinary revenue of the company for repayment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have a right to get judgment against them.

Mr. POPE. Does the hon. gentleman think the land is not good security. I remember that he expressed the opinion that the lands were worth from \$2 to \$1 per acre, and now he seems to think they are not security for less than \$1 per acre. I have no doubt that the lands are first rate security; and why we should look further than to have sufficient security, I cannot well understand.

Mr. BLAKE. In June, 1883, the Government decided that they would give North-West lands to aid railways at \$1.50 an acre, because they thought that the margin of profit to be derived by the companies would be sufficient to enable them to build the roads. The idea was, that the Government would obtain \$1 and the companies would make \$1 per acre. The Government had been giving land at \$1 per acre and they thought the companies could make \$2. In June, 1883, the Government decided that the price was too low, and proposed \$1.50, thinking that the companies would sell them for \$2.50, giving \$1.50 to the Government and \$1 to the companies. In September, 1884, the Government decided that the companies could not make anything by paying such rates, and they decided to give the railway companies lands free, in order that the companies might make \$1 per acre from the lands, which amount was necessary to aid the railway enterprises. And yet the hon. gentleman asks me if I do not think the land is not good security.

Mr. POPE. By no act of ours have we said that the land was not worth \$1 an acre. I have said that at the time the hon. gentleman speaks of they could not afford to pay \$1 an acre, and get enough out of it, at the number of acres we are giving per mile, which is a different thing.

Mr. DAVIES. In the first place, the Acting Minister of Railways does not state the case fairly, because he knows that this is not a first charge on the land, as there are millions of money ahead of it. In the second place, the answer to his question might be put in this way: Does he think that any prudent investor would take a mortgage on these lands now, and advance ten millions on them? I question very much if he would do so. I say it is a monstrous thing that we should have other security at hand and that we should refuse to take it. I should like to know the reason.

Mr. BLAKE. The reason is, because the result of our taking a second security, which shall be available to us as a charge on the company's railway, in 1891, before this land is sold, would be to interfere with their prospects of getting so large dividends paid back to themselves out of the earnings of the road. The hon. gentleman wants the earnings to go into the shareholders' pockets, instead of paying our debts.

Mr. MILLS. We have only to look at the sums received from sales of lands, according to the reports of the Minister of Interior, from year to year, to see what we are likely to realise from the land. The proposition made here is, that we are to look for the payment, not only of the principal, but of the annual interest upon this money, from those lands, as well as the charges of administration. Let the hon. gentleman take from the sales of lands by the Department of the Interior for the past six or seven years the cost of administration, and he has not enough left to pay the interest, or anything like it; and yet he wished the House to consider that this is sufficient security, not only for the principal, but for the annual payment of the interest. Now, I say the Government are bound to show how they expect to realise from these lands, not throughout the North-West, but in a small portion of it, a larger sum than they have realised from the entire property they have in this country.

Mr. POPE. These hon. gentlemen talk about my putting it unfairly, but they put it very unfairly themselves. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no question of paying interest on these \$5,000,000, except as security. The hon. gentleman knows that there are \$2,000,000 besides, making almost a half, and to say that this is not enough for the balance is to say something which no one in the country will say, who understands the question.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask what amount of revenue the Government has derived from lands in the North-West during the past year, after paying the expenses of management?

Mr. POPE. That is in accord with the hon. gentleman's usual argument; for he picks out the worst year we have seen for sales of lands, and he holds that up as an example.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman should bear in mind that the Government have lands set out for settlement, for homesteads and pre-emptions, and that the only thing which makes the settlers of the North-West buy railway lands at all, which are a mere fraction of the whole area of the North-West, is on account of the superior advantages in getting near a railway. For this reason the amount of land disposed of by the company in one year must form but a small fraction of the land of the North-West actually settled during the year. The hon. gentleman will see that the amount of sales would not pay the interest on the sum in question, unless the settlement of the North-West goes forward at a much greater speed than it has up to the present time.

Mr. McCALLUM. I submit from the amount of money which this Government has spent in making the lands of the North-West valuable, they should have more value than they had in 1881. Here is what the hon. member for Bothwell said about the lands in 1881 :

" We have had, ever since this discussion began, a studied attempt, on the part of Ministers, to depreciate the value of the lands in the North-West Territories. Now, Sir, we are not left in the dark upon this subject ; we can form a tolerably accurate conjecture of the sum that picked lands, such only as this company are obliged to take in the North-West Territories, are likely to bring. When the subject was before the country, on Sir Hugh Allan's contract, I took occasion to address an article to the *Canadian Monthly*, in which I said :"

Then he quotes from the article, which I shall not read and goes on to say :

" I call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that this statement was made eight years ago. My conclusions were not based upon vague and uncertain estimates of unoccupied lands in the vicinity of railways, but upon the conclusions which a careful induction of facts afforded. Since then, experience in the adjoining Republic has not modified the conclusions based upon the observations of an earlier period. Let me invite the attention of the Minister also to some of the returns for the past year, to the average price of the lands sold by several of the railway companies of the United States. I will now give, and I will mention first, the sale of lands in Texas, the region the mention of which has so greatly disturbed Ministers and their supporters during the last two years. The sales of the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway averaged, per acre, \$2.11 ; of the Texas Pacific Railway, \$2.16 ; of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railway, \$3.66 ; of the Iowa Falls and Sioux City Railway, \$3.36 ; of the St. Louis and San Francisco, \$3.81 ; of the Winona and St. Peter's Railway, \$3.90 ; of the Southern Minnesota Railway, \$3.34 ; of the Burlington and Missouri River Railway, \$4.20 ; of the Still Water and St. Paul's Railway, \$4.55 ; of the St. Paul's and Pacific Branch Railway, \$4.29 ; of the Cedar Rapids and Minnesota Railway, \$4.79 ; of the St. Paul and Sioux Railway, \$5.26 ; of the Sioux City and St. Paul Railway, \$5.84 ; of the St. Paul and Pacific Railway, \$6.83 ; of the Hannibal and St. Joseph's Railway, \$7. These sales, taken together, will average upwards of \$5 an acre."

This was the language of the hon. gentleman then ; he thought all the lands in the North-West were worth \$5 an acre, but now he thinks they are not good security for 75 cents on the dollar. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a short memory, and it is a good thing we have a *Hansard*, so that we can correct them sometimes. One year the lands, according to them, are not worth \$1 an acre, and the next year or two they are worth \$5, just as the circumstances suit them.

Mr. HESSON. The balance sheet of the company on the 31st of December last shows that the company sold 3,600,263 acres, amounting to \$10,506,234, less expenses and 10 per cent. premium on land grant bonds, \$1,111,947, realising \$9,394,286 ; in addition, their town sites realised \$504,675, or, altogether, about \$10,000,000 for less than 4,000,000 acres of land. Now, I conceive that out of the balance of the land, 21,000,000 acres, there ought to be sufficient security for the amount provided in this resolution. I must confess that the value placed upon the lands does not appear to me to be anything like their real value. The railway company themselves hold the balance of 21,000,000 acres to be worth \$2 an acre, or about \$43,000,000, although what they sold realised about \$3 an acre. What advantage will it be, if the proposition is to give the company some relief, to tie up everything they have, so that they may find themselves in a tight place, and be obliged to come back here and ask us to release some of the security ? I do not think that can be the motive or the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite. In helping the company we help the country and the great North-West, and I am sure hon. gentlemen will not say that the company has sold the best of the land.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman should recollect that the great bulk of the land sold by the company, 2,200,000 acres was sold to one corporation ; and that corporation bought originally, I think about 5,000,000 acres.

Mr. HESSON. No doubt they drove a tight bargain.  
Mr. MILLS.

Mr. BLAKE. They drove a bargain so tight that they were obliged to give more than half the lands in order to avoid utter ruin, and throw them back on the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and their stock of \$7,500,000 is now represented, according to their stock, by \$2,800,000 ; so that the lands, for which they paid on the average \$2.23 net, are now valued at from \$1 to \$1.10 an acre ; and these were the choice lands the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had to sell. There is no use of discussing these matters from that point of view, as these sales were made during the boom. I am glad to hear the amount of the sales of the company last year at good prices ; but the acreage sold is very small and the price not cash. If the hon. gentleman will look at the company's report he will find what their experience has been :

" The experience of the company in the matter of land sales has been to some extent similar to that of nearly all the land grant railways in the United States, where the first speculative fever has almost invariably been followed by a heavy falling off in land sales, owing to the presence of vast quantities of free Government lands ; but as these were taken up by settlers, the sale of railway lands increased, and prices increased as well. Profiting by the experience of others, this company has extensively advertised the free Government lands, and made every effort to stimulate their settlement. The settlements along the main line now extend something more than 400 miles west of Winnipeg, and for this distance the greater part of the Government lands within ten miles of the railway have been taken up, and there are indications of renewed activity in the sales of the lands of the company."

That is the best the company could say as to immediate prospects. The hon. gentleman says that we want to tie the company up. This resolution prevents any other mortgage being put on the company's property while this exists, so that they cannot use their property to raise more money on it. All we want is that, in case that happens which the hon. gentleman thinks will not happen, namely, if there is a deficiency in the sales of land to provide for the payment of interest, the revenues of the company should be made available to pay the deficiency of interest. If it be true that the lands will produce a sufficient sum, the revenues of the company will not be drawn on for the purpose ; but if it should turn out that the depression in the North-West lasts somewhat longer than is expected, and that it becomes somewhat difficult to sell the lands, why should we not get the revenue to pay our interest. We are giving this company an opportunity of getting \$15,000,000 more as a first charge on the railway ; why should we not have a second charge for the interest on that on which we have a first charge now ? We have now the first charge on the lands, the railway and all. We are asked for \$10,000,000, to become, not a first charge, but a second charge on the lands, and we are asked to take a second charge on the railway, but only after the whole 21,000,000 acres have been sold. I say we ought to have a second charge on the railway, in case the lands do not produce what you expect. If they do, the second charge will do no harm ; if they do not, there are the surplus revenues of the company with which to have our interest paid.

Mr. HESSON. The average sales realised on lands are over \$3,000,000 a year. The hon. gentleman says " hear, hear." Will he deny that we have realised about \$10,000,000 net on the sales of lands ? and that we have to provide interest on less than \$10,000,000 ? Does he suppose that the lands will not realise sufficient to pay \$500,000 a year, when they have realised an average of over \$3,000,000 a year ?

Mr. MILLS. The statement is an extraordinary one. The hon. gentleman says the company have sold \$9,000,000 worth of lands since its organisation, averaging about \$3,000,000 a year. Are those lands settled ? Why, those very lands are put into the market and are competing with what the company has in its possession.

Mr. HESSON. They have cash for it.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman expect the Government are going to sell millions of acres to a few speculators, in the same way as the company have sold their lands? The company sold to the Duke of Manchester's company in England; and everybody who has given any attention to the North-West knows that the very fact that this sale has been made will be an impediment to further sales, and years will be occupied in the settlement of those lands then disposed of. We have to look at what is being done now by the Government and the company; we have to look at the progress of settlement. I still adhere to the views I have expressed, and which were adverted to by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum). It is not the price the land brings, but the quantity of land put into the market and the aggregate value of the land sold, that indicates the amount of money that will be at the disposal of the company for the payment of the interest on its obligations. So long as we have such a wide extent of country to settle in the North-West, these sales of land on the part of the company must go on at a comparative slow rate, and the Government are not likely to realise a sufficient sum to pay the interest. That being the case, the security given is not sufficient. We require further security, not because these lands will not ultimately bring the amount the Government have advanced, but because they will not afford the means to pay the interest on the obligations of the company, as the interest matures year by year.

Mr. HESSON. The companies which purchased these lands purchased them on condition, requiring them to make certain improvements which they did not make. The Government will not have to settle these lands. They have their even sections to settle, and so far as the lands sold are concerned, will have nothing to do with settling them. Settling the lands is not a part of the consideration at all. The question is to get back the money. Does the hon. gentleman deny that is the correct position?

Mr. BLAKE. I do.

Mr. HESSON. Does he say that the Canadian Pacific Railway are compelled to settle the lands before they sell them?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. HESSON. That is all the case.

Mr. BLAKE. The boom is over, and the measure of the sales of land in the North-West is the measure of the settlement of the North-West, without taking the measure of the free settlement of the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. With regard to the sales of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands, a great number were sold in 1882, on conditions of settlement, which were not complied with, and the lands were abandoned. Those lands were situated, in some instances, away from the railway; in other instances they were taken up as a matter of speculation. Any man who had a few dollars to invest put his money in land in 1882; only 10 per cent. was required to be paid up, and the money was invested in the belief that the land would greatly increase in value. Those calculations, I am sorry to say, failed, and the lands are not selling in the North-West as they did during the boom, when the sale was made to the Duke of Manchester. I do not suppose that the company or the Government could make such a sale now.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman know of any Canadian Pacific Railway lands in the market to-day at less than \$2 an acre?

Mr. WATSON. I know plenty that would not sell at \$2 an acre; \$2 is the price they ask, or \$1.25 on conditions of settlement; but it is not what they ask, but what they can sell for, that we must look to. In making a bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway we should try and make one that would secure the Government as well as the railway.

It appears that the bargain to be made is to secure the company from all chances of loss and let the Government take all the risk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not surprised at the hon. gentleman thinking there is not much chance of our getting the money back out of the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for we have his recorded opinion that all the land west of Moose Jaw is not worth a farthing; that it is an arid, barren desert. I am not surprised, therefore, he takes the ground he does. But I think others who read more and perhaps know more than the hon. gentleman, have put a higher value on the land. The hon. member for Bothwell says: "Look at the account of the sales by the Government." That is not a fair comparison. The Government are giving away the lands and homesteads, and the moneys they receive are only for the pre-emptions. They are not, therefore, putting lands into the market in the same sense or way as the Canadian Pacific Railway, or as any other owner of private property is doing. They are really putting the lands into the market free, and taking such money as they can get for pre-emptions, from men who feel themselves rich enough to have farms, partly free and partly at a price to be paid at a future day. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake) says this is not a second mortgage, but it very nearly amounts to a second mortgage. When we are going to assist the company at this moment, I think, if we really believe we have substantial security, we should take warning by experience, and not make what I think was the mistake of the Government last year in exacting too stringent terms. We were so anxious to take every possible thing the company had to offer that we locked them up to such an extent that they were obliged to come here again. If we are satisfied that the country is in no danger of losing the amount of the loan, if they choose to exact it—if Parliament gives it away, that is Parliament's business—let us give the aid without prejudicing the credit or standing of the company in the money markets of the world. I think the House will agree that we ought to help them in that regard. I believe that a second mortgage, *eo nomine*, put in an Act of Parliament will, such are the prejudices, such is the timidity of capital and capitalists, or may have the effect of keeping down the credit of the company, when the principal object of Parliament and the Government is to raise the credit of that company and to give it a fair chance and a fair start. I think, therefore, that we ought not to put any encumbrance upon the road that we can help, if we are satisfied that the country is in no danger of losing, eventually, the amount of money we have lent to them. It is admitted that the company have a fine property and a good future, and that they will be a prosperous company, with very considerable revenues. That is an important admission, and a very fortunate thing for the country as well as for the railway. Then, although there is no second mortgage, the Government has a right, as a creditor, if there is a default made on the 1st May, 1891, or before that, if there has been been default in the interest, to sell the lands at forced sale. The half-year's interest—say, of \$200,000—is due. If the Government desire, they can force a sale to pay off that \$200,000, and they can repeat that operation twice a year, and sell sufficient lands—it would not be a very large extent—to pay this amount of interest. Then, besides that, they have a right to get a judgment at any time they please, and an execution following the judgment on all the properties of the railway. There cannot be anything to come in except other executions by other creditors of the railway.

Mr. BLAKE. What can the execution take?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can take what every execution against a railway can. The Government have a right to come into court and insist upon a receiver being appointed to take possession of the road and all its revenues.

That is practically the effect of an execution against a railway, that you can attach the revenues and have a receiver appointed. There can be no other specific charge put upon the road by way of mortgage or debenture bond of any kind to come in between your judgment for the full amount of the default and the property of the railway. I do not say that this is as substantial a security as a second mortgage, but it comes so near it, with the certainty, from my point of view, with the double purchase you have, first, of selling the land by forced sale, and secondly, by getting an execution and enforcing it upon the railway, that you get, substantially, what you require in this way, and at the same time you do not hamper the company in the markets of the world, by showing it so specifically laden down as it would appear to be by two mortgages. At the same time, the security is substantially sufficient, as it will, without a doubt, pay both principal and interest; and I would appeal to the House to look at it from that point of view, to assist the company, by not overloading it in the eye of the timid investor, the timid stock exchange, by showing that there is not only a first but a second mortgage for the whole amount.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the First Minister to say that, in case the company made default in the payment of the interest on these bonds on the Government loan, an execution could be obtained against the company, and on that execution the Government would be entitled to the appointment of a receiver. My impression is that the right hon. gentleman is in error in stating that to the House as the law. I am not aware of any court having jurisdiction, at all events, in the Province of Ontario, to deal with property of that kind in that way. The only ground on which the courts appoint receivers is that the creditor is a mortgagee of a thing that is not saleable, and that the only remedy the mortgagee has is to enter into possession of the rents and profits of the place; but that is not the position of an ordinary contract creditor, who obtains an execution against the lands and the property, and the only thing he can attach is some specific property.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole of the decisions in England and the United States show that railways are substantially highways, and therefore an execution in any way interrupting the working of the road cannot be enforced, but an execution will only operate as a charge against the revenues of the railway, after the working expenses are paid. Sometimes it is enforced in one way and sometimes in another, but in the United States the decisions are invariable.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think you can reach the earnings of the road by the medium of a receiver.

Mr. McCARTHY. Every judgment creditor is entitled *ex debito justitiæ* to the appointment of a receiver. I have not the shadow of a doubt about that. Having an execution and not being able to levy on your judgment, you are entitled to have a receiver appointed. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend make a statement such as he has.

Mr. WATSON. The First Minister stated, not long ago, that there was not one homestead taken up between the 3rd and 4th meridians, and only 23 between the 4th and 5th. I think that is far less favorable testimony than I gave. As regards the section 300 miles west of Moose Jaw, the information I gave was derived from a surveyor, and it has not been contradicted.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Simcoe surely cannot argue that by any process a creditor can obtain, through any formal machinery, any other right than that which the contract gives him. In this case the contract only gives to the Government a lien on certain funds, and I doubt if a general execution could be obtained against the general assets of the company on the security here pro-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

posed. I would ask the hon. member for North Simcoe if he can cite any case in which a receiver to a railway has been appointed, except at the instance of covenant creditors.

Mr. McCARTHY. The case of Fox against the Nipissing Railway Company was exactly in point.

Mr. MULOCK. That was not a case in point. There was a special demand, other than the right of simple contract creditor.

Mr. DAVIES. According to the First Minister, we are first to be driven to a suit of law against the company to recover a judgment, and when we recover it we have got to file a bill in Chancery, setting forth that we cannot realise on that judgment, because the property is already encumbered to an amount of thirty-five millions as the first charge upon it, and we cannot realise until a receiver is appointed. Now, what are we going to do? We have to apply for a receiver to take this road off the hands of the company, in order that we may get paid. Every creditor will sue at the same time we do. We know there are millions of these small contract creditors now, and God knows how many there will be ten years hence. The point is, whether we should say that in this contract we are now making our interest on this land should be secured upon some other property than the mere lands themselves. Are the lands selling now? The company are offering them at \$1.25 an acre, with condition of settlement, and cannot sell them. It is true that during the boom large sales were made, but no one expects that there is to be a repetition of that kind of thing. Now, we are not taking first security for this ten millions of money; there are eight and a-half millions of prior securities in outstanding bonds, and our interest comes in as a second charge, and you are making a stipulation that the current receipts of the company shall not be appropriated to pay any interest upon this ten millions. Suppose the Government asked the company, when default is made in payment of interest, to enforce the sale of lands, the shareholders will say: That is a most unjust proposition. You, yourselves, put a special clause in the contract, that none of our revenue was to be chargeable with the payment of this interest until you have disposed of all the lands. Political or national exigencies may require that you shall not force those lands into the market, either now or for the next five or six years. Therefore, you must not touch any of our revenue, and if you are going to appoint a receiver it will be a practical breach of faith. If you wanted to do this and appropriate any of our revenue, why did you not say so in the contract? I think it is reasonable to put a clause in the contract, that in case the land does not sell for sufficient money to pay the interest the interest shall be payable out of the general receipts.

Mr. McCALLUM. Some time ago, when the contract was before the House, the leader of the Opposition valued the land in the North-West at \$4.04 an acre. If we had a boom in the North-West it was owing to the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have been crying down our own country and booming Texas land.

Mr. BLAKE. The First Minister says that he has not given us a formal second mortgage because he is afraid it will frighten the capitalists. This will do us good, and the public will not know that we have the security. What harm is this going to do the company? It is only interfering with the shareholders' opportunity of drawing money and putting it into their own pockets. We ask that this be a claim only on the surplus after paying fixed charges. The question is, if, after the sales of the land there is a surplus, that surplus should go into the pockets of the shareholders, or go to pay interest. With respect to the question of receiver, I would not pretend to place my opinion against

the opinions of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), for my business has been here, and not in the courts, for many years.

Mr. McCARTHY. The importance of the receiver question is quite illusory. No person would pretend to say that the Government, holding the charge on those terms, is not in a better position than simple contract creditors. This is an express charge on the company's assets, in preference to the claims of shareholders.

Mr. DAVIES. When does it come into operation?

Mr. McCARTHY. It comes into operation as soon as the land fund is exhausted. The scheme is, that the lands are to be used for the payment of the debt of \$10,000,000. That particular fund having been exhausted, the Government claim becomes a charge on all the resources of the company, coming, of course, after the bondholders' claim for \$35,000,000. The company should not be embarrassed in floating bonds by the suggestion that under any possible circumstances any other creditors can rank with the bondholders and disturb their rights.

Mr. BLAKE. We are not suggesting it.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what the hon. gentleman's argument amounts to.

Mr. MILLS. How can the company derive a large revenue from the sale of its lands so long as the Government continues to put its lands at the disposal of such settlers as choose to take possession of them. That circumstance must, of course, largely interfere with the amount of revenue derivable by the company from its lands. Looking at what the company has done and what the Government has done by way of sales, the sales of land belonging to the company will not be sufficient to pay the interest on the company's obligations. It is only fair, under those circumstances, that should the sales of lands prove insufficient to pay the interest the Government's claim in question should be chargeable on other resources of the company. It is an extraordinary proposition, that when money is required to be advanced in the interest of this company and security is being taken, that a reasonable demand for further security should be resisted by the Government. They ought to seek to protect the public interest, instead of appearing simply as advocates of the railway company.

Mr. DAVIES. This is not a question between the bondholders and the Government. No proposition emanating from this side sought to impair the security which is to be given to the bondholders. The question is one simply between the Government and the shareholders of the company. It is whether the surplus revenue of the road shall be applied, in case of default arising from the sale of land, to paying interest on \$10,000,000; or whether it should be devoted to paying dividends to the shareholders. So it is a question simply between the people and the shareholders, and the Government evidently prefer that the shareholders be protected rather than the people.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain what he means by fixed charges, which are referred to in this clause.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought there was in one of the Canadian Pacific Railway Acts a definition of the term, but I cannot find it at the moment. There is no doubt, however, of what it means in railway parlance. The fixed charges, as stated in Mr. Stephen's report, amount to \$3,606,070 per annum, and they include the interest on these bonds and other charges, which are special, and specifically secured, and which must be paid in the first instance.

Mr. BLAKE. The reason I asked about these fixed charges is just on account of the passage in Mr. Stephen's report to which the hon. gentleman has just referred. It is

an odd thing that we are not going to have the leased lines, and yet that we should be obliged to pay, as part of the fixed charges, before getting the interest on the money, the rent of the leased lines. There is a sum of \$778,434 stated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as part of the fixed charges, which is made up of the rental of leased lines. They have given a guarantee to pay that rental, and to-morrow they may give a guarantee for some other operation. Does that then become *ipso facto* a fixed charge, and is it preferred to our claim? We must have some definition of fixed charges, with reference to this special arrangement.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman must know that the expression "fixed charges" is a well-understood railway term and is as almost universally used and as well understood as the term "mortgage" among lawyers. I suppose that here it is used in the ordinary sense in which it is used in railway negotiations.

Mr. BLAKE. We are not dealing with the whole railway system. I could understand a fixed charge if we were dealing with the whole Canadian Pacific Railway, leased lines and all; but when you are taking a mortgage, which is yet secret in the breast of the Prime Minister, as to what it means, when it may or may not mean leased lines, it is another matter. What are the fixed charges of the line proper when you are not taking the leased lines? It is a word of a varying application entirely. What is the "fixed charge" on the Ontario and Quebec system by itself? The net earnings of the Ontario and Quebec system are applied, first of all, and the first fixed charges on them are these rentals. The system, as I understand it, has been that a series of bonds have been issued by the Ontario and Quebec, to the amount of somewhere about \$10,000,000 at 5 per cent., and those bonds bear the guarantee of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They have given their covenant of guarantee to pay the interest on them. Then the Toronto, Grey and Bruce was leased by the Ontario and Quebec at something like \$140,000, and that is a rental. Then, I fancy that the lease of the whole system to the Canadian Pacific Railway has been for an aggregate sum, and equivalent to the interest at 5 per cent. on the bonds and 6 per cent. on the \$10,000,000 of stock. I suppose they are lessors, and give a covenant to pay this rental, which they expect to pay out of the profit of the leased lines, but which, in the case of a deficiency, the railway company will be liable for. Now, when you are taking a mortgage, which is said to be only on the main line, is it to be a fixed charge on the leased lines, if this difficulty should occur?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wanted to get us in a trap; but I think it would have been more candid if he had asked the definition of a word.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked the meaning of the word in this resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly did not understand the hon. gentleman in that sense. I simply rose to endeavor to assist the committee, by saying what, in my judgment, was the meaning of the term "fixed charges" in a railway contract such as this. With reference to what my hon. friend says, I do not think there is any great difficulty. If it is found difficult or impossible to float these securities I would say that so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway covers any of these branch lines they ought to be covered by this security. I do not venture to pronounce an opinion as to how far this security should go; but let us follow the hon. gentleman's illustration. There is the ordinary main line, with its fixed charges, and there is the branch, with its fixed charges; then there is the Ontario and Quebec line, with its fixed charges, for which the hon. gentleman says the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has given its mortgage. Assuming that to be true, what follows? That charge would not be a fixed charge on this system, so far as the

Canadian Pacific goes; it would simply, as I understand, take the guarantee of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the bondholders of another railway. They would hold the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as the guarantors, and they would be simply in the position of contract creditors, and that could not be a fixed charge on this particular railway, which is mortgaged to the Government. So that if this sum of \$9,880,912 includes any branch lines not embraced in the terms of the mortgage—

Mr. BLAKE. It includes the Ontario and Quebec system.

Mr. McCARTHY. If it does, that would be excluded. Then, if a dispute arose with the bondholders of the Ontario and Quebec Railway, we would be able to say that under the terms of this document we are prior creditors to them; because, although they have an ordinary claim, to be decided by a suit, we have a fixed charge authorised by Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I must disclaim any intention of trying to entrap the hon. gentleman. My anxiety was to get a specific answer as to the character of the fixed charges in this contract before us. The reason I asked it, was because I observed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had specified such fixed charges for our security, which I thought were not meant to embrace the branch lines. I think the discussion shows the term "fixed charges" may be very ambiguous. As applied to the company's security, it may mean one thing, and as applied to our securities, it may mean another thing. I think the committee will agree with me that there ought to be no question about it; it should not be determined by a suit at law, but by using some language which will be plainer than the phrase in the resolution.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). By the Grand Trunk Act the rental of the leased line is made part of their working expenses, and working expenses are far ahead of ordinary fixed charges, because they are taken out before the net revenue is arrived at. As to the rental of the Ontario and Quebec line, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has given its guarantee, it takes all the earnings of the Ontario and Quebec Railway. I think the earnings of that road are considerably more than the rental which was guaranteed. Of course, the company may have another line, of which the reverse is the case; but if they take the earnings and put them into their net revenue from the leased roads, they certainly ought to be able to pay the rental which they carry.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was not in awhile ago, or he would have heard the First Minister say that a separate account would have to be kept. The guarantee is not an obligation that will have to be met from the net revenue of the leased lines. The pressure on the main line will occur only in case there is a deficiency in the earnings of the leased line. But when the same corporation works the main line and the leased line, you will find that sometimes the traffic on the leased line is very great and sometimes very little; sometimes expensive improvements are made on the leased line, and sometimes it is stationary; sometimes there is competition with the leased line and sometimes not. For instance, assuming that the Canadian Pacific Railway is opened to Winnipeg next summer, for the North-West traffic there are two lines, by Perth, over the Ontario and Quebec and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railways, and by the boats to Port Arthur, and there is the main line in direct competition with that. The company can make the earnings of the leased lines good or bad, just as they choose; they can create a deficiency or surplus in the earnings of the leased line, just as they give the order; so that you may call the charge fixed, but whether it will be really an onerous charge on the main line depends on how the two lines are managed.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Then there may be others. Take the Toronto Grey and Bruce; the net revenue, according to the last account, was \$60,000 and the rent was \$140,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway may improve the traffic of that line very much by throwing part of their through traffic on it, but if they do they will be depleting the main line. So that we do not know what the operations of these lines will be. What we want is to have it specifically stated what these fixed charges are. If our mortgage is to include the whole system, the rental of the leased lines is properly a fixed charge. But it is not a fixed charge, in the proper meaning of the word, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, if you are going to cut the system into two, making one part the leased lines and the other part the main line. It would be outrageous, now that we have a security over the whole system, to part with that and take a mortgage on only a part of the system.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear, at all events, that the main line will be the most successful portion. To make the clause more specific we might add, "after the sale of the whole of such lands, any deficiency in the proceeds thereof to pay the amount charged thereon shall be a charge on the entire revenue, after providing for the fixed charges on the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Mr. BLAKE. I do not invite the hon. gentleman to make any specific alteration of this kind, for the obvious reason that the character of the alterations depends on what our mortgage is and what our security is on. It is doubtful whether it is on the main line alone or on the whole system, and I was drawing the attention of the hon. gentleman to the obscurity of the meaning of his language in connection with the obscurity of the meaning of the mortgage. Before taking the next resolution, the Government ought to decide on its policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it was suggested that some words should be put in to make the first part of the resolution plainer. I move that after the word "Act," in the 8th line of the 6th resolution, the following words be added:—

Applying the money applicable to land grant bonds in the hands of the Government, over and above the sum of \$5,000,000, referred to in the second sub-section of section 5 of the said Act, to the interest and principal of the said sum of \$9,880,912, instead of to the purposes provided for in the first sub-section of section 5 of the Act of last Session.

Amendment agreed to.

On resolution 7,

Mr. BLAKE. This is a clause which provides as to the application of Government money. It is "to be applied by the company, under the supervision of the Government, to the payment of work done or to be done for the development, improvement and extension of the railway, its connections and equipment, and for the maintenance, and credit and efficiency of the company generally, to the satisfaction of the Government." You might arrange for an extra dividend under that, and place it to the credit of the company. I never saw such words.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The language is decidedly wide, in order to meet the requirements of the company. In the first place, the money is to be applied under the supervision of the Government. They are to see that it is properly applied. It is to be applied in payment of work done or to be done on the railway. The words are wide, but I do not see how they could be limited, because the purpose is a wide one, to restrain the company, from now until July, 1886, by which time we believe the money will be paid and the company's efficiency and credit established.

Mr. BLAKE. Take a case in point. The company announced to the shareholders it would pay an extra 1 per cent. of dividend during construction. They have

kept, under very trying circumstances, to that promise, up to this time, I suppose with the view of maintaining the credit of the company. The next payment will be in September. The directors are strongly inclined, as they stated at their annual meeting, not to recommend it any more. Supposing they should change their mind, and think it is in the interests of the company, in order to keep up its credit, that they should pay this 1 per cent. extra dividend, these words are wide enough to allow them to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would not be to the satisfaction of the present Government, and not to the satisfaction of my hon. friend, should he enter office.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish the hon. gentleman had pointed out these views to the company on the 17th February, before they paid the last 1 per cent., which, as I have said, was practically paid out of our money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, that is a part of the contract.

Mr. BLAKE. They do not say they are inclined to advise the dispensation of it, although it is due under the arrangement. This is the clause under which the application of these moneys more specifically was to come in, and the clause upon which we are entitled to some information as to the probable application of these moneys, which are the motive of the whole transaction, and I would refer the hon. gentleman to the estimate of Mr. Stephen, which is the foundation of the whole procedure, in his letter of the 18th March, and would invite him to state what information he has acquired and can now give to the committee, as to the propriety and necessity of these different classes of expenditures. The first is \$1,000,000 for rolling stock of different kinds, which he specifies. The next is:

"For elevators, Port Arthur, Montreal, etc.; coal bunkers, Montreal; additional real estate, Montreal and elsewhere;revetment walls, Montreal; additional depot and tracks and other facilities, Montreal and other points. Additional yard room and track, coal and other docks, and other terminal facilities at Fort William and Port Arthur, \$1,500,000."

In one lump sum. Has the Government received any more detailed statement dividing up these expenditures; has it obtained any information as to the propriety or necessity of them, or any report from the engineer or other officer on the subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am really not able to give that information at this moment, but I will get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I am a little discouraged, but I am going on:

"For divisional shops and machinery at nine points, coal docks and machinery at two points on Lake Superior section, station buildings, section houses, and miscellaneous buildings at various points, additional station sidings and crossings, tracks at various points, extension of divisional yards, additional engine houses, improvement in water supply, additional tacks, permanent bridge work at various crossings, Bow River and on other sections, additional ballasting, filling trestles and raising roadway, \$600,000."

Among other items, I see "filling trestles," which, of course, is a portion of the building of the line, as it was stated by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways at an earlier period of the Session, in answer to the motion of my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that there was a certain amount of trestle construction, but that he would not give an account of it, because it was not intended to be permanent work; but here I find, in the further and unexpected expenditure, an item for filling trestles. Have the Government got any details of this, showing what amount is due to each of the different items, and any report upon that subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid not, but I am not sure.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the Government are in a similar position with regard to the next:

"For completing telegraph system, main line and branches, \$275,000."

I see a very large sum stated in connection with the telegraph system. That, however, to me, was not an unexpected thing. From the beginning, they took power to build a telegraph system, and they have been pressing it on and announcing that it would be a considerable source of revenue, and the completion seems now to be one of the unexpected things upon which further assistance is required. I think we should know whether it is in the railway interests or in the interests of developing a general telegraph system as a source of revenue. Another very important item is:

"For connection with Coal Harbor and English Bay, shops, buildings, docks, tracks and other facilities at Pacific terminus, \$760,000."

The Government told us very strongly, and no longer ago than last Session—yes, and even this Session. When I called the attention of the Acting Minister to the fact that there were rumors that the company were prosecuting an extension from Port Moody to Coal Harbor or English Bay, and pointed out that I had indicated before that, for the China and Japan trade, something of that kind would be done—he said: If it is done, the Government considers Port Moody the proper point, and if anything more is done it will be by the company itself, and we have no concern with it whatever; and at that moment he was making a contract for the additional expenditure of no less than \$70,000 to put down iron piles instead of the wooden piles in front of Port Moody wharf, which, if this arrangement is to be made, will be a structure little required. I do not mean to say there will be no traffic at Port Moody; but, if the terminus is to be some thirteen miles off, at Coal Harbor or English Bay, we have made a permanent structure at Port Moody to repair the ravages of the teredo, costing more than the wharf cost altogether, and in addition to giving that to the Pacific Railway we are to find means for borrowing, and perhaps are ourselves to give them, \$760,000 for this extension. The Acting Minister of Railways, early in the Session, said: This is a matter with which we have no concern; it is not our business; we believe the terminus at Port Moody is adequate. I want to know whether the Government have any further information on this subject, whether they have approved of this as necessary and important to the company, and whether they have verified at all the estimates and plans upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway terminus is to be transferred, in fact, from Port Moody to Coal Harbor or English Bay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand, these estimates are generally rough estimates, but before the money can be expended full details will be given. As to the connection with Coal Harbor, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was quite right in stating that it was the affair of the company itself. Under the contract and the Act of Parliament the terminus was stated to be at Port Moody, as far as the Government was concerned; the contract ends there, and it is a fine harbor, no doubt, and will always have a considerable amount of trade, I fancy, which will still remain and start from Port Moody, although it is the intention of the company to extend the line to Coal Harbor and English Bay. It appears, on fuller investigation, that the interests of the company and the interests of foreign trade will be promoted by going to Coal Harbor and English Bay, but it forms no portion of the contract, and they get no portion of the subsidy on this part of the line. I believe the extension of the road has been made for the advantage of the general Asiatic trade. You may depend upon it that the company, with the evidence they have before them, are acting in the best interests of trade and of their railway in going to the expense of extending it 13 miles further.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's answer is not satisfactory. The Government have had this matter under deliberation until the 30th April last; and amongst the things which it was incumbent on them to do, was to scrutinise the ground upon which the railway company stated they wanted more money, to investigate the particulars of their alleged necessity, and to ascertain whether it was reasonable to propose that this large additional sum should be advanced. Now, the hon. gentleman appears to have entered into no such investigation. I see the Acting Minister of Railways is here, and perhaps he will answer what the First Minister was unable to do—whether there are any more details with reference to the item of one million and a-half for elevators, and so forth, mentioned in Mr. Stephen's letter.

Mr. POPE. I haven't them here. I think, probably, on concurrence, I will have them.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the trouble always. I asked whether there was any further correspondence a little while ago on any of these points, and the Minister said there was none. I maintain we ought to have had a detailed statement sent into the Government of this. These must have been estimated, in order to make up the gross sum; the company must have had that information; they ought to have delivered it to the Minister, and the Minister ought to have had a report as to whether this further expenditure was so necessary as that he was justified in inviting Parliament to alter the securities and to advance this large sum of money. Now, if that was done, if, in fact, these details were furnished to the Government, if the Government recognised it to be their duty to obtain these details, if they obtained the examination of their permanent officer upon them, as they did the last time, when Mr. Schreiber's report was concurred in by the Government, then we ought to have it before us. That is one of the elements for our decision.

Mr. POPE. I have talked it over with the engineer. So far as a good many of these things are concerned, you have an estimate. For instance, the cuttings and obliterating the banks. Of course, everybody knows what that is who has travelled over the road. My chief engineer says that for the work that has been done this is a very small item. I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman several times that a large part of this expenditure was to be for improving the road. Some of it has gone to make iron bridges in place of wooden work. A good deal is in the cuttings and a good deal is apparent to anybody who looks at the elevators that have been built at Port Arthur and Fort William. This matter he speaks of at Quebec is largely for elevators, but there is besides a property that they intend to acquire there as well. In all these things you must take into consideration that it would be impossible to give detailed estimates. But I have talked it over with the engineer, and have got his opinion of these items, as he knows about these cuttings and bridges. I may say that I think the best bridge I ever saw in Canada was at Nipigon, a very expensive bridge, both as to masonry and superstructure. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the masonry I saw in that part of the country is as good as any I ever saw in the world, and all that, of course, is over and above that which was expended by the contract. Perhaps a little less might have been done in some of these places, but still the work is there. Perhaps wood might have been used in some places for a short time.

Mr. BLAKE. After all, here is a lump sum of a million and a-half, and we have no report from the hon. gentleman's engineer, and no detailed statement known to have been received even by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman must not lose sight of the fact that this is with reference to a Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

future expenditure, not to a past. It is only in reference to the mode in which this money is to be expended under the supervision of the Government. We surely can trust the Government to see that the money is not applied to other purposes than those mentioned in the detailed statement presented here. It is not presumed, I anticipate, that the \$5,000,000 are sufficient for all those purposes mentioned, or nearly sufficient. The sole duty of the Government will be to see to it that when Parliament decided that the money might be expended under their supervision for certain purposes it would be applied for those purposes. It would be quite impossible for the Government engineers to get up estimates or statements of the entire cost of the different works. The hon. gentleman is asking for further information than he should reasonably require.

Mr. BLAKE. I perfectly understand that they are estimates, and that the reason why the Government asks for money is on the ground that unexpected claims have been made upon them, and unexpected circumstances have occurred which required larger expenditures than were anticipated. The Government concur in that opinion. Parliament is thus entitled to call for evidence on which that conclusion was reached. Just as the Minister of Railways sent Mr. Miall to enquire into the account of the company, and instructed Mr. Schreiber to obtain estimates as to the cost of completing construction, so the hon. gentleman should have investigated the expenditures of the company and secured reports. The lump estimates submitted afford no information. The hon. gentleman has spoken of \$100,000 worth of prairie cuttings. Only a little while ago peans of triumph were raised on account of the high quality of the road; that it stands high above the prairie, and that every precaution had been taken to make it a first-class road. Yet it has got to be improved in the respect mentioned. In regard to trestles, the House has not yet obtained a full statement of even the permanent trestles.

Mr. POPE. The company have not received any payment for any temporary trestles; they are paid out of the contract money. But a good many trestles which were first laid have rotted out and had to be filled.

Mr. BLAKE. In what part of the country?

Mr. POPE. On sections 13 and 25.

Mr. BLAKE. Where?

Mr. POPE. Between Port Arthur and Winnipeg.

Mr. BLAKE. That is on the Government work?

Mr. POPE. I refer to a part of the road which was completed a long time ago, where the trestles and all the wood had rotted.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is paying for it?

Mr. POPE. We are paying for it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is making it good to the company at the public expense. It has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. POPE. The payment for the temporary trestles is kept out, under the contract, until they are filled. Then the company are paid contract prices. There are also permanent trestles, and I expect the company to be filling those in during the next eight years.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a sort of work which is not pressing, and which the company can extend over a number of years, and the Government should not be called upon to pay the expense. What will be the cost of the Port Arthur elevator, and when will it be completed?

Mr. POPE. The Port Arthur elevator is completed, and I think that at Fort William is completed or almost com-

pleted. They will cost from \$600,000 to \$800,000; they are very large elevators.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that amount included in this?

Mr. POPE. There must be a portion of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman know where the money came from for the elevators at Port Arthur?

Mr. POPE. No, I could not say.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I will tell him that \$120,000 that went towards these elevators was paid out of a vote for making a better road between Port Arthur and Winnipeg.

Mr. POPE. Not one dollar.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will find it in a return brought down to the House this Session. Then, as to the snow sheds in the mountains; have there been any particulars about that?

Mr. POPE. I took the recommendation of my engineer that it was a reasonable price, though, of course, it is impossible to tell exactly, until after we have had some more experience.

Mr. BLAKE. Snow protection on Lake Superior; I suppose that is fences?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is any portion for protection against the seas which break over that portion of the road close to the shore of Lake Superior, and which are said to be a source of danger to the road.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Then terminal facilities at Quebec; are those connected with the North Shore?

Mr. POPE. It is connected with what is supposed will be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, after a little time.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, as to this amount of \$2,500,000 beyond the contract, on the construction between Michipicoten and Port Arthur. Can the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman knows very well that that is a very hard piece of road, and that it will require a great deal beyond what the contract required. On asking my engineer, he did not think that this was too much to apply to that particular section.

Mr. BLAKE. But the contract prescribed that you should have a good road; it prescribed the grades, the curves and the alignment. The hon. gentleman settled all that, and the sum of \$70,000 a mile was fixed for a certain distance. The sum of \$7,600,000 of public money has been paid, irrespective of the land subsidy, on that portion; I know that it is a difficult part of the road, but I do not know that anything was required beyond the contract.

Mr. POPE. The road, as prescribed, was the sort of road only admitting the running of trains.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the standard was given.

Mr. POPE. Yes; but that very standard has had a great deal of money expended upon it since it was first built.

Mr. BLAKE. It is really a serious thing to tell us that the standard which the Government took was so inferior that it is necessary to expend, in this particular portion, two and a half millions more to make it a workable line. Is it that the alignment was not proper, or that the bridging is defective? I understand that it is hard rock cutting.

Mr. POPE. Well, there is a good deal of that.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it trestle work or the filling up of trestle work?

Mr. POPE. A good deal of the trestle work is being filled, and in every possible way the road is to be made a first-class road. The hon. gentleman knows that the embankments on that part of the road are some of the heaviest we have got, and it must be kept up in first-class condition. For instance, a great deal of ballasting is to be done beyond what was expected to be done by the contract, and undoubtedly there is a great deal to be spent in snow sheds, beyond the amount the hon. gentleman mentioned.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that is a pretty unsatisfactory explanation. We have heard Mr. Stephen's own statement of the snow protection required, and now the hon. gentleman suggests that more is required. I doubt that very much; and I think we ought to know what this extra expenditure of two and a-half millions is intended to cover. Although a portion of the work was heavy, it has turned out that there are long stretches on that line, as you will see by looking at the profile, which will almost compare favorably with the prairie line. They seem to have gone along the top of a divide; there is very little bridging, very little trestling or embankment. You must take the rough with the smooth, and although I admit that there is some heavy work, there is some which is extra easy. Now, I do not very well see that there has been any satisfactory statement from the hon. gentleman as to the details or the reasons why we are called upon to provide further moneys for the construction of the line on the north shore, and particularly when we find that, according to the chief engineers' statement, that \$4,000,000 is to be saved in British Columbia, which statement is accepted by Mr. Stephen in his letter. He says that although a large sum has been saved in British Columbia, there is a large sum spent in excess on the line north of Lake Superior, but that does not add to the whole cost. You find an estimate of \$27,000,000 to complete. You find, as was not unnatural, that the estimate was in excess in one end and in defect in the other. The chief engineer and Mr. Van Horne both agree about the \$4,000,000 saved in British Columbia. Mr. Stephen, in one part of his letter, says a large sum. Mr. Van Horne said \$4,000,000.

Mr. POPE. I think Mr. Van Horne said three or four millions, but I am sure he over-estimated the saving there and under-estimated the cost here. The chief engineer said nothing about the saving of three or four millions.

Mr. BLAKE. Assuming that they balance one another, which is the latest statement we have got, the circumstances taken together, furnish no ground for an additional demand, because there is no more wanted than was expected.

Mr. POPE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not quite honest there; in his anxiety to make out a case he goes beyond the mark. I have never said there is not enough money to complete the contract. Undoubtedly Mr. Van Horne made a very high estimate when he said he estimated the saving at \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000, because there was no sufficient data at that time to make a close estimate of the cost of the line north of Lake Superior, and when it came to be surveyed and properly estimated it was found that it was going to cost a great deal more money than was anticipated. I have myself ridden over the road from Nipigon to Port Arthur, and I know it would take considerable to put that road into such a shape as I would have it in if I were going to run it, and I consider that the road was quite within the contract, or within the understanding we had when we made that contract.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract is simply that the road should be sufficient to run a train over it, that is not mine, and certainly was not the interpretation at the time. Something has been said with reference to the terms on which the advance of last Session was made; but these are

entirely different, as I apprehend, from the terms of the contract. The contract was to complete and give us a workmanlike line, up to the standard of the Union Pacific, as it was in 1873, and it does not do to tell us that more money was required because they could not carry traffic over the line. The hon. gentleman said he would not like to carry traffic over the line unless more was done to it.

Mr. POPE. I said that if I were going to have a large traffic I should want more done to the road. Trains could be run on it, but it is not profitable to the company or advantageous to the country. It should be made a first-class road, and in order to make it such it would require more than the contract called for, which was, that trains should run safely over it.

Mr. BLAKE. I deny that the terms of the contract were that it should be a road over which trains could pass, and I deny that any such definition has been given of the company's obligations under their contract during the four years that have passed. On the contrary, we have been told that they were giving a better road than their contract required. Now we are told that we require to give this money to make a road over which trains can pass. I think this was expected to be done without farther advances.

Mr. HESSON. I may read the directors' report of the 13th of June on that very matter :

"It will be remembered that under the contract with the Government, it was stipulated that the line to be built by the company should be of a quality and character equal to the Union Pacific, as it was in February, 1873. But since that date the Union Pacific has been greatly improved, and other Pacific railways of a high class have been built; and it will be obvious to the shareholders, that in order to ensure the complete success of the enterprise, as a commercial undertaking, it is absolutely necessary that the railway, on its opening for through traffic, shall be in all respects, at least equal in efficiency to any of its transcontinental competitors as they now exist; and that it should be provided with ample facilities for taking care of its rapidly increasing local traffic. Recognising this necessity, the directors have made, during the past year, large expenditures for the rolling stock, grain elevators, terminal and other facilities, and for the general improvement of the lines in operation—all necessary to secure the requisite high standard of efficiency, though not fully foreseen at the time the contract was made with the Government. The amount expended towards this object during the past year was \$1,702,684, and this sum, it will be noticed, accounts for the greater part of the floating debt shown in the balance sheet. Further additions to the equipment are now being made; additional facilities will have to be provided immediately, and the usual improvements incident to all new lines must be made from time to time. All the various needs of a new railway in a new and rapidly growing country, and everything necessary to secure economical and efficient operation, and the full development and permanent control of its traffic, must be supplied."

On resolution 10,

Mr. BLAKE. As I said awhile ago, I am very anxious to see proper provision made to facilitate the creation of a line to Sault Ste. Marie, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would call attention to the fact that this additional proposal seems to be creating, in this part of the system, the same sort of break which it has created in the other part of the Ontario division. The hon. gentleman does not simply arrange for a mortgage on the Algoma branch, but he entirely discharges it from our lien. Now, I think it will be very unfortunate if that is done. I think it would be very much better to provide that the Government should be allowed to permit a first mortgage to be placed on the Algoma branch, for what sum might be necessary to aid in the construction of the rest of that portion; but we ought to be the mortgagees of the whole line to the Sault, and not merely the Algoma branch; so that, if our mortgage were in default, and we found it necessary to take hold of that system, we should have that line at the cost of the construction of the new link. The Algoma branch, as far as constructed, has cost some \$2,400,000. I do not object to that being used as a basis of credit to complete the line to the Sault, but I object to our parting with the Sault line altogether. Hon. gentle-

Mr. BLAKE.

men have said that it is very important, that enormous traffic is expected to come down. I hope it will. I want the Canadian Pacific Railway, if misfortune should happen and the system fall into the hands of the Government and the bondholders, to be enabled to control the channel through which that enormous traffic comes down, at the cost of the construction of the new piece; and that can be accomplished by our retaining a subsequent charge on the Algoma branch and the new line, and yet allow a subsequent mortgage to be put on the Algoma branch, in order to build the new line. I ask the hon. gentleman to consider that before concurrence, and prepare to bring down a proposal to accomplish that object.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 10:55, p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 22nd June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to communicate to the House that I received a telegram from Major General Middleton, announcing that the Maclean family and a couple of white prisoners are now free, and were expected to be at Fort Pitt at 9 o'clock this morning.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. FISHER) asked, Whether a commission was appointed during the year 1884 to devise a scheme for the House of Commons staff as a branch of the Civil Service, or for any similar purpose? If so, who were the commissioners? Have they made a report to the Internal Economy Commission or to the Government? If so, will such report be brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Certain gentlemen were appointed and made a confidential report to the commissioners and to the Government, in order that they might have some data to work upon and to report to the House, as has been done. That report was, however, considered a confidential report, as the hon. gentleman will understand, in order that the Commissioners might be perfectly *au fait* of the position of the different officers, and sometimes some remarks were made which would not have been made if the report had been intended for presentation to Parliament.

### VACANCY IN JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO. 6, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. KIRK) asked, When will the vacancy in Judicial District No. 6, Nova Scotia, caused by the death of Judge Stewart Campbell, four months ago, be filled?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe it will be filled very shortly.

## BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. KIRK) asked, When will the Government pay to the boat fishermen of Guysboro' county, N. S., the Bounty for 1884?

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries informs me that the cheques will be issued next week.

## ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS, &amp;c.

The resolutions adopted in Committee of the Whole, on the 15th inst., respecting the remuneration of analysts to be appointed under the Bill (No. 143) from the Senate, intitled: "An Act respecting the adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilisers," were reported, read a second time, and concurred in, and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee)

Mr. VAIL. The Minister who was in charge of this Bill was not able to give us much information about it the other day. Perhaps, as the Minister of Inland Revenue is present, he will enlighten us on the question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The resolution which has just been passed and referred to the committee on this Bill, deals with the remuneration of these officers.

Mr. VAIL. I notice that last year there was an appropriation of some \$12,000 for the adulteration of food, and this year there is a vote in the Estimates for \$20,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We can discuss that when we come to the Estimates. But when this law was passed a certain number of analysts were appointed for some of the principal cities of the Dominion. Since that time analysts have been appointed in one or two more cities; but these appointments do not increase the fees at all.

Mr. BLAKE. But since last year a chief analyst has been appointed, whose salary has been fixed by the Government; but there is no reason, either of convenience or otherwise, for leaving the salary of fees to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and the Act should state what the remuneration shall be.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only appointment the hon. gentleman refers to as having been made last year was discussed last Session, and it was stated then that the salary would be about \$2,000—not exceeding that. That appointment was made at \$2,000. The other analysts are paid by fees. The hon. gentleman smiles, but that is the same principle that was adopted when the Act was passed, and these officers were always paid by fees when the hon. gentleman's Government was in power—a retaining fee of \$200, and an allowance of \$100 for laboratory and furnishing it.

Mr. BLAKE. The reason I smiled was that I had refreshed my memory as to the statement of the hon. gentleman's colleague, that the salary of this officer was \$2,800, of which \$2,000 was paid by the hon. gentleman's Department and \$300 out of the Department of Customs; and when the hon. gentleman told me the remuneration had been fixed at \$2,000 I smiled; I beg pardon for smiling.

Committee rose and reported.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the amendments be read the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. BLAKE moved:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by stating the salary or remuneration to be paid out of the public funds to the chief analyst and the other analysts.

## House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bernier,  
Blake,  
Kurpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Casgrain,  
Edgar,  
Fleming,  
Forbes,  
Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Guay,  
Gunn,

Harley,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
King,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Livingston,  
Mackenzie,  
McCraney,  
McIntyre,  
McMullen,  
Mills,

Mulock,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,  
Rinfret,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wilson,  
Yeo.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,  
Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Chapleau,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Daly,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),  
Dickinson,

Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Dupont,  
Foster,  
Gigault,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guilbault,  
Hackett,  
Hay,  
Hesson,  
Homer,  
Ives,  
Kilvert,  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Pictou),

McDougall (O. Breton),  
McLellan,  
Moffat,  
Paint,  
Pinsonneault,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Royal,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Smyth,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Temple,  
Tupper,  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth.—60.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived; amendments made in committee concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

## HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS.

The resolutions adopted in Committee of the Whole, on the 15th inst., with respect to a loan to the harbor commissioners of Three Rivers, were reported, read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) to authorise the advance of certain sums to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman state what the revenue and expenditure at present are?

Mr. BOWELL. The estimated revenue for the year 1885-86, when the wharf is completed, as I explained the other night, will, from the dues, be some \$3,900, and from the rent of wharves, which is assured, \$2,000, making a total of \$5,900. The interest on the amount invested, which the Government propose to loan, will be \$3,280, leaving an ample margin, unless the business falls off, which is not anticipated. On the contrary, as soon as the works are completed, it is expected the business will increase, leaving an ample margin with which to cover the interest for which the Government is responsible.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CARLING moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole, of the 15th inst., on resolution respecting the provisional contract entered into between Mr. Andrew Allan and the Postmaster-General of Canada, for a weekly service of ocean mail steamers be received.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman promised to give us some information about this.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware what particular explanations were to be made. I think the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked me to bring down a copy of the contract and the Order in Council, which I have done.

Mr. BLAKE. The resolution passed through the committee stage at, unfortunately, an early hour in the morning, without any prolonged debate being had or much information as to the policy of the Government in carrying out this proposed contract. I invite the hon. gentleman to make some statement on that point.

Mr. CARLING. The question was pretty fully discussed by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier). As I stated, it has been considered wise to renew this contract for the term of five years, on the condition that the minimum tonnage shall be some 1,200 tons greater than it was in the previous contract. The Allan Company have given very great satisfaction in the running of their boats and in the carrying of the mails. The company intend increasing the size of their vessels, and that is one of the chief reasons we have for extending the contract for five years.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite time, having regard for the whole history of this contract in early days, to abandon all considerations other than those business considerations which belong to such a contract. Very high prices were paid for a great many years for this contract, and it was the cause of building up an enormous and most profitable enterprise. We have no right, in that point of view, to deal in the slightest degree harshly with those who have been contractors; but, on the other hand, we have no right, in the interest of the public, to deal with them lavishly or otherwise than the public interest at this time demands. My opinion is that the whole question has to be considered. It is unnecessary to make a new contract at this time. The existing contract continues until twelve months' notice is given, and therefore the public and the contractors are both protected by the present arrangements against any hurried or sudden change. It is now proposed, while that is the condition of things, that we should for a long term of years, I think five, make a fresh arrangement. I will not say that since the beginning, but since before our last contract, the whole system of carrying mails on the Atlantic Ocean has been changed, and the other Governments, who had to deal in former days with other companies, have recognised that change, and there is no longer any such system of contract in existence for a fixed term of years and with a single company. The system which they have adopted, as I understand, is one of payment in proportion to the value of the service done, and of the giving of the work to the quickest vessels. I do not argue that necessarily our condition is entirely the same as theirs, but I argue that these circumstances show that there has been an entire change there, and that there is room to enquire whether a change ought not to be made here. I see no grounds for contending that the price proposed to be paid is, at the present day, and under the present circumstances, a reasonable remuneration for the services rendered; it appears altogether an exorbitant remuneration. I see no grounds for contending that the service rendered is efficient. The speed across the Atlantic has been made very much greater within the last few years. It is now stated that the speed of the better class, not simply the crack boats, but the better class of boats of many of the lines is counterbalancing or more than counterbalancing our advantage in point of distance. The truth is, I fancy, that by almost all the Allan liners, except the *Parisian*, the entire time and sometimes much greater than the entire time which might be saved, if something like the speed of the other Atlantic companies was obtained, is lost because a very much slower

Mr. CARLING.

rate of progress is maintained across the Atlantic, and the result is we do not get the advantages which are due to the shortness of distance of our route. Again, a competition has arisen, and there are several lines of steamers now from our own ports to the British ports and back again, and one line has more than one crack vessel. It seems to me that the principle of tender would have been very reasonably applied on this occasion. It would be extremely reasonable to have applied for tenders for this service and to have obtained some better provisions than those now proposed. In default of that, we should arrange to have the mails carried on the fast steamers of the other lines when they run. It is ridiculous that our mails should be two or three days behind the time, carried by the contract line, which they might not be if carried by the crack vessels of the other lines. With reference to the amount of money involved, with reference to the encouragement which might be given to other deserving lines, and with reference to the speed of our ocean voyages, it is very important we should understand how things are, and are to be when we arrange for this service for so long a time as that now proposed. A little while ago, I pointed out that the arrangements for the delivery of letters on the other side of the water were very unsatisfactory. I pointed out that, as I had been informed by gentlemen engaged in trade in Canada, who sailed by the mail steamer, that going by that steamer to Liverpool and going hence to Manchester, they were in Manchester 24 hours before the mail, which had been landed at Moville, reached Manchester, so that it not unfrequently happened that the mails were delayed by the attempted expedition supposed to be involved in their being landed at Moville. Another cause of complaint is the assorting of the mails on board the steamer. We have expensive officers, a large number of them, and we pay the Allan liners included in these arrangements, I presume, for their passage money and the accommodation afforded them for their work. Now, that is not done for the whole of the American and British mails. The mails which convey the tidings, commercial and domestic, between Great Britain and the continent and between Great Britain and the North American continent, which convey the great bulk of the whole correspondence in volume, and the still greater bulk in importance, are arranged for as to their sorting at each end of the line—on the land. I do not see why we alone should preserve the expense of mail officers for sorting on the voyage, unless it be to make up for the unnecessary length of time that is taken in traversing the ocean, by diligence used in getting mails in a little later and getting them sorted a little earlier. It seems to me that that is an expense that ought to be saved. The agreement of the 12th April, 1884, between Mr. Andrew Allan and the Postmaster General provides that none of the steamers built or purchased for the purpose of carrying mails between the port of Liverpool and the port of Quebec or Montreal, etc., shall be of less size or power than the *Sardinian*. It provides for a service of 52 voyages, and it provides, as to the time, that it shall be 13 or 14 days, 13 days on an average in the summer, but special provision is made that, in December, January, and February, it may be 14 days, provided the average of the outward trips does not exceed 15 days, and then allowance is made for reckoning the time for stopping at Londonderry. It seems to me that we are going on in an old-fashioned and behind-the-time spirit in providing that, for the next five years, we shall pay prices far in excess of the prices paid for the conveyance of a similar amount of mail matter by the crack steamers of the Atlantic within a much less period of time between Europe and this continent, and, while we are paying that extravagant price, we are not taking the care that we should to get the most efficient service which could be found now, by choosing the most efficient steamers between the St. Lawrence and

Great Britain. On the whole, I believe that it would be infinitely better that the confirmation of this contract should be deferred and that matters should remain as they are for this Session, and in the meantime that the Government should endeavor to make some better arrangement so that we might have a more efficient and rapid service, so that, if possible, we might get the best and most efficient steamers that ply on our route to carry our mails instead of vessels which are behind the age in point of speed, although they are safe and commodious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but we must look at all the circumstances of the case, and we must look at the position of Quebec and of New York. It must be recollected by everyone that, in the inception of steam lines, they had to be assisted by the Government, by the American Government in the case of the Collins' line, by England in the case of the Cunard line, and, when the St. Lawrence desired to vindicate its position and Canada desired to support it against the United States, the Allan line was inaugurated and established. I would agree with the hon. gentleman that, if the only question was how quickest to get the mail matter from America to Europe and from Europe to America, we might disregard the St. Lawrence altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not propose to disregard the St. Lawrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not mean to say that, but that we might disregard the St. Lawrence altogether if the only question was that of speed from one continent to the other; but the original practice both of the United States and England was to subsidise lines in order to encourage them to carry the mails. Subsequently the increase of commerce between the United States and England was so great that there was no necessity for continuing that system, and the United States as well as England can afford to adopt the policy of sending the mails by the first and the quickest steamers; and they know perfectly well that, as England seems to draw to it all the moveable wealth of the world, so it is the United States, and the city of New York in particular, that draw all the steamships, or most of them, that are running in connection with North America. It is therefore certain that the mails will be transmitted as speedily as possible by the quickest vessels running between New York and England and between Liverpool and New York without the necessity of any subsidy, but we have something more to consider than the mere carrying of the mail. We have to counteract, as well as we can, the attraction of everything—mails, commerce, transport of every kind, traffic of every kind—to New York, that great centre, that great *entrepôt* and *depôt* and starting point. We have to meet that as best we can by encouraging the St. Lawrence route against very great difficulties.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You have five or six other lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will come to that. We have the New York route against the St. Lawrence route, and therefore we must, I think, unless we desire to hand over the whole of the great passenger trade and the valuable traffic to New York, continue to a certain extent the present system and encourage our lines. The Allan line was the first line which commenced, under very great difficulties, and succeeded to a remarkable extent, and was prosperous. It is true that there are one or two steamers equal to the *Parisian*, and one, I am told, still more speedy than the *Parisian* of the Allan line, but these are only one or two vessels, and we cannot depend upon the fact that in the year 1885 there may be one or two steamers which are as speedy as the *Parisian*, the best vessel the Allans have, because they have a large fleet, and there is no certainty that we shall be able to maintain or keep up at all a system of passenger steamers unless we give them some aid.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, the Government will take care that, in making the final arrangements authorised by Parliament, the Allan Line shall build vessels, to keep up fully in point of speed and in tonnage with the best vessels on the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. MILLS. But that is not in your contract.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but we will take care of that.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will take care of that. We know perfectly well that the Allans are very anxious to increase their trade by increasing the size and the speed of their vessels. We know they are going to do so; we know they are going to replace several of their vessels with other vessels, under the encouragement that is given them by this contract. And therefore we press that this Parliament shall sanction the contract for which provision has now been made.

Mr. MILLS. The statement of the hon. gentleman does not seem to be in exact accordance with the facts. Now this is not a subvention given to the ocean steamers of the St. Lawrence as a rival to New York lines, but it is given to a certain line of steamers on the St. Lawrence as competitors with certain other lines of steamers on the St. Lawrence, which are not receiving any aid from the Government. If the hon. gentleman could show that the Allan line were the only steamers that came by the St. Lawrence, and that this vote was necessary in order to maintain the St. Lawrence line, there would be something in his line of argument. But that is not the case. There are several other lines, I believe, on the St. Lawrence besides the Allan line, and the hon. gentleman is proposing to aid one of them unfairly against the others. When this aid was first given it was doubtful whether a line on the St. Lawrence could be kept up. The amount of passenger traffic was much less than it is now, the quantity of freight carried by these steamers was much less, and in fact the lines of steamers that were maintained between New York and Liverpool were far less profitable than they are now. We know that for years the Collins line was unable, it was said, to exist without the subsidies which it received from Congress. But that condition of things has wholly changed. Here you have upon the St. Lawrence route several lines of ocean steamers that are not aided by Government at all. Even supposing matters came to the worst, and you subsidised any New York line, the Allan Line would still continue to exist the same as any other line upon the St. Lawrence. No one is suggesting that, but we are proposing that if a line of steamers is to receive aid, you shall utilise those that are best suited to carry the mails. Now, the hon. gentleman did not propose this; he suggests that the Government will take care that the fast sailing steamers are employed. Well, we have the contract before us, and you have as the standard, of the Allan Line, the *Sardinian*. It is said:

"The said steamers shall be first-class vessels, and the line shall consist of the *Parisian*, *Sardinian*, *Polynesian*, *Circassian*, *Sarmatian*, *Peruvian*, *Nova Scotian*, and such other vessels, not of less size and power than the *Sardinian*."

There is your standard. With regard to the size and power you have named in the contract what the standard is to be, and we know that is not a swift sailing steamer. It does seem to me a most extraordinary course that we, at this day, should continue to favor one line of steamers and pay them, what seems to me, an enormous subsidy, as a competitor to every other line of steamers upon the St. Lawrence. Surely, if we are to employ a line of steamers of our own between the St. Lawrence and Liverpool—and I do not call

in question the propriety of doing that—we ought to put them on a footing of equality, we ought to see that the country receives the most efficient service possible, and we ought to see that swift sailing steamers, the property of other companies, should not be passed over and one particular line selected and favored with enormous subsidies in order that they may unfairly compete with other lines engaged on the same route. That is precisely what is proposed, and I think the proposition is wholly indefensible. If we had no other line of steamers than the Allan, then it might be said that unless you subsidised that line you could not keep it upon the St. Lawrence route. But we have four other lines, which fact shows conclusively that the Allan line is not dependent upon the aid given by the Government to maintain its existence, and that being the case, it is the duty of the Ministry to secure the best and most efficient service, and to secure it at as low a rate as possible. It seems to me it is our duty in the public interest, for the purpose of efficiency, for the purpose of keeping down undue charges on the treasury, that some other system should be adopted than that of favoring a particular line. I think that the proposition made by the leader of the Opposition, namely, that this matter should stand over for further consideration, is a very reasonable one.

Mr. LANGELIER. I cannot see any justification for the contract that is now before the House. If it is a simple business transaction that we are making with the company, tenders should have been asked for; the Government should have made their own specifications of the tonnage and speed of the vessels that were to carry the mails, and then have asked for tenders based on those specifications. If that had been done already, I think we would have had something better than the line of steamers which is mentioned in the contract before the House. But this is not intended as a business contract. As stated by the Prime Minister, the price we are going to pay is not a consideration solely for carrying the mails, but it is intended as an encouragement to a certain line of steamers. I think there is no longer any reason for this encouragement. It is perfectly true, as the Prime Minister has said, that there was a time when the Government was justifiable in granting large subsidies of money to encourage the establishment of a line on the river St. Lawrence to compete with the lines running from New York. But that is no longer necessary, because we have now three or four other lines which have been started on the St. Lawrence, composed of splendid steamers, but which have never received one cent of encouragement from this Government. It can no longer be said that we must give this subsidy for something which, without this special encouragement from the Government, could not be had. We have several proofs now that the same service can be obtained from other quarters. We have the Dominion Line, of which mention has been made several times, composed of splendid and fast sailing vessels, but which have never received a copper from the Government, not only to start their line but to maintain it. We have the Beaver line, which also contains some very fine steamers. We have the Ross line, and some other lines, the names of which I do not remember at this moment; but all these lines are so many proofs that it is no longer necessary to pay Government money to encourage the establishment of a line between Montreal, Quebec, and Europe. If it is said that we ought to give this money as a reward for the Allan line having been the pioneers in the ocean steamship traffic between Canada and Europe, there is no justification on that ground, either. I do not say that we have been paying too much, but we paid what was at first considered sufficient to encourage the Allans to start their line. At one time, if I am not mistaken, we paid this company as much as £104,000, or \$416,000 a year, to run their steamers between Quebec

Mr. MILLS.

and Liverpool, but I do not see that there is any longer justification for paying the subsidy that is now given in the contract. The only possible justification that can be offered for giving more than is necessary for carrying the mails, would be that it is given in order to encourage that line to put on larger and faster steamers than some of those which are mentioned in the contract. But what do we find in the contract? It is stated in the contract that the tonnage of the steamers to be built to carry out the terms of this contract, shall not be less than that of the *Sardinian*; but I see that some of the steamers of the present line are considerably superior to the tonnage mentioned in the contract. I take for instance the *Carthaginian*, the tonnage of which is 4,600. As a matter of fact the tonnage is much larger than is the tonnage of some of the steamers mentioned in the contract.

Mr. CARLING. The *Carthaginian* does not carry the mails at present.

Mr. LANGELIER. That vessel has more tonnage, I repeat, than some of the steamers mentioned in the contract. It is quite impossible for the mails to be carried by the seven steamers mentioned in the contract, namely, *Parisian*, *Sardinian*, *Polynesian*, *Circassian*, *Sarmatian*, *Peruvian*, *Nova Scotian*. The *Nova Scotian* is an old tub—a very old steamer, which has been enlarged; it is not at all a first-class steamer, not even a second-class steamer. She is a very good and safe boat, but is very slow. No persons in New York or the United States would ever think of sending mails by the *Nova Scotian*. We should not do so when we have such a steamer as the *Vancouver* and some of the other steamers of the Dominion Line, which are first-class boats. Very large freight steamers with high tonnage may be very slow boats. If we have large steamers, they must have large power; and if the power is not sufficient they will be slow boats. This contract will place us in a very inferior and humiliating position in the eyes of the travelling public, when they become aware of the fact that at this time in 1885, when there are steamers crossing from New York to England in six and a half days, Canada is giving a contract for 5 years to a line of steamships which makes the passage on an average in 13 or 14 days. We shall certainly be considered a very slow country indeed if we ratify this contract. I repeat that the only justification for spending such a large sum of money, it being far in excess of the actual cost of carrying the mails, would be to secure new boats of equal speed with, if not with the *Oregon* or some of the very fastest steamers, at least with the regular steamers of the White Star line, the Inman line, or the new steamers of the Cunard line. We should require the Allan Company to provide as good steamers as those, or we have no justification for entering into this contract.

Motion agreed to, and report received.

On motion to concur in the resolutions,

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot allow concurrence to be taken without saying a word with respect to the remarks made by the First Minister. He has given as a reason for adopting the resolutions, that the Government will take care that none but first-class steamers will be built. That cannot afford the slightest justification for carrying the resolution. The contract is here; the obligation proposed to be secured from the contractor is before us, and that is that the vessels shall be of the *Sardinian* standard. Anything better than that is at the option of the contractor, and the Government have no power to compel him to do anything better. The *Sardinian* standard of vessels takes thirteen or fourteen days to make the passage. So it is quite clear that Parliament cannot be asked to place any weight upon the statement of the First Minister that the Government will take care that the contractor will do more than he is asked under the con-

tract to undertake. Then the hon. gentleman said special allowances are necessary in order that we should enable the Allan Company to compete with the New York lines. That goes to the question of granting more money than the actual cost of freighting the letters, to the question of granting a subsidy such as this is. It may be a justification for granting somewhat higher inducements, that it is desirable to produce as good results as the general course of trade has produced at New York. What I complain of is that the hon. gentleman gives the inducement and does not produce the result. He does not give us anything like the advantages of our passage. Our passage is a short passage, but it takes as long to run by it to Liverpool as it does from New York; because the rate of the vessels with which the hon. gentleman makes the contract is very much slower than from New York by first-class vessels—I do not speak of the very crack steamers—of the four or five lines which ply between New York and Great Britain. I am willing to pay somewhat more liberal prices if we can obtain the same result. The result I want to obtain is that the Canadian line shall have in practice its theoretical advantage. Its theoretical advantage is having a short route. In practice it does not possess that advantage, because of the extra time occupied on account of the slowness of the vessels. Then the hon. gentleman says this grant is necessary in order to keep the Allan line alive. I deny it. I am satisfied that Mr. Allan and his company would deny it. They have rivals which have struggled into existence while the Allan Company had the contract, rivals which have managed to establish flourishing and substantial lines, not merely without a subsidy, but disadvantage by the high subsidy under which the Allan line runs. The hon. gentleman said there is another line which has one or two or perhaps three steamers equal or superior to the *Parisian*.

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

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said one, at all events; but I am told there are three. If this other line has two equal to and one superior to the *Parisian*, it means that this other line has twice as many fast steamers as the Allan line has. Hon. gentlemen will observe that the memorandum of the Postmaster General on this subject proceeds upon a theory which is hardly to be commended and which will hardly be defended. It says: The Postmaster General having given his best attention to Mr. Allan's proposal, and in the interest of the efficient maintenance of this line of mail steamers, which, for mail purposes, as well as in other respects, have doubtless rendered beneficial services to the country, is of the opinion that the Government should grant a renewal of the contract. There is the question. It is not simply in the interest of the efficient maintenance of a fast line of steamships for the carrying of the mails between Canada and England, but in the interest of the efficient maintenance of this particular line, whose past services, he thinks, should be recognised. I should add that Mr. Allan was not so modest. He demanded that the subsidy should be doubled—that instead of £500 sterling per trip, it should be £1,000 sterling. The Postmaster General proposed to give him the same subsidy, so we have not satisfied the Allans; and in view of past services of various kinds, and in view also of the efficient maintenance of the line, the subsidy of £500 is given. Now, that is not far from the cost of the coaling, and that is the advantage which is to be given. But, besides that advantage, it must be remembered that other advantages in respect of freight and immigrant traffic practically accrue, or the great bulk of them, to this line. My hon. friend from East York has informed me that when the negotiations were going on for the last renewal of this contract, which took place towards the latter part of his Government, he had a conversation with Sir Hugh Allan; and he pointed out to him the importance of increased capacity and

increased speed, and better general accommodation on the line. At that time, the *Parisian* was either contracted for, or partly contracted for; and Sir Hugh told him that that was the principal object in making this contract; that they thought about putting under contract some other steamers of first-class character, or of equal character with the intended *Parisian*; and my hon. friend pointed out that even so, it was not to be expected that this contract would endure for one term more, and Sir Hugh Allan told him that if the contract could be obtained for that term, this would be done. Not long after Sir Hugh Allan died, and the arrangements were discontinued, save in so far as the *Parisian* was concerned, and they had perhaps gone too far with regard to that vessel. That is another instance showing that if we are going to contract for five years to come, we had better have in writing the conditions of the bargain; we had better have nothing standing between the Minister and the contractor; if the conditions are to be better than those of the bargain, we had better have them stipulated plainly. Now I must say that instead of using their power for the convenience of the Canadian public, from what I can gather from the papers, the Allan Company are acting in a manner highly inconvenient to the Canadian public, in some instances. I refer for example to the sailing arrangements made as to the *Vancouver* and the *Parisian*. The *Vancouver*, it appears, was advertised to sail on particular days, which were not the same days as those for the sailing of the *Parisian*. The sailings of both vessels having been established, and the public thus having obtained the choice of two first-class crack steamers sailing at reasonable intervals, the Allan Company altered the sailing of the *Parisian* to the day upon which the *Vancouver* sailed, and being approached by the Dominion Company upon that subject, with a view of making a further arrangement, they declared plainly that if the Dominion Company should alter the days of sailing of the *Vancouver* over again, they would alter the day of the sailing of the *Parisian* to correspond, so that upon whatever day the *Vancouver* sailed the *Parisian* would also sail. What was the reason? It was because they did not wish the sailings of the *Vancouver* to be contrasted with those of any other ship of their line; because it might be possible to find that the Canadian mails would be arriving two or three days late on a subsidised steamer, and therefore they decided that the one crack steamer should be put against the other crack steamer. Now, all of us who happen to be going to Europe, are discomfited by this arrangement, because but for it we would have the choice, at intervals, of two crack steamers on the St. Lawrence route; but this arbitrary use of their powers has resulted in our practically being deprived of that advantage. It is only those who can sail on these particular days—at intervals of perhaps five or six weeks—who can now sail by a crack steamer on the St. Lawrence route. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he wants to preserve the St. Lawrence route for travel, he is doing that by this contract which is most likely to destroy it. I say we are entirely behind the age. I say there is no comparison in point of speed and accommodation between the average Allan liner and the crack steamers which are sailing from New York to Liverpool on more than one day each week. I agree in the importance of preserving our own line, and of attracting not merely our own Canadian travel, but the travel of visitors coming to this country from the other side of the world. I think that is important, and I am not disposed to look very minutely into the contract, if this result can be accomplished. But I say that for this result, this subsidy is beyond the mark, and the hon. gentleman is calling upon us to give us what, under present circumstances, is actually an extravagant subsidy, and yet without producing the results which should be produced, and you will find that that which has happened heretofore will happen again. I have

always travelled by the Allan line—though I am said to be anti-Canadian—I have always travelled by that line since 1847, but I have met many Canadians, commercial travellers and others, who have told me that they had always travelled by the Allan line until, for some particular reason, they went by way of New York, and sailed on one of those crack steamers, and the result was that they never went back to the Allan line. I think it is as well that that statement should be made when we are considering the conditions of travel between America and Europe by the St. Lawrence route, and by these other lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad that the hon. gentleman agrees with me so far as to state that it is of great importance to us to encourage the St. Lawrence line as against the lines by New York. It is of very great importance; its importance cannot be exaggerated—I think we must support the St. Lawrence route as much as possible. The hon. gentleman says that this contract does not secure that. Perhaps it does not in its terms, but I am quite satisfied that those of us who are spared to meet here in January or February next will find that that object has been fully secured. I feel quite satisfied that the Government should be judged by that fact. The Government will take care that so far as can be done, and so far as will be done, before the Allan line establishes a legal claim under this contract, there will be most satisfactory arrangements made, and I hope the House will accept that assurance. The real truth is this, that there is very great danger of the first-class passenger lines leaving the St. Lawrence altogether. It is true there are one or two vessels which have attained great speed, but I am under this difficulty and every hon. gentleman in this House is under this difficulty, that it is said that there are four or five other lines which are very successful, and it will not do to say that those lines are not successful. I will not enter into that, but we will suppose that they are peculiarly successful; that they are solvent, going, living, lines. But I will say this, that unless there is special encouragement given to the St. Lawrence line, there is great danger that first-class passages and the most expensive traffic—the carrying of the most expensive and valuable goods, which require speed, will leave the St. Lawrence altogether and that our lines will be simply vessels to carry traffic, particularly cattle, so far as the export trade is concerned, and second-class passengers and immigrants. That is the danger we have to face. I fear that there are not sufficient inducements to these St. Lawrence lines to go on increasing their vessels in speed, in tonnage, and comfort, and accommodation, and fighting and competing with the rival New York lines permanently, therefore I consider it of great importance that we should give them especial encouragement. I am very glad the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) agrees with me so far.

Mr. DAVIES. The objection is not so much that encouragement has been given to a line of Dominion steamers, but as to the manner in which it has been given, and the requirements exacted from that line. The hon. gentleman persists in talking of the Allan line as the St. Lawrence line, as contra-distinguished from the American lines; but the hon. gentleman is not using that expression in a fair sense. He is leaving the public to believe that he is subsidising a Dominion line as contra-distinguished from the New York lines, while the fact is that he is subsidising one Dominion line against two or three other Dominion lines; in other words he is handicapping these two or three lines that have struggled into a position in which they are now competing with the Allan line. He says that unless we take care the travel is likely to leave the St. Lawrence. What has he done to counteract that? Speed and comfort must be had in these modern days; and the hon. gentleman knows that he does not pretend to provide for those in this contract; he knows

Mr. BLAKE.

that the standard provided for in the contract is very much below that of first class New York lines; and he knows that if the company only act up to the standard he asks of them, the consequence will be that the freight traffic and passenger travel will probably go the other way. He is driving it away by placing in the contract a low standard of accommodation and power. The only thing that is secured by this contract is the subsidy that goes to the Allan line, of \$126,000 a year. It might be contended with force, and to my mind with irresistible force, that under the circumstances as they now exist, with three or four Dominion lines of steamers competing with each other for the freight and passenger traffic, not only of Canada but a part of the United States, across the Atlantic, if we entered into a contract for more than a year, the least we should have done was to call for tenders; but the hon. gentleman has not asked for tenders; he does not allow any of the other lines to compete. He cannot deny that they have good ships, because he knows that one is superior to those of the Allan line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One swallow does not make a summer.

Mr. DAVIES. How many swallows has the hon. gentleman got in the line he has contracted with? Only one; and some of the steamers he has provided for in this contract are very small swallows indeed. Seriously speaking, this is an important matter, and the hon. gentleman has put it in a more serious light than before. He knows that we are in danger of losing this traffic, and he deliberately adopts a plan calculated to drive it away. I say this House should not in the present circumstances sanction this contract. I protested against it the other night; we may protest without any effect, but I hope our protest will be put on record. The principle on which this contract was let was unfair, and the standard you adopted was a ridiculous standard. With the great progress that has been made in the construction of ocean steamships, with the fact that they are trying to cross the Atlantic from New York to Liverpool in six days, you adopt deliberately a low standard and say that you are perfectly satisfied if they cross in 14 days. I wonder what the country will think of that. You say that is all nonsense—that you will take care they do something better than the contract. How are you going to take care? You have made the contract in black and white, and you cannot ask the company to go beyond it unless you give them more subsidy. I say that the Postmaster General has not been alive or up to the age in making this contract; and his Department is one that ought to be alive to all the improvements in speed and accommodation made in the present age. We are behind the times, and I believe this contract will be injurious to the passenger and freight traffic of the St. Lawrence, and should not be sanctioned.

Mr. CARLING. The last contract terminated on the 15th of April, 1878, and I am not aware that the hon. gentlemen opposite, then in office, asked for any additional tonnage or power. If they were not satisfied at that time, they should have given notice that they wanted better terms. The hon. gentleman has said that the average time is 14 days; but we can judge by the past of what the time is likely to be. In 29 voyages made across the Atlantic during the summer of 1884, the regularity of the time has been surprising. I find that the trips were made in 8 days 15 hours, 9 days 10 hours, 8 days 6 hours, 8 days 15 hours, and so on during the whole six months that they went by the St. Lawrence. The time made was certainly far ahead of what was expected, and if they have determined to put on a better class of steamers, I think we may expect that the time they will make will be much better than that of 1884. The company have bound themselves, as the hon. gentleman will see by the 27th clause of the contract, that they will carry the mails on steamers

sailing every Saturday from Montreal to Glasgow, and also on the steamers which sail from Halifax by way of St. John to Liverpool, free of charge. As the Prime Minister has stated, I think all Canadians are proud of the way the Allan line of steamers is managed, and the satisfaction given, not only to the country, but to the Government in the transmission of the mails.

Mr. GILLMOR. It appears to me that the action of the Government is rather calculated to prevent competition. The hon. gentleman says that one swallow does not make a summer; but this company with the aid of this large subsidy, can outdo the rival lines which have grown up simply by their energy and enterprise, and have put on steamers equal to those of the Allan line. It appears to me there is no reason why tenders should not have been asked for this service. Owing to the energy and enterprise of these lines, there are now two or three lines of steamers on our route—quite a different state of things to that which existed years ago. In the interest of the public tenders ought to be called for, so as to encourage companies with most enterprise to put on fast steamers. The Government, on the contrary, are pursuing a policy tending to break down rival enterprises, and doing this by the expenditure of public money. The Government assure us that, independent of the contract, the Allans want to put on fast steamers in order to improve their line, and that the company will see that that is done, but I do not see any necessity for giving the contract without this clause. If the company are disposed to put on fast steamers they ought to be willing to bind themselves to do so in order to gain the contract. The Government are doing an injustice to the rival lines by not giving them an opportunity to compete with the Allan line for this service. If they have the enterprise and capital enough to do the work, they ought to have fair play and the competition will be for the benefit of the public.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had the pleasure of crossing in the *Sardinian* one occasion, and the *Dominion* steamer which left Liverpool at the same time arrived in Quebec not 2 hours behind us. The Dominion line, it is generally acknowledged, have as good and as fast steamers as the Allan line, and should have a chance to compete for the carrying of the mails. I was astonished to find on the other side that goods can be shipped from Liverpool by the New York lines at considerably less freight than by the Allan and Dominion lines. On my return here I enquired how it was Canadian lines would not carry goods as cheap as the New York lines, and was told that the Allan line fixed the rates, below which the others dare not cut. I shipped my goods by New York, at a freight one shilling and sixpence a ton less than by Montreal. Neither the Beaver nor the Dominion line dare cut below the rates fixed by the Allan line, or the Allan line would make them suffer for it. When a line exercises powers of that kind, to prevent fair and reasonable competition, it is not in the interests of the country that we should strengthen their hands. We should fairly consider the interests of the other lines, and if subsidies be given at all, stipulate for a rate of speed. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he is prepared to give information with regard to the speed of the Dominion and the Beaver Lines in 1884. We should fairly consider the claims of all parties. If the Allan line is exercising the power I believe they are exercising, of preventing other lines from competing in the matter of freight, they are driving commerce from our shores and diverting it to American ports, and we should not lend ourselves, by ratifying this contract, to any such course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In addition to the great length of time given to the Allan steamers, the penalty they incur is simply £100 for every 24 hours they are over time. They might be five days over time, and the forfeiture would still be less than the subsidy. The time allowed one

might consider a libel on the company; and yet if exceeded by five days, they would still not forfeit the entire subsidy for the voyage. A date should be put in the contract for accomplishing the voyage that would give the line a first-class standing as regards speed.

Mr. MULOCK. Should the company make default and become liable to penalty, and should the Government, under the provisions of section 30, have, at any time, to cancel the contract by reason of breaches of the contract, section 30 provides that in such event the Government are not entitled to collect any of the penalties.

Motion agreed to, Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. CARLING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 151), respecting Ocean Mail Service.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope before the hon. gentleman takes another stage, he will give us the information we require on this question. He gave us the number of days during a certain proportion of the summer voyages of this line, but we are anxious to know what the time was during the whole year. He might also give us the average rate of speed attained per hour during the voyages of this line as compared with that of the more modern vessels of the New York lines. I believe there is a difference of 2 or 3 knots per hour. The hon. gentleman said the time made was very good. It was good seven years ago, but times have changed, and we want to keep up with the times. Seven years ago, he says, you did not say there ought to be improvement. It was understood there was to be improvement, but it did not take place except in the case of the *Parisian* which has since been built. The hon. gentleman says that the service is satisfactory. In a sense it is; a few years ago we would have called it very satisfactory. There is a wonderful regularity in the arrivals, but I do say that the rate of speed is not what it ought to be. Greater expenditure has to be made in construction and fuel to attain the speed of the fast New York liners. If you except the *America*, which makes speedy journeys with comparatively small expenditure of fuel, more money is expended in fuel than formerly. This subsidy about provides the Allan Company with coal all the year round. It gives them motive power free; and with that positive and relative advantage that we give them, we ought to expect more than we get by this contract. We ought not to be satisfied with the assurance of the Government that they will see the company does more than the contract obliges them to do.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The schedules have been altered to meet the amendments made in the Bill, and I now move the adoption of the schedules, *seriatim*, which have been prepared by the Law Clerk.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are we not to have a reprint of the Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, before concurrence. On section 5,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This section stood over because I thought I could carry out my intention that for the electoral purposes the two cities St. Hyacinthe and Hull should be considered as towns in order to give them the franchise of towns instead of cities, in as much as it was ascertained that in those two places the value of property is more like that appertaining to towns than to cities. I

find I cannot do so here, but will move that specifically on concurrence.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman seems to have acquired new light since we discussed the different values in cities and towns and villages, but out of the large number of places in the same position, as regards the franchise, as St. Hyacinthe and Hull, he only selects those two. We all understand the hon. gentleman's reason for interfering with the cherished principle of uniformity in these two cases. They are cogent reasons. There are not the same reasons for excepting a town of 1,000 inhabitants, out of the category of towns, as there are for excepting a city of 10,000 inhabitants out of the category of cities. We will have an excellent opportunity of considering the hon. gentleman's principles of uniformity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have advanced, while the hon. gentleman exactly stands where he did. I have listened to every argument and every statement that seemed to be reasonable and amended the Bill, although I do not know that I have altogether improved it, by listening to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman was here but a very small portion of the time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was here all the time any arguments were used. I leave it to the hon. gentleman for South Perth if that is not so.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman promised to consider section 58. In case the first voters' list was not completed, the last provincial voters' list should be used. Provision ought to be made that, in case such list is not prepared, the list used should be that which would be in force if this Act had not been passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We might provide that, in the case of any election before the final revision and publication of the certificates of the first list provided for in this Act, the list of voters then legally existing should be used.

Mr. MILLS. There would be no legal list for local purposes under the new law. It would not be legally existing for the purposes of this Act. The provision should be that the list used should be the last which would have been in force if this Act had not passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is better. I move in amendment:

Provided that in the case of any election, before the final revision and publication of the certificate of the first list provided for in this Act, the list of voters that would have been used if this Act had not been passed, shall be used at such election.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BAIN. I think the First Minister stated that he proposed to place the tenants of property of sufficient value to qualify the owner, upon the first list, and I will ask when he proposes to do that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will do it when we go into concurrence. We will go back for that purpose.

On the preamble,

Mr. MULLOCK. Before the preamble is adopted, I wish to call attention to a circumstance which took place at an early stage of this Bill which, I think, involves your going back to a preceding clause. When we were considering paragraph 3 of clause 2, the definition of the term "tenant," on the 30th April, a number of amendments were moved to it. The amendments, as you will remember, were put to each paragraph, having been made from time to time in the proper order. A number of amendments were made to that paragraph, and just before six o'clock on that day the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) moved an amend-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ment, which was voted down. I also had an amendment to that paragraph, and I was waiting and watching carefully for an opportunity to move it, but as soon as the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford was voted down, the committee rose and the Speaker resumed the Chair and the House adjourned for recess. I was present in my seat after recess, waiting and watching without the slightest interruption to my watching until the Chairman took the Chair and opened the committee, with the view of moving my amendment to paragraph 3 of clause 2. Immediately that the Chairman took the Chair he began to read paragraph 4. I rose to move my amendment to paragraph 3, and without giving my own recollections of the remarks of that evening I will trouble you with referring to the record of it in *Hansard*. My reason for making these observations is this: That my impression is that you cannot adopt the preamble and report this Bill until paragraph 3 is declared carried. I do not propose to present an amendment now, nor to argue paragraph 3, nor do I suppose any other hon. gentleman does; but as a matter of regularity, paragraph 3, of clause 2 has never been submitted to the committee for the purpose of adoption, and if it is now submitted and declared carried, I have nothing further to say. If that course is not thought fit to be adopted then I will have to call the attention of the committee to the report of *Hansard* of the debate that arose on that occasion, and to see whether we can at this stage report this Bill without disposing of paragraph 3 of clause 2.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is, was the clause passed or was it not?

Mr. MULLOCK. Yes. I do not propose to discuss it at all, but I was ruled out of order at that time. I know perfectly well that the clause was not declared carried, because I was watching with all earnestness for an opportunity of putting in my amendment before six o'clock, and when the committee resumed after recess I know from my own observation that the paragraph was never carried and that it was passed over.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would remind my hon. friend that at that time we did not put paragraph by paragraph and declare each one carried, but they were called in turn and when discussion was finished we went on to another; but they were not each separately declared carried. But at the end of the clause, when all the paragraphs had been considered, the whole clause was declared carried. Two or three paragraphs were allowed to stand over, but they have since been gone into and adopted, and the whole clause as it stands now in the Bill has been put to the committee and declared carried.

Mr. MULLOCK. No, I beg your pardon. I have turned up the *Hansard*, and that is not the case.

Mr. DAWSON. I have turned up the *Hansard*, and at the end of the discussion on the whole clause 3 there is no declaration that the clause was put; there is nothing showing that it was carried at all. It was never carried as a whole clause, and was never submitted to the committee as such.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—it was done afterwards. Several paragraphs, relating to farmers' sons and others, were reserved and allowed to stand over to the end. The clause was not put to the committee until the last day, I think, of the discussion, but that it was so put I am certain, because I put my initials to the clause after it was put and declared carried.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The recollection of the Chairman is accurate. Instead of putting the whole clause, one paragraph was taken up after another, and we came to a sort of agreement and went on to the next paragraph without a formal vote being taken on each paragraph.

Some of the clauses about farmers and farmers' sons were allowed to stand over. At the last sitting we took them up again. I do not think the hon. member was here at the time. The whole clause, as amended, was put and carried.

Mr. MULOCK. Was that since the last discussion on the Indian question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was the very last time we sat.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it may have happened in my absence. If that had not occurred, I should not have felt that the paragraph had been put. At the same time I feel I have a grievance.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman propose to have the preamble put before section 53 has been adopted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I intend to carry it without that clause.

Mr. MILLS. That would scarcely be treating the committee fairly. We expected it to be submitted for consideration, and the hon. gentleman now proposes to carry through a Bill without making any provision in it for remunerating the officers whom it creates.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I intend to do that, if the House will allow me; and for this reason. The Act will not come into force until after 1st January. The House will meet in January. The judges I hope will in a great degree consent to serve as revising officers. I think so, and I have had a great many communications from them; and they will be satisfied with very small additions to their salaries. I do not propose, therefore, to proceed with the clause in question. I wish to see some of the judges and to settle as moderate a scale of remuneration as possible. That scale I will submit to Parliament at its next Session. This will be a much more economical mode than that of fixing a sum at this moment. I have my own ideas of what the amount should be; but I think it is desirable that we should have an opportunity before the Act will come into force of settling a scale of remuneration which will be moderate and at the same time satisfactory. A question may perhaps arise as to whether in case a revising officer is not a judge there should be any difference in the fee allowed. I do not think there ought to be. Judging from the number of applications that have come from members of the legal profession, on both sides of politics—and a good many have applied—there will be no difficulty in getting competent revising officers at very moderate rates indeed.

Mr. BLAKE. This seems to be a very extraordinary proceeding. The hon. gentleman the other day took the preliminary stage of the money clause, and since then he seems to have decided to abandon it. I hope the hon. gentleman's bargain with the judges of the land may turn out satisfactory, and turn out to be economical, and I trust that those independent suppliants for office who are pestering the hon. gentleman with applications—

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

Mr. BLAKE. I know they are pestering the hon. gentleman—will turn out as independent after they are appointed as they are at present.

Bill reported, with amendments.

#### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 139) to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. What real necessity is there for having two chief librarians with co-equal powers? The present condition of the Library calls for some improvement. Whoever may fill the office should endeavor to arrange the Library in such a way that persons may know what books are in stock. A short time ago I had occasion to deal with a certain subject, and I took from the catalogue a list of the books upon that subject which were supposed to be in the Library; and I found to my surprise on application to the librarian that about ten of the number—and though I will not say how many were on the list, I think there were about a dozen—were missing from the Library, and no trace of them could be found. From that circumstance I drew the inference that there has been no regular system of stock-taking and it is not known now what books are actually in the Library. The catalogue is entirely deceptive, and discloses a list of books which have been acquired, but which have gone astray from time to time. Now, I think that in every well regulated library there should be a time when there should be a careful examination of all the books which ought to be on hand, and enquiry made as to those that are missing. Such an enquiry might lead to the recovery of many of the books. I do not of course assume that those who take away these books do so intending any wrong, but we know that a great deal of latitude is allowed to persons entrusted with books, and it may be difficult for the librarian to keep track of them; but if he were to take stock, and find what books were missing, he could take steps to recover them, and as to those which he could not recover, the catalogue might be amended from time to time, and any such books as were missing, which were proper books to have in the first instance, might be replaced.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that the librarian should take care to see that books which are taken away are returned. I must say that for a number of years past the librarian has always taken care through his officers to see that books that are taken out of the library are returned. We know that members of Parliament have been called upon at different periods to return books which may have been kept by them for a longer time than was necessary, and then they are returned; but I know that years ago it was found that a number of books which were taken from the Library had disappeared, and upon finding that to be the case, I think the Committee on the Library adopted stringent rules in order that such a thing might not occur in the future. Though I am not a member of the Library Committee, I think that state of things has been remedied, and that now books which go out of the Library are always traced, and if kept too long, the person who has them is called upon to return them. The hon. gentleman recollects very well that at one time members of Parliament were allowed to give permission to others to have books from the Library, and these books were entered in the names of such members. This was a custom which also led to difficulties. When the books were not returned, the member in whose name they were entered was called upon to find them, and he would say that he never had the books, but as they were entered in his name, of course he was bound to see that the order was made good afterwards. I think that custom has ceased to a great extent now, and that books are given to members and not to others. If parties outside of members of Parliament want books, they are allowed to go to the Library under *surveillance* and read them, but not to carry them away. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that there should be a stock-taking of the books from time to time, and I have no doubt that the attention of the committee having been called to this matter, the librarians will see that this rule

should be followed,—that is to say, that from time to time there should be a sort of catalogue made. I think it would be a proper thing that these librarians should take care that stock should now be taken of all the books of the Library. Of course it will take some months, but we have to make a beginning some day or other, and it would be better now, that they may see what books are out and where they are, and if they cannot be traced the catalogue should be corrected accordingly, and more stringent rules adopted to prevent the recurrence of such abuses.

Mr. IVES. I would like to call the attention of the Ministry to the fact that the Library is notably deficient as a law library. It will hardly rank with any of the provincial libraries when, as it seems to me, from the amount of money expended upon it, it should take high rank as a law library. If it is to be of any special use to the Parliament of Canada, it is because it is a good library as a law library particularly. We have not so much occasion to study the sciences or light literature as to study constitutional law here, and it does seem to me that the new librarians ought to give their attention particularly to strengthening the library in those respects, which would make it more useful to the members of this House as members of a legislative body. I find that, comparing it with the law library of Montreal, it is far below it in rank. Now that should not be. I do not know so much of the Osgoode Hall library, but I fancy it is even further ahead of this library than the Montreal library is, and therefore, it seems to me, that if a little more money were spent on legal and semi-legal works, and less on works on light literature and subjects of that class, it would be more useful to us as a library.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will look at the backs of the books he will find which class are in most request. He will find that the works of light literature bear evident signs of much more careful and frequent use than the books bound in law calf of which he speaks.

Mr. IVES. There is nothing in them of use to legislators.

Mr. BLAKE. And I think, if the hon. gentleman was to dive into the recess wherein the librarians charges us with books borrowed, he will find that legislators do their share in taking out books from that portion of the library. Still, I do myself object to too many books of light literature being bought for the Library. On the other hand, I do not think the Library is specially a law library, as the hon. gentleman seems to view it. We did not pretend that it was to be more than an imperfect and rudimentary law library, until the establishment of the Supreme Court, since which time a large sum has been expended, simply in the view that we could not get along in the Supreme Court without a law library. We do not so much require, for ordinary legislative functions, a perfect and complete law library. We require those books which will be useful to us in the discharge of our legislative duties, but not the books which will be useful to us in the discharge of such professional duties as we may choose to combine with our legislative duties; and if it were not that the Supreme Court requires a great many law books, I should entirely dissent from the view that we should pay more for law books. There are a great many legal books that it is important that we should have. We deal with criminal law, and books on that subject are useful to us, as are books on commercial law. We deal to some extent, and I hope some day we will deal to a greater extent, with questions of international law, and we should have some books on that question. But I do not think we want all the text books and all the reports, simply for the discharge of our functions as legislators. How often are they quoted from, how often do they form the subject matter of hon. gentlemen's speeches, or how often do we have to resort to

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

them? But there is a vast mass of literature in which we are defective, and which should be useful to us. Our Library is not yet at all fully supplied with works relating to the early history of the North American continent, which the Library Committee a year or two ago made special efforts to obtain, and for which they got the assent of the Government to an appropriation. There are also a great many books that throw light on the federal constitution and on the growth and early struggles of the colonies both before and after the disruption between England and the United States, of which our Library ought to be much fuller than it is. I think it would be a great mistake to regard as necessary, except in connection with the Supreme Court, to keep members supplied with legal books beyond those that belong to the task of legislation. In the Parliamentary Library we have much more important gaps to fill up than this; but the librarians of the future will not have as much to do with this matter as the Library Committee, which has to direct the general policy of the library. I do not think we ought to entrust to the librarian the task of deciding the general allocation of the vote; its particular distribution will to a large extent devolve upon him; but its general distribution must devolve on the Library Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman in the principle he has laid down; but there is a great defect in the guardianship of the books of the library—in letting them out and collecting them again. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) said he found a list of ten books that were gone. That is a very large list to have disappeared in the experience of one hon. gentleman. My experience has been that there are a good many books which on enquiry were found to have disappeared, and there was nothing to show how they had disappeared or that anybody was chargeable with them. I do not know how that is to be avoided except by altering our practice, and making the Library a state library instead of a lending library so much as it is. The books are sent to everybody or almost everybody who can get a member to allow the use of his name, and there is no supervision and no means of getting these books back again unless you have a special officer to look after the parties. Members ought really to be chargeable with the cost of any book taken out in their name and not returned within a reasonable period. There is no objection in the world to allowing light literature to go out; but all works of really permanent value in literature, science or art, especially such books as encyclopedias, and scientific books which are very costly—

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think they are taken out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Many of them. At all events, you find you cannot get them when you want them sometimes. There ought to be a more rigid supervision in that regard. Then I think we ought to have a means of getting a more perfect catalogue. The present catalogue is not scientifically arranged. Perhaps I do not understand the method of utilising it, but I really cannot inform myself of the works on any given subject from looking at the catalogue.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad the hon. Minister of Public Works not only agrees with the suggestions I made, but goes further. These two officers are about to enter on their duties now, and there is no great profit in looking back and finding fault with the past, but I think we are entitled to start with a clean record for the future. I do not say that the books I referred to were lost, but the Library has got into such confusion that they could not be found. In proof of that I may mention that, in looking through the department for fiction and other light literature, I found a book which struck me as not being at home there, a medical book I think—"Gray's Anatomy." It was practically lost.

Mr. LAURIER. The difficulties now complained of have always existed and must always exist so long as this is a general library. Last year the Library Committee endeavored to stop this large circulation of the books, but they found that their order could not be carried out, and they had to rescind it. But the difficulties now existing, great as they are, cannot be lessened, and must be increased, if we adopt the system contemplated by the Act, of having a divided responsibility. If at present when we have only one responsible head for the management of the library difficulties exist, surely it must be admitted that when we have two heads instead of one it will be still more difficult to carry out the rules of the Library. No adequate reason has been given why we should have this double responsibility. These joint officers, wherever they exist, do not as a rule prove to be a success, except in very exceptional cases, and the reason is obvious. When there are two men at the head of a department, having equal power, it must be evident that they cannot exercise the same supervision over their subordinates as one supreme head. In the Province of Quebec these joint officers are pretty common on account of the double nationality of the population, and sometimes it is thought they are appointed for political reasons only. But in this case, I ask myself what reason is there why we should not continue on the old system? There is none. There is not even the question of nationality; for by keeping the present system and promoting Mr. DeCelles, there could be no objection on that score. Mr. DeCelles has proved himself to be a very efficient officer. For a long time the Library was administered under the leadership of the late Mr. Todd, assisted by Mr. Lajoie, the latter of whom was replaced by Mr. DeCelles. Now that a vacancy has occurred, there is no reason why Mr. DeCelles, if he is qualified, should not be promoted and his place filled by an English-speaking gentleman. Then, when a vacancy occurs, the assistant to the librarian will be eligible for promotion, and he will be replaced by a French-speaking gentleman so that there can be no difficulty raised under the present system as regards nationality.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me an outrage. This conjunction of two men in one office is a monstrosity; it reminds me of those fabulous animals, unicorns, griffins, etc.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know if I have the correct figures shewing the salaries of the various classes of officers, but the gross cost of the employes, according to those figures, amounts to a very alarming sum. There are two librarians at \$3,000 each—\$6,000; two first-class clerks who are receiving \$1,800 each—\$3,600; two second-class clerks, the minimum of whose salaries is \$1,100 to increase to \$1,400, say an average of \$1,250, or total \$2,500; two third-class clerks, salaries from \$400 to \$1,000, say \$700, or \$1,400; chief messenger, \$700; three messengers at \$400 each, \$1,200; total \$15,600. Some hon. gentlemen could tell us what is the cost of similar services at other public libraries. Take the parliamentary library of Ontario, the salary of the librarian is, I think, \$1,400 a year; no doubt, there are some attendants in that library. The salary of librarian at another public institution, at Toronto, where the number of books is over 40,000, is \$1,200 and he has only two attendants who get very small salaries, because they are in attendance in the institution in other capacities. The total salary is only \$1,400 for the management of a library of 40,000, yet here we are going to an expense of \$15,600 for the management of a library which does not contain more than 100,000 volumes. It is to be borne in mind that, with the exception of a special Session such as this, these officers are practically only in attendance three months of the year, for the remaining nine months they are not required. It must be possible to provide some more economical scheme.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has only given one side of the question. He speaks of the expenses, as he sees them, under the present arrangement, without reference to what will necessarily occur when a number of these officers will disappear, and on the other hand he takes only the figures of the new arrangement, without speaking of the figures as they are now. The salaries now paid to the officers and messengers amount to \$16,400, whilst, under the new arrangement, without reducing the present salaries of the present incumbents—because I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would ask us to reduce them—the total amount will be \$15,600 which would be \$800 less than the salaries paid for many years before. The hon. gentleman must see that whenever some of the officers disappear—for example, there is the house-keeper or the chief messenger; he has got up to \$900—his successor will have only \$700. That will be a saving of \$200. Then the messengers in the Library, which has been under the control of Parliament, managed directly by Parliament and not by the Government, have come up to \$700 each, whilst in the Departments, according to the rules of the service, their highest salary would be \$500. The successors of these men will not come in at \$500. They will come in, as in the Departments, at \$300; so that we have before us a number of reductions that must take place hereafter. Even should they remain, these salaries, under the new arrangement, will be less than under the present arrangement, and show a reduction; and the result of putting the officers and messengers of the Library under the Civil Service Act will save the members of the Library Committee, as well as of the House, the importunities of those officers and messengers to have their salaries increased. It is the same idea that has guided the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons in bringing, through Mr. Speaker, the other day, a report to put the officers of the Departments of Parliament under the same rule, that is to say under the Civil Service Act. Thus we will avoid all the importunities, if I may say so, or the applications of officers and servants of the House to have their salaries increased; they will be fixed once for all and increased according to law. In this case it is the same, and the hon. gentleman is quite in error if he thinks by this arrangement we are increasing the salaries. Far from it, the object of this is to reduce the expenses of the Library, but, as Parliament has always done, we do not want to reduce the salaries of the present incumbents, but to leave them with their present salaries, allowing the reductions to take place when the present officers disappear. The only increase we have made has been that, instead of having an assistant-librarian, he disappears, and instead of giving \$2,400 to that officer, we give each of the joint librarians \$3,000, while the previous librarian had \$1,200; so the increase is just \$400 on that account. There are some officers who must soon disappear; they are old, and are at the top of the list.

Mr. MULOCK. Which are those?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is one whose salary is \$1,800. He is an old officer, and before long he will disappear, and his successor will begin at, say, \$1,400.

Mr. VAIL. There is the superannuation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The policy of Parliament has been, instead of leaving an old officer, when he becomes unfit for service, to be paid his full salary, to give him a superannuation and bring in another officer at the minimum salary who was able to render good service as being more economical, and it was also considered proper that an officer, after twenty or twenty-five or thirty years in the service, should have a small pension to enable him to enjoy the rest of his life. I am sure the hon. gentleman would not desire to change that policy.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say that \$15,600 is not an unreasonable sum to pay for the management of the Library?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The measure the Government brought in, showed that they thought it was too much, because they propose a scale of salaries which, if we had to begin to-day, would reduce it very much. But the salaries have been fixed by the report of the Library Committee from year to year, and Parliament sanctioned them, and we have to accept the decision of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Public Works tells us he is in favor of reducing the cost of management of the Library, in illustration of that, he says that whereas at one time the salary of the librarian was \$3,200, we are reducing it to \$3,000. That is true, but he is duplicating the officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no assistant librarian now. We saved that salary.

Mr. MULOCK. You saved that office by creating a joint head at \$3,000 a year each. I am satisfied that there is a waste of public money in this branch of the service. See the number of clerks that you have—two librarians and seven other clerks, besides messengers, to look after this Library. It is an indefensible scheme.

On section 4,

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that this scheme is indefensible. I do not see why we should have a double head in the Library instead of one head. I have never heard any complaint against the management of the Library as it was formerly under Mr. Todd and Mr. Lajoie, and afterwards under Mr. DeCelles. What reason is there to go back on that? I am in favor of reform, but this change cannot be called reform. If there had been any defect, if the Parliamentary Committee had suggested the change, or if any complaint had been made in regard to the management of the Library, that might be a reason for making the change. The Minister of Public Works said the scheme contemplated a decrease in the expense, but all the decreases which are contemplated are contingent on the death or the removal of the actual incumbents, while the increase will at once commence from the appointment of the joint librarian. The decreases are all contingent. Take the chief messenger. He is paid \$900 a year. It is proposed that in future he shall be paid only \$700, when the present incumbent is replaced, but, as long as he remains, he shall receive his present salary. I do not complain of that salary. The present chief messenger is a most efficient officer and earns his salary, but all these decreases are simply contingent and are not to take place immediately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot kill these officers off.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not desire that you should, but the Government have no reason to boast of their economy on this account. I give them credit for their good motive to economise in the future, but they cannot boast of any actual economy now. On the contrary, in practice, they are making not a decrease but an increase. We have two officers at \$3,000 a year each, when we had one at \$3,200. These officers are not to remain forever, the most of them are young. Why, should we go into this present legislation? I see no good reason for it at all.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Public Works refers to the good intentions of the Government. Well, we have heard of the highway to a certain place which is paved with good intentions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has referred to the subject of the economy that will be effected in the future, Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

but this is an extraordinary way of securing it. Take, for instance, the messengers. Many of these messengers are under 30 years of age, and the hon. gentleman is basing his hope of economy upon the early death of these men who are at present engaged as messengers in the Library Department. I remember very well when it was proposed to pay those messengers the present salaries, and it was thought the employment of intelligent men, men of more than the intelligence of ordinary messengers, would be a source of economy instead of expense to the country, because when they were not actually engaged in the ordinary work of messengers they could, to some extent, discharge the duties of clerks. Take, for instance, Mr. Casault. The hon. gentleman will not say that he is not worth the salary he is receiving, and why? Not because it is worth that sum to discharge the ordinary work of a messenger, but because he is really an efficient clerk; he is well acquainted with the Library. There is no one, perhaps, in the Library at this moment who can more readily give you the information you require or the volume you wish to consult than Mr. Casault. Now, if that be the case, where would be the advantage in superseding a man like Mr. Casault with a man engaged in running messages and doing nothing else? You would have to get another clerk. You would have to have a clerk and messenger both to pay. The whole question was considered by the Library Committee when the former Act was prepared. I was at that time a member of the committee, and I remember very well the discussion that took place, and it was supposed that an economy would be effected by the employment of intelligent messengers who could, a portion of their time, discharge the duty of clerks. Well, Sir, the men are engaged in doing that work at this moment; I do not know whether every man who is acting as messenger at the present time, is also performing the duties of clerk, because I do not know exactly what kind of men the Government have appointed. But I know what the men were at the time the former Act was prepared, and I remember why the salaries of those men were fixed at the maximum, at a higher maximum than the salaries of ordinary messengers. The hon. gentleman knows right well that the members have not been efficiently served this Session. I do not blame the Library Committee or the staff as at present constituted. A very considerable number of them have been away, and the Government have thought it necessary or right and proper that one important clerk in the Library should go upon military duty instead of attending to the duties of his office here. But, Sir, the whole feature of this Bill is this: The Government are anxious, not to economise, not to fix the salaries of the messengers and clerks at a lower rate than they now receive, but they are anxious to provide for a party who is not in the Library at the present time, to give him a position in the Library, and put him upon a footing with Mr. DeCelles, and in order to do so, this legislation is proposed. We have the time of Parliament taken up unnecessarily, we have a discussion of this Bill instead of having a discussion of the Estimates. We are discussing here how to provide for a friend and supporter of the Government instead of considering how we are to provide for the public necessity, and how we are to deal with those important questions which the Government have so seriously mismanaged in the North-West Territories. I say, Mr. Chairman, that Ministers are wasting the public resources, they are wasting the time of Parliament, and we are keeping the House unnecessarily in session, the Government are unnecessarily prolonging the Session by bringing forward measures in order to provide for their friends out of the public Treasury, and that, too, at a time when the public are threatened with a very serious deficit. I do not know what the condition of things may be, but it is rumored

that the Government will have difficulty in providing for the public necessities at the present time. We shall know more about that in a few days; yet we have our time and the time of the country taken up with a scheme to provide for a political friend of the Government whom they are going to pension on the public service. He is found, perhaps, inefficient where he is, his usefulness is gone, he can no longer be of service to the Administration where he is, and it is necessary, in order to get rid of him from an influential journal, that he should be pensioned upon the public and put in a position where he can be equally well compensated, perhaps, without doing the party which he serves any detriment and without doing the public any good. We are certainly injured to the extent of having a useless officer pensioned upon the public Treasury by the provisions of this Bill, and we have the time of Parliament wasted upon this subject, instead of being devoted to the consideration of matters of public importance.

Bill reported, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

**After Recess.**

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

Mr. LAURIER moved in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred to Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same so as to avoid the inconvenience and expense of the office of Librarian of Parliament being held by two heads, as is proposed by the Bill, and to provide that the said office shall continue to be held by one person only.

House divided on amendment.

YEAS :  
Messieurs

- |                      |             |                      |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Allen,               | Forbes,     | McMullen,            |
| Armstrong,           | Geoffrion,  | Mills,               |
| Bernier,             | Gillmor,    | Mulock,              |
| Blake,               | Guay,       | Paterson (Brant),    |
| Bourassa,            | Gunn,       | Platt,               |
| Burpee,              | Harley,     | Ray,                 |
| Cameron (Huron),     | Innes,      | Rinfret,             |
| Cameron (Middlesex), | Irvine,     | Somerville (Brant),  |
| Cartwright,          | King,       | Somerville (Bruce),  |
| Casey,               | Landerkin,  | Springer,            |
| Casgrain,            | Langelier,  | Sutherland (Oxford), |
| Catudal,             | Laurier,    | Trow,                |
| Charlton,            | Lister,     | Vail,                |
| Davies,              | Livingston, | Watson,              |
| De St. Georges,      | McCraney,   | Weldon,              |
| Edgar,               | McIntyre,   | Wilson,              |
| Fleming,             | McIsaac,    | Yeo.—51.             |

NAYS :  
Messieurs

- |                           |                       |                        |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Pain (Soulanges),         | Ferguson (Welland),   | McDougald (Pictou),    |
| Beaugu,                   | Fortin,               | McDougald (C. Breton), |
| Blondeau,                 | Gigault,              | McLelan,               |
| Bowell,                   | Girouard,             | Moffat,                |
| Cameron (Inverness),      | Gordon,               | Paint,                 |
| Cameron (Victoria),       | Guilbault,            | Pinsonneault,          |
| Carling,                  | Guillet,              | Pope,                  |
| Colby,                    | Hackett,              | Robertson (Hamilton),  |
| Costigan,                 | Hall,                 | Robertson (Hastings),  |
| Coughlin,                 | Hesson,               | Royal,                 |
| Coursol,                  | Hickey,               | Small,                 |
| Curran,                   | Homer,                | Smyth,                 |
| Daly,                     | Ives,                 | Sproule,               |
| Dawson,                   | Jamieson,             | Taschereau,            |
| Desaulniers (Maskingé),   | Jenkins,              | Temple,                |
| Desaulniers (St. M'rice), | Kilvert,              | Tupper,                |
| Dickinson,                | Langevin,             | Wallace (Albert),      |
| Dodd,                     | Lesage,               | Wallace (York),        |
| Dugas,                    | Macdonald (King),     | White (Cawell),        |
| Dupont,                   | Macdonald (Sir John), | White (Hastings),      |
| Farrow,                   | Mackintosh,           | Wright.—65.            |
| Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)  | McCallum,             |                        |

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time on the same division reversed.

**SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.**

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Charges of management..... \$168,709.50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A promise was given that some further explanations would be made with respect to a certain sum payable to our financial commissioner in England, Sir John Rose. I am sorry to observe that in spite of the enormous sum hereafter to be paid to sinking fund, apparently the sum in our Estimates is going to be very largely increased. If I understand rightly, probably \$200,000 or \$300,000 more will be spent in connection with sinking fund than was estimated for. I observe on the preceding page that the nominal amount estimated for sinking fund is \$1,097,000. Now, that excepts the ½ per cent. which was due on the consolidated 5 per cent. Canadian loan, and that apparently, from the terms of the renewal, will almost all be paid in future; at any rate, the sum of about \$125,000 will be paid on that account; and I presume that on the loan which is now being effected, whether it be for four millions or six millions sterling, it will be the intention of the Government to pay a similar sum, so that in reality the sum total to be paid on sinking fund will probably amount to \$1,372,000 in place of \$1,097,000, being an increase of \$275,000. The Minister of Customs can no doubt inform us if I am correct with reference to this, and can also inform us more particularly what was the cause of the increase of \$2,000 on redemption of Dominion notes. The amount of these notes does not appear to have increased at all, although the charge has increased considerably. I think, too, that some further information was promised about the increase in respect to the sum of \$20,000, which is now demanded on account of contingencies of country savings banks. Those have not, so far as I am aware, increased materially in number, nor is there any reasonable ground for the increased expenditure within the past year.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no recollection at the present moment that any further explanation was promised in regard to the amount to be paid under the head of management in England. It was fully explained, when that item was before the committee, that it was to pay Sir John Rose for services rendered in connection with the different loans, extending over a number of years. Since that period I have heard no further explanation with reference to that sum, nor am I in a position to give further explanation. With reference to the supposed increase in sinking fund arising out of the new loan, I can inform the House and the hon. gentleman that the Finance Minister has adopted the principle which has been followed by many other colonies in putting their loans upon the market. The new 4 per cent. loan does not provide for a sinking fund, and consequently the amount which we anticipated would be added to the annual amount required to provide for sinking fund, will not, under present circumstances, be asked. The increase under the head of savings banks was fully explained when we were in committee. It arose from the fact of the establishment of some additional savings banks in the different Provinces, and to provide for the increases which are given to the different savings banks' agents, either by commission or salary arising from the much larger deposits and the consequently larger amount of work they have to perform. These are the explanations which were given when the House was in committee, with the exception of that in relation to sinking fund, and that is a principle which the hon. gentleman himself advocated on a previous occasion. He thought the time had arrived when Canada should place her loans on the market of England without providing for sinking funds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear that the new loan is to be established without sinking fund, for,

as I have frequently stated, I have regarded the sinking fund as out of proportion to the requirements of the country, and therefore, if the Minister is certain that it is to be discontinued, I am exceedingly glad to hear it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it is so with regard to the new loan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister of Customs has either omitted an explanation, or is not correct as to the renewal of the £5,000,000 sterling of the 5 per cent's. There sinking funds is distinctly promised; I examined the advertisement myself. That would make an addition of \$125,000 to the present charge for sinking fund, apparently.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I think that is provided for under the statute which authorises the loan to be made, and consequently, in the redemption of the debt, and not in the exchange in the 5 for the 4 per cent's., the same principle is provided for. I did not refer to that, however, in my first explanation, which related exclusively to the new loan. As to that, it is quite certain, as the leader of the Government has stated, that the sinking fund will not have to be provided for; that is the plain statement of the telegram which the Finance Minister cabled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the period for which the new loan is to run?

Mr. BOWELL. The information we have in reference to the term of the loan is that it is for 50 years, with the option of redemption at the end of 25 years, and that it is placed on the market at a minimum of 99.

Department of Postmaster General..... \$161,620

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there were some details which the Postmaster General reserved. I think they were with reference to the increase in the secretary's office and the money order office.

Mr. CARLING. It was necessary to have three additional third-class clerks in the money order office on account of the increased business of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of the increase?

Mr. CARLING. It is in the establishment of new offices in the different parts of the Dominion. I cannot tell the exact number at this moment. If there is any particular point on which the hon. gentleman wants information, I would be glad to give it to him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister was asked to give us some particulars on the increase within the last year or two. He pointed out at the time, I recollect, that there had been, as we all knew, a great increase in the last seven or eight years; but we wanted information in more detail. I know that such a long time has elapsed that the matter may have dropped from his memory; that is the inconvenience of considering these items with four months between.

The Department of Interior..... \$110,705

Mr. MILLS. I find that in 1878 this Department, including the Indian Branch, cost only \$42,760, while at present they both cost \$175,000, including \$30,000 charged to capital account for the expenses of the Department of the Interior. That of itself is a rather unusual proceeding; for if the business of the Department has grown to such an extent as to require this large expenditure, I am unable to see why \$30,000 should be charged to capital account instead of to the ordinary expenses of the Department. The hon. gentleman stated, when this item was last under discussion, that formerly a large amount went to contingencies, and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that this accounted for the difference; but the contingencies are greater now than they were then. I have mentioned that there have been periods in the history of the Illinois Central Railway when the sale of lands exceeded those of the entire Department of Interior; yet we find this Department has increased, including the Indian Branch, which was formerly a part of the Department, from \$42,760 to \$175,500.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a great difference between 1878 and 1885 in the progress of the country.

Mr. MILLS. Of course.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the Department of the Interior, last year, the amount was \$67,050. It is now \$69,305. One clerk more, a second-class clerk, apparently, and the statutory increase will make that up. In the Geological Survey Branch the salaries last year were \$32,834; they are now \$33,800. That is apparently made up altogether of statutory increases. In the North-West Mounted Police there is a statutory increase as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point which was referred to: the fact that the inside service in Ottawa absorbed the further sum of \$30,000, making an annual total charge of about \$100,000, the only difference being, this is placed on page 12 and the inside service is placed on page 108. It is clearly inside service, and ought to be put under this head.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These are extra clerks, brought in temporarily. The number of draughtsmen is increased or diminished according to the work of preparing the maps, township maps and large maps and topographical maps of every kind. This sum is for publishing maps, which are issued very largely, and these men are paid for their time; and then there is the cost of publication, and the printing and advertising, and other similar expenses, in all making an estimate of \$30,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, but the point my hon. friend was making, and to which I called the attention of the hon. gentleman is, that where you are taking votes for the inside service, whether you put them under the Department of the Interior or under the head of contingencies of the Department of the Interior, they ought to be put in one place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They ought.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see that they have any business to come in at the end here. It is confusing and misleading, too, because, I think, in the time of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), these identical expenses were charged either to his contingencies or to the general service of the Department, so that, for the purpose of comparison, the item ought to appear under one or the other of these heads.

Mr. MILLS. These items were formerly charged against the contingencies of the Department, when they were unforeseen and no special vote was taken. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman had a charge of this sort last year or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, there was.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know when the system began, but this is misleading; it represents the expenditure of the Department as far less than it really is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although in one regard, in the point of view stated by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), it might be well that all the charges for the inside services should appear on the same page, there is some reason, and perhaps a good reason, why the Department has placed this where it is, because the extra clerks at the head office are all for the special

purpose of preparing the maps and plans affecting the Dominion lands, and this is a charge which should go against Dominion lands. All the sales, leases, timber limits, and so on, are credited to Dominion lands, and all those charges, which are directly for the purpose of putting those lands into the market, are put on the other side of the account, and that is why they are put here. It may be a question whether it would not be better to put this item with the other charges of the Department; but, on reflection, one will see that this sum, being a distinct expense arising out of the preparation necessary in offering Dominion lands for sale, ought to appear on this sheet. It might be repeated and shown in both places, but certainly it is very germane to this account.

Mr. MILLS. So are all the expenses of the Department of the Interior. They are the necessary outcome of the management of the public lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; because the Dominion lands mean really Dominion lands of the North-West, and that Department has a large business to attend to besides the Dominion lands in the North-West.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I do not know where the large business is; the ordnance lands, for instance, form a very small part of the cost of the Department of the Interior. The management of that branch is not very large now, and need not be as large as it is. In regard to the management of the Indian lands, outside of the North-West, they are not charged to this at all, but against the Department of Indian Affairs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This \$30,000 does not apply to the Indian lands at all.

Mr. MILLS. All the expenditure in the preparation of patents and in the reports of surveys, and all the work done in the Department of the Interior, is a necessary incident of the management of the public lands of the North-West Territory and Manitoba, and there is no more reason why the preparation of these particular maps should be charged in this way than any other matters connected with the business. The expenditure of the Department is \$30,000 more than it appears to be under the head of Civil Government, and it is certainly misleading in that particular.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate.....\$57,288

Mr. MILLS. I am not aware that the Senate has had any particular employment this Session. In fact, I understand that their time has been principally taken up in moving adjournments from day to day, because they have had nothing to do, and I think we are entitled to some explanation from the Government as to why a vote should be given at all. What is this vote for? Burying the dead?

Mr. BOWELL. They are waiting for the Franchise Bill.

Publishing *Debates*, House of Commons.....\$47,100

Mr. BOWELL. The estimate of last year was supposed to be sufficient to cover the cost, but I do not think it will.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think that the vote of money last year, for publishing the *Debates* for the current year, will be sufficient, on account of the lengthy debates we have had. I suppose the Acting Minister of Finance will have to bring down a supplementary estimate, in order to meet the extra expense. I think the amount is \$10,000 more than was voted in 1884-85; that may be based on the probable expense of this year.

Mr. BOWELL. There was a promise made, I think, that some further explanation should be made in reference to the \$10,000 to which the hon. gentleman refers. I am furnished this statement by the clerk of the Printing Committee. He says:

"The increased estimate is required because, first, the distribution is considerably increased and demands are made authorised by the House; second, from the very large addition of documents of public interest to be printed, and from the increased number of blue books, etc."

This has as much reference, however, to the general printing account as to the *Debates*.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Several members of the House object entirely to maintaining the *Hansard* in its present form. It is very cumbersome and certainly very expensive. There is a strong feeling in regard to it, and I would ask the hon. Minister to allow this item to stand over, since a great many members are absent to-night.

Mr. MILLS. Let the absent men speak for themselves.  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let the item stand.

New militia pensions ..... \$4,457

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this item is carried I think it would be a proper time for the First Minister to state to the House what the intentions of the Government are with respect to those unfortunate persons who have been deprived of their natural protectors in the trouble in the North-West. That matter has been brought to the attention of the Government on several occasions, and they have expressed their intention to deal with it. I think this would be a proper time for the First Minister to inform us what scale of allowances the Government propose to make to the widows and children of our men who have been killed in putting down the rebellion in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government intend, of course, to take care of those who have been bereaved of their natural protectors during the outbreak. The pensions of relief would be at least as generous as they were on previous occasions—perhaps not on the same principle; but that will be laid before the House in a few days by the Minister of Militia, when the attention of the House will be called to the necessity of pensioning the widows and children of those who have fallen in fighting the battles of their country, on at least as liberal a scale as was adopted in regard to the persons who are mentioned in the items now before the House. The Government will take occasion at the same time to call attention to the conduct of our brave defenders, from the General downwards; and perhaps the attention of the House will be called to the necessity of showing a special mark of gratitude on behalf of the people of Canada to the conduct of our citizen soldiery in the North-West.

Pensions to veterans of War of 1812.....\$13,950

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister of Militia promised that when this item came up for concurrence he would give us a list of those who had received pensions last year, and the counties from which they came, in order that members representing those counties might have some idea of the correctness of the list.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry to say that my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia, being unwell, could not attend the House this evening, but I will take note of what the hon. gentleman says, and I have no doubt the Minister of Militia will bring down the information before the next stage of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. It will be seen that none of these people can be under 90 years of age, and the Government are paying them but \$30 each, and as it requires \$14,000 to pay pensions to the survivors of a small band in the first instance, none of whom can now be under 90 years of age, it does seem rather an extraordinary vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to the payment of these pensions, it is a question whether there may not be frauds existing somewhat similar to those that have been

unearthed in the United States within the last year, where it was found that pensions were being paid to people who were dead. It seems extraordinary that so large an amount of money should be required to pay pensions for that war, when the numbers were so few in the first instance. I think the Government should make a rigid investigation in regard to this matter, for I am inclined to think there are frauds.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are regular returns to show how this money is distributed, and the Department, no doubt, will be able to show a proper voucher for each of these sums. If the hon. gentleman wants to know how long men live who are pensioned, he has only to look back to item 40, and he will see that John Bright was a messenger of the House of Assembly under the old régime of Lower Canada, previous to 1837.

Mr. HICKEY. I can call to mind four claimants residing within five miles of my place. One of them, about 100 years old, walked four miles recently to get his certificate.

Mr. VAIL. Among the number paid last year there were several whose ages were between 81 and 89. It is quite impossible that they could have served in the war—they were boys at the time. No doubt amounts are improperly paid.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No one would desire that any one entitled to the amount should not be on the list. It is not a question of mere money consideration, but the list is a roll of honor. If people are placed on the list who are not entitled to be there, it is taking away from the honor of those who are fairly entitled to it. The amount does not fairly divide up, for it gives 464½ persons. The Minister should obtain a list, showing the counties from which these recipients of the amount come.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt the Minister of Militia will take care to ascertain more accurately than has been the case whether all those men are entitled to the pension.

Expenses, Antwerp and Colonial Exhibition,	
1886.....	\$40,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister of Agriculture promised us some further information with respect to these exhibitions.

Mr. POPE. My information is that the exhibition at Antwerp is a success, so far as it goes. It is not so large, and it was not expected to be so large, as will be the exhibition to be held in London. A large amount of material has been sent abroad, and the accounts go to show that the exhibition is a very fair one. It was an exhibition covering all departments. Everything sent over, it is understood, will be also sent to the London Exhibition.

Expenses in connection with Health Statistics.....	\$15,000
--	----------

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister promised us some detailed information with respect to the proposed distribution of money for the collection of health statistics.

Mr. POPE. With respect to the collection of the health statistics, as I explained in committee, these statistics have been collected in, I think, eleven of the principal cities of Canada, and now it is proposed to extend the system to as many towns, having a population of 5,000 and over, as choose to avail themselves of it. These statistics for 1884 have been completed, and I hope we will be able to get them out monthly after the 1st of July—not perhaps during the month, but those for each month in the following month.

Mr. WILSON. I think the Minister also gave us to understand that he was considering the advisability of col-  
Mr. CHARLTON.

lecting these statistics in rural sections, perhaps by utilising the township boards of health. We have been waiting for him to explain also the machinery by which he collects these statistics. I think it will be only fair that rural sections as well as the cities and towns should have the benefit of the collection of these statistics.

Mr. POPE. I thought I had explained all that in committee. I said that the parties who were engaged in collecting those statistics were those appointed by the local authorities, whom we made our officers for this purpose. As to the larger question of collecting these statistics in rural districts, that would involve the expenditure of a good deal more money—more, perhaps, than the House would be willing to give me, and, at all events, I would like to work my way to it gradually.

Mr. WILSON. Would the Minister explain the results of last year's work? As to the expense of collecting in rural districts, in Ontario, at all events, he could utilise the township boards of health very easily. If he would explain the results of his system for the past year we might be in a better position to give him the increased amount for the present year.

Mr. POPE. I am not asking an increased amount.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; but the hon. gentleman says that he only expended a small portion of the vote for last year, and that he expects to expend a large sum this year.

Mr. VAIL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us if he intends to enlarge the scope of his enquiries, as there is to be so much more money spent.

Mr. POPE. It is the same vote.

Mr. VAIL. Yes; but only a comparatively small portion of it was spent last year.

Mr. POPE. As I said, it is intended to extend the system to towns having a population of 5,000 or more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that the hon. gentleman paid a certain amount of this to some sanitary journal, and he promised some information as to the amount paid, the distribution of the journal, etc.

Mr. POPE. There is paid to a sanitary journal in Ontario, for Ontario and the Dominion generally, \$600, and to a French journal \$400, and a large number of these journals are circulated over the country, in consideration of their getting these amounts.

Mr. WILSON. What becomes of these journals, who receives them and what is the object of their distribution? I should like to ask, also, what information he intends to publish in these monthly reports.

Mr. POPE. Diseases.

Mr. WILSON. We have diseases enough; we do not want reports of diseases.

Mr. MILLS. I think we ought to have some further details. I think the hon. gentleman spoke about aiding Mr. Playter's sanitary journal in Toronto and one in Montreal. I suppose there are none of these journals circulated in consequence of what the Minister gives; I suppose the money is only a contribution towards supporting the publications. I do not understand the Minister to say that they shall be sent to any particular party.

Mr. POPE. Yes; they are sent to all the medical men who are interested in this matter, and to different institutions.

Mr. MILLS. Then, are we to understand that the medical men have these journals free of charge—those who are members of the sanitary board?

Mr. POPE. As far as they go.

Mr. MILLS. There must be other parties receiving them.

Mr. POPE. There are.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman know who they are?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say now. I can get the names.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, we may be mistaken, and the hon. gentleman may be mistaken. It may be that the Government are giving support to a publication that would not otherwise be sustained.

Mr. WILSON. If these journals are \$1 a year, there are 25 of those officers in different parts of the Dominion, which would be \$25. We should like to know what has become of the rest, \$575. Who has the distribution of it, and where does it go? We certainly should not be asked to vote that sum of money without receiving some information as to what is done with it.

### CANNED GOODS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 142) respecting Canned Goods.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to amend the second section by striking out the words "packed in Canada." These words were inserted during the discussion that took place while I was absent, with the view of giving facilities to our manufacturers to export their goods; but the addition of these words would have the effect of confining the operation of this Act to Canadian packers, allowing the same class of goods to come in from foreign markets to compete with them, without the restrictions of the Act, which, of course, was not the intention. I wish also to amend the third sub-section by adding, after the word "shall," in the second line, the words, "on summary conviction before a justice of the peace."

Mr. MILLS. I suppose these words are intended to be sufficient to enable a party to prosecute before a justice of the peace by summary process.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I insert them on the advice of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think they will be sufficient, without something else, to compel the party to bring a *qui tam* action.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

### OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 123) respecting Offences against the Person. He said: This Bill is an addition to the Act 32 and 33 Victoria, chap. 20, and provides that any person who, by false pretenses, false representations, or other fraudulent means,

"(a) Procures any woman or girl, under the age of twenty-one years; to have illicit carnal connection with any man other than the procurer; or

"(b) Inveigles or entices any such woman or girl to a house of ill-fame or assignation, for the purpose of illicit intercourse or prostitution, or who knowingly conceals in such house any such woman or girl so inveigled or enticed;

"Is guilty of a misdemeanor, and is liable to two years' imprisonment."

The second clause provides that, when there is reason to believe that any such woman or girl is concealed in any such house, she can be taken from the house on a warrant and restored to the custody of her lawful guardians.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the Secretary of State to explain why the punishment should be inflicted in the case of a person who procures the ruin of a girl and is not himself the person who has connection with her, while no

provision is made for punishing the seducer himself. It strikes me that the law comes very far short of what it should provide for, because, in the majority of cases, the ruin of the girl is due to the seducer himself, and not to the procurer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have moved the second reading of the Bill as it comes from the Senate. I think my hon. friend has already spoken upon the question of the seducer, and the sense of the House has already been taken upon it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; and the sense of the House in each case has been that it is a crime to seduce a girl. This law provides that it is a crime to act the base part of a procurer, but I think we had better amend it, by providing a punishment for the man who seduces a girl.

Mr. SPEAKER. That will come in the committee.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON moved that a sub-section, to be numbered (c), be added to section 50, as follows:—

Who seduces a girl under twenty-one years of age.

Amendment negatived. Yeas, 24; nays, 43.

Mr. WELDON. I would call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that sub-section (a) provides that anyone who procures any woman or girl to have carnal connection with any man other than the procurer shall be guilty, and the Interpretation Act provides that the context must be taken to show the meaning, and that it is therefore very questionable, if the procurer was a woman, whether any conviction could be obtained.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I believe the wording would cover both.

Mr. WELDON. The context would make it mean otherwise.

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. CHARLTON moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by adding to clause 50, as sub-section (c) the words, "who seduces a woman under 21 years of age."

House divided on amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,  
Armstrong,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Blake,  
Bourassa,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
Charlton,  
Davies,  
Edgar,  
Fairbank,  
Farrow,  
Fisher,  
Fleming,  
Forbes,

Foster,  
Gillmor,  
Guay,  
Guillet,  
Gunn,  
Harley,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
Ives,  
King,  
Kinney,  
Kirk,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingston,  
McCrane,  
McIntyre,  
McIsaac,

Mills,  
Mulock,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Rinfret,  
Scriver,  
Shakespeare,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wells,  
Wilson,  
Yeo.—58.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Beaty,  
Bergeron,

Gagné,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Guilbault,

Massue,  
Mitchell,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,

Bergin,	Hackett,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Pope,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Ray,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Robertson (Hastings),
Carling,	Jamieson,	Ross,
Chapleau,	Jenkins,	Small,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Smyth,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Stairs,
Curran,	Lesage,	Taylor,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Temple,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudrenil),	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	McDougald (Pieton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.),	McLellan,	Woodworth,
Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,	Wright.—72.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was greeted with some hearty cheers on my late vote. I am particularly anxious that this Bill should pass, and therefore that it should not be sent back to the Senate. A motion similar to the motion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk was made last year, and the Bill was sent to the Senate and met with no favor there. I fear the consequences of sending this Bill to the Senate at the present time would be that we would hear no more about it.

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### THE LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 134) respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move the adoption of the first clause. I gave notice of some additions to this Bill, but on reflection I will not press them.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman had agreed, on a former occasion, to put in the words, "is hereby suspended." It seems to me that it is important to make some further provision than is made here. I think the proper thing would be to suspend so much of the Act as is declared *ultra vires* to a fixed period after the decision of the Privy Council. The present arrangements render it uncertain as to what the decisions are to be with reference to those cases in which licenses may not have been obtained under this Act for the current license year. I think that even to the extent to which, if at all, any portion of the Act becomes revived, so to speak, by the decision of the Privy Council, it should come into operation from the commencement of the next license year thereafter—or, rather, not the license year so much as the next period at which the preliminary space for the issue of licenses was to commence. The hon. gentleman will observe that otherwise very considerable confusion would result. Just suppose, for example, that there should be a decision of the Privy Council in November next, declaring that certain portions of the Act which had been declared *ultra vires* of this Legislature were *intra vires*; the Act would revive at once for a brief space, and those persons who had not received a license under its operation would be without a license for a brief period of the license year. It seems to me that the proper course, therefore, is not to suspend the operation until the arrival of the first period thereafter for the commencement of taking proceedings for getting a license under the Act. Then the hon. gentleman also promised to amend this Bill at this stage by introducing in the schedule that portion of the opinion of the Supreme Court which we are in fact legislating upon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true; I really forgot that. I do not think it would be well to alter Mr. CHARLTON.

the clause, which is, in fact, the resolution solemnly adopted by this House. When the licenses have expired, no licenses will be issued until after Parliament meets again. I do not think there will be any difficulty about that; but I do remember now that the hon. gentleman suggested—and I thought it was a very proper suggestion—that the decision of the Supreme Court should be added, by way of schedule. However, in the meantime we might make it read thus: "Is and shall be suspended unless and until."

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### INSURANCE BILL.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 20) to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act of 1877, be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for further consideration. He said: A short discussion took place as to the propriety of expunging clause 7 from the Bill. Other suggestions have been made, including some modifications; and after consulting those who hold different opinions on this question: first, those who look upon the clause as a direct interference with provincial rights, and those who hold a contrary opinion, it is thought better not to expunge the clause, but to amend it as follows:—"No policy or certificate shall contain or have entered upon it any condition providing that such policy or certificate shall be avoided by any statement contained in the application therefor being untrue, except in cases in which such statement is material to the contract." The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) also desires, in committee, to move an amendment, which will make it clear that clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7 do not apply to the societies mentioned in clause 10.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL moved that the clause shall read as follows:

No policy or certificate shall contain or have endorsed upon it any condition providing that such policy or certificate shall be avoided by reason of any statement contained in the application being untrue, unless such condition is limited to cases in which such statement is material to the contract.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOWELL moved the insertion of the words "or registered," after the word "licensed," in the 19th line.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6,

Mr. MULOCK moved that the clause be amended by inserting, after the word "company," in the 2nd line, the following words: "Not being a company, society or association as is referred to in clause 11 of this Act." Clause 11 being clause 10 in Bill as reprinted, as amended and reported by the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. IVES moved that the following be added as the 12th clause of the Bill:—

1st. In every policy issued by a foreign company licensed under this Act in favor of a resident of Canada, a clause shall be either embodied therein or endorsed thereon, to the effect that an action to enforce the obligation of said policy may be validly taken in any court of competent jurisdiction in the Province wherein said policyholder resides or last resided before his decease.

Mr. WELLS. The House, by making the language of the 6th section negative in form, rather than affirmative, sought to give Parliament jurisdiction in a matter in which it was conceded they had none, but by this amendment they are directly going in

the teeth of the case of *Parsons vs. The Queen*, as it was decided, at all events, by the Ontario Court of Appeal. Mr. Bourinot has stated the law in these words:

"Policies of insurance being mere contracts of indemnity against loss by fire, and like any other personal contracts between parties, governed by local or provincial laws, the Provincial Legislature has the power to regulate the legal incidents of contracts to be enforced within its courts, and to prescribe the terms upon which the corporations, either foreign or domestic, shall be permitted to transact business within the limits of the Province—the power being given to Local Legislatures by the constitution to legislate over civil rights and property."

If this House has thought fit to give jurisdiction to itself by that alteration in section 6, it certainly is going too far by framing a contract in the section now submitted. Sub-section 8 of section 5 declares also what shall be one of the conditions of the contract; in other words, it expressly makes a contract for the parties, a thing which I am sure this Legislature has no power to do.

Mr. IVES. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that this amendment was framed to meet the very objection he raised. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), who, I think, first raised the point with reference to the original section 7, that it was a declaration of what should be the law rather than a condition upon which the companies working under this Act should do business, suggested the very wording of the amendment which I moved as being calculated to meet the hon. gentleman's objection. As I understand this clause, it fixes a condition upon which companies coming in and doing business under this Act shall work. They are not obliged to come here at all. This amendment does not declare what shall be the law, but it simply fixes another condition, which shall be complied with by companies doing business under this Act, namely, that they shall not do business under this Act unless they endorse in their policy the condition that a right of action for a policy holder exists in a court of competent jurisdiction in the Province where he resides.

Mr. WELLS. It is quite clear, if the law can be evaded in that way, that you can dictate what any contract shall be; it is clear that you are making a contract between the parties; it is clear that is a matter of civil rights, and it is therefore clear that this House has nothing to do with it. It is very ingenious, I admit, but it is only ingenious, and I am firmly of the opinion that being only an evasion of the law you cannot in that way give this House jurisdiction. If that be so, you can always make a contract between the parties by simply declaring that no company shall do business without making a contract in a particular form.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would have no objection to this being inserted in a negative form, that is, that no policy should contain a condition that an action must be taken at the place where the head office of the company is situated, namely, in the State of New York?

Mr. WELLS. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I have no objection to that being declared to be the law; my only desire is that this House should not do anything that will be *ultra vires*. I did not say I had no objection to this provision being put in a negative form. What I said was, that they had put it in a negative form, trying thereby to accomplish their object. But I think it is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is exactly what I was going to point out. We have already passed one condition in a negative form, and it has been accepted by the committee. It is quite clear that if we declare what shall not be in the policy we can declare what shall be in it. It seems to me the difficulty the hon. gentleman suggests applies to a great many clauses of this Bill as well as to this particular clause. We have already, in another place, where the matter was thoroughly discussed, agreed to insert these as

the only conditions on which these companies shall do business in Canada at all. We have the right to declare whether they shall do business in this country or not. If we have that right, we certainly have the right to declare the conditions on which we shall permit them to do business in Canada. Having gone so far, for instance, as to declare that they shall make a deposit and make returns, it seems to me we can go still further, and declare that they shall do business provided they agree to include certain things in their contract; we do not make the contract for them, but we say that they shall put into their policy such and such things. In the committee we had a policy submitted to us which contained the condition that when an action arose it must be taken at the place where the head office of the company was situated. We were told there that that had been abandoned, and that the more recent policies issued contained no such clause, the question being left entirely to be determined by the courts. What we desire here is to avoid all possibility of dispute in the matter; and having inserted so many clauses which are to be embodied as conditions of the policy, there is no reason why we should not require the companies to put in the further condition that when an action arises that action shall lie in the Province where the insured person happens to live.

Mr. WELLS. The hon. gentleman makes a mistake in saying that the policy contained a clause requiring that the action should be brought at the place of the head office. It was in the circuit court in whatever state the head office was in.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I have the policy here:

"The entire contract contained in this certificate and said application, taken together, shall be governed by, subject to, and construed only according to the constitution, by-laws and regulations of said association and the laws of the State of New York, the place of this contract being expressly agreed to be the home office of the said association in the city of New-York; and elsewhere than in the said State no suit or proceeding at law, or in equity, shall be brought or prosecuted, except in the circuit or district court of the United States; and said association shall not be liable, nor shall any suit or proceeding be brought, after the lapse of one year from the date of the death of said member."

Mr. WELLS. In the circuit courts, where ever they are.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). It does not mean the circuit courts of Canada.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman, the other day, framed an amendment himself, and submitted it as a substitute for my motion, that no company should insert a condition like that in the policy just read. I thought he was agreeable to that, and it seemed to me it was preferable it should be declared as a condition to the licensing of a company that our courts should be given jurisdiction.

Mr. WELLS. I have no objection, personally, to that, but it seems to me it is *ultra vires*.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I do not suppose there is any doubt that if a policy issued by an association did not contain the restrictive clause, action would lie in Canada, but this restrictive clause was put in to compel the assured to bring his suit in the State of New York.

Mr. WELLS. That is omitted in the policies now issued.

Mr. BOWELL. The whole argument is based upon the presumption that in the case of *Parsons vs. the Queen Insurance Company* the Privy Council declared that this Parliament has no authority to legislate on matters affecting insurance in the whole Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Mr. BOWELL. As I read the decision of the judges, they did not go to that extent. They upheld the rights of the Province to legislate on this particular question, but they said, further, that the right of the Dominion to legislate for

the whole country was not before them, and therefore they would give no opinion on that question. Inferentially, I draw the conclusion that this Parliament would have the right, when dealing with a question affecting the whole Dominion, to enact such provisions as the court declared the different Local Legislatures had a right to place in policies affecting the Provinces only. I think I understood the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Wells) to say that the courts of appeal in Ontario had decided that these questions were solely within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. Whether that be the case, I do not know; but, looking at the case of *Parsons vs. the Queen*, I came to the conclusion that the judges gave no opinion as to the authority of Parliament in questions of this kind.

Mr. MILLS. No Legislature, whether it be a sovereign Legislature or a dependent one, can create a corporation for the purpose of carrying on business beyond its own jurisdiction. The Legislature of England can create a corporation, but it cannot create a corporation to carry on business in France or Spain; their power to do business there is a matter of comity. The fact that a Local Legislature can only create a corporation to operate within the Province does not prevent that corporation carrying on business elsewhere. Whether it does or not, is purely a matter of comity, regulated by the rules of comity which are applicable in such cases. It does not seem that because a Local Legislature cannot create a corporation to operate over the whole Dominion such a power exists here. We look at the nature of the corporation, the purposes for which it exists; we look at the British North America Act to see where the power is lodged by which a corporation exercising these functions may be created, and if, as I think my hon. friend has pointed out, it was decided by the courts of Ontario that these powers are lodged in the Provinces, because a Province has no power to create these corporations to operate beyond its own limits is no evidence that power belongs to the Dominion. I think the power does belong to the Provinces, and that we cannot give ourselves jurisdiction by legislation of this sort.

Mr. DAVIES. If the committee before which this Bill was so long thought they could not impose certain restrictions or obligations upon these foreign corporations, the committee would never have allowed them to do business in Canada at all. Whether we have the power legally is not decided. *Parsons vs. The Queen* did not decide that this Parliament had not the power we contend we have, but merely decided that the Provincial Legislatures had certain powers to determine the conditions on which insurance companies might do business in their respective Provinces. I am not prepared to subscribe to the doctrine of my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) to its full extent, that a local corporation, because it is a legal entity, has power to do business anywhere. The British North America Act provides that the Provincial Legislatures may incorporate them for provincial operations only. We have as much power to pass the clause before the committee as we had to pass any other. If this clause is *ultra vires* a number of others are also *ultra vires*; and if they were all *ultra vires*, and that was known to the committee, these companies would never have been allowed to do business here. It is monstrous that they should issue policies in Canada and by a clause in their policies compel people to sue the companies in the United States.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### RAILWAYS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 147) to authorise the grant of certain Subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BLAKE. The Bill does not accord with my understanding of the statement as to what it should be, and what the hon. gentleman said it would contain. I understood that it was to provide that these grants should be made in accordance with the Orders in Council, but the Bill, as framed, is entirely bare, and is no more than the resolutions. It ought to have some amendments, and I shall have to press them, unless the hon. gentleman accepts the view which I understood him to concede when the resolutions were before us. I have another amendment which I wish to move, at any rate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right in his view as to the intention I expressed, and I think it would be better to let the Bill stand till to-morrow.

Motion postponed.

#### NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 144) to authorise the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to make some statement as to whether it is intended to carry on the force on the same general system of organisation as to officers and non-commissioned officers, and so forth, under this augmentation, or whether any changes are proposed in that regard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The system will be the same. The corps has been divided into divisions of 100, which is a larger number than the ordinary number of a company in a regiment. They are each commanded by a superintendent and an inspector. It is proposed that the same system shall be carried on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many officers would that give to each so-called company of 100 men? I think, in the British service, the strength of a company of cavalry is not anything like that. How many officers will there be to each?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems a small number for a service of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but that is the present intention.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. From what the hon. gentleman has just said, I would understand that the same plan precisely of organisation would be adopted, as to the additional 500 men as is now adopted with reference to the 500 men who compose the force, so that, unless we are able to economise in obtaining cheaper supplies, the expenditure will be on the same scale.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The pay and allowances will be the same.

Mr. BLAKE. And, speaking in a general sense, the expense will be doubled by this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the expenditure is decreasing very rapidly. The supplies originally were very expensive, the means of transport were very inefficient, and altogether it was more expensive, in consequence of the state of the country. Now, in consequence of communication being perfected, or nearly so, with the North-West, we find that contractors can be found to tender from all parts of the Dominion. We have had proffers from the

Maritime Provinces for supplies—saddlery, and things of that kind. There is sufficient competition now, which there has not been hitherto, and the ranchmen, the cattle raisers in the North-West, are beginning to compete for the supply of cattle. That is only within this year. There is no doubt the prices of everything are going to fall, and though I cannot at this moment give an estimate of the reduction in expenditure, it will be very considerable, and I hope to be able to give an approximate estimate when we discuss the Estimates to meet this augmentation.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman did not observe that I made that hypothesis. I said that, assuming the price of supplies to continue the same, the cost would be doubled. The price of supplies is a variable quantity. The cost of 500 or 1,000 men will increase or diminish according to the price of supplies; but, man for man, the cost will be double.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The pay will be double, of course, for the non-commissioned officers and the men, but not for the commissioner. In fact, we shall not double the non-commissioned officers.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why there should not be a double head. Is it only in the Library that that system is to prevail?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot have a parliamentary and a general commissioner up there.

Mr. BLAKE. There would be less danger of a difference of opinion up there, where the two heads might be separated by such a distance that the one could not mark his ten commandments on the other's page, than there would be with these pedagogues in the narrow precincts of the Library. Of course, I quite understand that we must expect supplies to diminish in cost, and diminish rapidly in cost. But I make to the hon. gentleman an observation which was made to me in a letter I received the other day, on the very point that is touched, as to competition. It was represented to me in this letter that the facilities for effective competition would be enormously increased if the Government would demand tenders for the delivery of goods that were required at the railway points, and separate tenders for such freighting as they required from those railway points into the interior. It was represented to me that the combination of demand for supplying the goods, and for the freighting to the remote parts of the interior, practically prevented a great many persons from tendering who could well calculate on getting terms from the railway companies, etc., for delivery at such points as Regina, and some other points, and therefore largely to increase the area of competition for the goods supplied to any point of railway. But if the Government, knowing what goods are required at those points on the railway, asked separately for tenders for freighting such a quantity of goods from such a point, they would then get domestic competition; but I am informed that certain corporations and large firms which had done a very large business in the combined work of selling goods and freighting had a very great advantage over other persons, in the knowledge they had and the combined opportunities they had in delivery and in freighting, and certainly rendered it impossible for a great many to tender at all for this combined operation of delivering the goods to the railway stations and the freighting to the interior. I do not express any strong opinion on the subject, because I am not acquainted with the facts, but it seems to me not unreasonable to say that a good many large houses who had not connections in the North-West might make tenders for these supplies if the hon. gentleman would make them deliverable at such and such points on the railway, while there could be other contracts made for the simple work of freighting them into the interior.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That point, of course, has been raised and brought before the Department, and it

would enable, perhaps, an additional number of men to tender for the supplies. But it would involve the necessity, on the part of the Government, of transporting the supplies from those different points. If there were twenty or twenty-five places to supply, the Government cannot make economical arrangements by which teams can be got to carry the supplies away from the principal points of delivery on the railway. There are many points far removed from the railway, and you cannot do that. They would have to organise some transport service, and if that system is introduced with regard to the Mounted Police it would be introduced with regard, say, to the Indian supplies, and it would grow to be a large transport service. It is infinitely better to have the present system, for parties to tender to deliver at the different points. Now, some men, perhaps, may be thrown out of competition because it does not suit them to make arrangements for transport, yet there is sufficient competition to ensure the articles now being furnished at the lowest possible prices. The competition is now sharp, very sharp, except in some remote places, where it does not suit people to furnish transportation. In those few remote places the Government are obliged to make exceptions, but on the whole, after consulting people who understand that kind of thing, it is thought to be more economical that the different stations where supplies are wanted should be pointed out, and that without anything further on the part of the Government, and with no further trouble, or expense, or necessity of any further arrangements, parties should make their tender and deliver the articles wanted.

Mr. BLAKE. I should be sorry to be understood as proposing that the Government should organise a transport service. All I suggest is, that the Government should ask for tenders for the delivery of goods at points on the railway, and should ask for tenders for the transportation of so many tons of goods to the different points where they were wanted, as two separate contracts, trusting to the freighters in the country for the contracts for the delivery of the various goods, groceries or other things, at the points on the railway. The hon. gentleman was to have given us, I think, some further information with reference to the cause or causes of these alarming representations from Washington and also from the Government of Manitoba, of the terribly disturbed state of the country there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not want to frighten the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. I believe it would be a great deal more satisfactory for both the freighters and the contractors if there could be some system arranged, such as suggested by the leader of the Opposition, whereby goods might be delivered at certain stations along the railway, and a separate contract given for freighting those goods. There are quite a number of freighters in the North-West who are simply under the control of the large contractors. They have to come to the terms of the contractor or they cannot get freight. Now, in regard to even the last tenders that have been asked for, some of the merchants in Ottawa here have come to me and asked if I knew how much it would cost to carry freight from Regina to Prince Albert, for instance. That was a point these merchants in Ottawa had no idea of. They said they could figure what the delivery of the goods at Regina or Qu'Appelle would cost, but they could not figure how much it would cost from those points into the interior. Now, there would be no trouble in dividing those contracts. It would be cheaper and more satisfactory. Of course, the present system may give the Government less trouble; but I think, as a rule, it costs more, and gives less satisfaction to the general public. It encourages large corporations to monopolise freights in the North-West. As a rule, only two firms get the supplying of the whole freight in the North-West, and I

believe if there was wider competition that a better supply would be furnished, and at a cheaper rate. I feel satisfied, that as concerns the freighting, it would be more satisfactory to the people to contract direct with the Government than to be under the control of one large contractor, who had the supplying of all the goods, for unless they carried the goods at a certain rate they could not get the carrying of those goods. I believe there might be some system organised at the principal stations whereby goods might be delivered of a better quality and for the same money. As the First Minister said, at some points it would be difficult to get freight rates, and it might be necessary to make contracts with small firms, local firms, for the delivery of those goods; but at such points as Qu'Appelle, Medicine Hat and Calgary, where large quantities of goods are delivered, I believe it would be better and cheaper to divide the contract.

Bill reported.

#### HARBOR MASTER AT HALIFAX.

Bill (No. 148) to amend the Act respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at Halifax, was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE FORCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 140) respecting the North-West Mounted Police. He said: This is a Bill from the Senate, introduced in consequence of the late events in the North-West, when the Mounted Police, a civil force, and the militia, were acting together. There was no provision for their acting jointly, nor did the military laws operate upon the Mounted Police. The latter force were liable to be punished for any dereliction of duty only under the Mounted Police Act. It is necessary, beyond the provisions inserted by the Senate, to insert a clause providing for the relative ranks of the forces.

Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:10 a.m., Tuesday.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 23rd June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders are called, I wish to make an explanation and a correction relative to an article which appeared in the *Canada Presbyterian* on the 27th of last month, and which was copied afterwards in the *Meaford Monitor* and other papers. The article is headed, "Dr. Sproule and the Clergy," and it reads as follows, the prelude being that of the *Meaford Monitor* :—

"The *Canada Presbyterian* of the 27th ult. takes one member severely, (and we think with good cause) to task for his utterances relative to the petitions against the Scott Act. The following is the article referred to: 'During the last two or three weeks a large number of petitions against the Franchise Bill have been presented to the House of Commons. Among others was a petition signed by Dr. Laing, and, we believe, several other clergymen from Dundas, and presented by Mr. Bain, M. P., for North Westworth. This petition was met, if the report is correct, and we have no contradiction, by the cry: "Christian politicians and other fanatics," Mr. Sproule, M. P. for one of the ridings of Grey, being the chief offender. Now, if these facts are correct, and we would be glad to know that they were not as bad as represented, such conduct is a disgrace to Parliament, a disgrace to the Dominion, and very especially disgraceful to

Mr. WATSON.

the so-called representatives of the people, who were guilty of such contemptible and indecent conduct. If a gentleman of Dr. Laing's character and standing cannot lay a petition before the Parliament of his country without being wantonly, grossly insulted, Canada is not a fit country to live in, nor is it worth fighting for. Dr. Laing is not a "politician" in the ordinary sense of the word. If he is a Liberal at all he is a Liberal of a very Conservative type. He most certainly is not a "fanatic." Nobody doubts that he is a Christian. This part of the charge then holds good. He is a Christian citizen who dares, after thirty years of earnest work for the highest interests of his adopted country, to lay a respectfully-worded petition before the Parliament of Canada. The mention of his name is met with ribald shouts from men who are supposed to be the guardians of their country's honor and the protectors of the citizens of the realm. Things have come to a serious pass in Canada, surely, when the fact that a petitioner is a minister and a Christian subjects him to the sneers of the members of the House of Commons. The right of petition and the right to receive civil and decent treatment in Parliament is not a matter of party politics. No respectable Conservative feels himself under any obligation to defend such ruffianism as insulting Dr. Laing on the floor of the House of Commons. The man who would defend such conduct would be guilty of it. Probably nobody in Canada feels the insult more keenly or would resent it more quickly than the Conservatives in Dr. Laing's congregation. The Christian electors of East Grey had better give this matter their early attention. It is a Presbyterian this time, but it may be an Episcopalian or Methodist the next. The Christian people of East Grey can easily find a Conservative member in their ranks who won't call out "christian politicians and other fanatics," when the petition of an honored minister is laid before Parliament."

I wish to say that in the prelude of the *Meaford Monitor*, although composed of only a few lines, there is a mistake. It speaks of petitions presented against the Scott Act; the petitions had nothing to do with the Scott Act at all. The article itself, while partially true, is in the main incorrect. When the petitions were being presented a number of members were amusingly calling out various things, among others, "15 cents a hundred." When the petition in question was presented I said: "From a good Christian politician; surely that ought to count," in a jocular way. I deny having done it offensively. The latter part of the sentence I heard nothing of until it was made use of by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in a speech he made some time afterwards. I distinctly repudiated, at the time, having made use of the remark stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Believing that the denials would be in the *Hansard*, I paid no more attention to it; but seeing that it is not in the *Hansard*, and that it is going around the press, I thought, in justice to myself and the reverend gentlemen who signed the petition, that I should make this correction and explanation.

Mr. CHARLTON. As I have been referred to, I may be allowed a word. I think it unfortunate that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not make the disclaimer at the time the words were uttered. The circumstances were, briefly, these: Petitions were being presented against the Franchise Bill. These petitions were received on the opposite side with derisive shouts and jeers and cries of "15 cents a hundred." When the petition signed by the Rev. Dr. Laing was presented, the hon. member for East Grey made use of the expression, "christian politicians and other fanatics."

Mr. SPROULE. I made use of no such expression as "other fanatics." I denied it at the time, and I deny it now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I called attention, at the time, to the fact that the right of petition was considered a sacred right to all British subjects, that the petitioner was uniformly treated with courtesy, that that courtesy had not been extended to the petitioners on that occasion, and I called your attention, when these cries were indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite, to the language used with reference to the petition signed by the Rev. Mr. Laing. If that expression had not been used by the hon. member for East Grey, it is unfortunate he did not at once disclaim it.

Mr. SPROULE. I did. I said, at the time, I made use of no such expression.

## DOMINION DAY.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the hon. gentleman to state, for the convenience of the House, whether they propose to sit on Dominion Day, or to adjourn for any space of time. There was a series of papers presented at the adjournment last night, with reference to the North-West, extending from 1878 to 1885. Are these all the papers of date anterior to that of the commencement of the outbreak which are to be presented? It is impossible to satisfactorily deal with the question until the Government has concluded the intermittent operation of presenting papers on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that there are any further papers, except the various Indian reports which are now coming in. The intention of the Government is, if it is the will of the House, to sit on Dominion Day.

Mr. BLAKE. Not on St. John's Day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is my day.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the hon. gentleman is not yet canonised. It requires a long space of time and the successful passing of the very serious ordeal of an inquisition with the *advocatus diaboli* as chief accuser.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will my hon. friend not take that office.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will turn his attention to less pressing subjects than his canonisation, and let us know whether we are to understand we have now before us all the papers with reference to matters preceding the outbreak which he proposes to lay before us, and at the same time I would ask him to lay on the Table the report of the Mounted Police.

## THE FISHERY CLAUSES.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the Government a question in the same line as that which I put to them a few days since, a question which affects seriously the interests of the Maritime Provinces and to a considerable extent those of Quebec and Ontario. I speak now with reference to the position in which our fishermen and traders in fish will be on the 1st July. I have not seen the official notice myself, but am informed on good authority that the United States have announced the fact that on the 1st July the duties on fresh fish will be resumed. The other day we learned, for the first time, that negotiations were under way, with a view of securing a reciprocity treaty between the United States and the Dominion; also, that some steps had been taken with regard to an understanding as to what course should be pursued with relation to the fisheries of Canada after the expiration of the treaty on the 1st July. What I desire to ask of the right hon. Premier is this: Is it true, and I believe it to be, that the Americans have issued a notice—I believe the notice was one to the Treasury Department—informing them that on the 1st of July fresh fish and other articles exempted under the treaty about to expire would be again liable to duty? As there is a large interest in my county involved in this question, and as there are large interests involved in the Maritime Provinces, we ought not to leave to the last moment the giving of information to our people as to the condition in which our fisheries will be after the 1st July. At present, the fishing industry is one of the chief industries of the Maritime Provinces; every day dozens of cargoes of fish go from these Provinces, involving, in the aggregate, hundreds of thousands of dollars, during the course of the season. I am not sure that I understood perfectly the other day the explanations of the right hon. gentleman, but I understood the Government of Canada were prepared to suspend the exercise of any exclusive right

we may have in relation to the fisheries until Congress meets in December next. I recollect last year it was suggested by myself, and the suggestion met the approval of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that in view of the almost certain repeal of the treaty and the possibility that no rearrangement would be made, it was necessary the Government should take a vote for the purpose of establishing some protection in regard to our fisheries. The Minister then did not accept the suggestion that was made, and I am not aware whether any steps have been taken to guard and protect our interests after the treaty expires. If it is true that arrangements have been made, with a view of accomplishing reciprocity, I am sure any arrangement which may be carried out on a fair basis will be hailed with satisfaction from one end of the Dominion to the other. If, as part of that, the Ministry have consented to suspend our exclusive rights over our own fisheries and to permit the Americans for the six months of the year, which have yet to elapse, to use these fisheries in the same way as Canadian fishermen, it is only right the American Government should suspend the application of their duties. I am aware they cannot do that without the action of Congress and the Senate of the United States. But at least they could do this: They could make an arrangement that, if the Canadians suspend the exclusive rights which they exercise and which they have a right to exercise over their own fisheries, the Americans should, if a treaty is subsequently made, refund to the fishermen of our country any duties they may pay between now and the time when that treaty, if it should be carried out, is carried out. I know it is only necessary to call the attention of the right hon. the Premier to the point. It is an important point; a point about which our people are enquiring constantly from me, and I think a public announcement should be made in relation to it. I think, also, that we should ascertain from the Government at as early a date as possible what arrangements have been made, whether any steps have been yet taken which can be made public, by which the public will receive an assurance that their interests are being protected and their rights are being looked after. They should, in the season of fishing, not be left to the last moment without knowing what steps are being taken. If \$1,000 or \$10,000 worth of fresh fish leaves the chief port in my county, as it does almost every week, sometimes every day, these men ought not to be left in an uncertainty as to what will be the result when their fish arrive at the American lines. This is a matter which affects the merchant, which affects the trader, which affects the fisherman. They cannot tell what price to give for fish. Everything is in an unsettled state.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to asking the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, then, I ask whether the hon. gentleman can give us any information on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not now in a position to give any further information than I did when the hon. gentleman, I think it was, brought it up last—I am not sure whether it was he or some one else. There is no re-imposition of duties by the United States. The Customs law of the United States puts a certain duty on foreign fish. That duty was suspended *quoad* the fisheries of British North America during the existence of the Washington Treaty. When the notice was given for the purpose of putting an end to the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty, it was done, as everybody knew, for the purpose of depriving Canadian fish of the free access to the American market. The fact of the termination of the treaty brings in the old law. Everyone knows that. There can be no surprise on the part of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, or of anybody, on that point. They all know the notice was given for the purpose of depriving Canada of the access to the American market at the termination of

the treaty. There can be no surprise about that. Everybody knows it—fishermen as well as others. Then, of course, we returned to our old relations. Canada has a duty imposed upon American fish; America's duties under the old Customs law respecting Canadian fish will be in force after the 1st day of July. I regret that I am not able to lay the papers at this moment before the House, as I mentioned when this subject was last before the House. The consent of Her Majesty's Government was asked to lay all the papers before Parliament. Had it not been for this late change, I have no doubt the answer would have arrived ere this. I am expecting every day, and am in communication with the Governor General on the point, that that permission will be given. The papers are all ready to be laid before Parliament the moment that assent is given. Some of the papers we can bring down, because they are not intimately or directly connected with Her Majesty's Government, but it would be highly unsatisfactory to everybody, to this House, to the Government, and, I think, to the hon. gentleman, to bring down any papers not showing the whole current of events and the negotiations which have been going on for what is now a very considerable time. I am in daily expectation, every mail, of that assent being given. The papers are all ready, the message is ready, everything is ready to bring down to the House at the moment that assent is given.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any probability that our fisheries will be protected by any extraordinary means?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is at all necessary or expedient that we should sever and discuss any limbs or branches of the one question. I think it would be a mistake, and would lead to false impressions, so I must decline to state, for the present, the position of the Government, until the House and the country are possessed of the whole of the negotiations on the subject.

Mr. VAIL. I am very sorry to hear the statement of the First Minister. If our people are bound to pay duties on their fish, and the Americans are at liberty to come in and fish within the three mile limit, we are at a great disadvantage. I think the Government should take the necessary steps to protect the fisheries, or should show they are determined to protect them, if the present negotiations are not satisfactory. I was in hopes, from what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said, that he was making arrangements, to fully protect the fisheries after the 1st of July. If we are going to allow Americans to come within our three mile limit and fish, while our people have to pay the duties on the other side, I think the Americans will be very chary, to say the least, about being in a hurry to make any arrangement. Of course, if a reciprocity treaty could be arranged, it would be the most satisfactory way of settling the matter, and I should be sorry to see anything thrown in the way of that, but we are bound to protect our fisheries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman had desired to destroy all hopes of successful negotiation, he could not have taken a better way than that which he has taken after the statement which I made; but, whether for some party purpose—

Mr. VAIL. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, then, for some purpose, and certainly not a common sense purpose, he has done his best to render impossible any successful negotiations.

Mr. VAIL. I do not see it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government, of course, desire—it is their duty, and it is their interest, and, even if the hon. gentleman has no confidence in the Government, he will, at all events, believe that they will act in what they believe is the best manner for the Government—to arrive at

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

satisfactory arrangements with the United States. That is all I can say just now, and I think, after the intimation I have given, that it is not at all expedient or wise that the discussion should be further continued. As I have already stated, I hope in a few days—I had hoped, and I am satisfied that, if it had not been for the change which has taken place, I should have been able—to bring down these papers.

Mr. VAIL. Permit me to say that I had not the slightest idea of censuring the Government. I only wished to point out that the Government ought to protect our fisheries.

#### OMISSION FROM THE ORDER PAPER.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to call the attention of the Government to what I presume is an accidental omission. On the 11th June, I gave notice of the following question:—

“On Monday next—ENQUIRY OF MINISTRY—The total amount of temporary loans obtained by the Government from banks or other sources in Canada, Great Britain, the United States, or elsewhere, on the 31st May, 1885, and at that date unpaid; but not including savings bank deposits or Dominion notes in circulation; the date and amount of each loan, from what source obtained, and when payable?”

That notice was duly given, but it never has appeared on the Order Paper and has never been answered. I was away on the Tuesday that the notice should have been called, and consequently did not notice the omission. The notice had been given before, and in reply to the enquiry the Acting Minister of Finance declined to answer, stating it was not in the public interest. If that was the reason this has been passed over I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that substantially the same question was asked when the Minister of Finance was present, and an answer was given to it. The question was asked upon the 4th of March, and is as follows:—

“What is the total amount of temporary loans made by the Government from banks up to 25th February, the date and amount of each loan, and from what bank made, and the terms of each loan as to time—whether upon call or otherwise.”

In reply to that question the Minister of Finance gave a detailed statement of the temporary loans, that it is unnecessary to read, the aggregate being \$12,500,000, and he gave the sum borrowed from each bank, and the time the loan ran. A subsequent question of the same character was put, which the Acting Finance Minister declined to answer on the ground that it was not proper. I stated then that the question had been previously answered, and that the only objection taken by the Finance Minister in reply to a subsequent question on these loans, was that he declined to give the rate of interest. Now I wish to enquire whether the failure to put this question upon the Notice Paper, given on the 16th of this month, was accidental or whether the Government did not desire to have it upon the Notice Paper and did not desire to answer it.

Mr. BOWELL. The Government had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with the appearance or non-appearance of the notice upon the Paper. I had not heard that the notice had been left off the Paper, and hence had no knowledge of it beyond seeing the notice in the Votes and Proceedings. It is quite true as the hon. gentleman says, that when the Finance Minister was present he gave an answer to the questions put by the hon. gentleman. Before he left for England he gave me the answer which was to be given to the subsequent question put by my hon. friend. From correspondence he had with the banks in Canada, and from cablegrams from England, he did not deem it expedient nor in the interest of the country, or of the Government, that the answer should be repeated. That is the reason I gave the answer that was given the other day. I can only repeat that I know nothing about the question having been left off the Notice Paper.

## MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. BOWELL, in moving that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 2420) for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion, said: It is not my intention to occupy much time in moving these resolutions. They have been upon the Notice Paper, for some time; they are very full, and, consequently, require very little explanation. I may, however, briefly refer to the financial state of the Province of Manitoba in relation to the subsidies and aid which it has received from the Dominion Parliament to help meet the expenses of the administration of the affairs of that Province. I find that in 1870, when Manitoba was erected into a Province, they were allowed the interest upon a debt of \$472,090, at the rate of 5 per cent., payable half-yearly. For the expenses of the Government and legislation they were paid an additional sum of \$30,000 per annum and 80 cents per head on a population of 17,000, making a total subsidy from these sources of \$67,204.50. By 39 Vic., chap. 3, in 1876, an additional sum of \$26,746.96 was added to the above subsidies, making, with the interest, and the balance to the credit of Manitoba, an annual payment of \$90,000, from 1876 to 1881. In 1879 an additional sum of \$15,653.04 was added to the \$90,000 granted by 39 Victoria, chap. 3, until 1881. The Parliament of Canada again, in 1882, made an additional grant for the support of the Government and Legislature, of \$50,000 for ten years, and 80 cents per head, based upon a population of 150,000 souls, making an amount of \$120,000. In addition to that the sum of \$15,000 was given in lieu of the public lands, making a total sum paid to that Province from these different sources in 1882, of \$215,000 per annum. Since that time, owing to the rapid increase of the population and the large expenditure the Manitoba Legislature had to make in assisting settlements in the different municipalities, in building bridges, and for various other purposes, they found it necessary again to apply to the Dominion for further aid in order to enable them to assist the settlers in the various parts of that growing Province. People in the older Provinces who know the large expenditure which is made every year by the county and township municipal councils, will understand that in a new Province like Manitoba, which has been erected largely into municipalities, but with a very sparse population, it was impossible for the people to bear those local expenditures which are borne by direct taxation in the older Provinces, particularly in the Province of Ontario. As that Province has, to a very great extent, framed its system of municipal government on the Ontario system, the Dominion Government thought it not only advisable, but in the interests of the Province, and of the Dominion generally, to render it as much aid as possible. In order to accomplish that object, it was decided after a good deal of negotiation, to grant the people of Manitoba still further aid; and that aid is set forth very clearly in the resolutions now before the House. I might mention in regard to swamp lands, that an arrangement was made with the Manitoba Government in 1882, I think, but I am not quite sure of the date, to transfer to the Province certain portions of the swamp lands, conditional upon the Province draining them, it receiving a certain portion of the lands after they were drained, in consideration of the money so expended. After due and full consideration by the members of the Manitoba delegation, and a Committee of the Privy Council—the conclusion at which they arrived being afterwards confirmed by the Council—it was decided that the same policy should be pursued towards the Province of Manitoba, in respect of swamp lands, as is pursued by the United States Government towards the Western States; that was to transfer from the Federal Government to the State Governments all the swamp lands that lie in each particular

State. It was believed that the expenditure which would devolve upon the Dominion Government in draining those lands and making them fit for sale, would be very large; and it was thought that the Manitoba Government could take the drainage of those lands into their own hands, and make them a source of revenue, whereas the probabilities were, that the cost of draining by the Dominion Government would absorb to a very great extent the full value of the lands. For these reasons the Government decided to transfer to the Province all the swamp lands within its borders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state approximately what the Government expect the quantity to be?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to state to the hon. gentleman the quantity, even approximately. A large portion of the Province has not yet been surveyed, and consequently we could not come to a correct conclusion as to the quantity. The second resolution provides for the setting apart of 150,000 acres of land for the establishment of a provincial university. These 150,000 acres are in addition to the school lands which have already been set apart by the Dominion Government for common school purposes. This university, as hon. gentlemen will understand, is to provide for higher education in that Province, and the grant is to be held in trust upon the basis of a scheme to be framed by the university and approved by the Governor in Council. The third resolution provides for the granting of \$100,000 per annum in lieu of the transfer of the land and instead of the \$45,000 now paid them for that purpose. The fourth resolution provides for paying a *per capita* allowance of 80 cents per head upon an estimated population of 125,000 instead of a population of 150,000 as was agreed upon two years ago; subject to be increased until the population exceeds that number; and provision is also made, in order that the Province may receive the full benefit of the *per capita* tax, for a census every five years, instead of every ten years as in the older Provinces. And to still further aid the Province, the *per capita* tax will be paid until the population reaches 400,000 souls. The fifth resolution simply repeals all that is inconsistent with this readjustment of the debt and of the *per capita* tax and also of the granting of \$100,000 in lieu of the \$45,000. The sixth resolution provides for an advance to the Province of \$150,000, chargeable to capital account, to enable the Province to construct and complete its lunatic asylum. These terms, as the House will observe by the sixth resolution, are conditional upon the Province of Manitoba accepting them in full for all claims up to the present time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Up to last Session.

Mr. BOWELL. I will leave hon. gentlemen opposite to decide that matter between them. What we propose to give the Province by these resolutions is to be in lieu of all claims up to the present time. Not only did the delegates accept these conditions, but the Manitoba Legislature has accepted the resolutions upon these conditions. The position of Manitoba will be simply this: The payment in lieu of lands is changed from \$45,000 to \$100,000, or an increase \$55,000. The subsidy on a population of \$150,000 under the old arrangement would have been \$120,000. Under the present arrangement, by which the population is placed at 125,000, the subsidy will be \$100,000, or a decrease of \$20,000. These items make a net increase on the different subsidies of \$35,000 per annum, and whatever may result from the sale of swamp lands, in addition to which a university for Manitoba will be endowed with 150,000 acres of land. The total income under the old arrangement was \$215,000 per annum, while under the proposed resolutions it would be \$250,000, in addition to whatever may be realised by the Province in the management and sale of the swamp lands

of the Province. This is simply a statement of the proposed arrangement with that Province, and I can only add that I am quite sure that this Parliament will readily acquiesce in what is proposed to be done for the Province of Manitoba, when we consider the subsidies that have been given to the older Provinces. The rapidity with which that Province is growing, will soon make it strong numerically, and one which I have no doubt will become one of the most wealthy Provinces in the Dominion. If nothing interferes to prevent the rapid progress which is going on in every section of that country, we may look forward in a short time to finding it numerously settled by a people who, I hope, will be wealthy and contented.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman look at resolution 7, in which reference is made to an Act of the Local Legislature passed during "the present Session." That Session is over, and I would ask the hon. gentleman if the Act was passed?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it was passed by the Local Legislature of the Province of Manitoba, and the assent was laid on the Table some time ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is what I said a few moments ago, and I understood the hon. gentleman to contradict me.

Mr. BOWELL. I apologise to the hon. gentleman; I misunderstood him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the present total income is \$250,000?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No more?

Mr. BOWELL. No more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the capital sum upon which the Province is entitled to receive payment of interest at the rate of 5 per cent.? You take the population at 125,000; what capital amount does that population represent? I should imagine it would be more than the sum the hon. gentleman stated.

Mr. BOWELL. The sum at 80 cents per head is upon 125,000 of a population.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of the capital sum.

Mr. BOWELL. The Province entered the Union with a debt of \$472,090. That has been reduced, and the present sum to the credit of that Province is \$353,885.96, upon which they draw 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not more than that?

Mr. BOWELL. No, that is the sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is some special fixed sum allowed to them in addition—speaking from memory, of some \$60,000, \$70,000, or \$80,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The debt allowed by the Union Act was \$492,090; by 31 Victoria, Chapter 30, there was a further sum allowed of \$79,351, and in the adjustment of the debts when the Dominion assumed the debt account between Ontario and Quebec, she was allowed \$110,825.07 as being her proportion. But that is all added to this sum, leaving a balance to the debt account of that Province, on the 30th of June, 1884, amounting to \$353,885.96, from which, of course, the \$150,000 advanced for the purpose of a lunatic asylum will have to be deducted.

Mr. WATSON. This is a matter of very great importance to the Province of Manitoba, and to this Government; as however the settlement which was made in 1881 for ten years, was broken, I am in hopes that this will not be regarded as a final settlement with Manitoba, which is growing so rapidly that it is impossible to calculate its future needs. It would be an unfortunate thing for

Mr. BOWELL.

Manitoba and for the whole Dominion, if she should be crippled by not receiving the aid she has a right to expect. It is not necessary to state to the House that the Dominion has been deriving all the revenues accruing from public lands, from timber limits, and mining interests; and also that Manitoba has contributed largely to the general revenues of the Dominion. I might call attention to the instructions which were given to the delegates when they came to the capital seeking better terms for Manitoba. Apparently the policy of the Local Legislature was entirely changed from the instructions they were given as to what they should apply for. I will read the resolutions which were passed by the Local Legislature of Manitoba, as instructions to the delegates who proceeded to Ottawa. These instructions were given on the 21st of April, 1884:

"(1.) To urge the right of the Province to the control, management, and sale of the public lands within the limits for the public uses thereof, and of the mines, minerals, wood, and timber thereon or an equivalent therefor, and to receive from the Dominion Government payment for the lands already disposed of by them within the Province, less cost of surveys and management."

Now, according to the explanations of the Minister of Customs and according to those resolutions, this claim has not been granted, or only granted to a small degree.

"(2.) The management of the lands set apart for education in this Province with a view to capitalise the sums realised from sales and apply the interest accruing therefrom to supplement the annual grant of the Legislature in aid of education."

This is another demand which has not been granted.

"(3.) The adjustment of the capital account of the Province decennially according to population, the same to be computed now at 150,000 souls, and to be allowed until it corresponds with the amount allowed the Province of Ontario on that account."

Now, there has been a reduction with regard to this clause from 150,000 souls to 125,000.

"(4.) The right of the Province to charter lines of railway from any one point to another within the Province, except so far as the same has been limited by its Legislature in the Extension Act of 1881."

Now, I look upon this as one of the most important claims that Manitoba could ask of this Parliament. This right has not been granted, the reason given being that Manitoba assented to this arrangement when its boundaries were extended. When Manitoba received an extension of its boundaries, according to anything I can find in the statutes of the Province or the records of the House, there was nothing said on behalf of the Province to the effect that for an extension of its boundaries the Province would be willing to barter away its right to charter railways in the Province of Manitoba. We recognise that the territories acquired by that extension should be subject to the disallowance policy provided for in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract; but the people of the old Province of Manitoba never bartered away their right to build provincial railways, and it is a right they hold dear and do not feel disposed at present to part with for any consideration. Then there is the grant of 80 cents per head which is provided for. At present we receive 80 cents per head to be computed on 150,000 souls. According to this new arrangement it is to be computed on 125,000, which will be a great reduction on the amount we receive at present.

"(5.) The granting to the Province extended railway facilities, notably the energetic prosecution of the Manitoba South-Western, the S. Uris and Rocky Mountain, and Manitoba and North-Western Railway."

Two of these roads have been provided for by land grants; the third, which is now called the Manitoba Central, has not yet been aided. It is a road which, for its first 100 miles from its terminus on the Canadian Pacific Railway, will accommodate as many settlers as any other 100 miles of road in the Province, and I would take this opportunity of urging upon the Government to grant it aid, so that its construction may be proceeded with this season. The people in the neighborhood of Rapid City expected that the Canadian Pacific Railway would cross the Little Saskatchewan at that point.

It is one of the first settlements on that river; people have been cultivating their land in that district for years, and the Manitoba Central is expected to cross there. West of Rapid City there is also a large section of fine country, a large portion of which was disposed of by the Canadian Pacific Railway on conditions of cultivation. The result is that there are many settlers there who have been cultivating their lands for years and have been waiting anxiously for the Government to aid this Manitoba Central Railway by a free land grant this Session, as other roads. The delegates were also instructed:

"To call the attention of the Government to the prejudicial effect of the Tariff on the Province of Manitoba."

This is a point which has hardly been referred to in these resolutions, although the Legislature of Manitoba were unanimous in asking that this Government should remedy this evil. I believe the aid proposed to be granted by these resolutions is probably quite sufficient at present to carry on the Government of the Province; but we expect the Province will in the near future grow to such an extent that this aid will not be sufficient to sustain all its public institutions. At the last Session of the Local House it was stated that the amount the Government will receive this year will barely cover the expenses of the year. As the hon. Minister of Customs has truly said, the Dominion Government could not expect to realise a large amount from the sale of swamp lands, in that Province, as it would probably cost the Government more to drain them than they would realise from their sale; therefore it is impossible that the Province can realise anything from them. As this is the only portion of the public domain granted to the Province, I do not think this should be considered a final settlement. Political exigencies sometimes force people to do things they would not otherwise do. Being a strong supporter of provincial rights, I should not perhaps find fault with anything the Provincial Legislature does; but I believe that these resolutions were forced through the Local House, and I believe the majority of the people of Manitoba are opposed to these terms being accepted as final. On that occasion the Local House sat till 6 o'clock in the morning, with only eight men in the Opposition and a few more than that number on the Government side. I may call the attention of the House to the memorial of the Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba, presented to this Government in 1884, which will show the contrast between what he understood then to be the requirements of the Province and what he has seen fit to carry through the House of which he is the leader. One paragraph in his memorial reads as follows:—

"The provision allowed for our requirements being now so inadequate, the contemplation of our position, when a great influx of population will multiply the expense of Government, is a far from pleasant prospect, but a fact that must be faced. Indeed, a large addition to the population of the Province would be nothing short of an evil in disguise. The rapid settlement of the territory would prove anything but a blessing; to meet increasing requirements under present circumstances would be an impossibility, our revenue being out of all proportion to our necessary expenditure."

I think it would be very unfortunate if the Premier of Manitoba should ever be justified on any future occasion in making use of such language as this. He has expressed himself in the same way at public gatherings, and his language has gone through the public prints. We should be very careful to avoid giving the Premier of a young Province like Manitoba, to which we are trying to attract immigrants, any occasion to state to the world that a large influx of immigrants would only be an evil in disguise. He goes on to state:

"Upon the heels of settlement will follow the necessity for schools, roads, bridges, and public institutions, such as asylums, reformatories and gaols; for which purpose the increase of the revenue from the allowance of 80 cents *per capita* on every additional citizen in the Province, would not commence to be adequate."

Looking to the future requirements of the Province and the different municipalities being formed there, the Premier

wished to guard against not being able to support or assist the municipalities in supporting public institutions. Referring to the settlement which the hon. Minister of Customs claims was made for 10 years, the Premier of Manitoba goes on to say:

"Referring to the observation made by the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech last year to the effect that the increase to the subsidy of the Province was intended to close any negotiation on that subject for the next 10 years, the undersigned would respectfully remark that, as the term of 10 years was not mentioned, either in the verbal or written negotiations on the subject, neither he nor his colleague, Mr. Larivière, accepted the increase then given on the understanding that the same would be binding for a term of 10 years."

On the contrary, very frequently in the course of conversation with the Hon. Mr. Pope, one of the committee appointed to confer with the Manitoba delegates, the suggestion was made that it would be unwise on the part of Manitoba to press for a definite settlement of her financial relations with the Dominion, as circumstances were changing so rapidly and it would be impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy what would be the exact requirements of the Province. Acting on this suggestion the delegates did not press for a definite settlement. That was the hon. gentleman's advice to the delegates at the time and at the last meeting, for he was one of those appointed to have an interview with the delegates as to the settlement of those claims. I believe he was right in stating that it would be unwise for Manitoba to have a final settlement with the Dominion with regard to the amount she should receive each year, unless Manitoba was placed on the same footing as other Provinces by being given full control of her public lands. Manitoba is in a very unfortunate position, as she will have to rely entirely on direct taxation if her subsidy is not adequate to meet expenditure, and this would be very discouraging for a young Province trying to induce settlers and immigrants to settle in that Province. For those reasons, I hope this House will not ask Manitoba to accept the terms laid down in these resolutions as a final settlement, even supposing the Local Legislature has accepted them as such.

Mr. ROSS. When these resolutions were agreed upon between the two Governments, the people of Manitoba generally were satisfied with the terms of the arrangement, with the exception of the finality clause. There was some exception made to that, and I hope if circumstances should arise in the future, on account of which the money at present given to Manitoba will not be sufficient to meet the expenses of administering public affairs in that Province and the expenditure on public works necessary, owing to its rapid development, this Government will be prepared to deal liberally with Manitoba. There is one feature in connection with the finality clause which is of advantage, and that is, it will prevent one or more Ministers of Manitoba coming down here almost every year and begging for better terms. Such a course is undignified and in some cases not profitable. With regard to the swamp lands, I agree with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) that the Manitoba Government, in getting them, have not received a very profitable gift. It will take a great deal of money to drain them and put them in proper shape for selling; it will take years before they will be saleable, and after the cost of rendering them fit for cultivation is taken into account there will not be much left from receipts of sale. Judging from our experience in the past of swamp lands, they will not prove very profitable property. One respect in which the Government has dealt very liberally with Manitoba is the arrangement for having the census taken every five years on which to base the allowance. That is an arrangement not made with regard to any other Province, but it is due in our case on account of our rapid growth and development. The arrangement as to the approximate estimate of the population, to be made at equal intervals of time between

each quinquennial and decennial census, save every two and a half years, is also a very liberal arrangement. Taking the arrangements all round, while I think this Government has driven a pretty hard bargain with regard to the finality clause, on the whole they are acceptable to the people of Manitoba. I quite agree with what the hon. member for Marquette has said with regard to the Manitoba Central. If the Government can do anything to aid that road, they should do it, as its construction will be of great advantage to a large number of our people.

Mr. BLAKE. The solution of this question of subsidy upon the lines upon which our constitution in this regard is based, is one of great difficulty, because those lines are not very scientific lines; they are not dictated by any particular principle, but by supposed adequacy to the interests and conditions of the four Provinces that formed the original Confederation. It was thought they would answer, and they were laid down; and there has been an effort, rather an unsuccessful effort, made to assume that they were based upon some principle, and to apply this principle, which was really inapplicable to other Provinces, for, as regards the other Provinces, we could not find the principle would answer at all. There is an excrescence here and another there, and something else incongruous elsewhere, until after all, if you read over the provisions with reference to all the Provinces, even the original ones, you will find in them nothing like symmetry, nothing that would lead you to believe the arrangement was founded on principle or even reason. I do not believe the arrangement will be lasting. I stated last year and the year before that I thought one of the questions we had to consider, and which ought to engage our most serious and earnest attention, was the question of the solution of the great difficulties which are involved in the grants to aid the Local Governments and the principles upon which these grants ought to be made. They are not now made on any principle. With reference to the proposal to take a quinquennial census of the Province of Manitoba, I wholly approve of it. In fact, when the last addition was made to the needs of the Province of Manitoba, I proposed that should be done. It was quite clear that, however measurably accurate the plan of a decennial census would be, as regards the older Provinces, which fill up more slowly than the Territories in the west, it was not applicable to the conditions of Manitoba, which began almost with nothing and swelled up to a very considerable population in a short time, and of which we had very bright hopes, which, still, in large part, remain as to its increase in the near future. It was quite clear that to put that Province in the same position relatively as to the other Provinces, a more rapid increase of subsidy than would be possible under a decennial census was necessary, and I am glad to see the suggestion I made in this respect acted upon. Another reason why exceptional conditions attach to the Province of Manitoba is to be found in the largeness of its area. It is not only the extent of the population of a Province, but also the extent of its geographical area over which settlement extends, however sparsely, that you must consider when taking into account the expenses of the Local Government. At the time that hon. gentlemen opposite were increasing Manitoba very largely, in fact, and as they believed, from the eastward down the neighborhood of Port Arthur, I pointed out that one of the objections to the course they were taking was that they were increasing the area of Manitoba largely without considering at the same time what the cost of that increase would be and what resources they should give to the Province in order to manage properly its enlarged area. It seemed to me you could not, even if our principle of provincial aid had been a sound one, even if our grants had been based upon a principle as applied to the other Provinces, apply the same principle in this case, for the conditions are different, the area is very large, the popula-

Mr. Ross.

tion is small and is increasing fast, and it is necessary to recognise these differences in estimating a reasonable subsidy to be granted. With reference to one of the questions which has agitated the Province of Manitoba, and as to which I do not know whether it is claimed by the Government that it is included in this final clause or not, I venture to say it is not a question which can be included in a clause of finality—I refer to the claim which has been made with reference to the right of that Province to have the same constitutional freedom in the matter of chartering railway lines within the limits of the old Province of Manitoba as the other Provinces have within their limits. That has been one of the great practical difficulties in the Province of Manitoba; it is one of the difficulties which still subsist. There are places in that Province of which it may be well said, as it has been said, that you may write over their remains the epitaph "Killed by disallowance;" and, apart from the question of disallowance, the strain and stress which were exercised by the Government of this country with reference to other railway enterprises, notably the Manitoba South-Western, in the direction of repression, was of itself of a character which has tended very largely to create the difficulties and the discontent which certainly have existed in that Province. It was but yesterday that it was my good fortune to have an interview with a gentleman from Manitoba who is not a politician, who is not one of a profession which mingles in politics, but who had a considerable acquaintance with the Province, and especially with the south-western part of it; and, grievous as I had believed was the condition of some of the settlers in that part of the Province, what he told me of their condition, attributable almost exclusively to this policy of repression and restraint as to railway extension, certainly surprised me. He referred to counties with which I am a little familiar, and of which the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) spoke the other day. He referred to the counties of Huron and Bruce, from which he himself had come in early days and with which I was familiar in the year 1868 and for some subsequent years, and he declared to me that, having himself seen the struggles, the poverty, the distress, and the condition of many of the settlers in the early days of settlement in Huron and Bruce, and having seen in the west as intelligent, as hard-working, as energetic, and self-relying people as those settlers were, instances of great and melancholy privation, they had been surpassed in south-western Manitoba. He had seen the grain in the stack for two and three years, much of it was rotten, because they could not take it to the market for want of railways. He had seen privation in the shape of rags, worn by those who ought to have been independent persons, and by their families, more marked than in the early days of settlement in Huron and Bruce, in south-western Manitoba. It was not merely a case of failure to get on to such an extent as people might have hoped to get on in a new country, but there was serious suffering in reference to food and clothing on the part of some of the people who were out there. I mean to say that these are serious things to consider, and that they tend to produce—they must have produced, they did produce—a state of feeling in that part of the country, which is in some respects its garden, which was a very unhappy state of feeling to have created in a country where contentment and happiness on the part of those who were in some sense the pioneers of settlement was an important thing to have developed. Last year, I say, hope was held out to these persons. Last year they were told by the Minister of Railways, when he was proposing the arrangements for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that this policy of disallowance should cease so soon as the road on the north shore of Lake Superior should be completed; that the company were prepared, and the Government were prepared, to concede that; and he assured us that the same measure of freedom

which has existed since Confederation with reference to the other Provinces should, at all events as to the old Province of Manitoba, supervene from that period. We hear nothing of that kind now. I know not whether it would come too late or no. Certainly it is not too late to do some good, though I fear it is too late to do much of that good which might have been done had the happy hour been still at our command, had the fortunate period been yet available, the period when bright and happy hopes existed in that region of more rapid railway construction than we may hope for even to-day, with all the liberal, the beneficent, provisions which we are making for that purpose. But I maintain that we have to consider, as constitutionalists, we have to consider as freemen ourselves, we have to consider seriously the question whether this policy of exercising the power of disallowance in order to prevent these people building railways within the limits of their own Province in the same way and to the same extent that the people are permitted to build them in other Provinces, shall be continued longer; and I maintain that they would be unworthy of the position of British freemen if they were contented as long as those rights are withheld. As to the management of the lands, I cannot think that we have much to boast of either in regard to our general policy on the subject of the land in the North-West, or in regard to the execution by the Government of the trusts which in this regard they have asked Parliament to confide to them. The Province of Manitoba is unhappily an example in itself of a bad land policy badly administered. At the very start there were unfortunate circumstances, circumstances due to that misgovernment and that misguidance, which made us begin our actual connection with that country with a rebellion. It followed from these circumstances that it was necessary hastily to make arrangements for the creation of the then small Province of Manitoba, upon terms and under plans which were liberal in some respects, not truly liberal, but giving certain rights which in part were premature, and in part were ill-advised. They may have been necessary. I do not mean to say they were not necessary in the emergency in which the country was placed at the time the Manitoba Act was passed, but they were things that would not have been acceded to, in the interest of Manitoba itself, but for this prior cause of misgovernment which produced the results from which the Manitoba Act became a necessity. You have very large reserves, areas of unsettled lands in private hands, throughout that country, in the first place. Will anybody deny that these unsettled areas have not hindered the prosperity of Manitoba, have not hindered the prosperity of Winnipeg, have not hindered the prosperity generally of the whole North-West, that being the gateway of the country. You have again a subsequent policy with reference to certain constitutional liberties, given perhaps a little too early, in the sense that there was a very small population, but you have a withholding of others, you have a decision that you will give that Province the rights of a Province, of a sister Province of the other Provinces of the Dominion, but, while with the one hand you give with the other hand you withhold. You tell them for example that they are not to manage their own lands, that they are not to manage their own school lands. Now, I regard the school lands of Manitoba as in one sense a very sacred heritage. I rejoice that we separated a very large portion of that country for the purpose of giving a grand endowment for a free education to the masses of the people; but when you come to consider who shall manage the school lands, when you come to consider whether the school lands are best managed—I do not say diverted from their trust, but best administered—whether they can be best administered by hon. gentlemen sitting here at Ottawa, or by the Local Legislature and Government, I say, you must admit that the administration at Ottawa is a difficult business at the best, you must admit that it would be only with the best

intentions and with a considerable amount of energy that it would be possible to avoid mistakes, and great mistakes have occurred with reference to the administration of the school lands, several of which have been the subject of discussion in this House from time to time as they went on. Well, then, what is the reason they are administered here? Because, you say, the people of Manitoba are not to be trusted themselves to decide when these school lands shall be sold, on what terms they shall be sold, and how the proceeds shall be invested. I maintain that that declaration, which is a declaration that you can do this thing at Ottawa better for them than they can do it for themselves, is a practical declaration that they are not fit for that measure of self-government which belongs to a Province of the Canadian Dominion; and if you tell me that it is likely that some mismanagement would have taken place that some jobbery would have taken place, that mistakes would have taken place, I ask whether even these sacred edifices which surround this hall are free from jobbery, are free from mistakes, are free from mismanagement. Now, the hon. gentleman, in supporting this resolution, goes farther. He proposes a thing that I delight in—a crowning of the edifice of education; he proposes that 150,000 acres of land shall be granted as an endowment for the Manitoba University—good. But I say the scheme and terms upon which that endowment should be managed ought to be settled between the Local Government and Legislature of Manitoba and the University of Manitoba. The question of education is a local question with which we have nothing to do. The disputes belonging to it are disputes which ought not to be brought into this House. The question is one belonging to the people of the Province; there it should be solved. Since we hold their lands it is fit that, as we reserve lands for schools, so we should reserve lands for a university. But my opinion is that the scheme, the terms upon which these lands should be held, they also being treated as a sacred trust, ought to be settled by the people of Manitoba themselves and not by this Administration. Well, then, in reference to the parliamentary arrangements, I have spoken of the original difficulties as to the lands, of the emergency in which the Government found itself plunged when they made the original settlement. But we have had land policies since that time, and those land policies, I do not think, have been very satisfactory for the Province of Manitoba. There has been a great deal of delay in the settlement of the land claims, even of the older claims recognised by the Manitoba Act, of which I believe some remain even to this day unsettled; there has been an immense amount of delay in the settlement of the more recent claims, and as we know from the answers which the hon. gentleman has given two or three times to enquiries made as to recent discoveries, there has been worse than delay in the management of the lands in Manitoba. Now there are several other questions to which I might advert but it is not, perhaps, necessary to do so upon this occasion. I wish to say with reference to the subsidy, having spoken in favor of the view of a quinquennial census and the intermediate adjustment, that the same considerations to which I adverted as distinguishing the Province, both in point of area and in rapid increase of population, as distinguishing its condition from that of the other Provinces, and necessitating special arrangements, apply also to the term, "it shall cease to be augmented at the population of 400,000." I say that whether you are able to justify—because I have never been able very well to justify the principle of that adjustment or that fixture—whether you are able to justify it or not with reference to the older Provinces, there can be no reason, having regard to the area, having regard to the population that is to fill that area, why you should expect that that subsidy will be more fixed when the population reaches 400,000. I do not think any of us can ex-

pect that some may wish it, perhaps, because we may feel that more and more, from year to year, this question of provincial subsidies becomes a more serious one for this Dominion, more and more pressing for a solution; we may wish to see an end, but as practical men, desiring that that great area of fertile land should be filled as rapidly as hon. gentlemen opposite say it is to be, we cannot expect that it will end with the 400,000, and I see no use in saying so; it certainly will not be so. Now as to the action of the Local Legislature upon these terms. In dealing with the question of British Columbia submitted to you last Session, I stated what I thought were the truer and general grounds upon which the Parliament of Canada should investigate a question of this kind in so far as we were obliged to look at it from a provincial point of view, namely, that we should recognise the representatives of the people in their parliamentary action in the Local Legislature as expressive of the views and wishes of the people, and I regard that as a very important factor in coming to a conclusion in this case; but I do not regard it as so decisive, as so conclusive as I did in the case of British Columbia, because it is almost impossible for anyone who looks at the Province of Manitoba, who looks at the present condition, geographically, of its population, who regards its electoral districts, to agree for an instant that there is at this moment any pretence of a fair representation of the people in their Local House. A rapid flow of population settling up one place and another at great distances apart has rendered it impossible to say to-day that they reach that result which we boasted we had attained, namely, something approaching to a fair representation of the sentiment of the people of that country. Now, Sir, last Session and the Session before, I alluded to the question of discontent which was rife on many grounds in the Province of Manitoba; and my hon. friend, the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) brought before this House a proposal that we should resolve ourselves into a committee to consider of this discontent, to consider of these complaints, to consider of these grievances, with a view of remedying them. The statement of hon. gentlemen opposite has always been that Manitoba was really contented, that the people were really satisfied, that there were but a few agitators who, for political purposes, were creating a sort of tempest in a teapot, but who were unable to create any real sentiment of discontent amongst the people of Manitoba, I say that was not an accurate statement of the condition of things in that Province, I say that it is not an accurate statement now. The people of that Province, so far, at any rate, as the recent immigration is concerned, are people who have gone very largely from the Province in which this Chamber is, and they are people accustomed to the municipal institutions, to the provincial institutions, to the Dominion institutions with which we are all familiar. They went there, many of them, having sold their farms at home, to better their condition; they went there with the expectation and hope, the great bulk of them, not that by some fortunate strike or speculation they would achieve wealth, but that they would achieve wealth in the exercise of their vocation as farmers, very much more rapidly, from the great fertility of that soil and the speed with which a large acreage could be brought into cultivation. Being such as they were, it is not reasonable to suppose that men of that description, who wanted to work hard, who had worked hard and who intended to work hard, who felt that wealth was to be obtained by hard work under reasonably favorable circumstances, would be stirred up by the discontent and excitement aroused without a cause by political agitators. It was not so. You could not do that any more with the men of that Province than with the men of the Province from which they came, and with whose general sentiment they were imbued. The Prime Minister, the members of the Government, and the Legislature of Manitoba, re-echoed the discontent. Still we

Mr. BLAKE.

heard statements from ministerialists repeated time and again that there was no real discontent in the Province, that everything was serene and happy. I do not pretend to say that all the grounds of discontent were justifiable grounds. It is the case in that country, in most countries, in fact in all countries I know of, that where an agitation sets in it is based on some well founded grievance, and that very circumstance forms the nucleus of grievances which are set up, perhaps not so well founded, and demands which are made perhaps exorbitant. That may have been the case in Manitoba; but I say that though some of these demands may perhaps have been couched in extravagant terms, yet they were real and substantial grievances. I trust the measure which is now before us may tend to a very considerable extent to allay that discontent, and that the Province of Manitoba may set out, after the very serious and severe experience which it has had of difficulty and depression and adversity, upon a fresh career of prosperity. But my impression is that if that is to be the case there must be an earlier, franker and more liberal recognition of the existing grounds of discontent than has taken place hitherto in the history of the relations of that Province to the Dominion, and there must be a more ardent effort to recognise the character of the problem which this Government has to solve in dealing more than a thousand miles off with questions of minor and local importance; there must be, I say, a more earnest effort to grasp the nature of the problem which is to be solved, and then there must be a more earnest endeavor to work it out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has made a speech of some length, and his speech is in some respects liable to the reproach he threw out the other day. He has ingeniously commingled the question of individual discontent with the question before the House. The question before the House has not the most remote connection with individual discontent—with parties who say they did not get their patents soon enough; that rights with respect to claims have not been recognised; with half-breed grievances which are said not to have received full consideration. Those things have nothing to do with the present question. The present question is simply this, a settlement of the terms on which the Government of Manitoba as a Government should deal with the Dominion Government and the Dominion Parliament as such. The two questions have no connection; but the hon. gentleman has brought them in by the ear, that is to say he has so far merely muddled up the question now before the House, which is whether these terms are reasonable, equitable and just, or whether they are lavish and too generous or too restrictive. No doubt we shall have to discuss fully before the blessing of prorogation comes to us the claims of every individual dissatisfied settler, every dissatisfied speculator, and every dissatisfied person who went to the North-West and who failed in getting all his expectations realised—no doubt we shall have that discussion at some future time. But it has nothing to do with the question before the House. The hon. gentleman ingeniously brought it in. He had to make a speech on the resolutions, so he took up individual discontent, and I must say he made the most of it. He said he saw a gentleman—no doubt he was a very intelligent and reliable gentleman—who came from Huron or North Bruce, perhaps he came from both, and that person told him that great as was the distress in Huron and Bruce it was insignificant compared with the distress suffered by the people of Southern Manitoba; that they were without food and without clothing,—

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—that they were ragged and unable to obtain food. Yet, in the next breath, the

hon. gentleman told us that the people had stacks of wheat for four years which they could not bring to market. He said they had abundant crops which they were not able to send to market; and yet they were without food or clothing. There is an old saying that some people are so unreasonable that they want better bread than wheat bread. Those people had the best wheat in the world, the Manitoba hard wheat, and plenty of it; there was no market, says the hon. gentleman, and yet they allowed it to rot in the stack while they and their children starved, while all they had to do was to grind it and eat it. That is one specimen of the many exaggerations that come to us from that Province, and of which the hon. gentleman has made himself a very able and willing exponent. Then the hon. gentleman said that wheat was \$1 a bushel; that the people could not get enough out of the crops to obtain clothing for themselves and their children. That statement bears its own reputation on the face of it; it is absurd and childish; and I am sorry the hon. gentleman should have put credence in the statement of a disappointed man, who felt disappointed because he did not happen to have a railway running through his barnyard. The hon. gentleman says there was great discontent about the disallowance of the railway charter. I believe if every charter had been allowed from the beginning not one of the railways so chartered would have been built. Why we have had the Canadian Pacific Railway with its enormous subsidies of land, according to the view of the hon. gentleman, unable to build branch railways. Yet the hon. gentleman believes that if the Legislature of Manitoba had been allowed to pass railway Acts *ad libitum*, the very fact of passing those Acts would have caused the lines to be constructed. Not one would have been constructed. Then the hon. gentleman said the Government had been treading on the rights of freemen, and if they had been freemen worthy of the name they would have resisted. How? *A la Riel!* Does the hon. gentleman propose that? For he says if they had been worthy of the name of freemen they would have resisted. If there had been one, or two, or three at the utmost of the local Acts disallowed, we have certainly been rather lavish in passing railway Acts here, not only in passing them here, but in granting the companies large land subsidies. Notwithstanding all that assistance, whether the companies are chartered under a Dominion or a provincial charter, there is no railway building worthy of the name. There is the Canadian Pacific Railway building in consequence of the enormous grants we have made. There is the North-Western struggling painfully, and it has at last built 80 miles. I am told that Mr. Pugsley and the Long Lake Company have graded a few miles, and that there are 50 miles of the South-Western Railway built; and that is the extent of the railway construction in the country. But that the exercise of the power of disallowance has in any way retarded railway construction, I do not believe, and the facts distinctly show that it has had no effect whatever.

Mr. MILLS. Why exercise it then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says, why exercise it? In the first place, the Parliament of Canada passed an Act granting certain powers and privileges, with certain conditions, connected with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government and Parliament are bound to carry out that arrangement. It was under the conditions specified in the Act establishing the Canadian Pacific Railway, that that railway was fixed, that that step was taken, that the road is now built; and it would be a breach of faith if that charter was broken without the consent of the shareholders, and without an Act of Parliament to repeal those privileges. The hon. gentleman says that Sir Charles Tupper in his place last Session said that the power of disallowance was

not going to be exercised and that the company did not care for it any more. Well, I do not think that since that time, there has been a single disallowance. I really do not at this moment know whether there has been any Act of the Local Legislature granting new charters; but at all events, there has been no disallowance.

Mr. WATSON. There has been a refusal to grant charters by this Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman coming from that part of the country evidently thinks this is an absolute Government here. The Government have refused no charters; the Government have disallowed no charters; the railway committee of this House composed of the representatives of the people, have in their discretion allowed some Bills and thrown out others; and though I am nominally a member of that committee I was not present this Session, and I was present but once last year, at the meetings of that committee. The hon. gentleman must not confound the Acts of Parliament, the Acts of representatives of the people, with the Acts of the Government. The Government have not disallowed any Acts. I presume from the hon. gentleman's remark that the representatives of the people in the Railway Committee have refused to report favorably on some railway enterprises coming from the North-West. Well, I think—

Mr. WATSON. Only supporters of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I am not a supporter of the Government in that sense, and I opposed the measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) says only supporters of the Government. Does the hon. gentleman, as a member of Parliament, deeply versed in parliamentary lore, knowing the rights of Parliament, desire or insist that railway Acts or other Acts shall be passed by the minority? I thought that in Parliament, under representative institutions, in a free country, the will of the majority was the will of the people, and if the will of the people returned a majority in favor of the Government, the hon. gentleman may be sorry that he is in the minority, but it cannot be helped; and the very statement that a majority of the House, a majority on the Railway Committee, threw out any Bill whatever, shows that according to the will of the representatives of the people, that Bill was a bad one and one which should not be passed. With regard to the question of disallowance, that power can only be exercised, so far as it is obligatory upon the Government, under the terms of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. But long before that time, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, there were railway charters applied for to Parliament, which came before the Railway Committee of that day, and my friend from East York, then at the head of the Government, objected to several charters and very properly objected to them. The hon. gentleman, as exponent of that majority, leading that majority, in the Railway Committee, objected very properly to several projected Bills which would be adverse, which would be hostile, to the prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway in which we were all interested, in which both parties were interested as representing the whole people of Canada. The hon. gentleman objected to those charters, and the Government of the present day, following the same sensible course, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was struggling faithfully with its great undertaking—the Government would not allow its credit to be affected, its prospects to be marred, and its trade to be led away to foreign channels, long before its road was constructed, and before it had a fair chance of competing for the great trade of the North-West. I say that the policy of the late Government and the present Government have been identical in principle in that regard, although in

particular instances we might not exactly look with the same view upon a particular measure. My hon. friend from East York might say for instance—I do not say it is so—but he might say as to a particular enterprise: I do not believe that will hurt the Canadian Pacific Railway. I might have a different view; that might possibly be the case; I am not at all aware that it is the case, but I am supposing that probably such a contingency might arise. But at all events the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman when leading the majority of the Railway Committee of his day, was the same principle which has been laid down ever since, and has been supported by this Parliament. Now, to come to the points mentioned by the hon. gentleman as to these resolutions. By the way, the hon. gentleman stated that there were large reserves made by the Government in Manitoba which are greatly injuring Winnipeg or the rest of the Province. I really do not understand what he meant; I do not know of such reserves. The hon. gentleman referred to the school lands which are not included in these clauses; he brought it in incidentally as being connected with the appropriation for the endowment of a university for Manitoba. He says it was very improper; he thought it was contrary to first principles, that the school lands of Manitoba should not be handed over to the Local Legislature. Now, I believe it is the belief of the great mass of the people there, that the lands should not be handed over to the small population which now occupies a small portion of Manitoba. There has been a strong pressure, a strong statement, from almost every great interest in Manitoba, that those lands at present, are safer in the hands of the Dominion Government, which has no interest whatever, except to preserve them, to make a grand endowment for the benefit of the future people of that Province. It is known that Manitoba, as a young Province, has been impecunious; it is known that it has been in great pecuniary straits; the fact of its coming to this Parliament year after year to be relieved shows that it has been suffering under pecuniary straits, and the people felt that if these lands were put in the market the proceeds would be used to relieve the straits of the Province; and from the present Government of Manitoba there has been no pressure or remonstrance against these lands being treated, as they are now being treated, as a sacred trust for the future population of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman says that those school lands have been dealt with by the Dominion Government without the consent of or consultation with the Manitoba Government.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I did not. I said they had been unwisely managed in several respects.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the only instance of un wisdom I am aware of was when the Dominion Government consulted the Government of the Province of Manitoba. In every case we have desired to ask the consent and the advice of the Government of Manitoba with respect to the disposal of these lands. At the time the boom, which has so often been referred to, was at its height, and was shortly to fall and become a depression as deep as the elevation had been high, the Dominion Government thought it would be well to put considerable tracts of the school lands within the area where the boom existed into the market. They were advertised and were about to be sold, when the Manitoba Government protested. They desired that the sale should be delayed; they said the prices were not sufficient. The consequence was—as the Government here naturally thought they were the best judges—that the lands were withdrawn from sale. Down went the price of lands, and they have never been sold since. There would have been a large and profitable sale made. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, reminds me that the local school commissioners also asked that the sale should be postponed. From the general idea, the craze, that had

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

got into people's minds that the land would not only be covered with gold, but with gold coins laid edge-ways, they protested against these lands being sold, and they have not been sold since. Now, the practice of the Department is this: Year after year, they consult the Local Government as to what lands they think ought to be put into the market, and what ought to be the minimum price. They desire, and have always desired, to take that Government's best opinion; but they have kept these lands from being played at pitch and toss in a small Legislature, representing only a small part of the Province of Manitoba, and more alive to the present interests of the Province than the future advantages of their children and their children's children for future generations. I need not say anything about the university grant, although the hon. gentleman objects that it should be left altogether to the Provincial Government and Legislature. The Provincial Government and the Provincial Legislature both approve of this arrangement; the university authorities approve of it, and are exceedingly anxious that matters should be as they are provided for in this resolution. That university, from my point of view, is happily situated, because there the question of religious differences does not arise at all; the Catholic and the Anglican bishops are both members of the common governing body of that university, and this endowment, a very fair and considerable one, well managed, will, I think, be a profitable endowment for that university. It is being dealt with under these resolutions by an arrangement between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments, with the sanction of the Provincial Legislature, and I believe with the sanction of the Dominion Legislature; and with all these sanctions, what can be said against this arrangement? It is a sensible one, it meets with the approbation of everybody concerned, and the hon. gentleman endeavors to raise an abstract point in connection with this question. I shall not say anything more with reference to the statement about the discontent as to the settlement of land claims. I believe there has been a more speedy settlement of these claims, a more speedy issue of patents, a larger amount of land surveyed, and more prompt action, than will be found to have been the case in the neighboring Republic, notwithstanding its extensive organisation and its experience of many years; and I believe we have the admission of the American authorities that, on the whole, our system is more prompt and equitable than theirs. Whether that be so or not, that has nothing to do with these resolutions. They speak for themselves, and as they have been satisfactory to the Legislature and the Government of Manitoba, so I am satisfied they will be readily sanctioned by this Parliament. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross) spoke of the last clause, which relates to this being the final settlement of all the questions between the Dominion and Manitoba. Well, that is not so; it does not read in that way. The settlement of last year was so; it was to be the final settlement of all questions. The hon. member for West Durham cannot object to that provision being put in, for if I remember aright, at the time of the better terms between the Dominion and Nova Scotia, he objected to the constitutionality of the better terms altogether, and when that view was overruled, fortunately for Nova Scotia, he insisted that a clause should be inserted, and it was inserted, declaring that they should be a final settlement of all matters between Nova Scotia and the Dominion. Well, I do not think, as I told Mr. Norquay, that the Province of Nova Scotia suffered much from that condition, and I said: I am quite sure, even with that condition, the Province of Manitoba will not suffer more than its sister Province of Nova Scotia did. But, as the question has been raised by a factious Opposition—and there are such things as Oppositions and factions in Manitoba—we do not provide that this shall be a final settlement of all questions between Manitoba and the

Dominion. But there are certain questions under discussion—the swamp lands, for instance, and the university question—and these resolutions merely affirm that they shall be a final settlement of these questions. They were to settle those questions which were under discussion, but not other questions which the future of the country could only develop. The several clauses in these resolutions will be discussed fully in committee, and therefore I see no advantage in going into them *ad seriatim* now. The resolutions have been drawn with great care, and they are, I believe, very liberal. The terms in the original Manitoba Act were satisfactory to the then people of Manitoba. The arrangement of 45 Victoria was satisfactory to the Government of the day; but by the Opposition, which I must say was an unreasoning one, one of those conditions was objected to, not on the ground of insufficiency, but on the ground that they should be final settlement of all matters and that no further relief should be given. Had that clause not been one of the conditions imposed last year, when the settlement was made, the Legislature of Manitoba would have adopted the resolutions of that day. We have removed that bar, and have given, after full consideration of the matter, much more liberal terms than both the Ministerial party and the Opposition in the Manitoba Legislature were quite willing to accept at that day, if it had not been for this unfortunate clause of a final settlement of all matters which we adopted at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen, as in the case of Nova Scotia and the Dominion. When I say unfortunate, I am not sure it was unfortunate, because it has given us an opportunity of going over the matter again. We have given, perhaps, much more liberal terms than before, and I do not regret that those terms are more liberal. I think we can afford to be more liberal to that young and growing Province. I think this Parliament will adopt the resolutions, and I am satisfied, for our time, at all events, they will form a satisfactory basis of arrangement for very many years between Manitoba and the Dominion. Of course, there will be individual claims, individual grievances, individual charges of mismanagement, and those will have to be dealt with on their own merits, but they have nothing to do with these resolutions. I believe this House will adopt these resolutions, and will leave Manitoba happy and contented.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman who has evidently misunderstood what I said. I did not say that the school lands should be handed over to the Manitoba Legislature to be treated as they please, but I said the administration of the trust should be entrusted to the Legislature of Manitoba. I had no thought of suggesting that any of those lands should be diverted from the trust.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman, and I do not wish to convey that impression to the House. Of course I understood he desired the lands to be handed over to the Province to be dealt with as school lands.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to what has fallen from the First Minister with reference to the action of the Railway Committee in refusing to adopt the preamble of the Bill to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway, I will inform the House as to my recollection of the occurrence in committee with regard to the Bill. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) supported that Bill, and in support of it read an extract from *Hansard* setting forth the assurances given to the House that as soon as the railway was completed on the north shore, the Government would not feel bound any longer to refuse to allow railways to be built running to the border. The acting Minister of Railways, who was present at the Railway Committee, opposed the grant of the charter to the Portage la Prairie Railway, and argued for some time on the merits of the Bill itself. There was for a while some

difference of opinion in the committee as to whether the Government opposed the grant of a charter or not, and so long as that doubt existed it seemed to be an open question to be dealt with on its pure merits. The acting Minister of Railways, having spoken rather strongly—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not allowed to refer to what has taken place in the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. There was a question as to whether it was the policy of the Government or the individual opinion of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. That cannot be referred to here.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The First Minister discussed what took place in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. He said he was not present at it, and could not have discussed it.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely the Government cannot escape responsibility for the action of the Government in the Railway Committee. Supposing a member of the Government should appear before the Railway Committee and say it is the policy of the Government, as it is my policy, not to grant this particular charter. The Government could not escape the responsibility of the committee because the action of the committee resulted in the preamble not being adopted and the Bill being disallowed. It is another way by which the Government can accomplish from what perhaps they would shrink from doing in the House. It is quite clear to every hon. gentleman what occurred on that occasion. The country knows well that on that occasion the acting Minister of Railways stated what the policy was.

Mr. SPEAKER. If my ruling is wrong, it must be overruled by a vote of the House. I have ruled that what took place in committee cannot be referred to here, except on the report of the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The First Minister referred to my having made a statement in the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has referred to what took place this Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There was a report of the Railway Committee showing that the preamble of the Bill was not approved of, and that came before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. There was a report before the committee showing that the preamble was disallowed. If that question comes before the House, the House has the right to discuss whether it was proper to disallow it or not, but the hon. gentleman has not the right to refer to what took place in the committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He has the right to discuss the fact that in the Railway Committee the preamble was not approved.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason was given, and that reason was that the Bill was not conformable to the policy of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has referred to what was stated by the Acting Minister of Railways in committee. That is what I rule is not in order.

Mr. MULOCK. I submit to your ruling on that point. Then I would simply submit whether I am in order to say this, that it scarcely seems to me possible for the Government to escape responsibility for the action of the committee in disallowing or in refusing to adopt the preamble, when the country knows that the Government advised the committee to disallow the Bill, that is the point I make.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman has referred to what has taken place in committee, and I do not propose to follow him into that, but there was a report made by the committee of the reasons for the rejection of

the preamble of that particular Bill, and the reasons bring up the whole question which has been discussed here to-day. The question which was involved in those reasons submitted to the House had nothing to do with the policy or impolicy of disallowing charters granted by Manitoba to railways within that Province. It was held, I think in the debate on the Pacific Railway charter, I know it has been held in discussion since, that there is nothing in the charter itself which legally binds the Government to disallow any charter passed by the Legislature of Manitoba. I think the question of disallowance is entirely one of public policy, and not of legal obligation; but the ground upon which that particular railway Bill was disallowed was because of the exact terms of the charter as applicable to Parliament and not to the Government. The clause is to this effect:

"For twenty years from the date hereof, no line of railway shall be authorised by the Dominion Parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such line as shall run south-west, or to the westward of south-west; nor to within fifteen miles of latitude 49; and, in the establishment of any new Province in the North-West Territories provision shall be made for continuing such prohibition after such establishment, until the expiration of said period."

It was held, in the reasons given for the rejection of that Railway Bill, that it was in contravention of this particular treaty between the Parliament of Canada, not the Government particularly, but the Parliament, and the Pacific Railway Company, and it was upon that ground that the Bill was rejected and the preamble declared not to be proven, and that reason reported to this House. The question of the disallowance of charters passed by the Legislature of Manitoba was a matter of public policy altogether, and the remark made last year in Parliament by the Minister of Railways was to the effect that, so confident were the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of their ability to control the traffic of the North-West country after the line was built north of Lake Superior and after a fair and reasonable development of traffic in connection with the line, that they were prepared to yield and give up asking the Government any further to disallow the charters; but that had nothing to do with the solemn obligation, no statement made by the Minister on the floor of Parliament could affect the solemn obligation, entered into by Parliament. In fact, so solemn was that obligation that, when the boundary of Manitoba was enlarged and the Province was made to include a certain portion of territory over which it had no control at the time of the making of this contract, it was found necessary to secure from the Legislature of Manitoba an acquiescence that this particular clause of the charter should apply as a binding obligation upon that particular portion of the Province which was new territory, and which, at the time the charter was passed, was strictly and entirely within the competence of this Parliament, and only within the competence of this Parliament, to legislate for it in regard to railway charters. The distinction is so easily understood that I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite fail to understand it. As to the future, there is no doubt whatever that the construction of the railway north of Lake Superior, that is the completion and opening of the railway, not the mere laying down of the rails, but the opening for traffic, as stated by the Minister of Railways last year, as he was authorised to say to Parliament, would justify the company in not asking the Government to protect their line any further in accordance with the spirit of this contract—not with the letter of it, but with its spirit. The spirit of this contract is in accordance with the policy of Parliament and the policy of respective Governments since 1871. In 1872, as I pointed out the other evening here, when railway charters were granted in Parliament for entering that country from the boundary, there were special clauses inserted that those charters should only come into operation by a proclamation of the Governor in

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Council. That proclamation was never issued by hon. gentlemen opposite, these charters were never brought into effect, and when, in 1879, the first Session of Parliament after the Conservative party returned to office, when the late Minister of Railways announced his policy in Parliament, not as the result of a compact or a contract or a treaty with any company at all, but as a matter of public policy, to secure the trade of that country for Canada, for Canadian merchants and Canadian cities and Canadian shippers, when he announced the policy to be that he would not permit any railway to be chartered from the boundary line, the hon. member for East York announced in the committee, and that has been referred to in Parliament, and may be quoted from the official reports of Parliament, that he entirely concurred with that policy, that he believed it to be the wise policy, and the policy which, if he were controlling the public works and railway policy of the country, he would affirm and maintain. You will see the distinction between the two cases. The one is that of a Bill brought to this Parliament, and, until after twenty years from the date of this charter, I venture to say that no lawyer will contend that we can grant a charter in contravention of that; but we can, and the Government can, and I have no doubt they will, in accordance with the policy announced last year, and in accordance with the manifest interest of all parties—once the railway is built north of Lake Superior, and there is an object in getting the American trade as well as our own trade over that line—allow Manitoba to grant as many charters as it thinks proper, as, strictly speaking, it had the right to do before, so far as this contract was concerned, subject, of course, to the power of disallowance which the Government exercised on their own responsibility, and subject to their responsibility to Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. In some respects I concur in the view expressed by the hon. gentleman. There is a manifest distinction between a railway corporation receiving a charter from the Parliament of Canada and railway corporations receiving charters from the different Provinces. The First Minister, a little while ago, informed the House that the Government disallowed those Acts of incorporation because they were in contravention of the terms of the Pacific Railway charter. I do not so understand it. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House and the First Minister, when the Pacific Railway contract was under consideration, stated that the Administration had no power to check Manitoba, had no power to interfere with the Legislature of that Province, and all those railway charters which the hon. gentleman has advised the Crown to disallow were railway charters received, not from the Parliament of Canada, not proposed charters, that could not be got through a railway committee of this House, but charters which were derived from the Local Legislature, charters falling within their jurisdiction, and which would, if they had come into operation, have continued in operation if the hon. gentleman had not advised their disallowance. Now, my hon. friend before me spoke of the dissatisfaction which had arisen in the Province of Manitoba in consequence of this interference by the Government of Canada with the undoubted rights of the Government and Legislature of that Province. What may be done here is an entirely different question from whether the pledge given by the Minister in reference to the Manitoba railways last year was such a pledge as would compel the Government to forego its opposition and the railway company to abandon the rights which were secured to them by the provisions of their charter. I do not pretend to say how that may be, it is not necessary to consider that at this moment. All we have to consider is the statement made by my hon. friend, that the disallowance of those charters had given rise to a very serious dissatisfaction and discontent in the Pro-

vince of Manitoba, and that their disallowance had seriously interfered with the settlement of the country and with the well-being of the population who are already there. The First Minister said this was not the case. He said, in the first place, that these charters had been disallowed because the Government were under obligations to the company to do so; and, in the second place, that it was carrying out the policy which, he said, had been adopted by the hon. member for East York when he was at the head of the Government. I deny that; I deny that there is any authority for such a statement, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to a single charter received from the Local Legislature of Manitoba which was disallowed by the hon. member for East York.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman did not say so; but the hon. gentleman was declaring that the policy the Government had pursued, of disallowing these charters, was a policy similar to that which had been pursued by the Government that preceded him in office, and that there had been no change in the policy of the Administration in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say anything about disallowance; I said the principle had been supported by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that the same principle actuated the present Government. I said nothing about any disallowance by the hon. gentleman from East York.

Mr. MILLS. I wonder how the hon. gentleman could maintain successfully that the same principle actuated his Government and the Government that preceded him, in the disallowance of charters, when the Government that preceded him allowed all charters to remain in force. The hon. gentleman said that these charters had been inoperative, even though they had not been disallowed. Well, if that was the hon. gentleman's view, why did he not allow these charters to remain in force? No action would have been taken, and that discontent which grew out of his improper and unconstitutional interference with the right of the Local Legislature would not have existed. Now, the hon. gentleman has declared that the observations made by the hon. member for West Durham, in reference to the condition of things in Manitoba, were a matter of ancient history, that they did not relate to the subject immediately before us. Well, Sir, there is no doubt that what the hon. gentleman calls the ancient history of Manitoba is exceedingly disagreeable history. Why, Sir, we have only to look to the beginning of the history. The hon. gentleman erected Manitoba into a Province in 1869, and he proposed to impose upon it an arbitrary system of Government. A rebellion was produced and a million dollars was expended in order to restore law and order again in that county. Then the hon. gentleman, instead of doing what had been done in the adjoining Republic, establishing a territorial government with a certain representation in this House, created an expensive and costly system of government, which was a burden to the small population living there, because we all know that at the time Manitoba was erected into a Province, with two Houses and with all the paraphernalia of a wealthy and populous Province, it did not contain 10,000 inhabitants. Then the hon. gentleman at that time assured us that this Provincial Government was necessary, that it was important that Manitoba should have this cumbersome system of government provided for her, because, he said, that such a thing as a territorial government was wholly unknown to our English system of parliamentary government. Well, Sir, it may be true that we have nothing in the British Empire called a territorial government, but we have colonies with certain representative features, and we propose to do with this colony that we

established in our territory what the American Government do with theirs—ultimately to erect it into a Province with representative institutions. It was easy for us to do what had been done there, and to provide a system of government suitable to the population, with representation here, simple in its machinery, and which would be superseded by full representative powers after it had received a certain population. Now, we do not wonder that the hon. gentleman pronounced the observations of my hon. friend ancient history. They pointed to the serious mistakes the Government have made, and those mistakes necessitated constant change in the terms and conditions upon which Manitoba entered the Union, from that day to this. The hon. gentleman has said that there is no difficulty connected with the land policy of Manitoba. Why, there were colonisation companies established, land speculators were allowed to buy to any extent, the settlement of the country was interfered with and delayed, and the hon. gentleman, by the disallowance of railway charters, had rendered it almost impossible for settlers to get into many portions of Manitoba; and there are districts in that Province to-day in which the population are so far away from any market that I am informed it would cost them more to take their products to market than those products would bring after they reached market. Now, it is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that in a fertile Province like Manitoba it is impossible that the people can suffer from hunger, or that they can be without adequate clothing, etc. The hon. gentleman has said that they can take their wheat to mill and grind it and eat it. But it was only by eating it that they ground it; milling facilities in many places were wholly wanting. The result was, and is yet, that in some portions of Manitoba the farmers have been unable to take their crops to market, they have large quantities of grain still on hand, in fact, I have been told by persons who have written to me since this House has been in session, that they have ceased to cultivate their land, they have ceased producing crops, because they have large quantities of wheat on hand that they are unable to take to the market, and the result is, that it is utterly useless to go on cultivating land and producing crops for which there is no market.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). How many miles of railway did you build when you were administering the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MILLS. There were no railways reaching the country at that time. My hon. friend from East York was engaged in building a railway. We introduced a measure to establish colonisation roads, and if we had remained in office I have no doubt there would be many more miles of railway in Manitoba than there are at the present time. I believe the country would have been much better settled; I believe the right hon. gentleman, by the policy of meddling interference which he has adopted, has not only retarded the construction of railways but has seriously retarded the settlement of that entire country. The sale of timber limits to the supporters of the right hon. gentleman, like the hon. gentleman sitting behind him, interfered with the rights of the population. The hon. gentleman is not engaged in that business. He is not a lumberman; he did not go into that business for the purpose of furnishing lumber to settlers of the North-West. He went into it to make money, and he could not make money in that transaction except at the expense of the public Treasury; for every dollar that goes into the hon. gentleman's pocket in connection with that business would be a dollar abstracted from the public Treasury, either immediately or prospectively. The First Minister spoke about the school lands of the North-West, and declared that he made a serious mistake in consulting the Government of Manitoba; that, in fact, the school commissioners had advised the Government not to

sell those lands, and a desirable opportunity of disposing of them had been lost. But of what does the hon. gentleman complain? He complains that there were strangers who went to Manitoba and he had not an opportunity of taking them in. He wanted to sell the land at "boom" prices, which were beyond the actual value of the land. I do not think the people of Manitoba care to prosper to the detriment of new settlers, so long as they obtain fair value for their land. It was not desirable to put the school lands at a very early day on the market. No doubt they will be made valuable by the settlement of the surrounding country, and as it is to the interest of the population of Manitoba that the school fund should be as large as possible, the land should not be placed on the market until a fair price could be obtained for it. The way to secure the value of those lands is not by speculating colonisation companies, not by creating "booms," or by advertisements describing the country as an Eden, as is done in Martin Chuzzlewit. It was not by that sort of policy that Manitoba or the North-West could be benefited. But what will give a permanent value to property in the North-West is the settlement of the country, the granting of lands to those willing to occupy them, the cultivation of those lands by the occupiers, by putting no impediments in the way of settlement, and by preventing the land falling into the hands of speculators, who seek to bleed strangers who go thither to settle. It is by the permanent improvement and settlement of the country that the school lands will have value given them, and it is not desirable that the First Minister should take advantage of a "boom" in order to obtain for those or other public lands more money than they are actually worth from those who may purchase them. The hon. gentleman has referred to the question of provincial subsidies. I have no objection to the provisions of the resolution. I think the general well-being of the entire Dominion is promoted by the well-being of Manitoba. It has a large and fertile district ready for settlement, the settlement of which will prove advantageous not only to Manitoba but to the whole Dominion. The occupation of those lands will increase the direct revenue, the Customs duties, will lighten the burdens of the Government, and while it will benefit Manitoba directly it will indirectly benefit the whole of this country. That being the case, I have no objection to these resolutions, and I do not think them so extravagant in their terms as that they should meet with objection on this side of the House.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman has again referred to the charge of my having a timber limit. I remember being a member of the Railway Committee when two parties applied from the Province of Manitoba for charters for railways to run to the United States. When they came before the committee the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), then First Minister, rose and said: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It happened years ago, when the hon. gentleman was First Minister. He said that they would not allow the matter to go any further, because if we built the Pacific Railway we must keep the traffic for the Government road, and if they gave a charter the Government must have something to offer to those who took the risk of carrying out the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is out of order. You, Mr. Speaker, have already given a ruling to which we all submitted, and now it is being deliberately violated. I do not admit the allegation of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. How far does your ruling, Mr. Speaker, extend? Does it extend to proceedings in committee eight or ten years back? I was under the impression that the rule was that a member was not permitted during a Session of Parliament to refer to the proceedings of a committee

Mr. MILLS,

during that Session, for the reason that the questions might be discussed in the House, and it would be only reconsidering the same question. What I should like to understand is, whether the ruling you have already given refers to proceedings of committees several years ago, or simply to the proceedings of committees this Session.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seemed to me, when I gave the ruling, it was with respect to committees of the present Session, because the report of a committee may come up for discussion this Session, or it may be under discussion, and what took place there, the arguments and reasons given, may be stated in the House. But what took place in committee years ago has, to a certain extent, become a matter of history. It has been quoted in the House, and is reported in *Hansard*. There is, therefore, a distinction between the two in that respect. References to what took place in Committee of the Whole are not permitted, and I presume the same rule applies to committees; but the rule has reference to proceedings during the same Session, I think.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). At the time the hon. gentleman disallowed that Bill, he said: "I may just as well have it thoroughly understood, Mr. Chairman, that the policy of the Government of which I have the honor to be leader, is not to allow railways to be built to take away traffic from the Government road. He wanted to have something to offer to the parties who would build the Pacific road." There were no yeas and nays taken; the word of the First Minister was final, and the matter went no further. I ask whether that was not disallowing the Bills before the committee. And that was not done by votes of the committee, but by the word of the then First Minister. I hope that if I make a second statement with respect to the timber limit question, I shall be able to satisfy even the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Mr. Rathbun, of Deseronto, a gentleman who employs from 1,200 to 1,500 hands, who carries on ship-building, who is the owner of several large mills, and Mr. D. Gilmour, each got on the Saskatchewan River a timber limit. They proposed that I should go and look at the limits and get a limit there for myself, and they would build at Edmonton a mill which would supply the people of that section, provided I would agree to look after and take charge of the business in that section of the country; and on that proposition I went up, and I spent time and money. Mr. Rathbun paid the Government \$250, Mr. Gilmour paid \$250, and I paid \$250. And, Sir, as I said before, I went to the Department and I surrendered the timber limit, and I say that, so far as I am concerned, let the people of the North-West Territories do as they please with their timber; I am not going to spend my time and my money, or the money belonging to Mr. Gilmour or Mr. Rathbun. In that fine country they want men of energy, men who have time and capital, but I, for one, do not want to go. If I take care of what I have got in Ontario I think I have enough to keep me, with care and with caution, without going up there to fight or battle with any party. But even if I did get a timber limit, I got it according to the Acts laid down by Parliament. But what did the hon. gentleman do? After the people of this country, by a majority of seventy or eighty, denounced his Government and party, and drove them from power, two days before they left office they passed an Order in Council giving to Mr. Cook and Mr. Sutherland 200 square miles each on the North Saskatchewan, not on the 50 miles square, but in 20-mile sections, as they could find timber to suit them, and under that arrangement they might have taken all the timber on the North Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this question of timber limits is relevant to the matter before the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether he gave up his timber limit in consequence of its being worthless, or if it was a valuable limit.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I would just say to the hon. gentleman, so far as the timber limit is concerned, that on the 1st of January, at 4 o'clock, I left Calgary, and drove with one Scotchman and a half-breed 40 miles during the night, and the next day 50. I was out nine or ten nights in the snow, and did not then get to where the timber was. I got just where I could see it, but the half-breed said he thought it was very good. That is all I can tell the hon. gentleman about it. There is this to be said to parties who are going for timber, that the nearer they go to the Rockies the better, because the Indians tear off the bark, which destroys the timber. So far as the present resolutions are concerned, I think they are very liberal to the people of Manitoba, and that the people of Manitoba should be pleased with them. I do not think any gentleman in this House can say that the Government does not desire to deal fairly and liberally with the people of Manitoba; and I believe those people will be more satisfied and better contented, and that the country will be more prosperous.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Cardwell declared that no alteration or modification could possibly take place in the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with regard to the twenty years' monopoly. Now, the late Minister of Railways made a statement in this House, in my hearing, that a modification would be made on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, and that certain privileges would be handed over after the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in respect of construction of other lines of railways. That promise was made on an occasion when the late Minister of Railways was advocating a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that his statement must certainly coincide with the views of his colleagues. That statement has been objected to by the present Minister of Railways. That plea was held out while the hon. gentleman was advocating the loan of \$30,000,000, for some purpose or other—to modify the views of hon. gentleman with reference to this claim, and to procure their votes in favor of the loan he then was advocating.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I had hoped that the resolutions would have passed the House without any animadversions being made upon them by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I thought the last person to say a word against those resolutions, liberal and generous as they are, would be the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). There was no member for Manitoba that had a word to say against them except that hon. gentleman; and you would hardly think it possible after all, considering the position in which he stands, and the strong party views he holds, that he would rise in his place when the time came and follow out the well-laid plans of a certain party in Manitoba, who have their political arteries extending all through the Dominion, by objecting to the resolutions. We know that the Manitoba delegates have been here year after year asking for further subsidies. We know that the country has heard, year after year, of the demands by that Province for money to pay the current expenses of the Province; and, Sir, we know that the newspapers of the country, on both sides of politics, refrained from saying a great deal with regard to the justice of the demands which were made by that Province, or as to whether they were exorbitant or not. The *Globe* newspaper said nothing to assist these men in getting a larger annuity. But, Sir, when this Government, almost to the surprise of the delegates themselves, had yielded to them an annuity worth more to them than the annuities of any Province of the Dominion, putting them on a better footing to-day than any other

Province of the Dominion; when they had given them, in addition to the \$227,000 they had in 1879, a financial position which puts them above every other Province in this Dominion, *per capita*—I thought that after doing all this the members for Manitoba, to a man, would have been found endorsing these resolutions. I am happy to say that there is only one man in that Province who does not—the same man who gave his vote against granting aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, if it had not been granted, would have left the Province which he represents here—or, at all events, he has a seat in this House for a constituency in that Province—would have left it a desolate wilderness, without any railway whatever. That same gentleman—at home a strong advocate for the building of that railway, at home a strong advocate for having communication by railway through the country—the moment that this Government offered the only solution which can be offered to assist that great railway enterprise, got on his feet, and, willingly or unwillingly.

Mr. WATSON. Willingly.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then we have the evidence of private conversations, not with me but with others, in which he said it was an unwilling vote he gave against that loan.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will not be turned from my argument by the hon. gentleman. If he does it willingly I believe he will live to regret that he gave such a vote or made such remarks in this House, on matters pertaining directly to the interests of his Province—to matters which would have helped his Province; but at the shrine of party, shall I say, because he had behind him another power egging him on to do that which his better judgment told him was wrong.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. WOODWORTH. These terms were offered to the delegates, and they went home and submitted them to their own Parliament, a Provincial Parliament; and after a long debate and full investigation on both sides, they were accepted by a majority of 19 to 7; and yet, after the Province had accepted these resolutions by a vote of two to one, we keeping our part of the compact, we find the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), a follower of the great stickler for Provincial rights, getting up and denying before the Federal Parliament the right of the Province of Manitoba to manage its own financial affairs. The Province of Manitoba as a Province had pronounced on these terms; its Legislature, with an unprecedented majority, had accepted them; and it does not lie in the mouth of any member from that Province, in the face of his own professions, to deny that it has the right to manage its own affairs within its own bounds, by agreeing to the passing of these resolutions. Mr. Norquay, in a speech in the House last Session, used these words:

"But with the present offer Manitoba would have \$5.38½ per head, which was far in excess of what any other Province was receiving; yet they were told publicly that if this offer were accepted the country would go into rebellion, the Province of Manitoba would secede. Mr. Norquay here read from the *Free Press* an advertisement signed by the officers of the Farmers' Union, summoning a convention, to be held on the evening of the 31st inst. On this he observed that was the spirit in which it was proposed to intimidate or coerce the action of this House. He had never seen anything so subversive of free institutions. If such was the spirit of the people of this country it was time for honest men to see that they left it."

A large portion of the members of this Farmers' Union are probably very good men, in their way; but the motive power, as I had occasion once before to say in this House, is hostile to the existence of the Federal Government. This Union created all the dissension possible, and attempted to intimidate and coerce the Legislature of Manitoba from passing these very terms; and this newspaper, the *Free Press*, the proprietor of which was an unsuccessful candidate,

recently, in an election in Winnipeg, protested against these terms, and attempted to browbeat the members of that House into ignoring and refusing to pass these terms. Now, I say the Government and the Legislature of that Province having accepted these terms as liberal and generous—unprecedentedly so—and as giving a better financial status to that Province, according to the Premier's own language, than that of any other Province in the Dominion, the hon. member for Marquette should have been the first man in this House to have got up and given his adhesion to them. They are a finality, says the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—I object to their being a finality, says Mr. Blake. Why, Sir, when Nova Scotia's terms came here to be passed upon, he took mighty good care that they should be a finality, and he had an amendment inserted in the resolutions to that effect. What is the matter with him to-day, that he does not want these terms to be a finality? In the long speech he made—and I watched him very carefully—he did not hold out to Manitoba any hope that he would give it better terms. He never said that these terms were ungenerous; he said they were a finality, and yet, a few moments afterwards, he said, notwithstanding your terms, they will be back here again. Last Session he denounced as unconstitutional and dishonest the giving of any subsidy to any Province by this Government. If he be true to his own professions, should he come into power he would not give Manitoba, or any other Province, a dollar from the Federal Treasury. But he says they will be back here, and that the Government and Parliament of Canada will give them more; therefore, he never expects to be returned to power. I believe Manitoba will not be back for better terms; I believe she deserves the liberal treatment that has been accorded to her, and I believe the other six Provinces forming this Dominion will be glad to give her this grant from the public Exchequer; but it is a poor, poor return, that a man with the great legal, forensic, literary and parliamentary abilities the hon. leader of the Opposition possesses, should stand on his feet for an hour trying to show that these terms should not be passed, and yet he dare not tell the public of the Dominion that they are too generous, because that would affect their little plan of political progress in Manitoba; and he had not the courage to tell them they were too little, because he knows he would not be able to make the speeches during the recess, if we ever get a recess, that he commonly makes through Ontario, and to tell the people we are giving too much to Manitoba. So he is between two fires; and yet I believe he is the only man in this Dominion who could for one hour talk on this question and say nothing about the main subject before the House. He told us about the university, the school lands, and political grievances; but the main question before the House he went by. He balanced the thing in the scale, and he said nothing whatever; he left it there, but he got his follower, the hon. member for Marquette, to be careful to denounce the terms. Why? Because the *Free Press*, the organ of the Reform party in the Province of Manitoba, had violently and personally assailed the members who passed these terms, and he would be wanting in his duty if he did not carry out the well-concocted plan and follow up, in this Parliament, all the attacks made on the Government by their friends in Manitoba. This is not a new question—it is sowing dissension; we have heard it ever since the hon. member for West Durham came to be the leader of the Opposition. The moment the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) ceased to be the leader of the Opposition there was a marked difference, as the waters of the Gulf of Mexico are different from those of the Atlantic. There has been one marked plan: show every Province it is discontented, and if you give them a subsidy, as you did last year, show them that that is an invasion of provincial rights; sow dis-

Mr. WOODWORTH.

sension in New Brunswick, in Nova Scotia, in Ontario—that is the baseball ground; that is where they are at home—sow dissension there; in Manitoba, be careful to have your Farmers' Union to sow dissension there; as to British Columbia, ask all the questions you can, and sow dissension there; and if the Government come to their relief and give them a grant from the Exchequer, be sure and tell them that if they give the other Provinces anything they are robbing Ontario. And if they do not, they will rise in rebellion. You will be all ruined if you will. You will be all ruined if you will not; you will be ruined any way. Take your choice; heads I win, tails you lose. Such a course of debate, such a course of conduct is apparent to the people of the country, and the reason hon. gentlemen opposite cannot win a single constituency from the Liberal Conservative party is because the people have higher, more intelligent, more patriotic and clearer political convictions than have hon. gentlemen opposite, the sole aim of whose political existence is not to help this Dominion, not to aid its progress and add to its prosperity, but to change seats and get into office. Had it not been for the five years they have spent in office they might have some chance; had it not been for those five years they might, with some degree of assurance, impose on the credulity of the people, by making these very long speeches. But the people cannot forget their record. I merely rise to give my adherence to these resolutions, believing it is in the interest of the whole Dominion that the Province of Manitoba, exceptionally situated as she is, with her vast internal resources and her promise of a great future, will well repay the Dominion, for this beneficent legislation. We must give her everything we can to start her on the highway of life and enable her to pay her way at the outset, confident that with the millions of people whom she will attract to her territory she will return to the public Exchequer not only dollar per dollar but dollars where we give her cents. I do not regret these generous terms, and I believe that the Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Norquay, by making the able speech he did, in accepting those terms which the Dominion Government have given, stands better to-day than he ever did. I, representing a small Province down by the sea, have a right to vote for those resolutions. It is my duty to vote for them, and I can defend my vote to my constituents. I can show them that I am helping the great arm of the Dominion, this great power in the west, which is going to give valuable aid in the near future in filling the coffers of the Dominion Treasury. In voting for these resolutions I believe I am giving my vote not only in the interests of Manitoba, but in the interests of the other Provinces as well. And as a lower Province man, I am not to be told, nor do I think it lies in the mouth of one of the representatives of the Province of Manitoba to tell us that this is a mere pittance, and should not be a finality. He, I may say, is the only man among hon. gentlemen opposite who came out flat-footed on this question, for though his leader went all round the question he did not dare to say what his follower said.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman has put words into my mouth I never uttered. It is well known he is in the habit of doing such things.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I desire the hon. gentleman to point out where I put words in his mouth.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman said I said this was a mere pittance.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not go beyond a personal explanation.

Mr. WATSON. The arguments I used against these resolutions were taken out of the statements of the Premier of Manitoba. These were the only arguments I used, and

the objection I have personally to those resolutions is the finality clause.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is not an explanation. The hon. gentleman says I put words in his mouth which he did not utter. I defy him to prove that.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I do not rise to investigate the reason why the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will not consult the member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Woodworth), as to the thoughts he shall think or the speeches he shall make, though we know his declining to do so has been a deep and constant cause of regret to the member for King's; nor do I rise to defend the hon. member for Marquette, for he is well able to defend himself, and my opinion is he will stand fairly and boldly before his constituents and meet their approval, when many others, like the gophers of the North-West, are hunting their holes. I rise to call attention to some remarks which fell from the First Minister. He did not understand how a man in the North-West could be in straitened circumstances when wheat is at \$1 a bushel. Well, a few evenings ago I quoted an extract from a letter I received from a gentleman who has been six years in the North-West, and who states he has seen wheat offered at 25 cents a bushel without finding a purchaser. The First Minister said the only thing for these people to do was to thresh the grain and grind the wheat and eat, but he must remember that something more than flour is necessary to supply the wants of families of the North-West. Their wants are more numerous than those of people in the older Provinces. The condition of the farmer there is quite different from what it is in the older Provinces. The First Minister is, no doubt, familiar with the difficulties the pioneers of the older Provinces had to go through, but though of a different character, they were not more severe than those which have to be encountered by the settlers in the North-West. The settler in Ontario had first to clear the land, but this labor furnished him with many things of which the North-West settler is deprived. For instance, he procured timber with which to build his house, and he had no difficulty in obtaining fuel; so that while he was not able to produce to the extent the farmer on the prairie can, he had much less to purchase. Furthermore, in the majority of cases the pioneers of the older Provinces found employment during the winter months in lumbering operations. There was not the forced idleness in winter that must occur to a considerable extent in the North-West. If they can grow immense quantities of grain more speedily than the old Provinces can, it is at this very point that the necessity comes in for them to find the market for that grain and the facility for placing that grain upon the market. His resources are largely limited in that direction; he is much like the coal miner in that regard, who can have all the coal he wants. He will suffer nothing from want of fuel, but the coal will not supply him with other things unless he can get it to market. To a large extent this is the condition of the wheat grower in the North-West. Hence it is of the utmost importance that he should have an outlet for the wheat he produces. He has no other means. I referred to the settlers in Ontario in their early stages. From the other employment they were able to earn some money. From potash they realized some ready cash. Many of the best farms in Ontario to-day rest, in the first instance, upon the proceeds of potash. The First Minister has stated, too, that without any disallowance at all other railways would not have been built. On this point, from information which I believe is reliable, I entirely disagree with him. I believe other railways would have been built had it not been for this disallowance. If, however, they had not been built, it would, at all events,

have relieved the Government from the responsibility. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has said that they have to wait until business is established along the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, to the men who went into the North-West five, or six, or seven years ago, five or six or seven years is rather long waiting; as I read the other day in a letter from a man possessing considerable means up there. "Our patience is exhausted; we must have relief or leave." Generally, on this question of the allowance of railways through the North-West, I can but reiterate the words of the ex-Finance Minister the other evening, that I believe that country can never reach the measure of prosperity it is entitled to until it has a free right to build its own railways.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister of Customs will tell us what was the total demand the Manitoba Government made. I have seen it stated in the reports of their proceedings that they demanded about \$450,000 a year.

Mr. BOWELL. Their demand is embodied in their applications, which have been laid before the House. I do not remember the exact sum, but they demanded the total surrender of the lands and the extension of the boundaries, running down to the Hudson's Bay and almost to the North Pole, and the surrender of the school lands, and the readjustment of the tariff as applicable to that Province alone. They did not ask to have it repealed or interfered with, so far as it affected any of the other Provinces. I am not prepared at this moment to state the total amount which they asked, but they consented, after a good deal of negotiation, to have the terms of payment changed to the sums which are placed in these resolutions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it reasonable to ask the Minister in charge if he can give me this information. I was quoting simply from the statement made in the Local Legislature, and that was that they had made a demand for about \$450,000 a year. I wanted to understand this from the Minister, because it is important for us, in considering these resolutions, to know how far what we ultimately concede agrees with what they ask for in the first instance. I am not now expressing an opinion as to whether their demands were right or not, though I am bound to say that if it was not for the fact that we have absorbed all their lands we would be treating them very liberally indeed; but no one knows better than the Minister of Customs that a good deal of necessary work was defrayed in the old Provinces out of the sales of lands, and that, I presume, is the reason, and it is a very good reason, why we should deal more liberally with these people. If the hon. gentleman has not the exact figures, I should be glad if he would ascertain them before another stage. Who formed the sub-committee to arrange these terms?

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of Railways and Canals. Finally, the greatest stress was laid upon the extension of the limits for the purpose of enabling the Province to assist the Hudson's Bay Railway, which they looked upon as a second outlet for the products of the Province, and they also laid great stress upon receiving all the lands within the territory. The reason why the committee and the Government did not concede these demands is fully set forth in the papers brought down. The large expenditure which has been made by the Dominion Government in aid of railways in that Province and the fact that they were pledged to the world that the homestead system should prevail in that country were considered of sufficient importance to justify the Dominion in retaining control of those lands. The hon. gen-

tleman will readily understand that, when the quantity of lands given and promised to be given to aid railways are added to those which are given in the way of free homesteads, nearly all the lands will be absorbed, and anyone who considers the question for a moment will come to the conclusion that, with the large grants already made and the expense which attends the management of those lands, taking them over by the Province of Manitoba would be a source of expense to them rather than a profit. In the older Provinces these lands have not been given away in the manner in which they were or to the same extent in which they were in the North-West, particularly in aid of railways. It is true that the homestead principle is recognised in our own northern countries. The lands there were rough and they have not been settled as rapidly as they have been in the North-West. On this point I may be excused from making an observation on the want of railway facilities among farmers in that section of the country. Those who represent constituencies like my own, extending into the interior 120 or 150 miles from the frontier, and 100 miles from a railway, should not attempt to draw an invidious distinction between the settlers of the North-West and those living in localities like that. The northern part of my constituency consisted largely of free grant territories for a distance of 100 miles, and when I was visiting that section of the country, in 1878, I found farmers who had been there for ten or fifteen years, with 60 or 100 to 150 tons of hay stacked upon their farms, their barns full of wheat and other grain, and not one single bushel of which could they sell anywhere. I could easily give the reason for that fact. The lumbering industry at that time was stagnant, and the people in that section of the country were largely dependent upon that industry for their market. Now, those people had no railways and they have got no railways to-day; I am very sorry they have not, because I think if they had a railway running into the interior through those free grant territories, it would have the effect of settling up a great area of land now lying idle. There are a great many people there with their granaries full of the best grain that can be produced in the country, and their barnyards stacked with hay, which they could not dispose of, and yet I never heard anyone complaining particularly of that as a reason why these people should go into rebellion, or that there should exist a chronic state of grumbling because somebody did not go in there and build a railway. And when we consider that these people have been but a few years in Manitoba, and that they have far less cause of complaint than those who live in the new sections of the country in the older Provinces, I think we must admit that some of these complaints are unreasonable. The Government have shown a desire, not only to improve their condition, but, so far as they possibly can, to give an outlet to an enormous extent of country in that Province. That this might have been done before I am not prepared to say; but as the First Minister pointed out—and the House will excuse me for referring to a previous debate—we have been constantly enlarging our policy, and when one system would not accomplish the object in view, of constructing railways, we have increased the aid; and the desire of the Government, like that of every member in this House, I am sure, is to extend a net work of railways throughout that country as rapidly as possible, in order that it may soon be settled up, and I have not the slightest doubt that the Dominion will be amply repaid for any expenditure in that direction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend, in his last remarks, has raised, I fear, a tolerably broad question. My objection to the policy of the Government is two-fold. In the first place, I have the strongest objection to giving a monopoly to any private company. I have no faith whatever in any private railway company, or any other com-

Mr. BOWELL.

pany having a monopoly. We know how it has been in the past, and the condition of south-western Manitoba is the best possible proof of the extreme inexpediency of that policy. Now, it is not solely in consideration of the interests of the people of south-western Manitoba that we have been arguing in favor of giving them help to build railways in former years, but because nothing could contribute more to the development of the North-West and to this whole Dominion than that they should be so assisted. However, I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that if we go into this subject very little indeed will be said about these resolutions. I want to get more information and some details about them. Now, I will call the attention of the Government and the House to this fact: When we had occasion to treat with the Manitoba delegates, in 1876, I think it was, we were obliged to overhaul their expenditure, which, I am bound to say, was extremely extravagant for so small a country, and we endeavored to induce them to adapt their outlay to their income. They did do that, to some extent; they reduced the expenses of Government, which were monstrous for the number of people whom that Government was intended to benefit; they abolished their Upper House and took further measures in the same direction, some at our own instance and some at their own suggestion, all for the purpose of bringing their expenditure within their income. Now, the Government is standing, it appears, to some extent, *in loco parentis* to Manitoba, and I would be glad to know if they went into any calculation with those delegates to see whether the income which they now receive is reasonably sufficient to enable them to discharge the duties which are cast on those Provincial Governments. In ordinary cases I do not know that we could fairly insist upon that, but in this particular instance it would have been an expedient thing to do, and I would be glad to know if anything of that kind occurred as between the representatives of the Dominion and the Manitoba Government. It would be important that there should have been; because, without at the moment entering into this question of finality, it is very clear that it is not desirable that we should have delegations from Manitoba coming down here year after year to ask us for more money and to show us that that Province is almost bankrupt, and that the great interests which are undoubtedly involved in settling up Manitoba will be sacrificed unless we make them further grants.

Mr. McLELAN. I may say, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that in the month of April, 1884, I was present at an interview with several delegates from Manitoba, at which the Finance Minister was also present, and the Premier of the Province went very carefully over the expenditures of the Provincial Government and the requirements of the Province for local wants; and they agreed pretty well upon an amount that would be sufficient to meet all those purposes, and to develop all the interests that were considered necessary to be developed in behalf of the country, such as schools and the maintenance of education; this latter subject, I may say, the Premier represented as involving a very heavy expense, for the Local Government had been establishing schools, making liberal grants for that purpose in many districts. The Finance Minister, unfortunately, was called away before the negotiations were completed, but the basis of them was arranged before he left for England, in the month of May last. I know that the Premier of the Province was quite satisfied with the terms agreed upon, and I believed they would meet all the local wants of the Province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the hon. gentleman obtain any detailed scheme from these delegates of how they proposed to administer their funds? I ask that because we found it necessary a few years ago to insist on their submitting some sort of scheme. I know it

had a very beneficial effect—at any rate, I was so assured by members of their Legislature and by gentlemen in Manitoba afterwards. My recollection is, that after discussing the matter we brought it down and laid it on the Table. I do not observe that there was anything of that kind in the papers submitted to us on the present occasion.

Mr. McLELAN. There was nothing of that kind done officially, but the expenditure of the Province for the last year or two was taken up by the Premier and the Finance Minister; item by item was discussed, and it was agreed what could be dispensed with and what was essential for this year, and what might be considered a permanent charge upon the cost of the country, divided into these several items, and the result was obtained in that way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, ordinarily, I would object to interfering with the expenditure; but when the Province is making applications, from time to time, we are lead to examine into the expenditure. I noticed in many of the statements, which I casually looked over, items of expenditure which struck me as being exceedingly large for so small and sparsely settled a Province.

Mr. BOWELL. The principal concession which hon. gentlemen obtained from the Government of that day was the abolition of the Upper House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was the most showy one, but there were many others, also.

Mr. BOWELL. If we were to endeavor to interfere with their appropriations there would be many things to which both parties would object; but this matter is one exclusively within their own control.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We must take care that this Province or any other Province does not get into the habit of spending too much money, and then seeking to obtain aid from the general taxes. If such a policy were allowed to be continued it would make government impossible. That is the reason why I call more attention to it than I otherwise would be disposed to do. If the hon. gentleman has not got a detailed statement, I do not see any use in pressing the matter any further.

On resolution 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can hon. gentlemen opposite give us information as to the probable quantity of swamp land that will be covered by the resolution?

Mr. McLELAN. No estimate was made by the Manitoba Legislature, nor was any proposed. It was considered those were lands that required to be improved before they were valuable, and that the Local Government was in a better position to take charge of the necessary improvements than the Dominion Government. It was therefore proposed that whatever might be determined to be swamp lands should be handed over to Manitoba.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have seen myself, in the Province of Manitoba, very remarkable results obtained at a very moderate expenditure in the way of reclaiming swamp lands. When they are reclaimed they are very rich, although, fortunately, in that country, land in so many places is rich that this consideration is of less consequence than it would be in the older Provinces. I desire to direct attention to this point. The Government of Manitoba is very poor and has no capital at its command. The Dominion Government, in parting with this land, does it at the instance of the Manitoba Government, but also, no doubt, with a view of having the land reclaimed. It will be very difficult indeed for the Government of Manitoba to reclaim swamp land unless the Dominion Government loans them the money. This is precisely one

of those cases in which a party or a Government having very considerable capital might afford to go to the expenditure, which will be amply repaid, but not for a term of years; and I fear very much, however excellent the intentions in granting this land may have been, of this swamp land will lie for a long time without being reclaimed, unless it be the intention of the Dominion Government to loan Manitoba the money to make the necessary improvements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the discussion first arose between the Manitoba Government and this Government in regard to swamp lands, there was a proposition made that the swamps, which are of very considerable magnitude, not very far distant from Winnipeg, should be drained; that is to say, that the Province of Manitoba undertook to drain those huge swamps, and was to receive half of the reclaimed lands for doing the work, the other half of the reclaimed lands going to the Dominion. That undertaking was not successful. The Manitoba Government spent a good deal of money without achieving much result. Thus the matter stood until the late negotiations were entered upon. Reference was then had to the practice in the United States, and it was found that in the western States, which were formed from territories, the United States Government held the whole of the land and sold it for the advantage of the whole country, and not of the particular territory. But the United States Government are in the habit of handing over lands that were deemed swamp lands, beyond a doubt, to the State, reserving such lands as did not need any expense for reclamation. We came at last to the conclusion that we would adopt the American system; that we would hand over to Manitoba the lands which were swamp lands, those which had been ascertained to be such by the Dominion Government. The Dominion Parliament cannot charge on the revenues of the country a sum of money in order to reclaim those lands in Manitoba. The Province was very glad to accept those swamp lands under the arrangement I have indicated, and they proposed, as I understand it, to do what has actually happened in the western States; that is, that the Province would make some arrangements with a body of capitalists by which the capitalists would reclaim a certain tract of land and receive a certain portion of the land as payment for their services. It is impossible to obtain an approximate estimate of the quantity of swamp lands in question. Manitoba now extends far north of the surveyed portion, and it is supposed that the further north you go the more rock and water you strike, and the more swamp. The Government might obtain an approximate idea of what the swamp land is in the surveyed portion of the Province. But I do not think that information would assist us very much. It is quite clear that the Dominion Parliament will not authorise the expenditure of money to drain those swamps, and if so, they will remain swamps or muskegs for all time, no matter whether they are large or small.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to know if any member of the Government can tell us the probable amount of land which will be transferred by this provision. No doubt surveys were made and reports given by the surveyors, so that there should be in the Department of the Interior an estimate of the quantity of swamp lands which will be transferred. The quantity might depend on the season of the year, because, especially in the valleys of the Red River and the Assinaboine River, a large quantity of land is flooded in the spring which is perfectly dry later in the season.

Mr. BOWELL. This same question has been put by three different members of the Opposition, and answered as many times. It was first asked by the hon. member for South Huron, subsequently by the hon. member for Brant, and now by the hon. member for Bothwell. It was explained at the time the first explanation was given, again by the leader of the Government, and I will now endeavor to repeat—

Mr. MILLS. Yes ; it is your turn now.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes ; and if it is any gratification to members of the Opposition to reply to each one of them, separately, I will get the answers stereotyped. Hon. gentlemen were informed that we had no possible means of ascertaining the exact quantity of land transferred under this resolution, from the simple fact that a large portion of Manitoba is yet unsurveyed, and consequently the quantity could not be given, even approximately. The hon. gentleman properly says that there may be a record of all the swamp lands which have been surveyed, but even that would be very difficult to arrive at, if the statement of the hon. gentleman be correct, that if these surveys took place in the spring or after a flood a large portion of the surface of Manitoba might be treated as swamp land ; but that if it took place in the fall, it would be found dry, covered with luxuriant grass or growing splendid crops. The resolution itself is the best answer I can give the hon. gentleman. I may say, however, that I will make enquiry in the Department of the Interior, and ascertain, before concurrence, whether they are able to give an approximate estimate of the quantity. I know that in discussing this question with the delegation we came to this decision, that all lands which could be shown to be *bonâ fide* swamp lands should be transferred, and that would have to be decided by some means hereafter. I may say, further, that under the resolution every precaution will be taken to see that any lands which may be applied for as swamp lands come within the meaning of that designation. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will not object to Manitoba having a very large quantity of land, and that the most liberal possible construction should be put on this resolution, in order to give that Province what many members of the Opposition are claiming they should have—the control over their own land to as great an extent as possible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says he will get his answer stereotyped, but one reason why the question is repeated is that we do not want a stereotyped answer. As this is to be a final settlement, according to the preamble, it seemed not unreasonable to suppose that there might be some estimate of the probable quantity of swamp land in Manitoba. But, looking at the matter from a patriotic standpoint, as I do, I would almost be inclined to doubt, from the speeches of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) and other hon. gentlemen on that side, whether there is such a thing in Manitoba at all as swamp land. I am not sure whether it is not unpatriotic, from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen, to intimate that there is any swamp land in Manitoba. One would think, however, that there would be an approximation to an estimate of what would be considered swamp land, under the meaning of this resolution, in the surveyed portion of the Province, at any rate, and that, I understand, is what the hon. member for Bothwell wanted to find out. Surely the Dominion Government must have some information in their hands upon that point. Would lands which are under water at certain seasons of the year constitute swamp lands, or only those lands of which no use can be made for any purpose until there has been an expenditure of money upon them ?

Mr. BOWELL. I should think that a very small quantity of land, with the exception of muskegs, would be con-

Mr. MILLS.

sidered utterly worthless at all seasons. In Ontario, we all understand distinctly what is meant by swamp land, where it is wooded, and consequently useless until it is cleared. Where swamp lands have been cleared of the wood, even without a drain being dug through the lower sections, they sometimes become very valuable meadow land, and in Manitoba they have overflowed lands as we have here. What I understand by swamp lands in that country is land which cannot be used, either for cutting hay or for agricultural purposes, until it has been reclaimed by drainage. As the First Minister stated, when this concession was made to Manitoba it was principally for the reason that the lands are generally given away in that Province by the Dominion, either for railroad purposes or homesteading. The amount that has been realised, from a monetary standpoint, is not very great, and it was considered that the lands could be drained by the Manitoba Government much more advantageously than by the Dominion Government ; they would take advantage of the organisation of companies, as is done in the adjoining States of the Union, capitalists taking a certain portion of the land in consideration of the amount they expended, the balance going to the Province. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I found fault at questions being asked, because when I was on that side of the House I did not hesitate to ask questions myself, and I have no right to find fault at the matter being closely scrutinised. What I did say, in a jocular way, was that the same question had been asked and replied to before. I will endeavor, if possible, to obtain the information asked for by the hon. gentleman, so far as they refer to the lands already surveyed.

Mr. MILLS. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's first explanation, and I do not know how he interpreted this expression, "swamp lands." As I understand, he now says that lands capable of cultivation without drainage would not be considered swamp lands. Now, there may be many lots or sections in Manitoba part of which is swamp and part of which is fit for cultivation ; I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the whole lot passes. How does he interpret this portion of the resolution ?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter of detail. The very question which has suggested itself to the hon. gentleman's mind suggested itself to my own when I was in conversation with the delegates, and I asked them the question in almost the same words. Suppose there is a section containing 20 or 30 acres of swamp, it is not expected to pass. Swamp lands, as understood by this resolution, and as understood by those who negotiated these terms, mean a general swamp, covering any large area of country. If 1,000 acres or 500 acres, or a whole section, were swamp, and could be shown to be swamp, to the satisfaction of the Government, that would be transferred ; but a section with a portion dry and a portion swamp could be cultivated, and would not pass. It must be swamp land, and it must be proved to the satisfaction of the Government that it is such.

Mr. TROW. It will be very difficult for the Minister of the Interior to ascertain the quantity of swamp land in the Province of Manitoba ; it would depend very much on the season. There are thousands of acres of land on the southern boundary of Lake Manitoba which, in 1877, was good, arable land, fit for cultivation, but which is now a total swamp owing to the felling in of the outlet to the lake ; and in the Boyne settlement there are 15,000 or 20,000 acres of swamp lands. There is also a very large swamp between Portage la Prairie and Westbourne, which is very valuable to the inhabitants of Portage la Prairie and the country around as hay land. Whether that goes to the Province or not I am not prepared to say. When a portion of a section is swamp and the rest fit for cultivation I do not suppose the Government will interfere with it, because

it is just as valuable to a settler, and probably more so, than if it were all fit for cultivation.

Mr. ROSS. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). There are large districts in Manitoba which, in 1872, showed no sign of being swamp land at all, and which, in 1877 and 1878, after a succession of very wet seasons, looked like total swamps. The swamp near Portage la Prairie I passed over in 1872, and could not get water for my horses; and in 1877 and 1878 it was impossible to cross it. When the Pembina branch was constructed, from Emerson to Winnipeg, the contractors found it very difficult to obtain water for their horses and men. Anyone passing over the same country some years after would think it was a complete swamp. There are two kinds of swamps; one is where the bottom is hard, where there is an overflow of water, and where the land in ordinary years is good meadow land; then there are swamps where the bottom is very soft, and drainage is required before you can render the land fit for a meadow. With regard to single sections, where there is a little swamp, I do not think the Government should take those into account. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) that it is fully as valuable, or more so, to have a portion in swamp, because it furnishes a meadow; in dry seasons it is the most valuable part of your section, if you are a dairy farmer. To select swamp lands you will have to take ordinary years and strike an average, as near as possible. From surveyors' reports you cannot make an estimate of the wet lands, because the character of the reports depends entirely on whether the season is a wet or a dry one.

Mr. WATSON. I can heartily concur in the remarks of the hon. members for Perth (Mr. Trow) and Lisgar (Mr. Ross). Lake Manitoba, as is well known to the Government, especially to the Minister of Public Works, rose, during some years ago,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet, but this year has receded, on account of the drier season; so that hundreds of thousands of acres around Lake Manitoba, which were actually worthless during 1879 and 1880, on account of their being covered with water, are now very fair land, and settlers are beginning to locate there.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). You would not call it swamp land.

Mr. WATSON. It is a question difficult to settle as to what is called swamp lands.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). There is a difference between swamp lands and lands covered with water.

Mr. WATSON. In 1876 I have seen as fine wheat land around Lake Manitoba, and apparently as good dry land as could be seen anywhere, and in 1880 I have gone over that land duck shooting, when it has been covered with 3 feet of water.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). The high water drove the settlers away.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; they had to leave the land. In some cases patents were given to settlers for homesteads that were probably as much as two miles away from where you could travel on foot without getting wet. It would be difficult to ascertain from any of the surveyors' reports of Manitoba as to what is dry land and what is swamp land. In 1873-74, when a great portion was surveyed, lands were put down as arable land, fit for cultivation, which, in 1880, were covered with water, some of them too wet to cut hay on. It would be interesting for the people of Manitoba to know in what year they should locate the swamp lands. I think the most liberal construction ought to be given, because a good many of the lands can only be kept right by constant watching and draining; and the Dominion Government would not see fit

to see to the draining of some swamp or particular location, which the Local Government might cause to be drained, or it might be done partly by the municipalities. I hope, when it is finally settled what is swamp lands, the most liberal construction will be given, or else the lands would be but little or no benefit to Manitoba. It has been stated by the Minister of Customs the Government have not received very large monetary consideration out of the lands of Manitoba. That being the case, and the good lands being given away for nothing, the Local Government cannot expect to get a large price for those lands. I do not wish to enter into any controversy, but I may say, with reference to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for King's, N. S., as to the stand I have taken on different measures, that as regards any votes I have given or opinions I have expressed in this House, I am willing they should remain between me and my constituents. I am quite willing to answer to them, for they are the proper persons to whom I should answer, and, so far, I have no reason to regret any vote I have given or statement I have made in this House, and I hope I shall not have any cause for regret in the future. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that no member of this House had the right to criticise the resolutions. If they are not to be criticised, what is the House for? I understand that if any hon. gentleman wishes to advocate more liberal terms for this Province he has the right to do so, and if there is, unfortunately, any hon. gentleman here who thinks the Province is getting too much, he has the right to express that opinion. I only wish these terms had been more liberal. I have not found fault with the resolutions, so far as they go, but I do not think they go far enough, and I am led to understand, by the remarks of the First Minister and the Minister in charge of the resolutions, that they are not to be considered final for the future.

Mr. BOWELL. They do not say so.

Mr. WATSON. That is one point I would like to understand. They do not prevent the Legislature of Manitoba coming back next year and asking better terms?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not.

Mr. WATSON. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction and alarm among the people of Manitoba when, in 1881, the Finance Minister made the statement that he had made a settlement with the Province of Manitoba for ten years, on certain conditions. That was contradicted by the Premier when the delegation was at Ottawa. I know there was considerable trouble in having that matter opened up, when the Premier of Manitoba visited Ottawa last year. I hope such misconstructions will not be put on anything done in this House, by means of which Manitoba would be deprived of the privilege of coming to Parliament any time the interests of the Province require and asking further aid, because I consider it of the greatest importance that the people of Manitoba should be dealt with liberally, not only in the interests of that Province but of the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS. I have been making enquiry of the Minister who has charge of these resolutions, for the purpose of eliciting information, that we may better understand the resolutions which are before us. The hon. gentleman has told us how he understands the term "swamp lands" is to be defined, and he has also informed us, if I understood him rightly, that the understanding on the part of the Local Government of Manitoba and the Government here was that where a section was partly swamp only the swampy portion would pass under these resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not even go so far as that. I said that there were a few acres, 10, 20, 30 or 40, on the section, which would not be considered as passing as swamp land.

Mr. MILLS. What I understood the hon. gentleman to say was that he had conversed with the members of the Manitoba delegation on this subject, and where a section was partly swamp land the whole section did not pass.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not even say any portion of the section would pass.

Mr. MILLS. If a section is partly swamp and partly dry land, do the Government propose to divide it? Supposing a swamp, embracing 2,000 or 3,000 acres: if each entire section containing any part of that is to be transferred, that may increase it by 500 acres. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that they would only transfer actual swamp land. I am anxious to see whether we have really in this a settlement or a foundation for controversy. If this resolution was understood exactly in the same sense by the delegates from Manitoba and the Government here, and we can ascertain exactly what that sense was, there is no room for dispute, but if that is not the case, we should hear more from the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. I explained very fully, a short time ago what the understanding was between the delegates and the Government. Now the hon. gentleman has carried it a little further, so as to suppose a swamp of 3,000 or 4,000 acres, with a dry spot of four or five acres in the centre, that was never under water. I do not suppose the Government would cavil about a matter of that kind. We know, in this Province, that in swamp lands we can find an acre here and half an acre there that they are never under water, and could not therefore be considered swamp land. I understand that what is generally considered swamp land in this country and across the border will, after full investigation, be dealt with as provided. Certainly the lands my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) has referred to could not be considered swamp lands. There is a great difference between swamp lands and lands under water for a time from the overflow of a river or lake. I have passed over railway when it was half under water from the overflow of the Red River, but the land could not be called swamp, because, at a later period of the season, it was able to grow almost any kind of grain. I think the language is very clear, unless the hon. gentleman is afraid to leave it to the two Governments to decide, after full investigation, as to what really are swamp lands, in the general acceptance of the term.

Mr. MILLS. I have no objection to that, if we understand what the sense of the resolutions is. I was anxious to find out whether the Government, in dealing with the Province of Manitoba, intend to respect the boundaries as laid down by the surveys. Do the Government intend to deal, in reference to sections, half-sections and quarter-sections, or simply to look at the swamp and disregard the surveyed boundaries? Surely, there must have been some understanding on that subject.

Mr. BOWELL. The understanding is, that whatever the Manitoba Government can show to be swamp lands will be transferred to them, irrespective of the quantity they cover. As I have said, I do not think it is contemplated to take a few acres and cut them off from a section, any more than it would be to retain a few acres of dry land in the midst of a general swamp. The intention is to deal in the most liberal manner possible with the Manitoba Government in reference to these swamp lands, but it is not proposed to transfer to that Government any lands that are not, in the general acceptance of the term, swamp lands. When they apply to the Dominion Government to set apart a particular swamp, in order that they may drain it and make it fit for the market, I presume an officer of the Government will be sent to thoroughly investigate the whole question and report whether that is swamp land, and if it is, it will be transferred.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. MILLS. Is it proposed to transfer portions of land from time to time, as they may be applied for by the Manitoba Government, as swamp lands, or is there to be a general ascertainment by the two Governments and a general transfer of all the swamp lands in Manitoba? And is that transfer to be by grant from the Crown, or does the Government propose to ask Parliament to make a parliamentary transfer of these lands?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If these resolutions are adopted we will then have a parliamentary sanction for the granting of the lands. Of course, it would be absurd to come to Parliament for the transfer of every swamp. I do not suppose there will be any general transfer; I do not suppose that we are going to have a regular ordnance survey and make one general transfer. In answer to the other question put by the hon. gentleman, I think the legal construction would be, under the terms of this resolution, that if a portion of a section was swamp land, and another portion was not, they would not have any right to the dry land at all. My hon. friend asked, what will we do if there was an immense swamp and a ragged edge around it of small portions of dry land. Well, I take it that a swamp generally covers a large portion of ground. There may be islets in it, and if they are of considerable size they would not be conveyed.

Mr. MILLS. In the case of the Hudson Bay Company the transfer is by Act of Parliament. There are certain sections that are set out as Hudson Bay Company land, and the moment the survey is made those lands become, by Act of Parliament, the property of the company. But I wish to ascertain whether the Government proposed to transfer those swamp lands in the same way to the Government of Manitoba or whether they purposed to treat them as ordinary proprietors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there ought to be a conveyance, directly from the Crown, of those swamp lands.

Mr. WATSON. I would suggest that lands which have not been located as homesteads, or pre-empted on account of being wet, should be considered swamp lands. The Minister of Customs has stated that the lands around Lake Manitoba should not be termed swamp lands, because they are wet only in certain seasons. Now, I think the Local Legislature would look upon these lands around Lake Manitoba as probably being the most valuable lands they would be able to acquire. Settlers cannot go upon those lands in their present condition; they have got, first, to be drained, and the outlet of Lake Manitoba has got to be opened up to let off the water in wet seasons. No man is going to take up a homestead and settle on the shores of Lake Manitoba, when he is liable, in a wet season, to be drowned out. If these lands are not to be termed swamp lands, I think it would be a mistake.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows they are not swamp lands.

Mr. WATSON. I know they will not be taken up by any settler unless they are drained, and some assurance given that the lake will not rise again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has nothing to do with it. They are not swamp lands.

Mr. WATSON. They are lands which the Local Government figured largely upon in making this arrangement with the Dominion Government, and unless this outlet from Lake Manitoba is opened up those lands will be swamps for most of the time. We have seasons of what are termed three or four dry years, and wet two or three years. In wet years the water rises 3 or 4 feet. There is only one outlet out of the lake, and that has been partly closed up by the ice carrying boulders into the mouth of the

river. Consequently when three or four large streams are running into the lake in a wet season, those lands are submerged; and unless they are reclaimed they are going to be a loss, not only to the Dominion Government, but to the Local Government and the municipalities, and the only way to reclaim them is by removing the obstructions from the mouth of the outlet. I certainly think that lands of that description ought to be termed swamp lands, and be conveyed to the Local Government, and they will undertake to do the improvements to reclaim them.

Mr. TROW. Is there anything in the regulations as to when these lands shall be reclaimed? What about the nature of the cultivation? Is it merely optional with the Local Government to let them lay there as a bar to settlement for any length of time? We can easily understand that it is not the design of the Government to interfere with small portions of swamp here and there, but only with large limits. I think all these areas as could easily be ascertained from the field notes of the surveyors.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no intention of interfering with the Local Government in the respect to which my hon. friend has referred. It would be as much to their interest to have these lands reclaimed as it can be to ours. It is our interest to have them settled, in order to secure a consuming population, and it will be their interest to have them reclaimed and settled, so that parties living upon them will be taxable and furnish a revenue to the Local Government to carry on improvements. We take it for granted that in the interests of the Local Government they will reclaim them as soon as possible and get them settled.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Minister to state that those lands, such as I have described on the shores of Lake Manitoba, will not be termed swamp lands, and will not be conveyed to the Local Government?

Mr. BOWELL. I said so most distinctly—that the lands that are subject to be overflowed by a river or by a lake for only certain seasons of the year, and that are dry lands the rest of the year, cannot be termed swamp lands. There are plenty of lands that are wet that are not swamp lands.

Mr. WATSON. Those lands have been swamp lands for five or six years at a stretch, and they may have been dry lands for five or six years. Now, are not those lands to be termed swamp lands?

Mr. BOWELL. No; they could not possibly be swamp lands, because some of them have been taken up and settled upon.

On resolution 2,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman fixed on any definite sum at which he proposes to dispose of these lands, and where does he propose to locate them? Are you going just to select those 150,000 acres and hold them for a certain time, or are you going to put them into the market at some fixed rate from the outset.

Mr. BOWELL. The resolution does not provide the mode in which it shall be done, because that is not yet decided. It was simply decided to set apart fair average land, that would bring a fair average price, the proceeds to be invested for the benefit of the university, which is to be managed upon some basis or scheme to be framed by the university and approved by the Dominion Government. We have not yet decided in what portion of the Province this land is to be selected. It was thought sufficient, for the present, to provide for the appropriation of 150,000 acres of Crown land, of a fair average quality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is going to be of much practical value, I suppose you will have to begin to sell that land in a moderate space of time. Has any com-

munication passed, as yet, between the Government and the authorities? It seems to be all *in nubibus*, as yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is in Manitoba.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know whether it is proposed to hold the land for an indefinite period, or to put it on the market promptly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These terms were settled generally. When Parliament has approved of the proposed grant of 150,000 acres of land for university purposes, the university will propose a scheme or basis with respect to the land, and with respect to the selection of the land. Of course, the university should obtain good land, whether the Government would agree to set aside a block is very doubtful. I do not think we ought to do so. That is my opinion, speaking without prejudice. The university will be anxious to sell its land. There is no danger of its holding out for high prices, because an infant university will want money as soon as possible. The danger is, that the institution may sell the land at too low prices.

Mr. MILLS. The Canadian Pacific Railway have power to select land in Manitoba. Could the Government, before the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway companies which have grants make their selection, set aside these 150,000 acres? If the university is to come in after all these railway companies, I am afraid it will fare very badly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is plenty of land for all.

Mr. MILLS. But what is the order of selection. Could the Government go forward and make a selection of land without prejudicing the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway under the terms of the contract?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot break the contract. The railway company will, of course, have the odd-numbered sections in the railway belt. There is, however, in the Red River basin, a very large tract. There will be land enough to provide whatever difference may have to be supplied, and it is almost impossible that settlement or appropriation of land would so exhaust the supply as not to leave enough land to make up the deficiency.

Mr. MILLS. Within the railway belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway, between the Rocky Mountains and Winnipeg there are only between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 acres. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be entitled to about 15,000,000 acres outside of that belt. What if the company choose to take the greater part of those lands in Manitoba? Has the Government enquired from the company as to how much of those 15,000,000 acres they propose to select in Manitoba?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Expenses of Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, etc.,  
House of Commons ..... \$13,000

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will say how many extra sessional clerks are employed.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are 28, I think, altogether—including translators; last year there were 29, and the year before 30, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At what services are they employed?

Mr. SPEAKER. At different work about the House, at which they have always been employed—copying returns,

in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and other work under the direction of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MILLS. What returns?

Mr. SPEAKER. Different members ask for copies of returns, which may be brought down and are not printed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is it the duty of these extra clerks to make copies of such returns?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; for example, the Canadian Pacific Railway returns brought down last night are all being copied. Sometimes there are thousands of pages copied in that way.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Are we entitled to have that copying done? If, so, I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. SPEAKER. They have been doing it all along.

Mr. BOWELL. Sometimes, in the case of returns which are of a local and not of a general character, the Printing Committee, instead of ordering them to be printed, order a copy to be made for a member who desires it.

Mr. TROW. As I understand, it is only done on the order of the Printing Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. If a member wants a copy of any paper of that kind, he applies to the Clerk of the House, and if he has any of these extra clerks that he can set at work at that duty, he does so. They are employed under the Clerk of the House, and members are continually applying for their services in that way.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As I understand it, all these papers go before the Printing Committee in the first place. Of course those which are printed are not ordered to be copied. But it is a common practice, when a return is of a local character, to have it copied for any member who may desire a copy.

Contingencies—House of Commons..... \$24,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this increase of \$1,000 for?

Mr. SPEAKER. This arises out of the vote for postage and telegraphing. It is not on account of any increase in the cost of the telegraphing, because that is small—it is not \$100 a year—and it is diminishing. The cost of postage used to be \$5,000 some years ago, and it was cut down to \$1,000, but that vote has been exceeded every year. This includes the cost of carrying the mail between here and the city post office, all the foreign postage we pay, and all the expenses connected with our post office. It is really no increase, as the vote has always been exceeded. I enquired into the matter and obtained details of the expenditures, and as the vote had been exceeded every year, I thought it right to ask the House to vote the full amount required. The real expenditure is some \$1,600 to \$1,800.

Library—Salaries, grant, purchase of works on America, contingencies, binding newspapers, etc..... 30,350

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask how much is applied towards keeping up the Law Library, or that portion which is in the Supreme Court. I understand that some hon. gentleman in this House went to that section of the Library for the purpose of consulting the reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, and found that they had not come down later than 1878. It seems to me that it is a very great oversight, because these reports are of the first importance, especially upon all questions of constitutional law.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will look under the head of "Administration of Justice," on page 20 of the Estimates, he will find that \$1,500 has been already voted for the purchase of law reports and text books for the Supreme Court Library.

Mr. WELDON. Who has the control of these books?

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I agree with my hon. friend that it was a mistake to give up the purchase of these reports of the Supreme Court of the United States. They are of the first possible consequence to members; we have to refer to them frequently. Up to 1878 the series is complete, but since then we have ceased to purchase them, for some reason. I think the attention of the Minister of Justice ought to be drawn to the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am rather surprised to hear that they have not been kept up. Certainly, I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that they are of the utmost importance. They would assist us very much in dealing with questions of jurisdiction between the local and federal powers, and it is of the utmost importance that we should have the light which is thrown on such questions by the decisions of the Supreme Court. These reports ought to be kept up, as well as the reports of the Privy Council of England.

Mr. WELDON. I had occasion to refer to the United States Supreme Court reports on a subject before Parliament. The volume I wanted was 112, but it was not there; the latest was volume 99, which comes down to 1878. It seems to me that it is important that these books should be not only in the Law Library, but in the Parliamentary Library, accessible to members.

Mr. DAVIES. A collection of United States reports are almost a necessity in the Library. I fancy the difficulty must have been in the amount voted by the House. There has been constant complaint by persons who attend the Supreme Court that the Library had been divided and the text books sent to the Supreme Court. Great inconvenience arises from the reports being in one place and the text books in another. Parliament makes a grant, which is expended under the direction of the Minister of Justice, who, last year, tried to overcome the difficulty by devoting the money to the purchase of text books. Perhaps the hon. Minister might consult the Minister of Justice as to whether it would not be necessary to increase the grant, in order that the United States reports might be purchased.

Mr. BOWELL. I will act on the suggestion of hon. gentlemen, and ascertain if these reports cannot be supplied out of the appropriation; \$10,000 are voted for the Parliamentary Library and \$1,500 for the Law Library, and judging from what has fallen from the legal gentlemen who have spoken, it is quite as important that these reports should be obtained as the text books.

Mr. MILLS. It would be very useful if we had the reports of the Supreme Court of the United States—the Privy Council and Indian Appeals in the Parliamentary Library as well as in the Law Library. The cost would not be much, and they would be a great service to us on many questions which come up in the course of legislation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly there ought to be a copy here of the reports the hon. gentleman mentions; but whether there would be any use of duplicating them, I am not so sure. It would not do either the bar or the bench any harm to walk up here and look at them.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Library is also very defective in the revised statutes of the various States. The statutes of many of the States are not in the Library at all, and those we have of many of the northern States are obsolete. It would aid those who take an interest in American affairs if we had a complete set of the Government reports printed at the Government printing office at Washington. Many of those reports, which are of great interest, are not in our Library at all; for instance, the report of the Internal Commerce of the United States. I have no doubt an arrangement could be made with the Government Printer, at Washington, for an exchange of documents, we sending

our Blue Books there, and receiving all the Reports published there. A request on the part of the proper authorities here would undoubtedly be very courteously received, and the whole set of the reports furnished to us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is for the Library Committee. They will attend to that, I have no doubt.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the sum for the officers of the Library is pretty large, although there is a reduction. I would like to know how many officials there are, and what salaries are paid to them?

Mr. SPEAKER. That was discussed last night. They are all enumerated in the Bill which has just passed through the House.

Mr. DAVIES. The officers of that Library have not that knowledge which they ought to possess, and which should be at the command of members when they seek information there. Some of the officers, of course, can tell you where the books can be had, but some of them are ignorant of the duties they ought to know and for which they are employed. Some effort ought to be made on the part of those in charge to see that they are trained in that respect. With the exception of the chief messenger, who is a remarkable man in that respect, none of the officials can give the information desired. Of course, we must make allowance for Mr. Todd, who is an excellent man in his way, but with one or two exceptions, the clerks in the Library do not possess one-half the knowledge of their duties they ought to possess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman want them to read the books, so as to inform the members what they contain?

Mr. DAVIES. They ought to know where the books are, and where there is so large a number they ought to be detailed off into particular departments. I had, a day or two ago, to make a search at some length for works on the fishery question, and it was utterly impossible to find one who knew anything about it. I have spoken to many members, and they all agree with me that many of the clerks do not make themselves acquainted with the work they have to discharge.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I visit the Library as often as most members, and never have any difficulty. The Librarian can always point out where a book is, or where it ought to be.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We have been accustomed to great things, in the years gone by, in the Library, when we had an exceptionally good man in Mr. Todd, who knew the Library off by heart. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that three of the officials are efficient, and perhaps the most efficient one is the chief messenger. In getting legal works, of course there is no difficulty in ascertaining where the books are; any person can find them, without assistance; but on general questions, such as those we had to discuss this Session, we have considerable difficulty in ascertaining where the books are. That is owing, to some extent, to the absence of Mr. Todd, who appears to have taken charge of the portion of the Library which contains works on constitutional subjects. Only one or two there know anything of that department. Another thing I have to complain of is the absence of books from the Library. That is not the fault of the Librarian, but it is the fault, in some cases, of Ministers of the Crown, who have had books out for months. Some books I desired to get in the early part of the Session I have not been able to get yet.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is unjust towards the employés. My friend has stated that none of the

employés, except the first messenger, knew their business; that since the demise of Mr. Todd it is impossible to find any one who can give information about books on constitutional law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not say so. I said outside three officials, including the chief messenger, it was difficult to find one who knew where the books were.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman said that since Mr. Todd left it was hard to find books in the Library, especially on questions relating to constitutional law. There is one subject on which it was impossible for the officials to do justice to the demands of hon. members, and that was on the franchise question, and the reason of that was the carrying out of a little scheme by some hon. members, which was discovered afterwards. Half a dozen of the books treating on the Indian question had been hidden behind some medical works, so that the employés could not find where they were for a considerable time, and they were not to blame for this. As to what the hon. member for Queen's said, about each official being detailed to a special department, that is intended to be carried out. Each employé should be given a special department. With regard to the ability of the employés, there are more than one who thoroughly understand their business. I might mention Mr. Sylvain, for instance. Consult him in regard to any point in the history of Canada, and he will be found one of the most efficient men on that subject. Then there is Mr. Thayne, of whom I will not say, as was said of Mr. Todd, that he is a walking library, but he is one from whom you can obtain satisfaction upon every difficult question. I think it is a very good suggestion, and will be a step in the way of progress, to attribute to the different officers of the Library special departments, and to arrange that these officers shall be succeeded by others in the same department who have known and studied that particular department. Of course, it is impossible for a young man, who has been only a few years in the Library, to be *au fait* of all the text books on certain subjects. Of course, they are to be helped by the members asking what they want, or by the Librarian himself, when members do not know what they would have or what they would like to have. I think the suggestion of the Librarian is a very good one.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman hinted pretty strongly that some member in the House, I do not know whom, had collected a lot of the Library books on the Indian question and concealed them in the Library, where no one else could find them. If he refers to me, I deny it. I concealed no books on the Indian question, or any other question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I knew the hon. gentleman knew everything about the Indian question.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But when I tried to study up the Chinese question, I found that the hon. gentleman had got every book in the Library on that subject, so I was obliged, from pure necessity, to abandon my discussion of that interesting portion of the Franchise Bill which related to the Chinese. The hon. gentleman is the guilty person, who had the books and kept them out on the Chinese question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must plead guilty to that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not sure that he is not the man who had the books on the Indian question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The difference is, that the name of the secretary of the commission was entered for those books about the Chinese, so that the hon. gentleman could tell where they were. I did not accuse the hon. gentleman particularly, but I spoke of people taking books and not giving their names.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the presumption is very strong that it was some gentleman on the other side who hid those books. I am quite sure that no man on this side hid either a book or his light under a bushel on the Indian question. No one knows that better than the First Minister.

Mr. CHARLTON. I fear that in this discussion we may do some injustice to the employés in the Library. Not only have we lost the Librarian, but we have lost by death Mr. Campbell; Mr. Todd has left us for a time, and Mr. Fletcher was unable to attend to his duty during most of the winter, on account of illness. Thus, three or four of the most efficient men in the Library were removed, and the delay of the Government in filling the position of Librarian led to a certain amount of disorganisation in the affairs of the Library. We have a number of good men in that Library. The ability is not by any means confined to the Chief Messenger. There are Mr. Sylvain, Mr. Thayne, the chief messenger, and others. There are some others, who cannot be supposed to be as familiar with their duties as they will be in time; but we may blame the Government as much as any one else for their delay in filling the office of Chief Librarian. It is true that they have now endeavored to make up for it by giving us a double head; but I fear that that will not make up for the loss of time and the disorganisation due to their own want of promptness in the matter. I believe most of the staff in the Library are efficient men, some of them remarkably efficient men; and it is due rather to the loss of the three or four who have either died or gone than to lack of ability in those who remain if there has been any ground of complaint.

Mr. MILLS. I quite agree with the remarks of the Secretary of State as to the efficiency of Mr. Sylvain. He is a thoroughly competent officer in his own particular department. The same may be said of Mr. Thayne, Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Todd, and Mr. Casault is eminently efficient. But Mr. Fletcher has been away on account of illness, and Mr. Todd has been sent away on military duty, and we have, of course, suffered inconvenience in consequence.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the Secretary of State please give the names of those works on Indians which were hidden. I am sure there is a very imperfect understanding of that question on that side of the House, and if we knew the names of the books we might be able to give them some further information on the third reading.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The books have been found.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hon. gentlemen opposite must have hidden them, for they appear tired of the subject, and we are not at all.

Printing, printing paper and book-binding..... \$80,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of the increase?

Mr. BOWELL. The explanation of the increase of \$10,000 is given by Mr. Hartney, the Clerk of the Printing Committee, who says this increased estimate is required because the distribution list is continually being enlarged on demands made and authorised by the House, I suppose on recommendation of the Printing Committee on the suggestion of members of the House; secondly, from the very large edition of documents of public interest which are being printed, that is, the number of returns, which have been much larger of late than in former years; and thirdly, from the increased number of blue books issued by the Departments, many of them containing expensive maps, and the expenses connected with the preparation of the maps.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). This is all, I understand, within the contract?

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose this covers the printing of the reports distributed to us during the Session, does it not?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think the grant for the printing of these blue books and reports is judiciously distributed. We could get very large numbers of some of these books that are of very little use to us, but of those that are most useful I do not think we could get enough. I think the more we can get of those particular reports and books, most necessary to the public interest, the better it will be. For instance, the Public Accounts, the Auditor General's Report, the Trade and Navigation Returns, and documents of that kind, are so generally useful that I think the Government should distribute a considerable number of them amongst the people. They are the Government's statements of their dealings with the people's funds during the year, especially the Public Accounts. On the other hand, we have, for instance, an immense number of returns about mortuary statistics this year, and things of that kind, of which we can get an unlimited number, but of documents that are most useful we do not want to be told, when we enquire for them, that the supply is run out.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a peculiar principle laid down for the printing of all these documents and their distribution to each member. I think, if the hon. gentleman attempted to lay down a classification to meet his own particular views, he would find that there are others who take an especial interest in the very subjects which he thinks of the least use. It would hardly do to say that you should have a dozen copies each of the Public Accounts and only one of Mortuary Statistics. There are others who take a deep interest in mortuary statistics, and most every doctor in the country would like to have one of them.

Mr. CASEY. I am not speaking of my own taste in the matter, but I take it for granted that there is no public document which so many people would like to see as the Public Accounts. It is natural that more people should wish to see the statements of how the money has been expended during the past year than any other statement that can be laid before the House. I have never been able to get more than four or five of these copies in the course of a year. We only get two distributed to us, but I can generally get two or three extra copies at the distribution office. Supposing we got five copies every year. My constituency comprises over 5,000 voters—and some other gentlemen represent still larger constituencies—and what are five copies of the Public Accounts amongst so many voters?

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the Government whether the printing of the Geological Report is included in this expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it is not, because, as a rule, that is not done under the parliamentary contract.

Mr. MILLS. Formerly, the practice was to charge it in the Geological vote, and that was done because the Geological Branch was in Montreal, and from the highly scientific character of a great deal of the information there given, it was thought necessary to have it printed where the proof sheets could be read by some one connected with the Department. Now, that Department is transferred to Ottawa, and there is no longer any reason why the printing of that report should not be done by the contract printers. Can the hon. gentleman tell us where that report is printed?

Mr. BOWELL. It is printed in Montreal and bears Dawson's impress, but the work is done at the *Gazette* office in Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. When this report was printed in Montreal the vote was defended in Parliament on the ground which my hon. friend behind me has stated, but the reason for printing the report in Montreal no longer exists, and now

that the office has been moved to Ottawa the printing still goes on at Montreal. It seems extraordinary that the printing should still be sent away from Ottawa to be done at Montreal.

Mr. BOWELL. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is, that I question very much, without disparaging the Queen's printers, whether they are in a position to turn out a piece of work like that Geological Report. I am not combating the idea of the hon. gentleman that the printing should be done here, I think the suggestion is a very good one, but in doing that the printers should be told distinctly that they must prepare themselves for turning out work of that character. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the work done for Parliament, even to the printing of the statutes, is not anything like equal to that which is done in England or the United States. So inferior is the printing of the statutes that those who are judges feel almost ashamed to send their exchanges to the United States or to England. I hope that, in future, the contract will be such as to compel the printers to turn out work which will be creditable to the country, and I hope that in the future the Geological Report may be printed here instead of sending it away. But the hon. gentleman knows that this particular job, this particular piece of work, has always been done in the city of Montreal by Mr. Dawson, or supervised by him.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see any reason why the hon. gentleman should correct his phrase, and strike off the word "job," in regard to this work.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not mean to use the word "job" in the sense in which the hon. gentleman is constantly using it. The printers always speak of a piece of work like this as a job, and I use the printers' phrase. Any piece of work is designated by a printer as a job, but not a corrupt job, as the hon. gentleman insinuates.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not at all object to the hon. gentleman's phrase; I was objecting to his correcting his phrase. I have only to say that if we are to be told that our contractors cannot turn out as good work as the job office of a newspaper, let us learn it. I do not mean to say that our statutes or blue books are very nicely printed, for I never thought so; but it is not necessary that they should be printed in the same style and upon similar paper to the Geological Survey Reports. I presume there were special directions given with respect to such jobs, and special arrangements made. There must have been such, in order to produce the results. The difficulty is the one to which I have referred, namely, that we were told for years it was necessary the Geological Survey Report should be printed at the place where the office was situated. The office has been moved, and yet the printing continues to be done in the old locality.

Mr. MILLS. I remember discussing this question with Mr. Selwyn, the head of the Geological branch; and he gave as a reason for having the report printed in Montreal, that each member of the staff could have an opportunity of correcting his own productions and so reducing the number of mistakes. Although the Geological branch has been moved here, the departmental printing has been still done in Montreal. It ought to be done here.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). If members of the committee will turn to page 209 of the Auditor General's Report, they will discover that the work was done by the *Montreal Gazette*, and not by Dawson Brothers. From an examination of the account published in full, it appears that there is quite a job in connection with the printing of the Geological Report, for I find there were 3,500 copies printed at prices very much in excess of those which would have been paid to the contractor had the work been done here. Furthermore, I do not see why the contractors could not have produced as good work as that produced by the *Montreal*

*Gazette*. I do not see any difficulty about that matter. The printing is improved more by the use of a better quality of paper than by anything else. If the contractors here were furnished with a better quality of paper the work could be done as creditably as it was done by the *Montreal Gazette* at the Montreal rate. This matter has been discussed somewhat in the newspapers. The *Montreal Gazette* and *Toronto Mail* have contended that the work was done at a much lower rate than the blue books show was paid. The *Mail* has stated that 35 cents was the price paid for composition, and the *Montreal Gazette* has made the same statement. I was not astonished that organs of the Government, especially the *Gazette*, which was very much interested in the matter, should misrepresent the statement published in the Blue Books. Instead of 35 cents being the rate paid for composition, I will read the amount paid as stated in the Auditor General's Report: Composition, 181,000 ems, plain, at 50 cents; 434,000 ems, at 75 cents; 25,000 ems, tabular, at \$1; the average amount paid on 640,000 ems being 69 cents. Yet the *Toronto Mail* and the *Montreal Gazette* said that the work was done for 35 cents per 1,000 ems, and it will be apparent to the committee that this matter was totally misrepresented, and that double the price was paid by the Government for the work. The same may be said with respect to the press-work. I call the attention of the committee to page 211 of the report. In referring to this matter the Auditor General thus writes to the Director of the Geological Survey:

"Please let me know why your report for 1880-1-2 and Prof. Macoun's catalogue were printed by the *Montreal Gazette* instead of by the contractors at Ottawa. I ask the question on account of the difference in rates—about \$790.10."

That is about the amount which the Auditor General estimates as the difference between the cost of the work as it was done and what it would have cost here. If the facts are closely investigated by a practical man it will appear that a very much larger sum was paid for the work, in excess of what would have been paid under the contract, than this sum of \$790.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order, This does not arise under the item at present being discussed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I have just about concluded. In answer to the enquiry made by the Auditor General, the Director of the Geological Survey replied as follows:—

"The report was printed at the *Gazette* office by authority of the Minister. The rate is greater than contract rates, but not greater than what are known as 'Ontario rates' and 'special rates,' which are paid for 'first-class work.'"

I have had considerable difficulty in ascertaining what this Ontario rate means. It seems to be changed in order to suit the purposes of the Government. I suggest that expenditures of this kind for the purpose of subsidising a Government organ ought not to be tolerated any longer. If printing is to be done, it should be done by the contractor here, at contract rates. If the *Montreal Gazette* cannot live without getting jobs of this kind, the sooner it goes to the wall the better. I do not think it is in the public interest that a newspaper should be supported by jobs of this kind. This is not the only one, as the committee will find out before we get through the Estimates. The contractor here could do the work just as creditably and at a much lower rate.

Mr. MITCHELL. I differ entirely from the position taken by the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville). He does not see why a Government organ should get any of the benefits derivable from public printing. I do not see that because the *Gazette* happens to endorse and represent, as it does very well, the views of the Government, it should be deprived of fair competition for any portion of the

public service. I am somewhat interested myself as a newspaper publisher. I have not derived much benefit yet so far as Government jobs, as they are called, are concerned. But I am like a celebrated party we have heard of, "I hopes to be some time or other." I do not think it is likely I will get much from this Administration, because I am not a Government organ, nor is the paper with which I am connected a Government organ. Sometimes we strike at one side and sometimes at the other. With regard to the *Gazette* and its work, from what I have seen of it I believe it does it well, and from what the Auditor-General says with regard to the prices charged, that they are only equivalent to the prices charged by the Ontario Government, I do not think very much can be said against the *Gazette* getting a fair share of the patronage which the Government may have to give. I do not believe in putting everything into the hands of the one firm which gets so large a share of the printing in this country; and I do not think that the contractors are prepared to execute the work in the same shape that the *Gazette* has done the report of the Geological Survey. I have heard numerous opinions upon it, and I believe that the work has been creditably performed, and I do not think my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), who is a good judge, will say that the prices are excessive. I differ from those who say that all this work should go into the hands of one individual. I should like to get a share myself; I am not one of those who say they would not like it, for I would; but I am afraid there is little chance of my getting it. I do not like, however, to hear the profession to which I have recently attached myself attacked, and I think, from the way the *Gazette* supports the Administration, it is well entitled to a share, if anything is going, provided they do it as cheaply as others in the same line, as I believe they do. That, at all events, is the opinion of the public, and though the Government does not often take my advice I will give them my advice on this occasion: it costs them nothing, and perhaps they will say it is worth nothing; but at any rate I say I would not give all the printing into the hands of one office, nor would I expect outside firms, such as the *Gazette*, to do the work even as cheaply as the firm which gets so enormous an amount of work, and does it on so large a scale, and can do it cheaper. I think it was a mistake of the Government to put all that patronage out of their hands in that way, and when I am Premier, as I expect to be, though hon. gentlemen do not seem to think so, I will try a change in that arrangement, and give a fair share all around.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The hon. gentleman seems to think that I was speaking disparagingly of the work; but I did not do so. I think it was a creditable job. But I think, also, that so far as the execution of that work is concerned, there are other offices which could do the work just as well; and I have no doubt that the office which is now controlled by my hon. friend, the member for Northumberland, can turn out just as nice a job as the *Gazette*.

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Herald* turns out good work, but I am afraid they have not much chance of getting the work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Perhaps the competition which he speaks of will take place between the *Gazette* and the *Herald* next year; and if they get at loggerheads the country will profit by the competition; but we have competition with regard to this printing. It is all let by tender. The contract was awarded to certain contractors, and they have a right to demand that they should have this work. As we all know, they have sued the Government, in years gone by, on account of work which was included in the contract having gone to other parties, and for this job itself they have a right to demand recompense for its being taken from them and given to the *Gazette*. I do not believe, with my hon. friend, that this

Mr. MITCHELL.

work should be divided up amongst the newspapers or printing offices that support the Government. I do not think it would be conducive to the public interest that such a system of corruption should be established, by any Government. It has been established, to a considerable extent, by this Government, as we all know, but the sooner it is put a stop to the better. The hon. gentleman said that the Auditor General had stated that this work was done at Ontario Government rates. The Auditor General said nothing of the kind, nor did I read that he did so. I said that the Director General of the survey had said, in reply to a letter inquiring of him why this work was given to the *Gazette* at exorbitant prices, instead of the contractors, that the Minister had instructed that this should be done. Furthermore, I call the attention of the committee to a Report of the Treasury Board, on page 10, which has some bearing on this and other work which may be done by outside printers:

"EXTRACT from the Minutes of a Meeting of the Treasury Board, held October 28, 1884, approved by the Governor in Council, November 2, 1884.

"The Board had under consideration a letter from the Auditor-General referring to the discussion in the Public Accounts Committee respecting public printing done otherwise than by the contractors, and requesting a ruling from the Treasury Board thereon.

"The Board, on careful consideration of the subject, recommended to Council that whenever printing is done by others than the contractors, the rates to be charged should be the current rates for work of the same magnitude at the place where the printing is performed."

That certainly will give very extensive latitude to the printers to charge what they please for any work which may be given them by the favoritism of the Government. Every man of them, after this, is to be entitled to his own prices, and this old cry about the Ontario rates is to be dropped. There will be no audit of the accounts in the future. There has been something like an audit heretofore, by the Queen's Printer, but in future every man is to fix his own price, as the Treasury Board has ordered, and is to get his own price; so I think the hon. member for Northumberland will have a "fat take," if the *Montreal Herald*, as it probably may, should get hold of some of this printing. If the hon. gentleman gets the rate which has been paid the last three or four years for this work, and if he gets a sufficient quantity of it, I can assure him he will soon become a rich man.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman thinks my prospects are so good. I differ from him, however, when he says that they can charge what they like. I take it, from the report he read, that the rates are to be the current rates of the place in which the work is done. Now, there is no place in the Dominion where there are so many newspapers and job offices as in the city of Montreal, where the competition is so great or where the printing is done so cheap. I only hope that his predictions about the *Herald* getting a share of this work will be realised. Knowing his experience in connection with that branch of business, I place a great deal of value on the statement he has made, and I consider myself in a better position than I was half an hour ago. The only drawback is, that I do not think I am likely to get much from this Government, because any man who takes the position of a free critic, as I do—hon. gentlemen may laugh, but it is so—any person taking an independent position as a free critic—of course I vote oftener with the Government than with the Opposition, but it is because their measures and principles are better, and not on account of any proclivities in their favor, any more than in favor of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think they give me much credit for it, or may pay much attention to what I say, but now that their attention has been called to it, I hope that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches will bear this in mind, and that if there are any stray jobs to be given that

the *Herald* Company, of which I am a shareholder, will get its share.

Mr. BLAKE. Nobody can object, after this, that if anything is given to the *Herald* Publishing Company it was not after public tender. What the hon. gentleman said when he compared the position of the *Montreal Herald* and that of the *Montreal Gazette* reminded me a little of the way they drive sledges in Russia. We will suppose that there is a great car, in which the Prime Minister is seated, drawn by a pair of horses; one is driving along with a good, steady, hack 'trot, like the *Gazette*; the other goes curvetting, and capering, and kicking up a row, but he pulls to the sledge all the same. They are both subject to the whip, and they are both entitled to the feed of oats.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a rare event to find a discussion taking place in this House in which so much amusement is created on a very small subject, and all I can say to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, with whom I sometimes sympathise and occasionally vote, is that if the remarks of their leader give them any satisfaction, I am glad they have got some. What troubles the hon. gentleman in his simile is, that the *Herald*, instead of using the whip on the horses, uses it on some of the guests; and if he occasionally applies the lash to the *Herald*, I am prepared to accept the joke that he has perpetrated at my expense with the same good nature that he has given it; and if the *Herald* should not, in the future, get any of these jobs, it will be because there is no public tender. I am no hypocrite in this matter; I do not beat about the bush; I am prepared to criticise in the public interest when there is a necessity for it, and I am prepared, as a printer, to do any work that is given me or that I can get honestly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman saying that occasionally these newspapers apply the lash to the guests, for the simple reason that they are paid well by the Government to do so, and they would be acting a very poor part, after all the pap they get from the Government, if they did not apply the lash occasionally to those opposed to the Government; and I have no doubt the *Montreal Herald* will succeed in ingratiating itself into the good will of the Government and secure a proper share of the Government patronage, if this system is to be continued. However, the hon. gentleman has a great deal to learn yet in the printing line before he knows all about the business.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would be glad to get any hints you can give me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I am going to give you some now. The hon. gentleman's interpretation of this clause in the report of the Treasury Board would not be workable, because if the work is given, say to the *Montreal Herald*, how is the Minister to ascertain the current rates at the place where the work is performed? Would he have to go around to all the numerous publication offices in the city of Montreal and take his report with him, after it was printed, and ask them how much they would have charged if they had been favored with the work. That would be a nice business transaction. The only way to get at the current rates where the work is done is to ask for tenders at that place. I think the committee will see the absurdity of the hon. gentleman's interpretation of this clause, and that the statement I make is perfectly correct, and the only solution of the paragraph, that the work is to be given out to the favorites of the Government—and they are to charge just what they please. There is generally a cordial feeling existing between printers in the same locality. In the city of Montreal, I have no doubt my hon. friend and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) will be found to work in harmony with regard to the prices charged for work. And, if the hon. member for North-

umberland (Mr. Mitchell) should happen to get the Geological Report next year, and the Minister referred to the hon. member for Cardwell as to whether he was charged too much for it, I think the hon. member for Cardwell would certainly say: The *Gazette* got this job the year before, and it is nothing but fair that the hon. member for Northumberland should get it this year, and he did not charge too much. The Minister would at once, of course, conclude that he was acting in accordance with this clause in the report, and that the printing was done at the current rates at the place where the work was performed. It is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that the intention of this clause is that the work should be given out to favorites, and that the price should be the price fixed by the men who do the work, without reference to current rates at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is judging others by himself, and is giving an illustration of the saying of the poet that "suspicion haunts the guilty mind." It is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman scarcely ever discusses a question relating to printing without indulging in very extravagant language. He put words in the Auditor General's mouth which are not to be found in the letter before us. He told us the Auditor General asked Mr. Selwyn why this work was done in Montreal at such "exorbitant" rates. The Auditor General said nothing of the kind. The only question asked by him was why the work was done in Montreal, costing so much more than it would have cost if it had been done by the parliamentary printer. Neither did the Auditor General call attention to the fact that the work was of a superior character to that done by the parliamentary printer at contract rates; nor did he ask whether any portion of that work was of a first-class character, or of a technical character; and my hon. friend knows very well that all these Geological Reports, and works of that class, cost a larger sum per 1,000 ems than the ordinary book work which is given to job offices. The hon. gentleman said he was unable to ascertain what was meant by the words "Ontario rate." I scarcely think that my hon. friend was honest or sincere in that; or, rather, I will not accuse him of being so ignorant as not to know what is meant by an "Ontario rate." The question has frequently been discussed before, and it was distinctly understood by everybody who knows anything of printing, to mean the rates the Ontario Government pays under its contract for printing, and I have every reason to know that the hon. gentleman knows that. The hon. gentleman says, also, that there is no audit. Now, there is no account paid for any work done which has not to be certified to by the Queen's Printer, whose duty it is to ascertain whether the prices charged by any printer in any part of the country who has been entrusted with the work were the current rates. We all know what current rates of printing mean. The hon. member for North Brant was a little facetious when he said it would be a nice thing for the Minister to go round from office to office, after the work was done, and ask at what price this or that man would do it. He knows, when the work is ordered to be done by a Minister or by the Department, it is the duty of his officer to see, first, that the work is done according to the order given; and secondly, that no more is paid, under the wording of the order of the Treasury Board, than the current rates. The reason the order was passed was this, that accounts were coming in from various places for work not included in the contract, at prices that were exorbitant, and it was deemed advisable to provide that classes of work which did not come within the meaning of the contract should not be paid more than would be charged for the same kind of work done for the ordinary publisher or private individual. That is what is meant by those terms. I can assure the hon. member for Brant that no job printer is permitted to charge what he pleases. If he

thinks that is the meaning of the Order in Council he is greatly mistaken.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). That is what the Order in Council will lead to. Whoever audits the accounts will have to ascertain what the rates are in any particular place where this outside work is done, if he is to audit the accounts properly. With regard to my seeking to misrepresent what the Auditor General stated, the fact that I read the sentence contained in the Auditor General's letter, not once but twice, and also the reply of the Director-General of the Geological Survey, shows that I did not wish to misrepresent or put any words in the mouths of the Auditor General or the Director-General of the Survey. I say it was an exorbitant charge, and I am prepared to prove that by the report of the Auditor General. On page 209 of the Auditor General's Report you have the items of the account, amounting to \$2,876.14. If you take off the amount which the Auditor General says was an over-charge, an amount greater than would have been charged had the work been done by the regular contractors—we find he deducted \$790.10. On a job amounting to \$2,786, an over-charge of \$790 is monstrous.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite appreciate what is required of them in connection with this question. I am justified in saying that whenever it has been shown that printing has been given to anybody else than the contractors, at higher rates than the contract rates, the transaction is *prima facie* a job and the burden of proof rests with those who have diverted the printing to show that the transaction is justifiable. The only reason given for the diversion of the work to outside parties is that the Minister of Customs thinks that the work could not be done as well by the departmental printers. There is no proof of that assertion. Even the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), with his knowledge of printing and job offices, might be mistaken in giving an opinion to that effect, although the paper with which he is connected is larger than that with which the hon. Minister of Customs has been connected. It would be easy to determine whether the contractors were able or not to print this report of the Geological Survey properly, by asking them to furnish sample sheets, and if they could do the work as well as printing offices in Montreal, there would be no shadow of an excuse for taking it from them. If they can print the statutes, there is no reason why they could not do this work. It is far more important to have the statutes correctly printed than the reports of the Geological Survey, if it comes to a question of accuracy. We had the admission from the hon. member for the Montreal—I mean the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that these matters given out to the newspaper offices would cost more than if given to the contractors. The Minister of Customs has said nothing on that. I think there is force in it. The case, then, stands thus, that this work admittedly cost twice as much as if it had been given to the Government contractors. It cost more, in some instances, but on the average, twice as much—69 cents as against 35 cents. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) reminds me that the contractors only get 10 cents for some of the work. At all events, it cost more than twice as much as it would if it had been given to the contractors. No reason has been given for this, and it is admitted the work if done by outsiders must necessarily be more costly. The reason urged for having it done in Montreal formerly now exists as a reason for having it done in Ottawa. We have heard the words of the horse who gallops outside the shafts in reference to this matter, but we have heard nothing from the shaft horse, to use the metaphor of the leader of the Opposition. The one who is supposed to jog along quietly inside of the shafts, and to do his full share of pulling the sledge, might, from his connection with this transaction, be able to throw some

Mr. BOWELL.

valuable light upon it, and might, perhaps, explain away these points, which are apparently established detrimentally to the character of this transaction.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have taken no part in this debate, because I look upon it as entirely out of order. The item before the committee is for parliamentary printing simply, and this matter of the printing of the Geological Report has really nothing whatever to do with it. I may, however, point out to hon. gentlemen that they are dealing with the question as if the printing of the Geological Report was included in the ordinary contract. If they will look at the contract and at the correspondence with the contractors, they will find that this particular work was expressly excluded from the contract. It was never done by the parliamentary contractors, and it forms no part whatever of the parliamentary contract. It has been always published by Dawson Brothers. It stands in a different position altogether from our ordinary Blue Books. It may be purchased at Dawson Brothers, who keep it on sale, I suppose by arrangement with the Government, or with the Director of the Geological Survey. It was originally printed, I believe, by Mr. John Lovell, of the city of Montreal. When the hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, it was transferred to the *Herald* office, the late Senator Penny and Mr. Wilson being at that time the proprietors of the Montreal *Herald*. It remained in that office until the change of Government, and then the managing director of the Montreal *Gazette*, finding that a job of this kind had been done at the Montreal *Herald* office, made application to have it done at the *Gazette* office, and it has since been done there; but the price now arranged to be given, and to be given for it next year, is very much lower than the price paid to the *Herald* office during the time they had it. It is not a matter, however, which comes under this item. I presume, from what the hon. gentleman says, that we are going to have this whole question of parliamentary printing discussed on some of the items, and that will be the proper time. I do not propose to be drawn into any discussion of it now; this is not within the parliamentary contract at all, but is specially excepted from the parliamentary contract by arrangement between the Department and the parliamentary contractors; and therefore, when they undertook to do our ordinary Blue Books at a particular price, they did not undertake to do any other kind of work for that price. We have, as a matter of fact, our *Hansard*, which, if the doctrine laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite is true, that all Government work ought to be done by the parliamentary contractors, under their contract, should be done by them at ordinary contract prices, and yet they are getting 60 cents a thousand ems, whereas their contract price is 25 or 30 cents. They are getting 60 cents, by a special arrangement, for the printing of the official reports of Parliament. It is Government work, but it forms no part of the parliamentary contract, just as the printing of the Geological Survey Reports forms no part of it.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement that this is not pertinent to the item now before us. The whole question is whether this printing of the Geological Report shall be embraced in this item for the next year or the practice in times past shall continue; therefore it is strictly pertinent. I have mentioned why it was that this work was done in Montreal formerly and was not done under the contract. It was because the Geological branch was at Montreal, and it was necessary that the proof sheets should be read by those who prepared the report, and that the report should be strictly accurate. Now the branch is transferred to Ottawa. When it was transferred, I called the attention of the Government to it, and stated the reasons why the printing had been done in Montreal and the understanding then was that it should be done here; but, notwith-

standing the assurance, not, perhaps, given in such definite terms as it should have been, but still leading Parliament to the conclusion that when the Geological Branch was transferred to Ottawa the printing of this report should be done here as a part of the general printing, the old practice continued. The reason for printing it elsewhere having ceased, the practice should have ceased at the same time, but it continued, and we now want to know whether that practice is to be continued or not. I think there is no reason for the continuance of the present practice. The Minister of Customs, in combatting the observations made by my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) said that, when printing of this sort was given out, if it was printing of the same sort as that done by the public printers, it was usually done at the same rates. He took exception to my crying "hear, hear." My reason for expressing dissent from the observations of the hon. gentlemen was that I remembered what took place in printing the report of the railway commission. Instead of that work being done by the public printers and at the ordinary rates it was given to Mr. Stephenson, who owned the *Chatham Planet*, and he gave the work to the public printers here; he made a bargain with them that the printing should be done at the same rate for which they did printing for the Government, and he was paid by the Government confidential rates, and received twice the amount of money that he paid over to the public contractors here for printing those volumes. Is it not obvious to every member of the committee that the public Treasury was mulcted to the extent that Mr. Stephenson was paid over and above what the public contractors received? Was it not as open to the Government to give that printing to Maclean, Roger & Co., the public printers, as it was to Mr. Stephenson to do so? I say that is a condition of things that, if this House discharges its duty as trustees of the public funds of this country, it would not for a moment tolerate. I complain of this system of jobbery—for it can be called nothing else—by which newspapers are subsidised to support the Administration. If the Government are not satisfied with the work done by the public printers let it be offered to public tender and let the price be so fixed. What have we an Independence of Parliament Act for? Is it not for the purpose of preventing the Government from exercising undue influence over the members of the House? We provide that in case a member becomes a contractor from the Government he shall forfeit his seat in the House. Yet, in the face of that statute, we have here a member of the House standing up in his place and publicly inviting the Government to give him a contract. The observations made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) reminded me of the meeting between the Black Knight and Friar Tuck; after a time they came perfectly to understand each other. The hon. gentleman says: The First Minister understands me; he knows I am independent of him; he knows that I freely criticise his Government, but still I am open here to receive a contract from the Administration. Now, I say that that is a condition of things that ought not to be tolerated any longer. The public printing ought to be handed over to the contractors to be done at the rates agreed upon.

Mr. BOWELL. Why didn't you carry it out?

Mr. MILLS. During the few years I had charge of the Department there was not a particle of printing given out from that Department by my order, with the single exception of this Geological Report, for the reasons which have been stated. It was my opinion that that exception, even, should come to an end as soon as possible, and the reason for its continuance ceased when the Department was transferred to Ottawa. I think that printing ought now to be done here and by the public printers, and I think the committee are entitled to know whether the Government

propose to continue this system or whether they propose that this printing hereafter shall be done at Ottawa,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that the Geological Report was printed at Montreal by his directions, in consequence of the Director-General living there. It was given to the *Montreal Herald* in his time, and at a higher price than it has been done for since by the *Montreal Gazette*.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know that. The hon. gentleman has not established that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is it not so?

Mr. MILLS. No; I do not believe it is so. I ask for proof that it was so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did the *Montreal Herald* tender for it? Will the hon. gentleman answer that?

Mr. MILLS. No; I did not say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I knew he would not say so. And the hon. gentleman gets up and reproves the hon. member for Northumberland for the joking way in which he said he was open to an offer. But the hon. gentleman did not object to this improper interference with a member of Parliament, this improper offer of a member of Parliament; he did not object to paying a higher price than was necessary to a member of the other branch of the Legislature, to Mr. Edward Goff Penny, the editor and the proprietor of the paper, a subservient organ and an able organ of the hon. gentleman, and a higher price than was paid to the *Montreal Gazette*.

Mr. MILLS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) states so, and when he stated so he was not contradicted. Then again, he says that in his own Department that was the only instance in which he was an offender. I do not know how that may be, but the Government of which he was a member offended again, and again, and again, by giving away printing which came within the contract with the public printers, and in consequence of that improper action there was judgment given in the Court of Exchequer of \$69,000 damages against this Government, which we had to pay, in consequence of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues having corruptly given away printing outside the contract made by themselves, and given it to their favorites in the press. The hon. gentleman, however, gets up and denounces this kind of thing. I wonder at his cheek in getting up and making such a statement.

Mr. DAVIES. It is amusing to see the simulated passion which the hon. gentleman puts on. He talks about the amount wasted by the late Government in giving out printing which should have been sent to the public printers. The Government erred, he said. Well, Sir, if they erred they had not an example before them such as he has. What were the facts proved in the Public Accounts Committee the other day? That, with the knowledge of that enormous sum of money which had been lost, in the face of the contract, in the face of the judgment in the Supreme Court, this Government is giving out, year after year, that very work—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is not.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not open to denial, because, at the last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, I took the contract which he has entered into himself, and I read the terms of that contract in the committee, and I challenged the denial of the committee there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He has no right to refer to what took place in the committee.

Mr. DAVIES. So far as regards the reference made to the committee, that can be obliterated. It does not affect the statement I made in the slightest degree, the fact, which is part of the public records of the country, that to-day there is a contract with the public printers, and the hon. gentleman is deliberately violating that contract day by day, and making the country pay higher rates for printing. A lecture is read to the Opposition, but the hon. gentleman, after judgment given and judicial notice given, is following an unjustifiable, improper and illegal course. So far from having made out a case against the Opposition, he has made a whip for his own back, because the printing contract is being violated day by day with his full knowledge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has worked himself into a passion. He has, however, fallen into another error, in saying that this Government was liable to penalties such as the late Government were condemned to pay. I may tell him that the contract with the printers has been renewed without any advantage to them, not later than last year, after six years of that extravagance which the hon. gentleman mentions; and we have so little violated the contract that we are not liable for a single cent of damages in any way whatever. The hon. gentleman need not be alarmed that the country will have to bear any burden under this head. I know this to be a fact, and from this time the hon. gentleman will know it.

Mr. DAVIES. I am very willing to accept any statement of fact made by the hon. gentleman of his own knowledge. I have, however, read the contract and have knowledge of the facts. If the hon. gentleman gives this as his legal opinion, I shall have the temerity to express a legal opinion of my own. On the face of the contract, the Government are clearly liable. I said so in another place; I read the contract to members of the Government who were present, and I challenged them to say that my opinion was not the correct one, and it was not denied. It could not be denied, because we had the contract in black and white. A change was made during last year, as I understood the hon. gentleman to admit; but that does not relieve the Government. They have not even acted in ignorance, but they have deliberately violated the contract by giving the work to their own private friends and paying double prices for it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I repeat that under the contract, which was a very plain and simple one, the Government are not liable to a cent of damages; and they cannot be condemned to pay \$69,000 for imprudence, if not something worse.

Mr. MILLS. The question is, did the Government give public printing to private parties when it should have been executed by the contractors here? I say they have done so. The First Minister has referred to the printing done during the term of the late Administration. I can turn up the accounts of the Interior Department and show that since the present Government came into office \$15,000 has been spent for advertising in a single branch during one year, and \$24,000 in another branch. In fact, that advertising formed a large percentage of the entire cost of the Administration. I can show a small sheet, called the *North Star*, printed two or three times at Rat Portage, in which the Government advertisements appeared.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order. We are not dealing with the question of advertising.

Mr. MILLS. We are dealing with the question of public printing, and I am answering statements made by the First Minister. The First Minister has referred to printing done at the *Herald* office. That case does not apply, for Mr. Penny was not a member of this House, but a member of the Senate.

Mr. DAVIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman's statements amount to this: It is a great sin to bribe a member of the House of Commons but no sin to bribe a Senator.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging from the case of Senator Ogilvie, I should say that is the way.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The First Minister has referred to the verdict of \$69,000 on account of printing done during the late Administration. He must, however, remember that one year of that time was during the period while the hon. gentleman himself was in power, and his Administration is therefore included in that verdict. With respect to the publication of the Pacific Railway report, I will give the facts. The copy was sent to Messrs. Stephenson, of Chatham, sons of the former representative of East Kent. That member of the House had conveniently retired to a fat berth in the North-West, and had transferred his business to his sons. The Government took them under their care and protection, and sent a copy of the report to be printed by them. Messrs. Stephenson found they were not capable of doing the work. They had not the necessary material or machinery in the office to do the work, and they made a trip to Ottawa, and conveniently got the Government contractors here to undertake the work. And, Mr. Chairman, although it may seem incredible, it is the fact, that those gentlemen actually never touched the work, they never set a type, they never printed a sheet, they never read a proof, they never had anything to do in connection with the publication of the book, and yet they pocketed \$3,000 of the money of the people of the country for having been favored with an order for that work. Now, I contend that that \$3,000 was given to the Messrs. Stephenson. The Government might as well have put their hands in the public Treasury and taken out \$3,000 and handed it to them as a bonus for their support of the Government, and as a favor to them for the feeling they had for their father as a supporter of the Government in this House. I say, Sir, it was a gross outrage, and these are just samples of instances which are continually coming up in connection with the public printing, as administered by the present Government. I think it is high time that a new leaf should be turned by the Government, and that they should endeavor at least to act honestly in this matter, to try to economise, and try to treat the public funds in the way they should be treated. I say it is a disgrace that any Administration should act in the way they have done, and I think it will be found, before the House prorogues, that even greater jobs have been perpetrated in subsidising the newspaper men who support the Administration.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not wish to protract the debate, but there is one reference I would like to make. My hon. friend to my left argued, and I thought fairly, that the conduct of the Government in these matters of printing, and their administration of these matters, is to be judged by its own merits; and it is no answer, when you prove a thing to be wrong, to say: True, it is wrong, but some previous Government did the same thing. That is a foolish way of arguing.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. My hon. friend from Cardwell thinks that party exigencies justify it; prove it as wrong, or as corrupt, or as wicked as you like, party exigencies will justify it. But if you take that ground, where is it going to end? We will never get a pure system. I will take the remark the hon. First Minister made and apply it to the hon. member for Cardwell, and see how he likes it. He argued that the late Government was guilty of a corrupt act, guilty of attempting to bribe a member of the Legislature—

Mr. BOWELL. He need not have gone so far as that.

Mr. DAVIES. I prefer to take his own language; the application will be better. The late Mr. Penny was, he said, proprietor of the *Herald*, and at that time he was a member of the Senate, and, therefore, the giving of this printing to him was a corrupt act on the part of the Government—an act of bribery. The hon. gentleman still adheres to that statement; it would be a corrupt act. Very well, what are the facts? Mr. Penny was not the proprietor of the *Herald* in a legal sense.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He was, at that time.

Mr. DAVIES. No; the *Herald* company was a corporation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No; not till after that.

Mr. DAVIES. In point of fact, Mr. Penny occupied exactly the same position that the hon. member for Cardwell now occupies; he is a member of the *Gazette* firm, and if it was an act of bribery to give printing contracts to the *Herald* Company, of which Mr. Penny was manager, a fortiori it is an act of bribery to give contracts to the *Montreal Gazette* Company, of which the hon. member for Cardwell is a member. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain that question to the hon. member for Cardwell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is taking the role of the hon. member for Bothwell. He says: It is no matter how corrupt we were, that is no excuse for you; you are a Reform Government, in the best sense of the word—that is what he says to us. We are a Reform Government, and although it is natural that in our time, not being a Reform Government, and not being so sensitive as our successors, it is natural that we should help Mr. Penny and others in that way. But you have no right to do so. You should be governed by a different principle. But the reason for the *tu quoque* argument was this: The hon. member for Bothwell got into a high state of indignation; he denounced the present Government; he charged them with all kinds of corruption and impropriety for doing what he admits his Government did, when they were in. It will not do to get out of it in that way—it will not do to try and change the suit. The hon. gentleman said: Well, if I did commit a sin in the way of printing in my Department, you have been guilty of paying too much for advertising. Very well; when the advertising question comes up, perhaps we will look into that, Mr. Chairman; meantime, the hon. gentleman is trying to drag a herring across the dog's nose—he is trying to draw away the attention of the public from the admitted fact which was brought out, and he denounces with great indignation the present Government for this printing. He admits now that his Government is liable to the same charge; but you should not bring it up, he says; no matter what we did, you should not bring that up. What we say is, that it does not lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth, after his confession, to bring charges against us, and he has not answered the question why the *Montreal Herald* got more than the *Gazette*. I found out since; I did not know it at the time, but there were two or three of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, stockholders, partners in the establishment, members of the Administration and members of this House. Mr. Laflamme and Mr. Huntington were shareholders, and they were putting this additional sum into their pockets, and he knew, and his colleagues knew, that they were shareholders in that newspaper.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says that I did not explain how it was that the *Montreal Herald* received more than the *Montreal Gazette* does now. Well, I cannot explain what I have not admitted to be the fact. I do not admit it now. I say that if you look at the prices of the *Geological Reports* you will find no difference in former prices and the prices at present. The work of the same size is sold at the same price. I am quite ready to assume

full responsibility of the arrangement made with the *Montreal Herald*, though it was made before I became a member of the Administration. In fact, I came here in November, and the arrangement had been made some months before. The price paid the *Herald* was the price which the hon. gentleman himself had paid to Lovell & Co. for printing which had been done at the *Montreal Gazette* office—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, no.

Mr. MILLS—by the present Queen's Printer. The hon. gentleman says "no," and if he speaks of his own personal knowledge, I accept his statement; but my recollection is, that Mr. Lovell had the work printed at the *Gazette* office, when the present Queen's Printer was in charge of the *Gazette*.

Mr. BOWELL. At that time Mr. Lovell had the largest book and job establishment in the Dominion of Canada, and he was not likely to go to any newspaper office to get this work done.

Mr. MILLS. The Dawsons have a large establishment at the present time, but everything for them is now done at the *Gazette* office.

Mr. BOWELL. They have no printing office; they are only publishers.

Mr. MILLS. Well, the hon. gentleman has said that I have not explained a certain statement. I have already stated that I do not admit or believe that that statement is correct. I believe that the cost of printing in Montreal has been much the same for years, and it is not to be supposed that a newspaper would do the work as cheaply as the public printers. What I complain of is, not that the work was printed at Montreal while the Department was in Montreal, at rates which the Government could reasonably agree upon, but after the Geological branch is established here it is wrong that the Government should keep up the business of printing in Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Whether the printing is done at the *Gazette* office, or at any other office, I have no hesitation in saying, as knowing something about these things, that I should be deeply sorry to see the Geological Report printed at Ottawa, until the establishment here is in a better position to do good work. No one can look at that work and compare it with our ordinary work, without seeing that there is a very material difference, not only in the paper, but in the character of the type, and everything else about it. Personally, I sincerely hope that the next contract made for the printing of Parliament will include all the work, both parliamentary and departmental, so that the best printers in the country can come here and tender for it. I do not wish to reflect on the contractors; their contract is nearly run out, and they would be foolish to renew their plant at such a time as this; but if the whole printing of Parliament and the Government, were in the hands of one contractor, as the result of one tender, as I hope will be the case under the new contract, with regard to which I expect to make a statement before the close of the Session, we might be able to get work of this kind done at Ottawa as well as it could be done by anybody in the country. The hon. member for North Brant referred to the Messrs. Stephenson; and without saying whether the arrangement to which he referred was right or wrong, I wish to remind him that the chief complaint made with regard to the late Administration had reference to work given to an hon. gentleman who occupied the Chair in this House, and who, having printing contracts, did not perform the work himself—he had no means of doing it—but farmed it out in the city of St. John, and that he did precisely what is said to have been done by the Messrs. Stephenson, except that he did not send the work to the public contractors, but to another printing office, and that he derived his

profit from the difference between what he paid the printers and what he charged to the Government. Another thing I want to point out is this, that the Geological Report is not a part of the printing contract, but, is expressly excepted from the contract; and if to-morrow the contractors were asked to do that work, they would have the right to do precisely as they have done with regard to the *Hansard*, charge their own price for the work. But what these gentlemen did was this: They gave printing of the Departments of that profitable kind, the doing of which by the contractors enables them to do other work, in reference to which we have prices cited here, at that nominally low rate. They gave out the ordinary forms of the Departments, which are practically kept up in stereotype form. They gave envelopes to be printed—in fact, all those things which are the fat work of the printer. That was the kind of work they gave out, and for which judgment was obtained in consequence of enormous profits. But no one can say that \$230,000 worth of printing—which I believe was the amount done outside during the term of hon. gentlemen opposite—of ordinary printing of solid work, would yield such a profit as nearly \$70,000. The profit arose from the fact that it was part of the work given to outside printers for their benefit—a practice which has been entirely abandoned by the present Government; and I venture to say that hon. gentlemen cannot find a single case, unless it be an odd notice for a post office about a holiday, or something of that kind, of printing of that description given out by this Administration since they came into office.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The error on the part of this Administration is far more glaring than that of the former. There was some common sense in giving the work out for the Lower Provinces; it was only continuing the practice which had been followed by the former Government.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You were a Reform Government—why did you not reform it?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). If they are to blame, that blame must fall on hon. gentlemen opposite. They established the bad rule, and the Reform Administration were foolish enough to fall into the trap set for them by their predecessors, and they continued the practice that had always been followed, of giving out the work for the Maritime Provinces. It was on that ground that the suit was entered and the damages were obtained. But this Administration gives out the work in a more glaring manner. They give it out in \$10,000, \$20,000 and \$50,000 lots from the Department of Agriculture; we find that this year no less than \$80,000 has been expended by that Department for publications, which have all been got at outside prices. There can be no excuse for the Government doing that, for the simple reason that they know it is wrong. It is high time that they should see they did wrong when they established this practice, prior to the Mackenzie Government's term of office, instead of re-establishing it when they came back to power and committing greater sins against the public good than they did when they gave the work out in the Maritime Provinces only.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I remember that after the Mackenzie Government was in power for three years the Speaker was unseated in connection with a printing contract, and the former Minister of Militia and the late Mr. Jones were also unseated.

Mr. VAIL. No.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Well, he resigned; he took the hint. What are the facts? This Government has been seven years in power, and no hon. gentleman in this House has been unseated. Why do hon. gentlemen not bring a charge?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. DAVIES. The same work is done under the guise of a corporation.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Is there any member of this Government connected with a printing establishment? It just shows how sincere these gentlemen are now, when they forget their former sins.

Mr. VAIL. I have refrained from saying anything about this matter; but as I have been referred to so pointedly by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), I may say a word or two. It did happen that I was very remotely connected with a paper in the Lower Provinces; but I had no more to do with it, in the way of receiving receipts, than my hon. friend; I never received a dollar from it in any way; I only gave my subscription to it. But as I was connected with it, I had a feeling that I did not care to sit in this House and have any man point his finger at me, and say that if this matter were investigated I would have to give up my seat, therefore, I honorably resigned my seat. It has been properly stated by the hon. member for North Brant that this system was handed down by the former Government, and after the change of Government took place the work was transferred to the *Citizen*, at the same prices that were paid to the *Reporter* before. I did not intend to say a word with regard to this. I do not want to charge any hon. gentleman opposite with these things, with which I think they are certainly chargeable, in consequence of the delicate position in which I find myself. I do not think any man can say I took a cent for printing, or anything else I was not entitled to.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Hastings said that no Speaker, since this Government came into office, has been unseated. A contract was made for printing on behalf of the Post Office Department, by Mr. Anglin, when Speaker. He believed then he was not violating the Independence of Parliament Act. There was a case, that of Mr. Bell, of Russell, who had done printing for the Government when he was connected with a newspaper. His seat was contested; a committee was appointed, with Sir John Rose as chairman, to enquire into his case, and they reported he had not violated the Act. Then there was the case of Mr. Stephenson, who did printing for the Government to the amount of \$1,200, and the Minister of Customs, as connected with the Belleville *Intelligencer*, who was paid over \$600, and Mr. Boaty, of East Toronto, was paid for printing, \$5,000; and all these hon. gentlemen continued to sit in Parliament. No one questioned their right to sit here. The rule in Bell's case was held applicable, and the question was not raised again, until the case of Mr. Anglin was brought before the committee, which laid down a different rule, and Mr. Anglin resigned his seat.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has repeated over and over again these statements with reference to myself. If he will look at the records he will find that I was charged with receiving \$1,000, and if he will turn back to the speeches of the late leader of the Government he will find in a campaign speech of his, in which the same charge is repeated. But if the hon. gentleman has any recollection at all, he will find that the amount which was charged against my name, as connected with the *Intelligencer*, should have been charged to the Toronto *Patriot* or *Leader*, I don't know which; for when I called for the receipts, Mr. Irving, of Hamilton, who was the chairman, said it was all an error. All the hon. gentleman will be able to find that I received was the sum of 63½ cents. I know the hon. gentleman refers to the report made by the committee. I will not characterise that report by stating the opinion I hold of it, because I know that it is not necessary. The only sum paid the *Intelligencer* was for the ordinary advertising of discounts on American money. That is the head and front of my offending. I know I was served with a writ for dam-

ages, I challenged the opposite party to take it into court, and they did not dare do so, but allowed it to drop. When the whitewashing Bill of hon gentlemen opposite was introduced I voted against it. I had no fear that anything could be proved affecting my seat, as I had done nothing in violation of the Act. The hon. member for Digby was a little in error when he said the prices paid to the *Halifax Citizen* were the same as the regular prices paid.

Mr. VAIL. I did not say that. I said they were the same as those paid the *Halifax Reporter* for doing the same work under the former Government.

Mr. BOWELL. I know nothing about that, but if the hon. gentleman will refer to the speech of the Postmaster General in 1875 or 1876 he will find that he said the Government were paying 50 per cent. more for the work done in the Maritime Provinces than should have been paid. I call the attention of the committee to the error of the hon. member for Brant, quite unintentional, no doubt, in reference to the time covered by the suit entered by McLean & Roger, by which they obtained a verdict of over \$69,000. He said it covered a year of printing done during this Administration, and to prove that satisfactorily he said the suit was not entered for a year or eighteen months after this Government came into power. The action was not entered until a year or eighteen months after this Government came into power, and it was only after the last Session of Parliament that it was finally adjusted, on the award made by the Exchequer Court. The hon. gentleman is in error in saying it covered any part of the printing done by the present Administration, I think I can establish that fact, for I have the dates and the items in my office, and will be happy to show the hon. gentleman that he is in error.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I was so informed by an authority I have no reason to doubt, but if the hon. gentleman will show me, as he says he will, a convincing statement, I will be convinced. I think my authority is very good, and until I see those statements I am not prepared to admit I am wrong.

Mr. BOWELL. From my experience of the hon. gentleman, I do not expect him to admit that he is wrong. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the confidence he places in me. He is not prepared to accept my statement when I tell him I have the proof, but says he has the statement from a gentleman who is a good authority. Under the circumstances I do not propose to attempt to convince the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I have not refused to take the hon. gentleman's word, but he himself said he would show me the proof; and since he has said so, I do not think it any imputation on his veracity that I should say I am willing to believe the hon. gentleman when he shows me the proof.

Mr. VAIL. I said that the prices paid the *Citizen* newspaper were exactly those paid the *Halifax Reporter* under the former Government, and printing had been going on from 1867 to 1874 before it was transferred. If the prices paid had been exorbitant there would have been a change made before that time. He did not say I was the only one out of 33 members who, strictly speaking, were just as much, in fact, more open to the charge, who resigned his seat and went to the country. I am not at all sure that the hon. the Minister of Customs should not have been one of them.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Customs says I have charged him with receiving over \$1,000, when he received only 63 cents.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I did not. You said \$600 or \$700. I said the report charged me with receiving \$1,000.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman may have received only 63 cents after the general election of 1874, but I did not pretend to speak of that, but of what he received after he became a member of Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows that 63 cents was not the account of the *Belleville Intelligencer*, but over \$600. The hon. gentleman had forfeited his seat before the election of 1874, and it was a mere fraction that he received after that. I referred to Mr. Beaty, of Toronto, who was not a member of this House, except during the first Parliament, and yet he drew over \$500 while he was a member, and Mr. Stephenson drew upwards of \$1,100, and the hon. gentleman's account was over \$600, but not after the general election of 1874.

Mr. BOWELL. Let the hon. gentleman be honest when he is talking of this matter. The accounts of the *Belleville Intelligencer* were for advertising the post office letters, which were advertised at that time by the post offices in the different cities and towns in the country. Every month the uncalled-for letters were published in the newspapers of the different towns and cities. As far as printing was concerned, while I was connected with that paper I have no recollection that I ever had the slightest job from any Government. There may have been advertising of mail contracts in the town and in the county in which I resided; there was the advertising of the uncalled-for letters, there was the printing, sometimes, of little slips, which came from the local postmaster and not from the Government; and I have no doubt that these items were charged to the contingent account of the post office and sent to the Government. But they were not printing sent by the Government to the office with which I was then connected, except the advertisements to which I have referred, that is, mail contracts, and articles of that kind. I am quite satisfied, and I have the very best opinions of the first lawyers of the country that, as far as that was concerned, and the advertising of the discount on American invoices, it did not come within the meaning of the Act. If it did, why did not the hon. gentleman's friends prosecute, as I challenged them to?

Mr. VAIL. That is the very printing the *Citizen* did all through.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error. I am not discussing the *Citizen*, and I made no charge against the hon. gentleman; but the printing which the *Citizen* had was of various kinds of blank forms for the post office in Halifax. I never had any work of that kind.

Mr. MILLS. What is the difference between advertising letters for the post office and printing blanks for the post office?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is a contract in the one case and not in the other.

Mr. CASEY. The subject of the transactions with the hon. Minister of Customs was introduced chiefly in order to point out that, when the transactions with Mr. Anglin, which were referred to by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), took place, it was not as clearly settled as it is now that payments of that sort were improper. Attention was drawn to Mr. Anglin's case; it was enquired into by the Committee of Privileges and Elections, in which there was a large majority of that gentleman's own friends, and they reported that he was technically justified by precedents, but the committee chose to lay down their own opinion of what the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act required, and decided that these payments were unconstitutional. Mr. Anglin loyally accepted that decision, went to the people, and came back with the endorsement of his constituents, and resumed the Chair of this House, with credit to himself and to the House. What are the lessons to be drawn from that case? Is it that those transactions are to justify similar ones now? Quite

the reverse. The law is now settled by the Committee on Privileges and Elections adversely to that view, and if that was blameable at that time, how much more is it blameable now? What is the difference between Mr. Anglin's position and that of some gentlemen who have sat in the House since, who, perhaps, sit in it to-day? The plan of forming a corporation, a joint stock company, has been hit upon, in order to evade what has been declared the spirit of the Act. I do not know how long that will stand, and how long it will be held to be proper for a member of this House, as a member of a small corporation, perhaps a family compact, perhaps a ring of friends, to receive in that way what he could not receive if he owned the paper himself. I think it was certainly unwise on the part of a gentleman occupying a position in connection with a newspaper of that kind to attempt to cast blame on another gentleman who had been a member of this House, and I think it might have been inconvenient for that hon. gentleman, and for others who have been members of this House at different times, if the Committee on Privileges and Elections were now disposed to interpret the spirit of the Act as strictly as they were when the Liberal party was in power.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. member for West Elgin asserts that a plan has been hit upon by which members of Parliament can be shareholders in joint stock companies, and so being evade the law. I would ask the hon. gentleman who introduced that clause into the Independence of Parliament Act? I find, in chap. 5, 41 Vic., assented to on 10th May, 1878, that clause 7 is as follows:—

"This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons by reason of his being a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government."

The hon. gentleman, in all fairness, must admit it was not this Government, but the one of which he was a very ardent supporter, and of which the member for Bothwell was a member, that introduced this provision to further secure the independence of Parliament. The hon. gentleman has referred to the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) and has said that the errors, or indiscretions, or inadvertencies of a former Speaker of this House, occurred in consequence of attention not having been called to the matter before it came before the committee. I think the hon. gentleman was one of those who read Opposition newspapers of that time, and in 1874 I find two articles, very suggestive and brief, which speak very strongly against this action of the Government, in giving Mr. Anglin, then Speaker, large printing contracts. I find the following in the St. John correspondence of the *Montreal Gazette*, of 18th July, 1874:—

"There is a good deal of talk in the city about a job perpetrated by the Dominion Government on behalf of Mr. Anglin, the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is said that His Honor, not satisfied with the salary which he receives as Speaker; not satisfied with being permitted to turn the press out of the rooms which they have occupied since the Parliament buildings were erected, and which were expressly built for them, in order that he may have larger quarters for his family, has demanded and received the printing patronage of the Province, and that notwithstanding he has no job printing office of his own, he is farming out to other printers, making a comfortable commission for himself out of the transaction. There are two objections to this proceeding; it is a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, which forbids members of Parliament receiving gratuities from the Government. It is disgraceful that the Speaker, above all men, should become thus the recipient of favors from the Government, a fact that must entirely destroy all confidence in his impartiality and make him what he proved himself to be last Session, a mere partisan Speaker."

I find, further, in the *Ottawa Daily Citizen* of 9th July, 1874, the following:—

"When Mr. Gray, a member of the Dominion House of Commons, accepted work from the Government of Sir John Macdonald, the Grit press could find no language strong enough to condemn him for the 'corrupt act.' They were forced to admit that it was not in contravention of the letter of the Independence of Parliament Act, but they condemned it as a violation of its principle. Foremost among the assailants of Mr. Gray was Timothy Warren Anglin, M.P., editor and proprietor of the St. John *Freeman*, and his violent speeches and rabid articles upon the subject were copied approvingly by the Grit press. It

Mr. CASEY.

now turns out that the same immaculate gentleman, while holding the position of Speaker of the House of Commons, has secured the post office printing, but having no job office in connection with the *Freeman* has farmed it out to other establishments. This is the charge made against Mr. Anglin, and admitted by him to be true, and his sole defence for the job is, that there is very little profit in it. We can remember well how frequently Mr. Anglin quoted the Independence of Parliament Act against Mr. Gray. Let us see how it suits the case of Mr. Anglin. The Act declares that 'no person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, to which an annual salary or any fee, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind or amount whatever, from the Crown, is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote in the same during the time he holds such office, commission or employment.'"

Now, when the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) states that the only printing done in the Lower Provinces was given to the papers there, while the same rule did not apply to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, if he had looked over the schedule of claims made by the Government contractors he would find there was an amount, I think, exceeding \$216,320 paid for printing outside of the contract, then held by Maclean, Roger & Co. He must remember that during the past year and previously journalists have been stigmatised as being subsidised organs if they did Government printing. Why, if there were any subsidised organs at all in this country, they must have been the organs supporting hon. gentlemen composing the Government which fell in 1878. Hon. gentlemen must remember one case not far from this city, when in twenty-four hours the most rabid Tory organ was changed into the most subservient and loud mouthed Government organ and apologist. In looking over the record of the amount paid to that newspaper by the Reform administration, I find that not less than \$45,000 or \$50,000 were paid out for work belonging to the contractors, and it will be discovered, when the vouchers are brought down which were asked for, between 1874 and 1878, large amounts were paid for work given to various printers, and portions of that work were never performed. This, I think, I shall be able to establish. It is most unfair that journalists who, from 1874 to 1878, fought against the then Government, who gave them a fair field, but showed them no favor, It is most unfair that gentlemen, because they happen to receive, for the papers with which they are connected, either as editors, or publishers, or managers, a certain amount of printing from the Government, should be stigmatised as being merely subsidised organs. For my part, I have always been a publisher of a Conservative newspaper; I have always supported the Conservative party; I have always given a Conservative vote, and when my party fell in 1873, I stood loyally by it, and fought its battles; but neither this Government, nor any Government that ever existed, could buy my opinions as a journalist or my liberty as an independent elector or member of Parliament. Therefore, I hope that hon. gentlemen on both sides who are connected with the press will have some respect for the amenities of the profession. As journalists, we are bound to let the country know on which side we stand; we may at times say and do ungenerous things in the excess of partisan zeal, or the temporary excitement of political passion, but aside from this, I do not believe the press of either party is corrupt in this particular, and I trust that every hon. gentleman connected with the press will at all times endeavor to maintain a manly and honorable position. So far as I am concerned, I shall fight the Reform party when it is in power, and as things are now, shall fight it when in Opposition, and knowing my position, I think that the public will believe that no printing contract, given to a journal in which I may have an interest, will have anything to do with any expression of opinion which I may record, when I believe such expression is beneficial to the public.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It is very convenient to enjoy the favor of the Government, with regard to public printing.

Mr. HESSON. That is the trouble with you.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I can tell the hon. gentleman from North Perth that I have been publishing a newspaper for over thirty years, and during the whole of that time I never got enough Government patronage to keep him in board for a month. It is very convenient for those hon. gentlemen who are proprietors of newspapers to be in the good graces of the Government, for we find in the Public Accounts occasionally that advances are made for work which is not done. It is very convenient, when a Government organ becomes hard up, to be able to come to the Department at Ottawa and draw \$500 or \$1,500 for work which is actually not done. That has been done during the past year by the proprietors of the *Ottawa Citizen* and of the *Montreal Gazette*; advances have been made to them, as can be shown by the Public Accounts. The proprietors of those papers have gone to the Government and have got advances upon work which was not done, and was not delivered. Now, I consider this is not the right way of conducting the public business. It is time enough to pay for work when it is completed and delivered; but I have strong doubts, in my own mind, as to whether a great deal of the work that has been paid for by this Government was ever done at all; at least, I believe a large part of it was never delivered. That is the case with this celebrated pamphlet, published by the Rev. Alfred J. Bray, of Montreal. It is difficult to trace where those 5,000 pamphlets went, for we paid for that number. There are many other instances of this kind. It is very convenient for those gentlemen, when they find themselves in financial straits, to make a visit to the Department of Agriculture and say to the Minister that they are a little hard up, and would like to get \$500 or \$1,000. Now, I say that does not add to the independence of Parliament; it does not add to the influence of the newspaper press of this country. The Conservative press of this country, by the way it has been treated by this Government, has been degraded and debased. It no longer represents the people, but is the mere mouthpiece of the Government. These men, who are continually receiving large amounts from the Government, cannot express their opinions independently; they are the wards of the Government in every sense of the term, and therefore incapable of expressing an independent opinion.

Mr. HESSON. I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is a little bit troubled because the Government do not distribute their favors to the press of the country, irrespective of politics. Now, he knows perfectly well that the Conservative party never professed to neglect their friends and to patronise those who are opposed to them. My hon. friend paid a poor compliment to the *Globe*, the *London Advertiser* and many other papers who are supporting the Ontario Administration to-day, and who receive the patronage of that Government. I do not say the *Toronto Globe* has sold itself to assist Mr. Mowat; I believe it is advocating the principles which it believes to be right and in the interests of its party. I am convinced that the press which supports the Mowat Government would not cease to write articles in favor of that Government, even if they did not receive patronage. I have been surprised that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should have paid so bad a compliment to the newspaper profession, to which he belongs. When the hon. gentleman first spoke I did not understand that he found fault with the character of the work done, but that he said it had been well done. Indeed, I did not at first understand him to complain that the price was high, but his complaint was that the work should have been done by the regular contractors. The matter should then have been allowed to drop. The amount now asked for printing under this head is the same as was asked in 1877-78. Two or three hours have been spent on this item; the hon. member for Bothwell has been up ten or twelve

times, and I do not think the committee have any more information than they formerly possessed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think the time has been wasted. It has been shown that, according to the Auditor General, there has been an over payment of \$790 on an amount of work costing \$2,800. The hon. member for North Perth, surely, must not think it is waste time to consider such a question. If the facts are true, a remedy should be applied, and the amount overpaid be repaid.

Mr. MILLS. I asked the First Minister whether he intended to continue this work of printing the Geological Report to private parties. We have not yet had an answer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will ascertain all about it before the subject of printing comes up again.

Mr. MILLS. Then the hon. gentleman will inform us what is the intention of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely.

Immigration.....\$368,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This item requires considerable discussion. There is scarcely an item in the Estimates the propriety of which may be better questioned than this item of nearly \$400,000 for immigration. I have paid some attention to the reports of the Minister and to the statistics therein contained, and I find the alleged statistics as to the immigrants into this country appear to be totally irreconcilable with other facts known to us. I do not know whether it be that the report made to the Department grossly exaggerates the number of immigrants who come to this country, or whether it is that the immigrants who come here only remain for an exceedingly short time and then depart, or whether, as a matter of fact, they displace a number of our own people, and drive them into other countries. I know that no sort of explanation of a satisfactory kind has ever been given by the Minister or any of his employés, as to the alleged number of immigrants who come into this country and who, so far as our census returns and municipal returns go, certainly do not remain here. My own impression of this matter is this: That the whole system of assisted passages is becoming a gigantic fraud on the people of Canada. I believe we get exceedingly little benefit from this expenditure. I doubt very much whether desirable immigrants, who come to this country and remain here, come in any proportion by reason of the information furnished by the Department of Agriculture, or by reason of the assistance given to them by that Department. I think it is well worth the consideration of the House and of the Government whether this whole system of immigration should not be reformed, from the bottom. The United States, for a long time, I think from the very commencement, have not found it worth while to go to the expense of maintaining a department of this sort, much less of paying for it out of the public funds. It may have, in past times, been worth our while to bring people here at the public cost; but I do not think it is worth while any longer. Those portions of our people who are, from various causes, most affected by this immigration, have remonstrated against it in no uncertain language. From the various great cities of Canada over and over again representations have been made to the Government and to the Department, all tending to show that this system is being greatly abused; that a great number of persons are being brought here for whom there is no employment. This means one of two things; either the people do not remain here, and the money is worse than thrown away, or, if they do remain here, drive out of employment other persons already resident in the country, who deserve our best consideration. I find in the four years, 1881-82-83 and '84, the Department alleges it has brought 397,000 people into this country. I cannot find that there is any tolerable evidence that those persons, or any great num-

ber of them, have remained in the country. One thing is clear; they do not appear to have settled in the Maritime Provinces or in the Province of Quebec. The Department gives certain figures, more or less reliable, or perhaps I should say more or less unreliable, as to settlers in the North-West, Manitoba and British Columbia, but it leaves wholly untouched the question of where the great remainder have gone. Now, we know from the census reports which we have had submitted to us at various times, that the Province which has always received the greatest number of those emigrants has been Ontario, and we also know, from the municipal statistics of Ontario, that it is physically impossible that more than a very small percentage of them should have remained in that Province. For those reasons, I believe it is high time for us to consider this whole question—high time, I believe, unless a much clearer account can be given, and much better evidence brought down than we have received, that those immigrants remained in this country—to consider whether the greater part of this sum which the Government demand may not be saved altogether. Now, I shall be glad indeed to hear from the Minister in charge where he supposes these 400,000 persons have gone, who are alleged, within the last four years, according to the returns of his Department, to have settled in this country. The evidence, so far as we have it, apart from this bald statement in these reports, all tends to show very strongly that precisely the same result is occurring in 1881-82-83-84 as occurred from 1860 to 1871, and from 1871 to 1881, and that result was this: That the vast proportion of the persons who are alleged to have come to Canada did not remain in Canada, but went elsewhere, presumably to the United States, though possibly a smaller proportion may have returned to England. Now, I believe the time has arrived in Canada when little is to be done by assisting persons to come here. The older Provinces are, as we find to our sorrow, not only well supplied with population, but are unable to retain the natural increase of their own population; and I doubt exceedingly if there is any great advantage to us in paying sums of money to bring persons to go to the North-West. There may be exceptional cases, but from all I have seen or heard of the North-West, I do not believe we are doing any good to that country in bringing these persons, without some moderate supply of capital. I think the only immigration likely to be of service to us in Manitoba and the North-West consists of persons possessing a sufficient amount to enable them to bring a reasonable quantity of land into cultivation; and I think nobody will contend that the persons whom we are obliged to assist out here will, unless in very exceptional cases, be likely to be useful settlers in the North-West. As for the older Provinces—for reasons I have stated, and particularly for the well-known reason that we are not able to keep our own people, as is only too clearly shown by the returns submitted to us, not from American but Canadian sources, and particularly in Quebec and Ontario—I say as to the older Provinces, we are not likely to do ourselves any good by bringing these people, as we have been doing.

Mr. POPE. I have heard the same remarks of my hon. friend before, and I have read them before. It is the old story which the hon. gentleman has been parading since last Session throughout the country, in about the same style as he has told it to night. I can say that the information I have received shows that these men do come here, that returns are made by the agents where they come, and returns of their distribution in this country are also made, and I believe he has no right to say—I do not know, in fact, that he did say—that they do not come to this country. But that men will go from this country as well as come to it there is no question. The hon. gentleman says that people are driven out by others coming, but does he think that the people are too thick here, and that there is not

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

room for those who are here as well as for those who come. I remember when he told a different story; when he wanted all the immigration he could get. Now his tune is changed, and he finds that some of the cities complain of being crowded. But is it to the cities alone that we must look? Does he find that the agricultural communities have got all the laborers they want? The fact is, that this year we are not supplying all the demands for agriculturists, and he knows very well, for I told him early in the Session, that I do not assist any but agricultural laborers to come to his county. Still, I have not been able to supply the demand, with all the efforts I can make, partly for the reason that all kinds of stories have gone to the old country, and partly because there are people living in the cities who denounce immigration and keep the people from coming here. But he will find that Mr. Donaldson, the agent in Toronto, cannot begin to supply the demand in Ontario. I know that that is the case in Quebec and other parts of the country, and I say the little assistance we give to those men is doubly repaid by their coming to the country. He says, also, that he does not believe that those people should be assisted to go to the North-West. Well, the hon. gentleman just shows that he does not know anything about what is done with regard to those people going to the North-West. No man is assisted from Quebec to go to the North-West. We have always laid that down as a principle, and I agree with him in that. I believe that he has told a truth that cannot be denied, when he says that the right kind of men to go to the North-West are men of some means, who can go there and take care of themselves. I think it would be the height of folly to send poor men there, who are not able to take care of themselves. But what is happening every day in this country? Our people from Ontario, well-to-do immigrants from Europe, do go to the North-West. They are continually going there, more or less, while poorer men, agricultural laborers, who are so much wanted in this country, stop here and work for the farmers in the older Provinces until they get enough to go to the North-West. He says we are depopulating the country; that we have not got the number of people that we ought to have, according to the immigration statistics. I do not pretend to say that some of our people do not go the United States, but I believe we get as many from that country as go there, and perhaps more. I do not think we have anything to complain of in that respect. A short time ago, when the hon. gentleman sat on this side of the House, he believed it was important to assist immigrants. I shall be told, probably, that my figures have run out—that I have paid a large sum. Well, I have paid a considerable sum, more than was paid in his time—more than was paid in my own time, in 1872. At that time the present leader of the Opposition, who was leading the Government in Ontario, sent his commissioner of immigration to me, who said that he wanted to make a bargain, so that people should come up through Ontario free, that he did not want them to have to pay a dollar. Well, I said to Mr. McKellar that I would meet him as far as I could. I said that at this moment we only paid a portion—I think it was about one-third—and that if they paid two-thirds they would go through free. That was an arrangement made with the Local Government when my hon. friend was there, and he sent his commissioner here. Now, what has happened? This Government has paid the whole cost during the last few years. This year I am not paying out any more than I can possibly help. The immigration coming this year, although small, is considerable. Of course, I cannot yet estimate the result of this year's operations; but I warned Sir Charles Tupper that the railway was about completed, and that navvies and mechanics should not be induced to come to this country. The result is, that we have very few of that class; most of the people who have come have been agriculturists or agricultural labor-

ers, and my hon. friend will find a good many of this class of people scattered throughout the country, taking the places of our people, not because they are driven out, but because they have gone to the North-West to settle up that great region. Last year we had an immigration to the North-West of 30,265 out of a total immigration to Canada of 103,824. No assistance is given to immigrants from Quebec to Manitoba, because I do not think a man without means should go there; I think such man does better in the older Provinces, working for farmers, until he earns enough money to settle in the North-West. A gentleman who was here the other day said to me: "I want you to assist 5,000 of my people to go to the North-West." "No," I said, "I don't think that is the place for them; but if you will send me 1,000 or 5,000 agriculturists, I will find places for them in the older Provinces, and in a year or two, when they earn money enough, they can go there." If I understood the hon. gentleman, when he spoke the other day, the ground on which he based his statement that the population was decreasing in Canada was the municipal returns and the census of children going to school. I find that in several parts of the United States, where the population had largely increased, the school attendance had decreased, and I do not think anything can be concluded from that circumstance at all. A good many of our people have gone to the North-West, and I do not always rely on the municipal or school statistics in this respect. So that I very much doubt if the hon. gentleman has based his calculations on a proper ground; because, when we look about the country, we see that a great increase in agricultural and mechanical business, and in everything else, has taken place; so I think our population must have increased. A great many have, no doubt, gone to the North-West, but no matter whether they are here or there, they are in Canada.

Mr. CURRAN. I am very glad to hear from the hon. Minister that there will be no assisted passages to any but agricultural laborers. I think that will be good news to the mechanical class in our large cities. I merely wish to draw the Minister's attention to a statement that was made in a document which was sent to me a few days ago, and which I transmitted to him, regarding a certain class of immigrants who are said to be coming to this country at present, and who, I think, are not very desirable. We all know that there is plenty of room for female servants in all the cities; that it is as difficult to-day, as it has been at any time, to procure servants, and that any good girls coming from the old country, who wish to enter into the service of families, will find plenty of work without displacing anybody. But I was informed in the document which I transmitted to the Minister that a certain number of persons from poor-houses were being brought here. I can hardly credit that myself; but the statement having been made, I deemed it my duty to bring the matter thus prominently to the attention of the Minister, and I trust he will have it investigated, so that persons of that class, who are generally helpless, to a certain extent demoralised, and who certainly cannot, in any way, be considered a desirable acquisition to our population, may not be brought into the country. The hon. Minister asks whether they are children or not. I have not been informed of that; it was rather grown up persons who were mentioned as being likely to be thrown on the charities of our public institutions. I trust there is no foundation for the report. The statement was that some 100 odd persons of that class had disembarked from the steamship *Parisian* on her last trip to Montreal, and it is for that reason that I bring the matter to the hon. Minister's attention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to what the hon. Minister has said, I beg to call the attention of the committee to this, that it does not in the slightest degree answer the question as to where the great proportion of

these immigrants have gone to. In the hon. gentleman's report, in 1881, 47,991 are reported; in 1882, 112,458; in 1883, 113,624; and in 1884, 103,824; in all, in four years, 397,897 immigrants are stated to have come to this country. Now, if we turn to his other reports, we find that in British Columbia he alleges a total of 36,000 to have settled, a very large percentage of whom are a class of immigrants we are not likely to get more of, inasmuch as there is a measure on the Table just now to impose some \$50 a head on them. In the North-West, during those four years, the total was 62,000 taking his own reports, and if you deduct that 98,000, you get 300,000 to be accounted for. The Minister has not pretended that any considerable amount of these have gone to the Maritime Provinces or to Quebec. It would be utterly impossible any considerable percentage of these persons could have gone to these other Provinces without making themselves at once felt and perceived amidst the population, particularly in the Province of Quebec, where, by reason of difference of language, any large percentage of immigrants, unless, indeed, in Montreal and one or two points like that, would be at once identified. Nobody has pretended that this balance of 300,000 has gone anywhere except to Ontario. Now, we have this evidence before us. We know well that in Ontario, as well as in the other Provinces, there is a very considerable natural increase of the population, an increase which, in the four years, ought to have amounted to at least a couple of hundred thousand, or something very near that. We find from the municipal statistics, which, although not perfect, are the only ones we have to act upon, and which, going back a series of years, show a reasonable proportion of increase—we find in those four years the total population of Ontario does not appear to have increased by more than 60,000 or 70,000 at the outside. I am in hopes that the great immigration from Ontario which has been going on for a very considerable period is coming to a stop, but it is perfectly clear that those 300,000 cannot be accounted for, unless we suppose that those statistics which, as I say, are the only ones we have to go upon in Ontario, have suddenly, within those four years back, become entirely unreliable. My position is that they are reliable, relatively speaking. Great pains have been taken with them of late years, and are being taken with them now, and I have no doubt they substantially represent the increase which has been going on in Ontario for those four years. If that be so, these 300,000 people who have to be accounted for have not settled in Ontario or they have displaced a very considerable number of the existing population, because it is clear to demonstration that even allowing the total number who are alleged to have settled in Manitoba from Canada generally to have all belonged to Ontario, and we know they do not all belong to Ontario, though, no doubt, a great portion of them do—it is quite clear, from our municipal statistics that the total increase and the number settled in Manitoba and the North-West put together do not equal the natural increase of both taken together, so that these 300,000 remain wholly unaccounted for, except on one of these two suppositions. I do not say the immigrants have not come in, but that they have either gone away within a very short period after they have arrived in this country or else they have displaced our own people. There is no getting away from that position, unless the hon. gentleman declares that the municipal statistics of Ontario have been deliberately and with set purpose cooked. I do not suppose he will allege there has been any such attempt; it would be absurd to suppose so. If you look over them for the last fifteen years, you will see they show a general and reasonable increase for ten years, but of late years not so much of an increase. But they prove conclusively that point. Over and above that, the information I have got from the hon. gentleman's own Province is to the same effect, that in the Province of Quebec the municipal statistics show an increase to the

population very much less than the natural increase which ought to have taken place. These are questions of great importance, which go, no doubt, to the very bottom of the question, whether we are wise in spending our money for immigration service, and no doubt they prove a good many other things, which I do not propose here to allude to. The hon. gentleman ought to give us some information in detail as to the location of these 300,000 people. His own report shows an immigration to this country of 400,000; that of British Columbia and the North-West, all told, from his own report, will only account for one-fourth of that number. I submit the only probable place they have gone to—that is the vast majority of 300,000—is Ontario, and there we do not find them. The population of Ontario, though not quite to so great an extent as some of the other Provinces, is becoming stationary. The agricultural districts are not increasing in population. If there be any increase, it is in a small number, I am sorry to say, a very small number of towns and of cities, but in rural districts there is almost necessarily no increase.

An. hon. MEMBER. What about Algoma?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a moderate increase in Algoma, Muskoka and one or two other districts, but nothing like the number that would be required to account for the mere natural increase of population, without taking into account, in the least, this apparent enormous immigration. The hon. gentleman will not dispute my position, that the Maritime Provinces and Quebec do not receive any appreciable part of this. That has been stated over and over again, and has never been contradicted; I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would contradict it. To Ontario, evidently, they have come, but unless there is an extraordinary error in our municipal statistics—I put aside, for the moment, the question of school statistics—these immigrants have not stayed in Ontario, or else they have displaced a considerable number of our own population. I am inclined to think what has happened in former years has happened these four last years. We have only to turn to the census records to see that, although enormous immigration took place to Canada between 1861 and 1871, and between 1871 and 1881, yet when we came to take the census of our people we discovered that the vast proportion of immigrants we had brought to this country, many of them at our own expense, have not stayed here. As far as the census can be relied upon, it makes a strong presumptive case that the process which has been going on for the last twenty years has been going on for the four years, without adding to the strength of Canada, by devoting \$400,000 public money to bring immigrants here.

Mr. SPROULE. My experience is entirely different from that of the hon. member for Huron. For several years, up to 1878, there was no demand for immigrants in my part of the country. In 1879 there was a little demand, in 1880 there was more, and in 1881 and 1882 the demand increased. I applied to Mr. Donaldson, of Toronto, on behalf of several farmers, two or three years in succession, for farm laborers, and I was unable, in any one year, to get more than one-fourth of the number applied for. During the last few years, to my own knowledge, a large number of immigrants, principally farm laborers and men with capital, have come to that part of the country, and they have remained there and can be found there to-day. I know that some people are paying \$5, and even as much as \$8 per head, to persons who will bring laborers to the farms. When this is the case, we must admit that the money is wisely spent. Many of the men who come here are men of means and buy out the farmers of our own country, many of whom go to the cities where their sons have gone, or follow them to Manitoba and the North-West, where they have gone to better their condition, because those who have been used to the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

pioneer's life in Ontario are better fitted to make money in the North-West than men from the old country. Of those who have come to my neighborhood, some have bought farms for themselves and others are working, but my experience is that not one out of three has gone away, instead of three out of four as the hon. gentleman stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The statements I gave are derived from the census. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to examine the census returns he will see quite distinctly from them that, for the only two periods for which we have accurate information, from 1861 to 1871, and from 1871 to 1881, from whatever cause, precisely what I have stated has occurred. We have brought some 300,000 or 400,000 immigrants here in ten years, and the census returns show us that, making a very liberal allowance for the death rate among the immigrants who were here before, not one in four has remained in the country. The census may be inaccurate, but I suppose we are bound to accept it as the most accurate statement we can get. That is the evidence up to 1881, and although I do not say it is conclusive, it is strong presumptive evidence that the current which was going on in all those years is still continuing to go on. It may be quite true, and does not in the least affect the argument I was advancing, that in his particular part of the country more immigrants may have stayed than elsewhere. The hon. gentleman apparently has not noticed the fact that our municipal statistics in Ontario showed that, during those four years, we have only had an increase of 60,000 or 70,000 souls. If that be so, it is very far indeed from accounting for the natural increase of the people, even throwing in the number who are alleged to have gone to Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. As far as my knowledge goes, the municipal statistics are entirely unreliable, as you may see by comparing them with the report of the Board of Agriculture in Ontario. I gave my illustration in answer to the hon. gentleman's argument, that we need not expend that money for immigration, because there was not a demand for the emigrants.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Did I understand that no more assisted passages are to be given to artisans and mechanics?

Mr. POPE. That is the instruction.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Then, I think it would be well that you should withdraw from circulation one of the pamphlets put into circulation, a very expensive one, which, it was stated before a committee of this House, had been placed on the tables of all the hotels in Great Britain and Europe, in order to induce immigrants to come to this country. I refer to the Rev. A. J. Bray's pamphlet, and at page 25 I find the following statement:—

"Knowing well the wants of this agricultural and industrial country, Mr. Pope has made great and patient efforts to induce laborers of all kinds to emigrate to the Dominion. The rapid development of agricultural resources keeps up a constant demand for farm laborers; railway building makes a demand for navvies, and mechanics and artisans are needed to carry on the common trades. To help the work of supply, Mr. Pope has devised a system of assisted passages. Female domestic servants and families of agricultural laborers are helped to more than the ordinary and advertised passage money; other laborers and mechanics get a considerable reduction in the fare."

I think it will be necessary for the Minister to withdraw that celebrated publication from the tables of the hotels in Great Britain and Europe, if he does not wish to deceive the mechanics and artisans of the old country, by inducing them to come here, by advertising that there is plenty of work for them. I know, in the town where I do business, during the past year and before, a large number of mechanics and artisans have been thrown out of employment altogether. Some of the factories have been closed up, and a large decrease has taken place in the staff in a number of the manufacturing establishments there. Mechanics have been compelled

to go to the United States for employment, many of them, and the artisans in the cotton factory were out of employment altogether for three or four months last summer. I think it is a great injustice to the artisans and mechanics for the Government to give assisted passages to bring out others to work against them.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman has discovered a mare's nest altogether. He does not say that I assist these men, and he does not read any statement that I would assist them. He read a statement that agriculturists and female domestic servants could get assistance, and that the others got a lower rate but no assistance. The pamphlet, as he calls it, was written eighteen months or two years ago, and at that time we wanted, and did all we could to bring, navvies and mechanics to work on our public works; we could not supply the demand; but, as I told him, I had found this season that we would not have work for these men, and I gave my instructions accordingly, that they should not be encouraged to come to this country. The hon. gentleman has not shown that a word has been published since that time to induce them to come here. We did no more than necessary to assist the navvies whom we encouraged to come because we wanted them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I think the statement I made is correct. The report says that mechanics get a considerable reduction in fare, but I fail to discover where the difference is between a considerable reduction in the fare and an assisted passage. It must be that the Government have paid the steamship companies to bring them out here.

Mr. POPE. Not at all.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How, then, do they secure a reduction in the fare?

Mr. POPE. Because we make a general arrangement with them, and we assist these other classes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As to the statement that there was a great dearth of mechanics or artisans during the past two years, so far as the section of country I live in is concerned—and it is a manufacturing section—no such dearth existed. The depression has continued for that length of time, and there was no necessity for introducing mechanics and artisans when those who are already here were out of employment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister has not disputed the accuracy of the increases alleged to have taken place in the municipal census.

Mr. POPE. I do not believe in the municipal census at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has no other source of information whatever, and he has not shown himself anxious to obtain information in Quebec where he could obtain it. There he could obtain accurate information from the Catholic clergy, who keep registers of the movements of the Catholic population. Now, I would call the attention of the House to what the municipal returns of Ontario say. They show that between 1873 and 1879 the population of Ontario was increased 220,000, and from 1879 to the middle of 1884, which is the last detailed statement we have got, it had increased barely 80,000. From 1881 to 1884, both inclusive, it had increased barely 58,000. The rural population has been perfectly stationary—in fact, has slightly decreased; towns and villages have increased slightly; cities have increased considerably, but the great bulk of the increase was in Toronto alone. Now there is internal evidence to show that these figures are relatively accurate. They show a considerable increase over a number of years, and that increase corresponds with the other facts we have got. They show conclusively that for the last four years the

total increase in Ontario has been vastly below the natural increase, and that allowing for all he claims to have gone to the North-West, that increase does not equal the natural increase. Now, what has become of these 300,000 people? I call upon the hon. gentleman to disprove these facts if he can. These facts are corroborated by the three censuses of 1861, 1871 and 1881, and I cannot conceive how it can be disputed that even if we have brought these people here we have not succeeded in keeping them here, or if we have succeeded in keeping them here, it must have been by displacing our own people. Now, he has not gainsaid a single statement I have made, either as to the estimates of British Columbia, or as to his own estimates of the population in the North-West. He has not gainsaid my other statement, that no considerable portion of these emigrants has gone to the Maritime Provinces or to Quebec. Now, it is quite impossible that so huge a number of persons as 300,000 should remain uncounted, for every person acquainted with Ontario knows that the conditions of life there are such that 300,000 people cannot be absorbed among a population of little less than 2,000,000 without every person being aware of the fact; it would amount to very nearly one person in six. The hon. gentleman must see for himself that these facts require more explanation than his Department or himself have yet vouchsafed to give us.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister has not attempted to dispute the accuracy of the statistics that have been presented. There is another fact which would corroborate the statement that we are losing population much faster than is for the benefit of the country, and that is the revelation made by the census returns of the United States.

Mr. BERGIN. That is all your authority.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; for that is where all our emigrants are going, as appears from the United States census returns. The census for 1870 shows that there were 493,000 people living in that country who were born in British America; while in 1880 there were 717,000 persons born in British America who were living in the United States. By careful calculations it is shown that the immigration statistics of the United States, professing to show the number of emigrants going from Canada to the United States, are substantially correct, because the increase in the Canadian population from 493,000 to 717,000, making the usual allowance for loss by death, is the same, within a few thousand, as the result shown by the statistics of the emigration of Canadians; and if that is correct, and the census of 1880 is correct, then the immigration statistics from the United States since 1880 show that there are living to-day in the United States 1,000,000 people born in British America. That is why our country does not prosper. In addition to those 1,000,000 native-born British Americans living in the United States, there are no statistics to show how large a proportion of the foreign-born immigrants brought to this country, largely by assisted passages, remain a short time here and then go to the United States. But from all the statistics and evidence we can arrive at, there is every reason to believe that at least two-thirds of the immigrants brought to this country from the old world after remaining here a short time leave us and go to the United States. Hon. gentlemen may throw out the taunt that this is American authority. It is a very serious thought that our population is drifting away. The 1,000,000 of Canadians in the United States is the very cream of the population of the Dominion. The loss of that population is not only a serious matter, but is a great disaster to this country; and if we are wise, we shall strive to ascertain what are the remedies for preventing this great depietion of our population, and if any remedy is practicable, I think a loyal Tory as well as a loyal Liberal ought to be anxious to apply it. With respect to the effect of the whole policy of maintaining an immigration department, I will be guilty of

the great crime of drawing some more information from the great country to the south of us. That country, which has 1,000,000 Canadians resident within its borders, has been successful in inducing immigration. In 1880 the total number of immigrants was 417,000; 1881, 669,000; 1882, 783,000; 1883, 599,000. How do the United States promote immigration? Do they keep up an extensive staff and immigration officers in Europe? Do they spend \$3 or \$4 per head in promoting immigration? No; they do not expend one cent. They make no provision for inducing immigration or granting assisted passages, or anything of that kind. But, on the contrary, they tax every immigrant landing on their shores 50 cents per head; and their immigration law, approved on 3rd August, 1882, provides that no more money shall be spent on immigration in the United States, on immigration agents, or providing lodgings or sending immigrants to their destination, than is derived from the head tax of 50 cents per immigrant. The disbursements last year were \$235,000, the receipts \$224,000; and the report of the Secretary Treasurer explains that the additional amount required was provided by a balance in the Treasury of \$104,000. The whole consular service of the United States cost \$486,000 a year. It is probable that the consuls may furnish information that may assist immigration, although the consuls are not appointed for that purpose, and it is only an incidental part of their duty. Consuls are appointed in the chief commercial cities and towns of Europe, and they naturally, though incidentally, disseminate information that leads to emigration to the United States. But the great power leading to immigration is the fact that immigrants have gone to the United States, that they have left friends behind with whom they communicate, and that there is a demand for labor in the United States. These combinations form a potent agency. The United States does nothing to assist immigration; it spends no money, but it imposes a head tax on every immigrant. The Bill providing a duty of 50 cents per head sets forth that this amount is to be levied on every passenger not a citizen of the United States coming from any foreign port; that it shall be collectable at the port of landing; that it shall be paid into the Treasury and known as the immigrant fund, and that this duty shall be a lien on the vessel bringing immigrants. It provides that a general sum shall be expended, that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be charged with executing the provisions of the Act, and that he shall make contracts with the State boards for carrying out its provisions. The only defect found and amendment suggested from experience in the working of the Act is the adoption of more efficient provisions for returning undesirable immigrants, such as convicts, lunatics, and so forth. As I have said, under the provisions of this law a great stream of immigration has poured into the United States. I do not believe our system of spending a large sum, and keeping up an expensive system of this character in Europe and in England, has proved to be such a success as to be of interest to the country, or to have greatly promoted immigration. I believe the desirable class of immigrants are those who have ascertained the advantages which this country has to offer, and come here voluntarily and make it their home, and those who are assisted here are not, as a rule, that class, and are not so likely to stay as are those who voluntarily come here. For that reason I believe the whole system requires to be changed, and that we should adopt the system calculated to promote the prosperity and advantage of the country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There can be no doubt that what the non. gentleman has said as to the policy of the United States Government, that is, the Central Government, is correct; they do not expend a large sum of money in maintaining agents abroad, or with a view of bringing immigrants to that country. Nor do they give any assisted

Mr. CHARLTON.

passages. But I do not think the hon. gentleman was quite fair in assuming that we can afford to be placed on the same basis as they have adopted. It is quite true that there are 750,000 or 1,000,000 of British Americans in the United States. We have suffered from the policy of migration which has obtained in the United States as well as in Canada. We must recognise the fact that with respect to the State of New York, which has a population about equal to that of the Dominion, there are to be found in other parts of the United States 1,400,000 persons who were born in the State of New York. No less than five States of the American Union, at this moment, have citizens or native-born persons in other parts of the Union to a larger number than we have Canadians in the United States. Up to comparatively a few years ago, Canada, as a field for immigration, comprised only the old Provinces, which placed us in a similar position to the eastern States, and an examination will show that the population of Canada, during the recent decennial periods, has actually increased to a greater extent than has the population in New York and the eastern States. Although the American Government, that is, the Central Government, have not granted assisted passages, although they have not adopted, to the same extent, the policy we have adopted with a view of attracting immigrants, they have practically had in the United Kingdom and on the continent of Europe immigration agents, in the form of shipping agents of the large steamship companies. I remember when I had the honor of being on the other side for a short time for the Ontario Government, making some enquiries with respect to immigration matters, I discovered this to be the difficulty: those immigration agents, acting as agents for the various steamship companies, received a commission on the tickets they sold, and also on any tickets sold to go into the interior. It became, therefore, their interest, from the amount of commission which they receive, to send immigrants to the furthest point in the interior, they could send them to. If they send an immigrant to Chicago they get a larger commission than if they sent him to New York; if they send him still further west they get a further and a larger commission; and, as a consequence, by the mere operation of that system of payment by commission on the tickets they sell, resulting from the connection between the inland transportation companies and the ocean transportation companies, they were practically active agents for immigration to the furthest points on the American continent. The result of that was, that every one of, say the 1,200 agents of the Messrs. Allan—although they did a great deal for Canada, although they were willing to distribute our pamphlets, and do everything in that way that they possibly could, yet, when the question came of selling tickets, if they could sell that ticket to a point that was in the interior of the continent they got so much more commission, that they were practically the agents of the United States for the purpose of immigration. Now, we are just getting into the same condition as our friends on the other side. At this moment there is every indication that not only from Europe, not only from the old Provinces of Canada—as there was from New England to the western States—are people going into our own great west, but that from the United States those people are going. Just as they went formerly from New England to the western States, so now they are going to our western territories. We are precisely at that period of our national existence when we have to encourage that kind of thing, when having that large territory to fill up, we have to adopt means of bringing people into that territory, and when, as we bring them in, year after year more coming in, we produce that kind of agency which is, of all agencies, the most effective for immigration, that is, the successful settlers in the country, who send home money to bring out

the'r friends from the old world. I saw a statement some time ago as to the amount of money sent to Ireland alone from the Irish people in the United States in that way. I shall not venture from memory to state the amount, because it was some years ago that I saw it, but it was a fabulous amount, an inconceivably large amount which was sent home from the earnings of the Irish people of the United States to Ireland, to bring out their friends to the west, to settle in those western States and territories. So with the Germans, so with other nationalities coming from the other side and settling in the country. With a wide field for settlement for them, they become the best possible kind of immigration agents to induce their friends to follow them. We are simply establishing for ourselves at this moment that condition of things, and if hon. gentlemen will allow me to say so, I do not think they are acting wisely in the interests of the country—I do not use the term "patriotism," but speak simply of a business proposition for the settlement of that county—I do not think they are acting wisely when we are in that condition of our existence when we have to adopt means to put ourselves in the position in which our American friends already are, when there are hon. gentlemen perpetually, every year, drawing attention to the fact that our population is becoming depleted, as the hon. gentleman says, in spite of the fact that our census returns show that our population in the old Provinces has held its own with the populations of similarly situated States on the other side of the border. We have no Province in Canada where the population has actually decreased within the decennial period, as is the case in the United States. There are at least two or three of the American States where the population has not increased anything like so rapidly as the least progressive of the Provinces of Canada in point of population; and in view of that fact, I do think that if hon. gentlemen could only for a moment cease to dwell upon conditions which are almost inevitable, having regard to the tendency of immigration to a new country, the disposition to seek for new fields, the disposition of people in the older Provinces to go into those new fields, and having in view the fact that we are just getting into our new fields for settlement by means of the railway communication and the facilities which are affording opportunities for successful settlement—I say that they ought not to press, year after year, debate after debate, the point that we are losing our population. As a matter of fact, we are not losing our population, taking everything into account, taking into account our condition, and the fact that we are now only opening up the North-West, only affording the people an opportunity of securing homes in our North-West, when formerly they were compelled to go into the western States of the American Union—I say that I believe the population of Canada has progressed fairly rapidly, and that we are on the eve of a progressive development in the matter of population, which will bear a fair comparison with the wonderful development of our neighbors on the other side. But if you send across the water for every immigration agent who is interested against us—and although the United States Government do not send immigration agents, the land companies send immigration agents, the railway companies send immigration agents; you find them in every part of Great Britain and the continent, working hard, not subject to enquiries as to what they are doing, but influenced simply by the business consideration of how many immigrants they can bring over by any means—I say, if, in addition to the large inducements they have in the shape of a large *per capita* commission, you put in their hands the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this country is unfit to come to, because our population is all leaving us, that our population is becoming depleted—I say that in doing so hon.

gentlemen, unconsciously, it may be, but none the less effectively, are playing the very game of our opponents, and aiding in preventing that development of our population which they urge that everything should be done to promote. I am satisfied, myself, that in the meantime we must adopt such a policy as has been pursued for the last few years; and I have no doubt whatever that that progressive development of Manitoba and the western territories will go on; that as people go in there, and as the same conditions of immigration agency, arising out of prosperous settlement, and the people sending back money to bring out their friends, come to be realised, as they will be, we shall then be able to adopt the same plan as our friends on the other side have adopted, and discontinue the system of assisting immigration altogether.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In other words, it would be infinitely convenient, when it is perfectly clear that the statements made in our immigration reports for the last four years cannot be justified—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They are justified.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are neither justified nor proved.

Mr. POPE. Who denies them?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I deny them; I say the municipal statistics of our Provinces deny them; I say that the returns of immigration to the United States deny them; I say that every statement of every trades council and labor league in the country denies them. I say that the Minister is utterly unable to explain, and has not attempted to explain, where the 300,000 of the 400,000 alleged to have come to this country within the last four years are. I say that the whole business is becoming a gigantic swindle, and that the object of this \$100,000 vote is to provide \$100,000 to distribute amongst their subsidised press. If the hon. gentleman wants to know where it goes, I have no doubt that by reference to the Auditor General's reports I can inform him of the destination of a great deal of that money. I find that the *Toronto Mail* got \$3,900, the *Montreal Gazette*, \$9,700; the *Quebec Chronicle*, \$3,900; the *London Free Press*, over \$6,000; the *Prescott Messenger* \$6,000; the *Courier de St. Hyacinthe* \$7,000, and so on and so on. That is the reason, and not any honest desire to bring immigrants into this country; that is the reason, perhaps, of a great deal of the advocacy we have of unlimited expenditure for immigration purposes. Now, we have the greatest possible desire to see this country peopled by Canadians. What I complain of is, that it is the quintessence of folly, until you can keep your own people in Canada, to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to bring foreign immigrants here, who are not as good, any one of them, as our own people. I do not value half-a-dozen of them as much as I do the retaining of one of our own people. I do not say that in any narrow spirit of prejudice, but because our own people understand the country, are infinitely better suited to it, and more valuable to us in developing the country, than immigrants from Norway, or Russia, or Poland, or Switzerland, or anywhere else, not forgetting the Chinese, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture can induce to come here. Not only on this occasion, but on every other occasion when this question has been up, hon. gentlemen have entirely shirked the question where these immigrants are. The hon. gentleman, by his report, has accounted nominally for about 98,000 of them. I doubt myself whether those alleged to have settled in British Columbia and the North-West during the last four years are there now. In fact, I am certain a very large proportion are not; but the hon. gentleman has not accounted for the balance of 300,000, and I think we are wantonly wasting the public money when we are spending, in defiance of the remonstrances of our own artisans and

mechanics, \$400,000 a year for bringing people to this country who must, to a very considerable extent, displace our own artisans. As I see the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) opposite me, I will take leave to call his attention to a memorial from the wage-earners of Hamilton to the members of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada in session assembled, in which they resolve:

"That the workmen of Hamilton condemn the policy of the Government in allowing the importation to our shores of pauper immigrants, and call upon them to take measures to return such foreign paupers as are now in our land, and to legislate against the arrival of others; that we demand the recall of the emigrant agents and lecturers employed by the Government, and the application of the money appropriated for their remuneration to some public work, upon which some unemployed Canadians can earn their bread; that we especially protest against introduction of Chinese labor in any part of the Dominion, and call upon the Government to send back all Chinese now in Canada or enforce such a poll tax as will drive them hence; that we demand that the workmen of Hamilton refrain from giving support to either of the political parties in the future, until such time as they secure by legislation, not promises, their rights."

Now, if the Minister is able to give us any reasonable ground for believing that the 400,000 persons he has brought to this country are still here, I would desire him to give it. I agree with the hon. member for Cardwell in this, that I think it desirable on all occasions to do our best to keep our people in this country. It is true, we are laboring under much the same conditions which exist in many of the eastern States, with this difference, that a great part of Canada is entirely a new country, whereas many of those States have been settled for 200 or 250 years, and the comparison he makes is open to considerable criticism in that respect. Now, there never was a vote asked for on which it was more in the line of our duty to require explanations that this particular vote, and I may go further and say I never heard a gentleman ask for such a vote under the circumstances, and offer fewer explanations than the hon. gentleman has done.

Mr. POPE. I have said to the hon. gentleman that, in the first place, I have no confidence in his municipal statistics for Ontario or Quebec, or anywhere else; they have never been proved to be good for anything. I have told the hon. gentleman that man for man they come into the country. The hon. gentleman asserts that they have gone out of the country. Well, we have tried the point where he said the most of them had gone out; we have taken every possible means to find out the truth at that point, and this year there were more came in there than went out. I thought I would try to find out what was really the case with regard to persons leaving Manitoba. My own figures were that 6,000 went out and 30,000 came in. Then I wrote to Washington, to see what they would say about it there, and the reply I received was, that in 1881 1,863 went out of Manitoba; in 1882, 1,390; in 1883, 1,143, and in 1884, 924 against my 6,000. That is signed by Mr. Whitney, chief clerk of the Bureau of Statistics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the 300,000 people not accounted for are settled in the older Provinces?

Mr. POPE. A very large number of people have gone to Manitoba, and the hon. gentleman knows, as well as I do, that their places have been very largely filled by immigrants from the old country. Of those 300,000 people, some of them have gone to the United States, but a larger proportion have gone to Manitoba and the North-West. Does the hon. gentleman suppose he is giving anything like the true state of affairs? Does he tell us, as he has said all over the country, that from 1875 to 1878 the people did not leave this country, but that it is only from 1880 to 1884 that they have been going out? We know that the reverse is the case; when we know that during the former time the people did leave the country, when they were oppressed and could not get anything to do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Would it not be ridiculous, when men can get fair wages in Canada, as they have been getting during the last four years, to suppose they would leave Canada for the United States. No; nothing of the kind; they know how to look after their own interests. I know of hundreds and thousands of men last year and the year before who came into this country from the United States to get work. But the hon. gentleman will accept no proof; he takes the municipal statistics and he goes howling and screaming through Ontario that the people are leaving the country. I do not believe he really intends to deceive or mislead the people, but he has worked himself up to such a fever that he believes it himself. With respect to the counties the hon. gentleman speaks of, no doubt there are not as many immigrants to the lower Provinces as I hoped there would. I would like to see a good deal more. There are a good many in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LANGELIER. Where do they go?

Mr. POPE. I will tell the hon. gentleman where they go. He can live in the city of Quebec and he will never know where they go. They have gone into Richmond and Wolfe, Arthabasca and Drummond, which is almost doubled, and Sherbrooke and the county of Compton. What do you find in Ontario? If I had the census, I could show the hon. gentleman where a large number of the people have gone. In several of the counties of Ontario the population has almost doubled. A greater number have gone to the North-West. I defy the hon. gentleman to give a single proof to show these people have gone to the United States during the last four or five years, in large numbers.

Mr. DAWSON. The population of the district I represent has increased very largely within the last few years. Port Arthur, where the population was less than 2,000 at the last census, has now a population of over 6,000. With regard to the Kainy River district and Rat Portage, where there were but a few people when the last census was taken, we have now a population there of 3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And all those are fully accounted for in the municipal statistics of Ontario.

Mr. DAWSON. Still, that shows where the population is going. A very much larger increase of population has taken place in the eastern part of Manitoba, the Manitoulin Islands and the Island of St. John. Last year we made an estimate of the population, and while there were 20,000 in Algoma proper and 8,000 all over the disputed territory when the last census was taken, we have now 55,000, taking the whole district.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am very much surprised at the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. Their policy seems to have been entirely changed since 1878. Perhaps it would be interesting to them to be reminded of what they said then about the policy of immigration. The Minister of Agriculture then said:

"He objected to the item, and in doing so knew that he would be met with the statement that it stood in the same position as in 1873-74. This was not so, however, for the Government of that day appointed these agents for short periods, not longer than 8 months, and it was never intended to make them permanent officers. He would suggest, too, that this item no longer stand a lump sum, without a single explanation. If these agents were made permanent officers, the House should receive reports from them as to the way work was being done."

Then I find another hon. gentleman of the party opposite said:

"Mr. White (East Hastings) said it was not necessary to retain the staff as at present. One gentleman at Quebec had \$1,500 per year, and another, an assistant, had \$1,000; one gentleman would be sufficient."

The Minister of Agriculture made a few more remarks on this subject:

"Mr. Pope (Compton) called attention to the largeness of the expenditure under this head, compared with the smallness of the immigra-

tion, reaching only 15,323. He declared that the immigration was not due to the action of the agents, but to natural consequences. The agents of steamship companies possess great influence as emigration agents."

There is the policy propounded by the hon. members in 1878, the statement that there was no use for us to spend money to bring immigrants into this country when the population was leaving it to go to the United States.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is the time they did go.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; it is not the time they did go.

Mr. COCHRANE. They did go then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not one man left in our time for three who have left in yours.

Mr. LANGELIER. The Minister of Agriculture stated that it had been ascertained that some people were coming back from the United States to this country. A few did so, but they have gone back again to the United States; and there is a very plain explanation of the fact he has mentioned, namely, that at that time there was a great commercial crisis in the United States, and they were working on half time, or the factories were closed.

Mr. POPE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGELIER. A few French Canadians came at that time, but they have all gone back again. Look at the figures from the municipal returns. The Minister does not think much of those returns, probably because they do not come from his Department. I know the way in which both the census and the municipal returns are made, and I say the municipal returns are worthy of three times more credence than the census. I know how the census was made. In many places it was made by people who knew nothing of the inhabitants and took information which might be all wrong, while it is impossible to have statistics founded on a system calculated to give more correct returns than the municipal system of returns in the Province of Quebec. The municipal assessors, when making the assessment rolls, are obliged to go from house to house to ascertain the value of property, and they are bound, under the municipal code of Quebec, to take a census of the population. It is perfectly impossible that they should be mistaken. They know the people in each house before they go to it, but to ascertain the exact number they must go from house to house. The result is every year revised by the municipal council; every one knows his neighbor in the township or the parish, and knows the number of children born during the year. I will give the Minister of Agriculture some proof of the care with which the municipal statistics have been made. Last year and two years ago it was ascertained that the municipal returns did not agree with the official census. The authorities at Quebec took the precaution, because those municipal returns are sent to the Provincial Secretary and graded and published, to inquire into the discrepancy. Take the parish of St. Colomb de Sillery, near Quebec, and I have a personal knowledge that the statement made is perfectly correct. There was a great difference between the population given by the census and the municipal returns. The officer of the Government at Quebec wrote to the Secretary Treasurer of St. Colomb to call his attention to the glaring discrepancy. Here is his answer:

"As to the diminution of population mentioned, I may say that what is called the floating population of the municipality, that is the laborers who form a very large portion of that population, varies considerably some years. When work is plentiful and wages high they crowd into the parish in large numbers, with their families, and remain while they can procure employment; when the reverse is the case they leave.

"M. H. O'RYAN."

There has been a great decrease of population from 3,700 in 1882 to 3,500 in 1883. In St. Romuald, there was a diminu-

tion of about 2,000 in two years, and this cannot be denied. The member for the county of Lévis (Mr. Guay) lives in that place, and I was mentioning these figures to him, and he says they are perfectly correct. But the official census would not show that, because, when people had left, with any remote hope of coming back to the country, they were marked as being still in the country. That is not an isolated case, because I have several letters of explanation. Here is a letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of St. Gregoire, in the county of Iberville:

"The population of this municipality in 1882 was 1,773, including present as well as absent from the country, that is to say, those who had left with the intention of coming back, but they have not come back yet.

"J. C. PION."

Here is another letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of Mille Isles:

"Sir,—In answer to your's of the 21st February, calling on me to correct the mistake with regard to the number of souls in this municipality, my answer is that 500 is the number given to me by the valuers in the month of July, 1881, and is the number on the assessment roll of this municipality. In 1881 I took the census of this municipality, and according to our instructions a great many young men and women in the United States, and in other Provinces, were taken as if they were living with their parents in the district, who, up to date, have not committed the sin of Lot's wife, to look back, and every year is taking more away. Your obedient servant,

WM. STUART."

Here is another letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of St. Anne de la Pérade, in the county of Champlain:

"In answer to your letter of the 19th inst., I have the honor to inform you that the decrease of the population of this parish which exists in my return of 1883, compared with that of 1882, is due to this cause, that the return of 1882 was based upon the general census which had been made during the preceding year, in which the families of those who were absent from the Province were included, whereas the one of this year has been made by the *curé* of the parish in visiting his parish, and of course he has not included those who were absent from the parish. That is the occasion of the difference.

"A. D. TRUDEL."

Here is a letter from another parish of the Province of Quebec, from the county of Pontiac:

"LESLE, 26th February, 1884.

"In answer to your letter dated the 19th September, referring to the decrease of population, it is due to emigration to the United States. In the summer of 1882, in a single day, on the 2nd of July, five families, numbering thirty persons, left for the United States for Stillwater, in the State of Minnesota; afterwards, almost every week some other families have left from time to time. There are forty-four families that have left during the last two or three years for several places in the United States, and a good many of them have left lands which would have made fine farms but which are now abandoned. Some speculators who had purchased them with the expectation of re-selling them afterwards at a higher price have been badly sold themselves. As emigration is always going on they have no chance of selling again.

"F. R. S. PELLETIER, Secretary-Treasurer."

Here is a letter from a different portion of the Province, from Cape St. Ignace, dated 1st September, 1884:

"I have received your letter, in which you ask me to explain my return of last winter. The population does not appear on the valuation roll. I have consulted the *curé* on this subject, and we agree in saying that there is as much decrease of population as last year. It is due to emigration to the United States, caused by the fact that our lumbering operations are stopped.

"(Signed), JOS. BOISSINOTTE, Sec.-Treas."

Here is another from the county of Nicolet:

"STE. BRIGGITE DES SAULTS, 5th September, 1884.

"Here is, to the best of my knowledge, the information you ask. The decrease which you see in the population of this parish is due to emigration to the United States. A great number of Irish farmers have left this place to live in the United States, and a few have gone to the Eastern Townships."

Here is still another:

"ST. ARMAND, WEST, 5th August, 1884.

"Yours of the 22nd ult. to hand. In reply, will say I have no means of ascertaining what the population of this municipality is. I have enquired of the person who took the last census but could get no information from him, as he says that he was not allowed to keep any figures regarding the same.

"F. H. THROOP, Sec.-Treas."

I have a great many other letters to the same effect, explaining the apparent discrepancies between the census and the municipal returns, and all in the same way—emigration to the United States. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to go to the municipal or Government census to ascertain that there is a great deal of emigration going on. Any one who travels over our lines of railway going to the States must have been struck with the number of people going to that country. Last summer, when I was carrying on my election, I had to travel over the Grand Trunk Railway at least once a week, and sometimes several times a week, and I saw on every train three, four and five cars loaded with farmers from the lower portion of the Province of Quebec, all going to the United States. It was on the first days of the week that I saw the greatest number, as they do not like to leave on Saturday. Now, it is preposterous to say that there is no emigration to the United States from the Province of Quebec. It is denying the most evident facts which are patent to any one who knows anything of that Province. We know that hon. gentlemen opposite, when the previous Government were in power, criticised the vote for emigration, which was only \$120,000 a year for emigration and quarantine together, whereas this year it is nearly \$600,000. We know there was some emigration in 1878, which was due to the great commercial and financial depression which then existed, but those reasons do not exist now, and the emigration is very much greater now than it was then. I have conversed with a great many gentlemen of the clergy on this subject, and they all say that emigration is depopulating their parishes. And it is the best portion of the people that are leaving, chiefly able-bodied young men, who go to work in the manufactories of the United States. I am not going to enter into the causes of this exodus, but I think it is important we should know what the facts are, that we should no longer remain in a kind of fool's paradise, always repeating that we are in a great state of prosperity, that immigrants are flocking to this country and that our own people are not leaving, when the reverse is the case.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I think that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has brought forward very poor testimony when he quotes the census taken by the municipalities in Ontario in proof of the extent of emigration to the United States from that Province. It is quite clear that there is no care whatever taken in the enumeration of the people by the municipal officers. I can speak from experience, so far as the city of Hamilton is concerned, in so much as when the census was taken there this last year it was discovered that one of the wards of the city, which it was well known had increased in population, was reported to contain several hundreds less of a population than it contained the year previous. It gave rise to a good deal of enquiry, and a new enumeration was ordered for that particular ward, and it was found that the assessors had made a mistake of several hundreds, that the ward really contained several hundreds more than the municipal officers had credited it with. In many cases, in municipalities, the assessors never visit the people at all, but take the assessment roll of the previous year, for the purpose of getting at the value of the property, and then they guess at the number of people in each house. I have been a resident of the city of Hamilton for over eight years, and I have never been asked how many people were living in my house, how many servants I had, or what was the number of my family. But, Sir, our own senses tell us every day that there are strangers constantly coming in. Every man who lives in any city must know that he cannot walk the streets without observing strangers. It cannot be said that Toronto, London or Hamilton are not increasing in population. Why, seven or eight years ago Hamilton was only a city of 32,000, whereas now it is a city of 40,000. All

other things go to show that there must be a very considerable immigration to this country. With regard to the memorial which the hon. gentleman read from the workingmen of Hamilton, that, I think, goes rather against the hon. gentleman's argument, because it complains that too many people are coming in; that a certain class are being sent out to this country who are competing injuriously with our own people. We know perfectly well that during the last two or three years there has been great depression in the United States, and mechanics have been flocking into Canada from that country, who could not get work in their own country. That has given rise to great dissatisfaction among the workingmen in different cities. I do not think we can rely with a very great deal of satisfaction upon the representations made by the labor union people, because they are looking after their own individual interests; they are not looking after the interests of the country particularly, but they have a single eye to what would benefit themselves, and they would exclude any man who would interfere with their getting a day's work. That is not very disinterested evidence in support of complaints against the Government in regard to their immigration policy. I hold in my hand my assessment notice for the present year. The assessors are instructed, as I believe, to take an enumeration of the people, but it is well known that they do not do it very efficiently. There is just one name in the notice of my assessment and that is my own. Yet I have three servants and four members of my family, making seven in all, and yet only one name is entered here. That is the kind of evidence the hon. gentleman brings forward to substantiate his attack on the Government. As regards the hon. member for Quebec, I could not exactly understand what he was trying to make out, unless it was that a great many people had left his Province and he is anxious to bring them back. I suppose he was speaking of former times, when his friends were in power, when there was such a state of depression existing all over the country; but now, that there is prosperity, they are anxious to come back, and he is desirous of having the Government pay the expenses of bringing them back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope an adjournment will be now taken, as it is quite impossible to get through the discussion to-night.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Some hours can fairly be taken up in the discussion which has just been entered upon.

Mr. BERGIN. If you are going to take some time you had better go on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I have to go on to-night, it will not be in this connection.

Mr. BOWELL. It is quite evident, from our experience, that there is no object in asking the members of the Opposition to go on. We know that they can prevent the business of the country being done; that in committee, under our system, they can talk as long as they like; and I understood the remark of the hon. gentleman to be a threat of obstruction. A threat has been thrown out by the hon. member for Brant, and we know he can frustrate any progress if he thinks proper. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that some portion of the Estimates will have to be got through before 1st of July. If not, some other means will have to be adopted to obtain the means to carry on the affairs of the country. We do not desire to cut short discussion on this question. I thought the discussion was on the general vote, and was applicable to the whole item. There may be other points which hon. gentlemen opposite may desire to discuss, and there may be individual items to which they have special objection, but they can be fully discussed either on concurrence or when in committee again.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister alludes to a threat. I threw out no threat.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I do not understand the English language.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Surgeon-General said that if we were going to take some time, it was better to go on. I replied that if we go on to-night it will be on another subject. I addressed my remarks to a private member, not to a Minister. That is just the direction in which we would go on, so far as I am concerned. I have no hesitation in saying so. When we have sat here until 2 o'clock in the morning, I have not the slightest fear that I will not be supported by my constituents. I shall not pretend to press any further in that direction. I have not talked on this matter yet. I think, perhaps to-morrow, I shall have occasion to say something; but if it were necessary for me to go on now, and if I have to do it, at half-past 2 in the morning, I will not talk on it. But I will talk on something I understand better, and feel more keenly, and that is, that at this hour of the morning we are too fatigued to discuss this question, and that we should adjourn.

Mr. BERGIN. The observation I made was made in reply to the threat of the hon. gentleman, that if we did not adjourn now we would have to stay here till to-morrow night.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, after what the hon. member for Brant has stated, we understand fully what is to be discussed if we proceed after this hour. The intention is to waste time, if we were to remain here for the purpose of going on with the business of the country—which the hon. gentleman does not intend to do. He intends to speak against time. He intends to use the time of the committee only on the question that we should adjourn.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I distinctly deny that the Minister has any right to say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I rise to make a statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No; the hon. Minister of Public Works has got the floor, and it is out of order to interrupt him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am just repeating what the hon. gentleman stated, that if we were to continue sitting this evening he would not speak to the question, but he would discuss just what he stated, that we could not get along any further; that he would speak to the adjournment and to the question that the committee must rise. The hon. gentleman opposite (from Huron) proposed to adjourn, and I tried to induce him and his friends to go on and finish this item. I thought, as we had discussed it so long, we might carry it, and afterwards I suggested that it might be as well to finish the item. The hon. gentleman did not seem disposed to do that; but he did not suggest that he would spend the time of the committee afterwards in speaking against time. But the hon. gentleman who had just spoken has stated that he did not say, "I will speak against time," but that he would show that we must adjourn, that we were fatigued. The House and the country will understand that the hon. gentleman does not wish to go on with the business of the country, but that he wants to keep us here. I thought that after the time we had spent during the last five months we might have tried to get on, but of course, if the hon. gentleman will not go on, if he does not want to discuss this matter, I will not ask the House to proceed. I know that my hon. friends will not ask hon. gentlemen to stay here only for the purpose of destroying our aim of going on with the business of the country, and

under these circumstances I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Public Works has done himself the credit of putting words in my mouth to which I gave an emphatic contradiction; and I have had the satisfaction of seeing that he took those words back before he sat down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He himself attempted to use words I did not use.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; he did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; he did not.

An hon. MEMBER. It was a fair interpretation!

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He gave an interpretation to my words, and I want no hon. gentleman to interpret my words. He went on to say that I had deliberately said so-and-so, and I say that I did not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He did do so.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He did not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He did, and it is proved by the fact that he himself stated the remarks I did make. There is where the hon. member for Cardwell is. The hon. member for Cardwell says that which the hon. Minister takes back. I made an emphatic contradiction to the statement which the Minister put forth, and with all due deference to the Chair, I think I had a perfect right to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It has always been the practice that when a person makes a statement which is not correct, and puts words in an hon. member's mouth which he did not use—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman will say himself that he has a right to do anything that is contrary to the ruling of the Chair. He is directly out of order, and has no right to act against the ruling of the Chair, unless he appeals from it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know that I do appeal, but I am satisfied that the practice of Parliament has been, that a person has a perfect right, when a statement is being made by a member, putting words in the mouth of another member which he did not use, he should rise and contradict it at the time. I appeal to you, Sir, if that is not the case.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not without the consent of the member.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; without the consent of the member.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Adjourn, adjourn.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; we will adjourn when I am through. I have no objection to stand by what I have said, but I will not have words put in my mouth, and I did not say that I would stand here for the purpose of wasting time. I said that the time of this committee had been fully taken up to-day; that I had fully discharged my duty as a member of the House and the committee, not in the way of taking up time in debating, but in listening to the debate and keeping watch of the progress of affairs. We did this from 2 in the afternoon until a quarter after 2 in the morning, and I said I had something more to say, and other hon. members said that they had more to say. Others said: Better go on now. I said no; I will discuss something else than the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do hon. gentlemen think that I want to draw back from that? I said: I shall discuss something else; I shall discuss a question in which I will take more interest and feel more keenly, and that is the question of the necessity of an adjournment. That is what I said. But the Minister of Public Works rose and said that I said that I would speak here for the purpose of killing time. Why, the time for adjournment has passed; the time for the discussion of the question by mutual understanding, by a recognised understanding—the time for the discussion of the question has been past by a quarter of an hour. If hon. gentlemen think I want to recede from the position I took they are mistaken, but the words that the Minister of Public Works used are different from mine, and if hon. gentlemen say that I recede, will they take exception to that statement?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to prolong this, but I am very glad to know the hon. gentleman begins to realise his position. I did not say he would stand up and talk against time; I do not think any one said he would.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not going to bandy the lie across the House with the hon. gentleman, because that is what he is doing. I do not think it is dignified either in him or in any one to use such language. When the suggestion was made, in a very proper spirit I am bound to say, and with a good deal of reason, by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), that at this hour of the morning this question ought to be postponed, as there were other gentlemen on the Opposition benches who would desire to discuss it, and the hon. Minister of Public Works asked if that could not be done on concurrence, the hon. gentleman demurred, and said it was better to discuss the question in committee. About the time it had been arranged to adjourn, the member for Brant rose and said if he had to stay here he would not talk on this question, but on some other. Everyone knows what that means. If the hon. gentleman's health is sufficiently good to enable him to stand here and talk for half an hour or an hour on the question of adjournment, he could occupy that time just as well in talking to the question. I am quite satisfied this little difficulty would not have occurred if the question had been left with the hon. gentleman leading the Opposition at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The remarks of the Minister call for a few more from me. Hon. gentlemen were anxious to sit, and yet they moved immediately to do the very thing I suggested. I have no objection to the hon. Minister of Public Works repeating what I said, but the objection I took was to his putting words in my mouth which I did not utter. What I said was, that if I were compelled to speak I would speak to the question of adjournment, which I know more about. The hon. member for South Huron was arranging the matter very nicely, and I recognise him as my leader in the House when my leader is away. But I was anxious that my leader should not misunderstand what I said on this question, because the other night I thought he consented to have a discussion closed a little too soon. Now, I think it would be as well for the committee to rise and report progress, and I can finish my remarks to-morrow.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

#### LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1885; and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 23rd June, 1885.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the Message, and the Supplementary Estimates referred to therein, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

#### REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the North-West Mounted Police.—(Sir John A. Macdonald).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:35 a.m., Wednesday.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 24th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### AUGMENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 144) to authorise the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend at any length to pretract the discussion on the third reading, because I have given my views at an earlier stage, to which views I still adhere. I have given my opinion that it is impossible for the House to adequately deal with this question in an isolated manner, but that it should be considered as embraced in the whole question of protection of the North-West, in reference to the changed conditions of things which prevail in consequence of recent events, and in reference to the proposals on the subject of citizen soldiery in the North-West. The hon. gentleman, having declared that this measure was framed entirely irrespective of the recent outbreak, has eliminated that question from consideration, unduly and improperly. He based this proposal for an increase of the police upon statements with reference to horse-stealing, and I have been inviting him earnestly to bring down the report of the Mounted Police for the year, and last night that was laid on the Table, too late to make effective use of it. I observe that report, very meagre as it is with reference to some important events in the North-West during the year, does contain reference to questions to which I think the hon. gentleman ought reasonably to have referred in dealing with the measure. For example, when the commissioner is dealing with the question of the duties of the force and giving his views as to the necessity of its increase, he adverts to a matter which did not seem to be thought worthy the attention of the First Minister, namely, the fact that the area of jurisdiction of the Mounted Police has been increased by a distance of 150 miles west of the summit of the Rocky Mountains, in what is commonly understood to be British Columbia. I think it would have been well that the hon. gentleman should have stated the circumstances under which, and the arrangements upon which, and the authority—of course I am aware there is a limited statute author-

ity which, if it be exercised, I presume the papers will be brought down to indicate—upon which these arrangements have been made. He should also have informed us whether it was intended the force in British Columbia should be permanent, and if so what force should be stationed and upon what arrangements it should be stationed in British Columbia. I cannot too much impress on the House the fact that this North-West force has been established and maintained in virtue of our peculiar duties and responsibilities in reference to the North-West Territories, though there may arise circumstances which would make it expedient for us to utilise this force in other parts of the Dominion. Still, if the Government are making a proposal to utilise them permanently in respect to an established Province we ought to know it, and it ought to be brought before us as an important question of policy, both in a constitutional point of view and the point of view of expense. The commissioner adverts to the difficulties of horse stealing; but, so far as we can judge, it is one officer and seven men who were detached in that connection. It may be that a great many more will be required in the future, but he adverts to the fact that, at any rate, up to July last, in the report which is given by the officer in charge, there were, I think it was, nine horses stolen from our side and taken to the American side. This does not seem to be a number so great as the hon. gentleman's original statement would have led one to suppose it would be, nor do I find in this report any statement at all with reference to difficulties occurring in Manitoba, to which, in his second statement on this subject, the First Minister specially alluded. If it be intended that Manitoba on the east as well as British Columbia on the west, is to be blessed with the services of the North-West Mounted Police, a statement similar to what I suggested with reference to the circumstances under which, the time for which, the authority upon which, and the arrangements under which the police force is to be utilised for service would have been also a proper preliminary to this House being invited to consider this subject, and, still more essential to the House, being invited to take the final stage upon it. I said I would refer to that part of the report in which the commissioner adverts to the prevalence of horse-stealing:

"The prevalence of horse-stealing by white men, half-breeds, and Indians indiscriminately throughout the Territories is a marked feature of this year's annals of crime, and in connection therewith, I would take leave to say a few words which are not uncalled for by past experience. The extension of the boundaries of police jurisdiction from Manitoba on the one side to a point 150 miles west of the summit of the Rocky Mountains on the other, has, of course, considerably diminished the effective strength of the force available for duty in the Territories. And that, taken in conjunction with the fact that in the month of June last no less than thirty-six non-commissioned officers and men took their discharge on completion of their term of service, cannot but have detracted from our ability to afford these assistance in many cases. It is necessary to record that police posts, as now constituted, containing valuable Government stores, cannot be absolutely denuded of their occupants under any circumstances; further, that even police horses have their limits of endurance."

Then he proceeds to discuss the facility with which the settlers call upon the police to put down horse-stealing. He proposes, at a subsequent point, to recruit 300 additional men, though whether that is in addition to the then strength which was diminished by at least 36 men, or 300 men in addition to the full complement, is not stated. Now, the commissioner himself alleges that the effect of strengthening the force has been greatly diminished by its performance of duties to the westward, and on that point we have not had as full a statement as we were entitled to from the hon. gentleman when he proposed this important measure. There is another point, the condition of the carriages and limbers of the seven-pound guns of the Mounted Police. Upon that subject, three years beforehand, reports are made in the annual report, but there is no reference to it at all upon this occasion, and I would invite the hon. gentleman to say whether there is any special report on that subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With reference to the extension of the force in British Columbia that is merely a temporary measure. The action of the Mounted Police all along the line of railway, during its construction, was most satisfactory. We are informed that in the United States while some of the great lines were being built, and where there was an unlimited supply of liquor, the assassinations and murders by the navvies amounted to one a day—perhaps that may be exaggerated, but that is the statement made to me. The Mounted Police in our North-West has been employed praiseworthy in the direct line of their duty in excluding ardent spirits from the works of construction at different points on the railway, and the consequence has been that there was not, I believe, a single life lost in riot or outbreak. Many of the navvies thus employed worked on the railway during the whole of its construction on the prairies. The moment that the road got into the mountains and within the jurisdiction of British Columbia, that kind of thing ceased. It appears that in British Columbia there has been great disturbance, and I am not sure at this moment whether there was not loss of life, but at all events there was great dread of loss of life, and the Public Works Act was brought into force there on the application of the railway company, under which a commissioner or stipendiary magistrate was appointed, and although I think their jurisdiction is properly confined to the North-West itself. It is thought of great importance that the stipendiary magistrate appointed to prevent outrages on these public works should have a force at his disposal. The consequence was that a detachment was sent there under, I think, Superintendent Steele, a most admirable officer, I believe, who put down with a strong hand any attempt to introduce spirits along the line of railway during its construction within the limits of British Columbia. I am sorry to say that the local authorities did not well support the stipendiary magistrate, and at this moment there are a number of persons who are holding provincial licenses, and who are attempting continually to thwart the praiseworthy efforts of the stipendiary magistrate to exclude ardent spirits from the area of the railway in British Columbia. However, that was put down, and then the stress of circumstances in consequence of the outbreak caused the recall of Superintendent Steele with his force. This House knows how well that officer has behaved in command of the force, leading it all the way from Calgary to Edmonton. There are some few police who are left there. There has been, I fear, from the imperfect information we have got, and in consequence of the diminution of the force and the withdrawal of the commissioned officer, there has been to some extent, a degree of license used in forcing liquor from across the line into our country. However, the roads will soon be finished, and then the duties of stipendiary magistrate will cease, and of course he will be withdrawn. It was merely a temporary exigency that caused these men to be sent there. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that British Columbia must, like the other Provinces, keep the peace within its own boundaries, but this the hon. gentleman will see was an exceptional case. There is no British Columbia population in that part of the country. The population will flow from the east across the slopes of the Rocky Mountains and across the Selkirks. There is no people coming from the west. I have no doubt there has been many applications for licenses, though I cannot speak with any certainty—but an attempt was made to force the introduction of ardent spirits among the men there, and I fancy that there has been a very considerable number of applications for licenses from the Local Government and those have been granted for revenue purposes without much regard to the general welfare of the Province and the cause of good order in that part of the country. The report, I may state, is not very full. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it ought to be fuller, and I hope that will be

amended ere long. I believe that the Province of Manitoba is sincerely desirous of performing its duties in keeping the peace, and in performing its general obligations as a Province. But they are not a rich Government, on the contrary they are very impecunious, and the only means of preserving the frontier from outrages one way or the other, is by a mounted police. They were unable, though I dare say they would be very willing if they had been able, to generate a permanent Mounted Police to watch their property, and as these forays across the line might cause international complication, the Government thought that they might well employ the force in patrolling and watching the frontier to keep the peace along the line. I may state, also, that we have had the most cordial co-operation of the officials of the American Government. That question, however, must be dealt with, and will be dealt with in British Columbia and Manitoba, so that we may arrive at some permanent conclusion as to what we ought to do as a Government, and what they are called upon to do by law, and what they are able and willing to do. The hon. gentleman, once or twice, asked questions as to the character of the guns. I am not aware that there is any special report about them, but they were sent up there originally, more with the notion, which proved to be a correct one, that the Indians have a superstitious veneration and dread in regard to cannon. The guns were 7-pounders, I think.

Mr. BLAKE. The 7-pounders are the mountain guns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two mountain guns there. I think the mountain guns are less than 7-pounders.

Mr. BLAKE. There are mountain guns of a less calibre.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But these mountain guns are, I think, from 3 to 5-pounders. I am not able to say whether any special report was made about the calibre of these guns. It is a matter of very small importance, as they were considered to be something like those guns we have strewed through our cities to show that we have such things as guns. With respect to this force, the experience of the late unhappy events shows that we must have mounted men in order to effectually prosecute anything like warfare. Our militia who have distinguished themselves, were, perhaps, placed in a very disadvantageous position on several occasions for the want of mounted men, and I think my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will say that it is the opinion of the General that mounted men are required, and that, with a reasonable number of mounted men—say this 1,000 men—and the organisation of the militia, and the military school which it is proposed to establish at Winnipeg, similar to those which are now established at Toronto, Fredericton and St. John's, near Montreal, that force will be quite sufficient, when peace is restored, when the Indian outbreak is crushed, and when the last embers have been extinguished. I believe that these 1,000 men, always ready to proceed on the first suspicion of riot or outbreak, with the organised militia of the country and the military school at Winnipeg, will be amply sufficient to prevent a recurrence of these unhappy events. In respect to British Columbia, I believe that I am not trespassing, and if I am, my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will pardon me, in stating that the only military provision it is thought necessary to make for that Province is the battery at Vancouver. There is no idea that there should be any other military force provided for by the Dominion.

Bill read the third time, on a division, and passed.

#### NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 140) respecting the North-West Mounted Police.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. BLAKE. The only suggestion I have to make to the hon. gentleman opposite is upon the amendments he introduced into this Bill the other day. I have not had an opportunity of reading them, and I am not certain whether they are entirely adequate to that which is essential to the protection of the men as well as the officers when they are acting as a military body. If I rightly understood the objects of the amendments, they gave certain ranks and placed the commissioned officers in certain positions corresponding to those ranks, but there might be a position in which the non-commissioned officers might have to take command and give the order to fire. Suppose the commissioned officers were all *hors de combat*. I do not think the amendments make any provision for the non-commissioned officers who might have to take command in such a case. We know that the protection of a force of this kind depends upon the law, and it seems to me important that the rank and file and the non-commissioned officers, as well as the commissioned officers, should be placed entirely within the protection as well as the restraints of military law, when acting as part of a military force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right. Under these Acts they are a civil force, they are a constabulary. Under the penalties mentioned in the Mounted Police Acts, they are liable. They have no protection in those Acts more than is given by the Police Acts in England, and it may well be that, in order to efficiently keep the peace, they must be substantially a civil force, yet they should have the same protection and the same means of resistance, or even of aggression that troops would have, in case they came into collision with Indians, or with other persons, breaking the law. I do not propose, however, at present to go into that subject. Until these late events, no occasion has arisen in which the police have been obliged to fire, except as a distinct Act of self-defence. The Act was introduced in the Senate in consequence of the late events, and, if the state of war had continued, would have been pressed through both Houses very rapidly, as it was necessary to provide for the very natural omission of any provision for the joint action of the police force in the North-West and the military force. We did not know how long the state of things would continue in the North-West, and we introduced this Bill, because the commissioner was ordered to put himself, with the whole force, under the command and control of the General in command of the military forces. In order to prevent any complication, the Bill was introduced in the Senate, providing that, whenever, by order of the Governor-in-Council, the Mounted Police were directed to act with the military force, they should be subject to all the military laws which govern the militiamen and the militia forces generally. The necessity for hurrying this Bill through has, I am happy to say passed, but we may as well have it, because it amounts simply to a general provision that, where, by Orders of the Governor in Council, the police are ordered to serve with the military, they should be subject to military law, and in fact should be soldiers. I am not soldier enough to say whether this will involve any subsequent provisions. General Middleton, who I hope will soon return here covered with just credit for his conduct of matters in the North-West, has been asked by myself, through the Minister of Militia, to examine and report upon the organisation of this force; and when he arrives here the whole subject of that force will be fully considered, in order to make it as efficient as possible. After discussion with him, I hope to be able, if I come here next Session, to introduce a complete system, for the consideration of the House, with respect to the Mounted Police and their relative duties as a military as well as a civil force.

Mr. BLAKE. The question to which the hon. gentleman has referred is one on which I would not venture a suggestion without having given it much more consideration than I have given it, because I am sufficiently jealous of the liberty of the subject and of according military privileges to a civil body. My proposition is simply this: You are providing that under certain circumstances the Mounted Police shall be a military force, and in that the Government is acting rightly. The force must be subject to military restraint and discipline, and must, under those circumstances be entitled to the immunity which the law gives to soldiers acting under orders. My enquiry was whether this measure gives that immunity to the rank and file and to non-commissioned officers as well as to those officers mentioned in the amendment. Occasions may arise when a non-commissioned officer may be obliged to take command of a small detachment. The commissioned officers may be all wounded or killed or absent. The non-commissioned officer in command who gives the order to fire should be as fully protected, as well as restrained, as the commissioned officers who are subject as well to restraints as they are covered by the immunities of military law. My enquiry was whether the hon. gentleman's measure was complete in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the Bill covers that question. The non-commissioned officers of the Mounted Police would stand in the same position as non-commissioned officers in the militia. I am not aware just now, and cannot speak positively that a sergeant commanding a party has any specific protection given by the present laws for the regulation of the army. However, that will be a matter worthy of every consideration.

Mr. MILLS. In the discussion on the Irish constabulary, in the Imperial Parliament, it was stated that a change could not be made without re-enlisting the whole force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They keep their obligations in every way as a constabulary; but, I take it that as we are all militiamen in Canada, we could pass a law compelling the hon. gentleman to go as chaplain or as combatant; and we could do the same with respect to the Mounted Police. The Minister of Militia has called my attention to the fact that, in the Bill, the words are "any officer or member." I take it that that may cover the case of non-commissioned officers to which reference has been made; but that is a matter that may be considered hereafter.

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 2420) for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

On resolution 4,

Mr. BOWELL. This resolution, which was drawn by the Law Clerk, is not strictly correct. In reading the Order in Council he confounded the *per capita* allowance with the proposed increase to the capital account. The Order in Council reads as follows:—

"Having been delegated by the Legislature of Manitoba to urge upon the Privy Council a reconsideration of its offer of the 20th May last, on settlement of the claims of the Province, we would respectfully suggest the following modifications as a basis of settlement:—

"That the Dominion pay the Province annually the sum of \$100,000 in lieu of lands. That the debt capital—"

Not the *per capita* debt, the committee will observe—

"In consideration of the above, be allowed on a population of 125,000 instead of 150,000, etc."

In the arrangement which was entered into but not accepted by the Manitoba Legislature at a previous Session, the proposition was to base the debt capital of the Province upon an assumed population of 150,000. Instead of that, a change was made to base that debt upon an assumed population of 125,000, but the *per capita* allowance is continued upon the population of 150,000, and not reduced. The committee will see very clearly where the error was made, the officers of the Department, therefore, in making their calculations, made them on the basis of the resolutions as they had been prepared and laid before them. Last evening, during the consideration of this subject, my attention was called by my hon. friend to my left (Mr. McLellan) to the Order in Council, and in reading it carefully, it was then seen how the blunder had arisen. Of course, the committee will see that this makes the terms much more liberal to Manitoba than they would have been, under the supposed basis upon which we were proceeding last night. It will be necessary, therefore, to strike out in the paragraph now before the committee, after the word "shall," in the third line of the fourth resolution, the words "from said first day of July next be allowed only on an estimated population of 125,000 souls," and it will read:

"That the yearly *per capita* allowance to the Province of 80 cents per head, made under the Act 33 Vic., chap. 3, on an estimated population of 17,000 (increased by 45 Vic., chap. 5, to 150,000), shall be subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say, &c."

And then change the words in the 4th line from the bottom of the same clause, 125,000 to 150,000. That will leave the *per capita* allowance upon the basis of 150,000 and not upon the basis of 125,000 population. Then it is proposed to add the following words after the words "subsequent Act" in the 3rd line of the 6th paragraph:

"Shall, from and after the 1st day of July, 1885, be calculated upon a population of 125,000 and at the same rate *per capita* as was allowed on the estimated population as provided in the Act, 33 Vic., chap. 3."

That is to say, when the Province came into the Dominion, that population was estimated at 17,000. The financial condition of the Province under the present arrangement, as compared with what they received before, is this: the total amount paid to them last year was \$232,694.30. If you add to it the increase which is proposed to be made in lieu of lands, of \$100,000 instead of \$45,000—in other words, if you add \$55,000, you have a total of \$287,694.30 paid to the Province, and the additional 5 per cent. on whatever the debt may amount to. I may further explain that the debt based on the 125,000 population at the same rate as was allowed in 1870, will be calculated at the rate of \$27.77, and interest will be paid to them less whatever may have been expended by the Dominion Government in that Province upon what are termed in the other Provinces, local improvements. That will have to be deducted from the total debt; the balance has not been ascertained and will be matter of investigation hereafter. Calculated, however, upon those bases, the debt will be considerably increased, amounting to about \$4,000,000, or perhaps a little over that sum. The committee will recollect that a very large amount of money has been spent since 1870, when that Province first became part of the Union, for what are legitimately local improvements, and the advance of which would have been charged in the other Provinces to capital account. I am unable to inform the committee what that amount will be until there has been a full investigation as to what has been expended, and what the amount left to the credit of the Province will be. I may say also, for the information of the committee, and the gentleman who asked me once or twice last night, as to the probable amount of swamp lands—though that question is not now under consideration—that the Department of the Interior has set one of its clerks at work to ascertain approximately the quantity of such land in that portion of the Province which has been surveyed, and I have no doubt will

have the information to lay before the House before the Bill passes.

On the first amendment,

Mr. BLAKE. This seems to me to increase the public charge materially. Is not that so?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it does increase it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose it is possible for the hon. gentleman to propose in the committee an amendment increasing the public charge. His duty is to bring down a proper resolution and to move it in the regular way.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is correct, according to strict parliamentary rules; but as these papers have been before the House a very long time, and as I supposed everybody had become acquainted with them, I took the liberty of proceeding in this way. If the hon. gentleman objects, it must stand over.

Mr. BLAKE. I was very wrong, but I really supposed the hon. gentleman meant what he said in this resolution. It is my fault.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the hon. gentleman's fault; but as this is an age of improvement, and as the hon. gentleman is a member of a reform party, I thought he would not object to this reform.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all, but I like the ancient parliamentary rules to be observed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is merely an error of the draughtsman, the respected Law Clerk, in confounding the *per capita* annual allowance with the capital payment. But this clause does not increase the public charges in any way.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the hon. Minister of Customs the hon. gentleman is contradicting, and not I.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that the annual grant of 80 cents per head is based on a population of 150,000 by the present law. This resolution proposes to reduce it to 125,000. This is merely to keep the law as it is.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite correct that literally it is a contradiction of my statement. When the hon. gentleman asked me the question, I supposed he had referred to the full effect of all the resolutions; hence I said it did increase the public charge. I must be more careful in future when I answer the hon. gentleman, because I know he is hypercritical.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the observation of the hon. Minister is quite justified. He proposed without any notice a very considerable amendment of the clause; I enquired of him whether that amendment was an increase of the public charge or not; he said, yes. Under these circumstances, I stated that the parliamentary rule should be followed. Now, when the First Minister says the hon. gentleman was wrong, the hon. gentleman says I am hypercritical.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that can possibly be said of the question put by my hon. friend in this instance at any rate, because the hon. Minister of Customs will recollect that I put the question to him yesterday, and he then informed us that he computed that about \$250,000 would be allowed to the Province of Manitoba. But the allowance we propose to make would amount to \$420,000 less 5 per cent., or whatever sum may have been advanced on capital account.

Mr. BOWELL. In none of these calculations was the interest on the amount remaining to our credit calculated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the amount, I think, would cover some \$325,000, which he thought

Mr. BOWELL.

was the remaining capital they were entitled to. He will remember that I asked him whether the demand made in the Manitoba Legislature was not for \$450,000 a year. The sum now arranged will come tolerably close to these figures, although I do not know, and he does not know, exactly how much is to be deducted from their capital account. From what I recollect of the state of their account, it is a good deal made up of over-drafts; and his estimate of yesterday, I think, is approximately correct that about \$1,000,000 has been advanced. But it is probable \$150,000 or not much less than \$200,000 will be added to the income of the Province of Manitoba by these resolutions.

On resolution 6,

Mr. BLAKE. This is a large increase to the public charge. It ought to be recommended by a message and be preceded by a motion to go in committee, and not on the same day as the resolution is proposed. The hon. gentleman proposes to amend the resolutions without taking any of these precautions upon which the wisdom of Parliament has insisted and the absence of which would make the proceeding void at any stage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The assent of the Crown will be given to it. If the hon. gentleman insists upon it it will be held over, but this merely carries out the arrangement made with Manitoba. It was an accidental transposition of language, the draughtsman mingling the two accounts, the one the capital sum and the other the annual payment. This is really what was intended to be proposed, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not object to it in the ordinary course. If he does not greatly object, I would ask that this be adopted now, the assent of the Crown being obtained.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not believe it can be done. The British North America Act itself has provided that no motion having a tendency to increase the charge on the people should be preceded otherwise than by the protection I have referred to. So careful was the hon. gentleman that this ancient and wholesome rule should be maintained that he put it in a cast iron provision in the Act, thinking perhaps that some bad Government at some future day might propose to modify it if it was in their power to do so. Having so wisely guarded this right 18 years ago, he is debarred from interfering with it now.

Resolution allowed to stand.

Resolutions to be reported.

#### BETTER PRESERVATION OF THE PEACE.

Mr. CARON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend an Act for the better preservation of peace in the vicinity of public works and the Act in amendment thereto, said: There is to be no change whatever in the principle of the Act, it is simply a consolidation of the various amendments.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CARON. These clauses have been redrafted. The object was to consolidate the amendments which have taken place from the time the first Act was introduced. In the redrafting the expressions have been changed slightly, but there is no material change, except the substitution of the word "and" for the word "or."

Mr. WELDON. The 12th section makes a person liable to imprisonment when his clerk has been guilty of the offence without his knowledge.

Mr. CARON. That is the old law.

Mr. WELDON. I think it is very severe that a man should be liable to be imprisoned for six months for an offence committed by his servant, perhaps against his orders.

Mr. MILLS. It is a wide departure from the ordinary rule of criminal law or police regulation. If a servant does an injury, the principal may be liable to damages, but it is a wide departure from the recognised rules of our law to apply that to the criminal law.

Mr. CARON. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but this Act is for the special purpose of preserving peace in the neighborhood of public works, and from the beginning the evident intention has been to make it as strict as possible.

Mr. WELDON. No doubt that is true, but, while I can understand that the penalty should be enforced where the clerk offends against the law with the sanction of the principal, it is very severe to make the principal liable to imprisonment when the Act is done against his consent.

Mr. CARON. This is an exact copy of the old Act, chap. 24, 32-33 Viet., the Public Works' Act. The principle upon which, no doubt, this clause is based, is that the proprietor of any place of that kind is supposed to have control over his servants, and the consequences of allowing intoxicants to be sold on public works may be so grave that the strictest possible interpretation is placed upon the Act. But except in special circumstances like these, I agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat that it is going, perhaps, too far to make a man responsible for any act except of a person under his control. Of course if a man who commits an act of this kind is not shown to be an agent of the proprietor, the latter cannot be held responsible.

Mr. WELDON. The Liquor License Act provides that if any contravention of the Act took place it should be endorsed on the man's license and three convictions not only forfeited his license, but rendered him incapable for three years. I am acquainted with a fact where a clerk violated the Act contrary to the proprietor's express order. In that case surely the principal should not be held guilty.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt that in general it is a very objectionable principle to make a man liable criminally for something done by another person, perhaps, without his knowledge and against his express will. I believe the Liquor License Act does provide that a violation of the statute committed by the servant or agent shall make the principal responsible; but the hon. gentleman in this clause not only provides that the man shall be responsible for the guilty servant, but for what anybody else does who is not his servant or agent. I think that is monstrous. I think the hon. gentleman ought to strike out the words "or other person;" the proprietor ought not to be responsible for what somebody else does.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does not say that he shall be responsible for an act done by every other person, but "every man who, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent, or other person, violates." He must do it by the agency of his clerk, servant, agent or any other person. I presume the words "or other person," which I see are inserted elsewhere, are for the purpose of reaching a person who may be the agent but who still acts under the authority of the principal.

Mr. BLAKE. Everything depends upon whether the construction of the First Minister is correct. If that is correct, there does not seem to be any harm in leaving it as it is, because in that case it is impossible to convict a man unless he has done the act by another.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we must hold to the clause.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The interpretation given by the First Minister is not the correct one, and is not the interpretation given by the courts on a similar law, couched in similar language. If this law passes, if liquor is sold by an employé without the knowledge and against the express wish and direction of the principal, the principal is nevertheless liable. He should not be made responsible for anything except through his servants and by his knowledge.

Mr. CARON. I think the clause can be fairly interpreted as the leader of the Government has stated. I take it that everyone who commits an act in contravention of the law, either by himself or his employé, shall be liable to punishment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The law maxim is *qui facit per alium facit per se*. It is provided that either a principal by himself or by his servant, agent or other person shall be liable. These words were inserted evidently for the purpose of pointing out how general the clause was intended to be in its operation. It was prepared for the purpose of acting with a strong hand and putting down this crying evil. And if there is not the *mens rei*, if a person violently breaks in and sells the spirits, that would be a criminal act, but in the other case it would not.

Mr. MILLS. It is made so by this section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it is by himself. If another person under him does it, it is done by that person as a distinct individuality—a distinct entity.

Mr. WELDON. A totally different construction has been put on the Liquor License Act, in which the principle is precisely the same as this Bill. It has been held that although the person does it in express contradiction of the orders of the master, still he is liable to the penalty, and I think it is proper it should be so, because it makes the man responsible to the public for the good conduct of his servants. But when you apply this principle to the substantive imprisonment, in addition to the imprisonment for non-payment of the money penalty, I think you are going too far.

Mr. MILLS. This 12th section is based upon a principle of public policy. We hold persons engaged in the sale of intoxicants strictly responsible for the acts of their servants. They have a special franchise conferred on them by license, and we hold them responsible for the men that they employ. The courts have construed the law in that way, and I think that construction should be adhered to. If it is pleaded by the principal that the act was done without his authority, the answer would be that he should have taken care what sort of men he employed, and should exercise the strictest care in that respect; but when you make the principal responsible for what the servant has done, under the criminal law, you are going much further, and you are applying to an ordinary police regulation, the principles of criminal law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, there is no imprisonment as a punishment at all. It is simply a means of collecting the other penalty.

Mr. MILLS. It is a punishment in the other part of the clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; in the second, penalty. Suppose some loafer breaks into the bar and hands out liquor to a friend; the owner of the house would not be liable under this clause. There must be the *mens rei*—there must be some relation between the principal and the person who violates the law, an inn-keeper gives a wink to a loafer of that kind, who is not an agent or a clerk, and he deals out the liquor. He may be a person who is good for nothing, and cares little if he is sent to gaol; in that case the law is evaded. There is no chance of oppression under this law, and I do not think we should weaken it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman is still proceeding on the assumption that there must be a *mens rei* on the part of the proprietor, in order to constitute an offence. There is no such necessity according to the law, as it has been interpreted in the courts of Ontario. If the offence is committed by a servant, clerk or agent, contrary to the expressed directions of the principal, the principal has been held liable all the same; and the courts will so interpret the hon. gentleman's Bill. Either the courts are incorrect, or the hon. gentleman is incorrect in his interpretation; but we must take the interpretation of the courts. Therefore, we ought not to pass this clause, without knowing exactly what its meaning is. If you leave out the words "or other person," according to the interpretation put on the law by the courts, the proprietor would be liable, even though the offence were not committed by his servants or agents, but by some other person. The hon. gentleman has no precedent for such a provision. The person must be in some position of trust for the principal before the principal can be made liable or ought to be made liable. Therefore, the hon. gentleman ought to have acted on his own interpretation of the law, and not on the interpretation put upon it by the First Minister, because the First Minister assumes that the offence cannot be committed except with the knowledge of the proprietor. I say the offence can be committed without the proprietor knowing the first thing about it. He ought to be liable if his clerk or servant commits the offence, but not if it is committed by a person who does not occupy the position of clerk or servant or agent. The hon. gentleman will do a great wrong, perhaps to innocent people, if he allows the clause to pass as it is.

Mr. WELDON. It has been held, under the Liquor License Act of 1883, that a proprietor who was brought up for selling liquor on Sunday was responsible, although it was sold without his knowledge by his clerk. The court not only held that he was liable to the penalty, but it was endorsed on his license as an offence against the Act. The wording of this section is a little different from that of the old section. In the old section the penalty was \$20 fine for the first offence, \$40 for the second, and imprisonment for the third; while this section makes the penalty \$40 and costs for the first offence, and the same penalty with imprisonment for six months for the second offence. It seems to me that the imprisonment for six months ought to be confined to the case where the offence is committed with the knowledge or consent of the principal, expressed or implied.

Mr. CARON. The Bill as sent down was handed to me by the Department of Justice. I must say I have a great deal of confidence in the experience of the two hon. gentlemen, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and I would move that the clause be now adopted; but before the third reading I shall look into the matter, and I have no doubt we shall arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

On section 4,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Section 14 provides:

"If any person makes oath or affirmation before any commissioner or justice of the peace that he has reason to believe and does believe that any intoxicating liquor with respect to which a violation of the provisions of the 11th section of this Act has been committed or intended to be committed, he can get a search warrant and put that in the hands of the proper official to be executed."

The hon. gentleman has changed the law altogether in that respect. Under the provision of the old statute, no such warrant can be issued except upon the oath or affirmation of three credible witnesses that they believed the offence was committed or intended to be committed. This was the guarantee that the process of the court would not be abused.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Perhaps, requiring the testimony of three credible witnesses before a search warrant could be obtained, was running to the extreme; but under this provision you provide that if any person makes an affidavit that an offence has been or is intended to be committed, you can get out a search warrant. I am not aware of any English law which requires the evidence of three credible witnesses before a search warrant can be obtained. If an offence against the law has been committed, such as larceny, and the goods are still in possession of the offender, any person can obtain a search warrant on the affidavit of any one person, setting out that the offence has been committed, and that he believes the goods are still in possession of the guilty person. Under the provision of your statute, you provide that if any person makes an affidavit that an offence has been or is intended to be committed, you can get out a search warrant. That is a principle wholly unknown to the criminal law, and it will leave the way clear for harshness and misconduct, setting the machinery of the law in motion without justifiable excuse. Under what circumstances can a man be justified in swearing that an offence is intended to be committed? I can understand the provision of the law entitling you to set the machinery of the law in motion on the affidavit of a credible witness that an offence has been committed, but the hon. gentleman has taken the power upon the affidavit that an offence is intended to be committed, to set the machinery of the law in motion. This will give opportunity to people who have grudges against others, to harass and perhaps ruin them. While I do not go so far as to insist on the necessity of having three credible witnesses, I think the hon. gentleman's Bill should be confined to cases in which the offence has been committed.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman's first objection was that the old law, as it stood, requiring three credible witnesses to make the affidavit, was an improvement of the present Act as sought to be amended.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). On the contrary I said there was no necessity for three witnesses.

Mr. CARON. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman as to the second objection, I think the law would be insufficient, if the hon. gentleman's idea were to prevail. In these districts where great public works are carried on, one can well understand how a person may be able to make affidavit that it is the intention of a certain person to act in contravention of the law. Persons may have been present when the tavern keeper or store keeper purchased liquor, and may have heard him state that he was purchasing it to sell in his tavern near the public works. That is an instance which may occur, and it was right and proper, in furtherance of the object of the Act, the protection of these public works, to make the Act as wide as possible. This legislation, I take it, is much stricter than the criminal law, but we should go as far as possible, of course with due respect to the liberty of the subject, in our efforts to protect these public works against the evil effects resulting from the sale of intoxicants to the men who work upon them. We know what evil effects the sale of intoxicants has had in the case of public works in the United States; we have heard the leader of the Government state that the murders committed on them averaged one per day, and it is for the object of preventing such frightful results here that this legislation is submitted. I think the clause as it stands is perfectly good.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is of the first possible consequence to make the law as strict as possible to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in the neighborhood of public works, but at the same time we must carefully guard the rights of the subject. I think the hon. gentleman has gone too far. If a person goes to a magistrate and says: I believe I have

reason to believe and do believe that an offence against the statute is to be committed, he is entitled to a warrant and can go anywhere and search the wine cellar of a private individual and take possession of the stuff he finds there and carry it away. I think the informant should assign the reasons, so that the magistrate may be seised of the facts upon which the deponent comes to the conclusion that an offence is about to be committed. At present a malicious person can make the statement and invoke the machinery of the law from the worst possible motives. The hon. gentleman is invading the old rule that a man's house is his castle, and that even an officer of the law has no right to enter a man's house unless an offence has been committed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A person may take out a warrant maliciously to search the hon. gentleman's house by making an affidavit that he has lost his watch and believes it is in the hon. gentleman's house, and he will be liable for any malicious conduct of that kind. The hon. gentleman talks as if we ought not to have any preventive justice at all. If there is a steamboat on a river in British Columbia or anywhere else where this Act is in force, that is about to start, and it has got a lot of spirits on board, some one makes an affidavit and a search warrant is issued. That does no great harm. The officer searches the vessel, and if he finds any liquor on board contrary to the terms of the law, he throws it overboard. The hon. gentleman says there must be a crime committed first, but the steamer or the raft may be about to start, and according to the hon. gentleman, after the liquor has been drunk, and riot and outrage has been committed along the line, you must issue a search warrant to find the liquor in the stomachs of the fellows who drunk it. I suppose the man who gives the information will be a teetotaler and therefore a respectable person, and the object of the clause is to get at the liquor before it is used. There is no object in issuing a search warrant after the offence is committed. Under the old law three witnesses were required to make the affidavit that they had reason to believe and did believe that intoxicating liquors were intended to be sold or bartered in contravention of the law, and the only difference between this and the old clause is that one informant is sufficient under this clause. In all other search warrants to look for property believed to be stolen, the affirmation of the owner, of one person, is sufficient. The result of the hon. gentleman's argument—although he does not intend it—is that there is no means of preventive justice seizing this liquor before it is actually drunk and consumed.

Mr. CAMERON (West Huron). The hon. gentleman does not meet my argument. I say it is not fair to leave it in the hands of the deponent—of any person (not a temperance man) who desires to set the machinery of the law in motion for private purposes, but any blackguard, any person can do it. It is not confined to temperance men, or respectable men, but any person—it does not signify whether he is a gaol bird, a loafer or a blackguard—has a right to go before a magistrate, and, by swearing that he has reason to believe that an offence is to be committed, he can set the machinery of the law in motion. Now, I say that you ought not, upon the affidavit of any person, no matter how disreputable he may be, set the machinery of the criminal law in motion. I would have no objection to leave it in the discretion of the justice of the peace. But he has no discretion; he is bound to issue a search warrant when an affidavit is made, although the deponent may be a perfect stranger to the magistrate. Now, I say the deponent ought to state to the magistrate the circumstances and the facts upon which the process is to issue, so that the magistrate may know whether they are sufficient to justify him in issuing the search warrant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The affidavit for a search warrant will be made the same way in this as in any other

case. The party says: I have reason to believe, I do believe upon oath, that there are spirits in that vessel. He gives a reason, that is all he can state, and the consequence is that the search warrant shall issue to any constable or bailiff—

"Who shall forthwith proceed to search the steamboat, vessel, boat, canoe, raft, other craft, building, premises, carriage, vehicle, conveyance, or place described in such search warrant."

And if any intoxicating liquor is found thereon, the person executing such search warrant shall seize the intoxicating liquor and the vessel in which it is contained, and shall keep it and them secure until final action is had. If the officer makes a search of the vessel and there is no liquor thereon, there is an end of it, and no inconvenience to anyone. But if liquor is found there, he takes possession until the matter is tried before a magistrate. But the right of the dwelling house is protected under the 2nd section. I would call the attention of the committee to this section:

"But no dwelling house in which, or in part of which, or in the premises thereof, a shop or bar is not kept, shall be searched."

No private house can be searched, no house, unless there be in it a shop or bar.

"Unless the said informant also makes oath or affirmation that some offence in violation of the provisions of the 11th section of this Act has been committed therein."

And it must be within one month before the information is laid. So that no private house can be searched at all unless the party makes oath that an offence has actually been committed in it, and committed within one month. But if it is a tavern or place where there is a liquor shop, or if it is a corner grocery or anything of that kind, or if it is a vessel which can carry the intoxicating fluid, then upon his affidavit a search-warrant is issued. What harm does it do the vessel-owner or the inn-keeper, upon an affidavit being made, that his place will be searched? He has got a remedy against the blackguard the hon. gentleman supposes may maliciously make the affidavit. But we are not to provide for cases of that kind. We know that in the vast majority of cases when information is laid before a magistrate, and the party is getting the penalty, that it is not with malicious intent, that a case of malicious intent does not occur once in a thousand times, and it is unreasonable to prevent the chances of preventive justice being done altogether on the mere chance of some blackguard making an affidavit with malicious intent.

Bill reported.

#### SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE MAGISTRATES

Mr. CARON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 128) to make better provision respecting summary proceedings before justices and other magistrates, said: The object of the Bill is to prevent the failure of justice because of irregularities or informalities in the proceedings before justices of the peace. If hon. gentlemen will look at the Procedure Act, 32-33 Victoria, they will see that it was intended to prevent miscarriage of justice in case of irregularities or informalities in proceedings before Superior Courts exercising criminal jurisdiction, and it seems to me that there is greater reason why similar provisions should apply to proceedings before justices of the peace who, as we know, have not the legal training of judges of the higher courts. These observations refer more particularly to sections 1, 2, 3 and 4. Section 5 provides that if an application is made to quash a conviction or order made by a justice of the peace, the court or judge may, as a condition of quashing the same, provide that no action shall be brought against the justice of the peace who made the conviction or against any officer acting under any warrant. This is, I believe, a proper provision, knowing as we do that some of the justices of the

peace, who endeavor to the best of their knowledge to exercise their judicial functions, are not men of learning and of legal training. It is thus intended to protect the justices against vexatious actions. Section 7 provides that no writ of *certiorari* shall be allowed if the defendant has appealed from the conviction or order to any court to which an appeal from such conviction or order is authorised by law. In Ontario under the Summary Convictions Act there is an appeal from the conviction or order made by a justice of the peace to the Court of General Sessions. In Quebec the appeal lies to the Court of Queen's Bench, Crown side. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba it is to the County Court. In Prince Edward Island the Supreme Court, and in British Columbia to the County or District Courts. This section provides that any person availing himself of the right to appeal from the conviction or order to one of those courts, may not, after having appealed, endeavor to remove the proceedings to a different court. Section 8—In many cases Acts are brought into force by a proclamation, and it has been held in some courts that the proclamation to bring it into force must be proved. In the Province of Quebec this has led to legal proceedings with little practical result. It is intended by clause 8 to provide, that in cases where the objection is taken that evidence of the proclamation was not given, the court or judge before whom the application to quash the conviction comes, shall allow evidence of the issue of such proclamation. I think possibly it would have been well to have amended the law of evidence so as to provide that in no case should it be necessary to prove such a proclamation, but this gets over the difficulty in another way by providing that whenever a proclamation is not proved on the hearing, the court or judge before whom the application to quash the conviction comes, may then allow evidence of the issue of the proclamation. Section 9 is a procedure section intended to simplify proceedings when the rule to quash a conviction or order is refused or discharged. Section 10 is consequent upon section 6. Sections 11, 12 and 13—By the Summary Convictions Act it is provided that if the conviction or order is made more than twelve days before the sittings of the court to which the appeal is given, such appeal shall be made to the then next sittings of such court, but if the conviction is made within twelve days of such sittings of such court, then to the second sittings after such conviction or order. It is also provided that the person aggrieved shall give the prosecutor or complainant, or to the convicting justice for him, a motion in writing of such appeal within four days after such conviction or order. This time has been found short, especially in the unorganised districts in Ontario, and after correspondence with the Attorney General of Ontario, the Minister of Justice agreed to recommend the amendments provided by these three sections, viz.: by striking out the word "twelve" in the first and fourth lines of the sub-section numbered one, and by substituting therefor in each case the word "fourteen," also by striking out the word "four" in the third line of sub-section 2, and by substituting therefor the word "ten." In consequence of the understanding between the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Ontario, the local law of Ontario has already been altered to correspond with these three sections.

Mr. WELDON. I have no objection to the general principle of this Bill, but I think there are some of the details which might properly be amended in committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There are one or two provisions of this Bill which, I think, are unobjectionable, but there are others which are wholly unnecessary and which, instead of simplifying the law, rather tend to complicate it. The second clause provides that no conviction shall be declared invalid by reason of irregularity, informality, or insufficiency therein—that is, purely technical objections. Now, if the hon. gentleman will refer to section 67 of the

Summary Jurisdiction Act, he will find that it goes still further, and makes full, clear and ample provision for the very point with which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal. By that section it is provided that no conviction or order of a justice of the peace shall be declared invalid by reason of either a technical or a substantial objection. The present law, therefore, is infinitely better in the interests both of the litigant and the magistrate, than the proposed law, and I ask what is the necessity, under those circumstances, of introducing this clause when the present law goes so far as I have indicated. The 68th section is still stronger. According to it, in case of an appeal from the adjudication of the convicting justice, to the Court of Appeal, or in our Province to the Quarter Session, that court is bound to hear the case upon its merits, notwithstanding any defects in substance or in form; so that the hon. gentleman does not improve the law, but makes it worse. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman has not drafted this Bill; if he had, he would not have interfered with the law as it now stands. This Bill has come from another branch of the Legislature, who have nothing else to do, and who are not able to do the little they undertake effectively and well. The law, as it now stands, after years of experience in the various Provinces, especially in the Province of Ontario, is so perfect in this respect that it is almost impossible to improve it. It affords ample protection to litigants and to justices of the peace. This clause is open to another very grave and serious objection. The law as it now stands contemplates an appeal to the Court of Quarter Sessions, where the evidence has to be taken and the case heard *de novo*. The hon. gentleman proposes in this Bill to invest the chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions with the power, upon perusal of the depositions taken before the justice of the peace or upon affidavit, to sustain or quash the conviction. It is an unheard-of proposition that the Courts of Appeal should, upon a mere affidavit, have power to declare whether a conviction is valid or invalid. No such power ought to be vested in any court, especially in any Court of Quarter Sessions; it ought to be seized with the case, as it is now, with full power to deal with the matter as if it had never been investigated by the justices of the peace at all. The provisions of the law are ample and clear, and to tamper with the law, as this Bill proposes to do, is not certainly in the interest of litigants. Section 5 is, to my mind, an exceedingly objectionable section. No matter how a justice of the peace may conduct himself; no matter whether his convictions are warranted by the law or not; no matter whether he has been actuated by malicious motives or not, the hon. gentleman proposes that the person injured or aggrieved shall have no redress against the justice of the peace, unless by permission of the court. Under this provision a magistrate may convict a man, impose a fine, and award imprisonment, wholly unjustified by the law or the facts; an application is made to the courts to set aside that conviction, and the judge may say to the party: You are aggrieved, you are wronged, the conviction is wholly unwarranted, but I will not interfere unless you consent to bring no action against the magistrate who has wronged you. I say no such provision ought to be in the law. Section 7 ought not to prevail; it involves a bad principle. The principle that has prevailed hitherto in our law is that any person who is concerned in proceedings before a justice of the peace, and who is not satisfied with his adjudication, shall have his remedy; he can go before the Court of Quarter Sessions by way of appeal, or to a higher court by a writ of *certiorari*; and this writ of *certiorari*, which has existed for generations, is to be abolished by this section. No man's hands ought to be tied in this way; a man who has suffered an injury, or has been aggrieved, ought to be able to get redress in the courts. He may not have sufficient confidence in the Court of Quarter Sessions, and he should have the right to go to a higher

court. This Bill, in many of its provisions, is wholly objectionable. I do not understand the necessity of three-fourths of the Bill, and the remaining fourth is wholly objectionable. I am satisfied that if the Minister of Militia had drawn this Bill there would have been no such provisions in it.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman has said the Bill has come down from a branch of the Legislature which has very much less to do than we have. The fact that the hon. gentleman has been very busy, as we all have been this Session, may be the reason he has not had the time that hon. gentlemen in another Chamber have had, to find out the reasons for the changes sought to be made by this Bill. The hon. gentleman wishes to know why clause 2 is introduced. As I stated in moving the second reading, the object was to prevent failures of justice because of the irregularity or informalities in proceedings before justices of the peace. The principles upon which the amendments are based are taken from the clauses of the Procedure Act, to which I have referred, the provisions of which are considered to work well in other courts and are now applied to justices of the peace. The reason for this is that justices of the peace being men who have not the legal training of our ordinary judges should be protected to the utmost limit. The necessity for these changes is to be found in some cases which have come before the courts of Ontario, which have been quashed in consequence of several complications or informalities that were looked upon as really technical and really of no great importance. We are endeavoring to frame the laws in such a way that they will be carried out as effectively as possible, consistent with giving every possible protection to the liberty of the subject. These amendments were suggested to the mind of the hon. gentleman who prepared the Bill and sent it down to the Commons in consequence of his experience of cases in which technical informalities resulted in the quashing of convictions. The hon. gentleman says that clause No. 5 is very objectionable. This clause, to my mind, is one of the best clauses contained in the Bill. The hon. gentleman says that if the justice of the peace has been actuated by malicious motives, the complainant in the court below would have no recourse against him. I consider that the fact that the judge of a Superior Court before whom the case is brought, having within his discretion the power to enforce that clause or not, is quite sufficient protection for the appellant. If a justice of the peace has been actuated by malicious motives, the court above will allow the law to take its course, and the appellant will have a perfect right to take out an action against the offending magistrate. Unless it is proved that the magistrate below has been actuated by bad or malicious motives, it is quite proper he should be protected from any of these actions.

Mr. DAVIES. This Summary Convictions' Act, which we have been carrying on for a good many years in Canada, is practically the Jervis' Act, I take it. It is highly important that we should have the same amendments in our law which are made in the English Act, in order to get the benefit of the English decisions, and I would ask the hon. gentleman whether any of the amendments in the present Bill are taken from the English Bill or are amendments suggested by Canadian lawyers.

Mr. CARON. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman's question now, but, before the third reading, I will look it up and give all the information he asks for.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. WELDON. I think a portion of this clause is very objectionable. It is quite right that the court before which

the question is raised may be satisfied upon perusal of the depositions, but the clause says "or by affidavit", and that I think would be opening the door to a very serious matter, because it would be practically trying a man behind his back. I think that ought to be struck out.

Mr. CARON. I understand that to mean, if the irregularity could be cured by an affidavit.

Mr. WELDON. If the matter is to be decided by an affidavit there is no opportunity of cross-examining, and the only way would be to bring counter affidavits. I also think with my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Davies) that we had better follow the English Act.

Mr. CARON. The view I have taken of it is that it must mean that the depositions would be completed by cross-examination, but that, where there was an irregularity which could be disposed of by affidavit, this clause would permit it to be done, otherwise, I do not see how it could come in, because the fact of mentioning depositions before affidavit shows that the court could exercise its discretion, and it must have before it a complete record. The mention of depositions presupposes a completed case where the defendant has had an opportunity of cross-examining the plaintiff's witnesses. As I take it, it means that the question can only be decided upon a completed record, and the affidavit would simply come in where an informality in the description of the offence in the conviction could be cured by it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should a Bill of this kind be left open to any doubt? The hon. gentleman thinks that is the correct interpretation, but he is not certain, and I have not the shadow of a doubt as to the meaning of these words, that the judge who tries the case may try the point as to whether or not the conviction is within the jurisdiction of the magistrate, by deposition or by affidavit. It would be an outrageous thing to say that a judge, behind the back of the litigants, should have the power to decide whether the conviction was bad or not. If this clause is allowed to stand as it is, then the Court of Appeal may give a decision upon an affidavit of one of the parties, the other party probably knowing nothing about it. My idea is that the Minister of Militia should strike out of this clause the words "upon perusal of the depositions or by affidavits," and instead of the words stricken out I would insert "upon hearing the parties."

Mr. CARON. That is tantamount to a new trial.

Mr. DAVIES. It strikes me the draughtsman had in view that the Superior Court may quash the conviction either upon perusal of the depositions when the question comes up by way of appeal or by way of affidavit on a *certiorari*; but I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman that they ought not to be allowed to quash a conviction upon a mere affidavit.

Mr. CARON. Of course the depositions must be before the court. The court before which the appeal is brought should have the complete record. We know that several of these convictions before justices of the peace are made up in such a deficient manner, the crime is so badly described, that it is almost impossible to make out what it may mean, and in that case the affidavit comes in to cure the informality or irregularity. The object of appeal is to prevent a complication of proceedings by curing the irregularities which exist. When an application comes before the court this offence is so badly defined that it becomes next to impossible for the court to ascertain exactly what is meant, and in such case the affidavit comes in to cure that irregularity, and if it be so I see no great objection to it. I would be sorry indeed to see an appeal decided by a court upon *ex parte* evidence; I would be sorry to see a court changing the decision of the court below by allowing an

affidavit to come in; but the depositions are not at all open to that objection simply because the parties have had an opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses and coming before the courts. Therefore, I think it is perfectly right to allow the court before which this appeal is brought, to decide as to the irregularities upon the depositions produced before that court.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). After consideration I confess that I do not see that there is any great objection to the word "affidavit." The question is raised upon the perusal of the depositions, and the object of the affidavit is to decide if an offence of the nature described in the conviction or the warrant, has been committed. Now, one object of reading the depositions or the affidavit is to give the court jurisdiction, as it were. A conviction may be presented to the court and on the face of that conviction it may be informal, and might be quashed, and in that case it is not necessary that evidence should be gone into at all, it would not be necessary for the jury to be sworn, the conviction would be quashed because of its informality. But before the case is proceeded with it must be ascertained whether a crime has been committed, and in order to give the application force an affidavit can be produced to show that the crime was committed, and the case, on its merits, then goes for appeal.

Mr. DAVIES. The clause should be simply confined to cases brought before the court by *certiorari*. The court must be satisfied on two points: First, that there has been an irregular conviction; and second, that the case came within the jurisdiction of the justices. How can these facts be ascertained? Only by the depositions taken before the justices, when the parties were examined and cross-examined. It should not be left to be done by affidavit.

Mr. CARON. Perhaps there cannot be an appeal because there is nothing to appeal from. If the conviction is irregular and it can be cured by an affidavit according to the theory which I believe is the true one, namely, that if there is an irregularity in the description of the offence in the conviction, the court before which the appeal will come can by affidavit ascertain what the offence in the conviction is. If that be so, I cannot see what harm can result from retaining the words, and in fact I think they are required. Unless you put before the courts such an offence as is described, there is nothing to appeal from.

Mr. WELDON. The court has to be satisfied upon two points: First, that an offence of the nature described has been committed; and second, that it comes within the jurisdiction of the justice. If you take the depositions there is no difficulty. Suppose action is taken by affidavit as is suggested, there is the fundamental objection that action is being taken behind the back of a party. It will be an invasion of the general law. Great powers are already entrusted to justices of the peace, who are afforded even every protection and who may do many things with impunity, but we should be careful not to materially alter the law, which at present follows that of England.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). No doubt they deserve great consideration, but hon. gentlemen have forgotten one thing with reference to this clause. It is not intended to try cases by affidavit or in appeal, but simply to give the court power to see whether a crime has been committed of the nature described in the conviction, and so far as that goes, whether it is true or false, because if the court is satisfied that such a crime has been committed, the case goes on.

Mr. DAVIES. Only by appeal—not by *certiorari*.  
Mr. CARON.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). As I understand, this is with reference altogether to cases appealed to the Sessions.

Mr. WELDON. That is provided for now.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I certainly would not support it at all as applied to cases coming up by *certiorari*, and it would be well to make that point clear. If the hon. gentleman's view is right, that this only applies to cases of appeal, we are legislating without any necessity as we have full and ample provision in the present Act for such cases. According to the clauses of the Act at present, if the crime is not properly charged, you could not go on.

Mr. DAVIES. The crime might not be charged in the exact phraseology of the indictment, but that would not make a difference. I will not discuss the matter further, because if the Minister intends to limit it to cases of appeal, the Bill is utterly useless.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is perfectly manifest that this section at present applies only to cases of appeal, but I would like the Minister of Militia to say whether or not it is intended to cover all cases.

Mr. CARON. Except by *certiorari*.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is my judgment that this Bill was intended to be limited to the remedy given by means of a writ of *certiorari*, but there is no doubt the law at present gives as full and ample a remedy, and indeed more so, than this Bill. If, however, the hon. gentleman will limit the operation of the second clause to cases of application by *certiorari*, it would be consistent with the present law.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). If the hon. gentleman's interpretation is right, I would certainly agree with him, but from conversation I had with the promoter of the Bill in the other House, I do not think that was his view. I understood from him that the first clause was intended to apply to cases where there was an appeal.

Mr. DAVIES. What word can the hon. gentleman point out which limits its application to cases of appeal only?

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I am not sure hon. gentlemen are not right, and if there is any question about it, I certainly would be in favor of striking out the words "by affidavit," because I think it would be very unfortunate if a case of that kind were disposed of in that way. But I think the second clause is a very good one, if it applies in the manner in which I understand it.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman will read clause 7 in conjunction with this clause, I think it explains what the intention of the framer of the Bill was. Section 7 provides that if a party has selected the appeal, then he is refused the benefit of the *certiorari*; and if he selects the appeal, as I understand, section 2 applies.

Mr. DAVIES. Suppose he elects the *certiorari*.

Mr. CARON. Then he does not proceed by appeal; and if he does not, the right of *certiorari* is not taken away from him by the Act. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.  
(In the Committee.)

Immigration..... \$380,025

Mr. MILLS. Are we having many Norwegian immigrants this year?

Mr. POPE. We are having a few. We have a few every year.

Mr. FISHER. I see by the Auditor General's report of last year that only \$200 were paid to the messenger at Quebec, although \$365 were voted. What is the reason for the difference?

Mr. POPE. We paid him for what time we had him, at the rate of \$1 per day.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think the Norwegian interpreter might very well do the duties of messenger. He is a very good officer—I know him personally. I think he is more useful in bringing Norwegian immigrants than many agents we might send to Norway, because he is constantly writing to Norway to induce his fellow-countrymen to come to this country. But I know his duties are very small, and he might very well do the duties of messenger.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman give us some idea of the immigration this year? Representations have been made to me that the emigration from Canada to England exceeds the emigration from England to Canada. The hon. gentleman will perhaps be able to tell us precisely what the prospects for immigration this year are.

Mr. POPE. The prospects are not so good as usual. Up to this time the immigration has been about a third less than last year. I do not know anything about emigration, but my impression is that a good many discharged navvies have returned. I have no idea of the number.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the Department not receive a return of the passengers outward-bound by the St. Lawrence lines?

Mr. POPE. I believe not.

Mr. MILLS. Are those navvies who are returning, people who obtained assisted passages to this country a short time ago?

Mr. POPE. Not that I know of. They came out to work on the railway, and received the benefit of cheap passages, but were not assisted.

Mr. BLAKE. The custom has been heretofore to publish shortly after the close of each month, a statement of the immigration by the St. Lawrence and other routes. Has that been adhered to this year?

Mr. POPE. It was not the custom till last year that I know of. Up to the 31st last May I think it was about 27,000,—that is of those who remained in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the St. Lawrence route?

Mr. POPE. I have heard that the immigration by the St. Lawrence route has for the past few weeks been very small indeed.

Mr. FISHER. I understood the hon. Minister to say the other night that a year or two ago the Department had assisted in bringing in navvies to Canada, because at the time there was considerable railway work to be done.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman did not understand me correctly. I said they had all the advantages of the cheapest rate we could make for them, but they were not assisted as were other classes; and early this year we instructed our agents on the other side not to encourage mechanics and navvies to come to the country. We assisted agricultural people, laborers and their families and domestic servants and that class of people, but not the navvies.

Mr. FISHER. Were there no Finlanders assisted?

Mr. POPE. I think there were not. A large number of them came by New York, and I sent a man there to direct them to come on this way, but their passages were not paid.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman could obtain the information showing the number who left the country it would be interesting, because it was understood the majority of these people would settle in the country.

Mr. POPE. I will try and get it.

Mr. FISHER. In what way are the other employés at the agencies, besides the agents, provided for? In the Auditor General's report are to be found the salaries of assistants, interpreters, etc., at the various agencies, but in the Estimates they do not appear. Are those other salaries provided for in the contingencies of the Department?

Mr. POPE. It is taken out of the general vote for immigration; out of the contingencies.

Mr. LANGELIER. What is the reason for the salary not being voted for the subordinate officers here as it is in Quebec? The only salary that we are called upon to vote in this case is that of the agent. The others are to be taken out of the contingencies. If these officers are permanent, why should they be paid in that way? If they are not permanent, I can understand it.

Mr. CURRAN. I think that is a great injustice to the city of Montreal, that our deputies and our messengers and others are not made permanent at once, as well as those in Quebec.

Mr. POPE. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Curran) has asked me a great many times why we did not put these officers on the regular list, but Quebec is the port where the immigrants come, and these men are kept on all the season there, and are made permanent. The others I found in the position in which I have kept them.

Mr. LANGELIER. The salary of the caretaker in Montreal is \$428, and in Quebec it is only \$365. These are the amounts paid last year which I take from the Public Accounts. In Toronto, the salary paid to the messenger was \$566.

Mr. POPE. \$366.

Mr. LANGELIER. No, the amount paid last year was \$566.

Mr. POPE. It must have been for extra work or something of that kind.

Mr. BOWELL. It is only set down as \$366 in the Auditor General's report.

Mr. FISHER. I find, by the report of the Auditor General that there is not one of these officers who gets less than \$1 a day and some of them get a great deal more, while the messenger at Quebec, who is a permanent official, receives only \$1 a day. Either they are overpaid, or you would save by making them permanent officers. As it is now, they are paid at the discretion of the Department, without the House knowing how much they are paid until the Public Accounts are brought down the following year. I do not see that the Minister's argument is a valid excuse for the change.

Mr. POPE. There is no change.

Mr. TROW. Does the agent at Toronto work in conjunction with the Province of Ontario in regard to immigration?

Mr. POPE. Of course he does, in regard to the disposition of immigrants and so on.

Mr. TROW. What is the name of the agent?

Mr. POPE. It is Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. TROW. Is there any refund from the Province of Ontario?

Mr. POPE. No. There used to be two-thirds of the passages refunded, but for the last two or three years there has been none refunded, and this year they refused to pay anything.

Mr. BLAKE. A statement was made to me some time ago to which I call the attention of the Minister. It was stated, with reference to one or more of the agents in the Province from which I come, that they were in the habit of acting as the paid agents of those who wish to sell farms to immigrants with means, receiving a commission for their services. I do not know whether the Minister is aware of or sanctions any such relation of any agent, but it seems to me to be rather an objectionable position. If an agent engages in anything of that kind, it should be as a part of his public duty, and not in a way which would be liable to misconception on the part of those coming fresh to the country.

Mr. POPE. I have often known people to ask me to allow the agents to act for them in this way, promising that they would be paid for their services, but the instructions are that they should give any assistance in that way that was possible, and should take no pay for it. Of course, if they did, and anything took place that was not right, the Department would be responsible, and I have always refused to allow them to do it.

Mr. TROW. The idea is current in the Province of Ontario. There is a paper there called the *Medium* which is published monthly by an agent, and it is said that he receives a very large number of farms for disposal, and receives a certain percentage in connection with his office, and that he is doing a large business.

Mr. POPE. I do not know to whom you refer.

Mr. TROW. I refer to Mr. Donaldson, your agent.

Mr. POPE. I will, of course, make enquiry into the matter. Nothing of that kind can be allowed. No agent can be allowed to take a commission for selling farms.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that the statement is correct. I happened to be an executor of a certain estate, and advertised the property. Mr. Donaldson cut out the advertisement and sent it to me, and asked me to place the property at his disposal, and stated that he would charge \$100 as commission and \$15 for expenses. I did not even answer his communication, but that happened within the last year.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman was perfectly right in refusing the offer. If there is anything of that kind going on, I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for bringing it to my notice; but I know that Mr. Donaldson has been a very useful agent indeed, and I have never before heard of any complaints against him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that last year his salary and travelling expenses amounted to \$4,478.29. I think that is a rather large item.

Mr. POPE. I do not think it large for last year. He has a great deal of work to do. A great deal of the distribution of immigrants falls upon him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The agent at St. John, who is put down for \$1,000, mentions in his report to the Department that some 60,000 pamphlets had been issued exclusively relating to New Brunswick. Does the Minister know what portion of the cost was borne by the Dominion Government? And has he joined with any of the Local Governments in issuing pamphlets exclusively relating to one Province?

Mr. POPE. If any Local Government asks me to assist in circulating pamphlets for their Province, I have often done so. I never failed to give them all the encouragement I can to induce immigration into their Provinces. The

Mr. Trow.

Ontario Government generally provide for their own pamphlets, but I have assisted New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba, in that way.

Mr. PATERSON. I notice that the St. John agent does more than our other agents in collecting information from his Province. Do the duty of the agents at St. John and Halifax, for instance, relate to the location of immigrants within the bounds of their own Provinces?

Mr. POPE. Their duties are the same as those of other agents.

Mr. PATERSON. This agent, I see, takes a great deal of interest in his own Province. He has written letters to different parties and it is gratifying to me to read some of the answers. He gives such a description of that Province that really it ought to attract immigrants to it. There is one gentleman to whom he writes with reference to one of the exhibits at one of their agricultural shows. He reports that:

"About the usual quantity of grain was shown, and the roots were far above the expectation of every one, taking into consideration the past season."

"But when the visitor turned to the ladies' department, an exclamation of gratified surprise involuntarily escaped his lips. For one item was twenty samples of butter, among which there was none inferior, and the quality of which would satisfy the most fastidious gourmand. One side of the room lined with mats, upon which a Turkish prince would not disdain to place his feet; and another side with quilts, under which any one of them might well sigh to recline; another space devoted to fancy work, the work of the younger ladies, defied description, it was simply immense."

Now, that is very encouraging, and a report like that ought to be very gratifying to our New Brunswick friends. I was pleased with another description from another of these agents with reference to New Brunswick. It is written in a very nice style, and I read it for the sake of one sentence in it which shows to us the importance, if possible, of retaining our young men in our midst. We cannot avoid a feeling of depression sometimes as we have had unwilling admissions that our young men do not stay with us, as we could desire. This correspondent, at the request of Mr. Gardner, the St. John agent, dwells upon that point, and I will read an extract from his letter:

"Here, for the first time, have I been able to realise the full force of the Psalmist's statement, that:

"Children are God's heritage.  
The sons of youth as arrows are, for strong men's hands prepared.  
O happy is the man that hath his quiver filled with those;  
They unashamed in the gate shall speak unto their foes."

A man's progress here, to a large extent, depends on the number of strong, healthy boys he may have."

There can be no doubt about that, and it is a great pity, indeed, that more of them could not be induced to remain with us. One of the gratifying things with reference to the report that Mr. Gardner makes is that they seem to be remaining with us more than they have, and some of them are coming back. The same writer gives also a description of the beauties of the climate of New Brunswick. He seems to be an enthusiastic Scotchman:

"I suppose I need not tell you that although we have more snow and frost during the winter than they have in Scotland, we have, during the same season, much more sunshine and brightness, having longer days and brighter nights. The night sky presents a panorama of brilliancy never seen in the old country. There are no dark winter nights here, and often there are nights so calm and still the very stillness seems oppressive. On such nights the young folks often turn out for an evening drive in their sleighs. Here the stillness is broken in upon by the silvery jingle of the sleigh bells and the joyful laughter of the young people. The horses fly over the smooth snow without striking sound from its white surface, and the sleighs glide after them with a motion which gives a sensation to the occupants much like sailing in a swiftly rowed boat on a calm lake. The surrounding snow throws back, with sparkling brilliancy, the splendor of the evening sky, while the trees—the feathery boughs being tipped with ice—seem laden with silver fruit; the whole forming a scene more like a chapter of the Arabian Nights or some fairy tales than reality."

Now I do think our New Brunswick friends have much to boast of. It has been some time charged upon them that they had not got as hospitable shores as some of the old Provinces which are recognised as more purely agricultural. But I think we may look in vain through the Minister's report to find a description that would tend to draw more young people to it than the description I have read. I would just say that I do not know that it is to be the idea that we should seek to get information with reference to a Province in this way. Of course the Department of Agriculture, as the Minister has told us, and the immigration work pertaining to that, is not strictly advertising, or seeking to promote immigration to the older Provinces; that is supposed to be a work that they will attend to for themselves, the idea being rather to secure immigrants for our own lands which pertain to the Dominion. It is not at all objectionable that such a description as this should be given of one of the Provinces of the Dominion, for if one Province prospers it must tend in a measure to the prosperity of the whole. Our friends in the east have often thought that too much attention was being paid to the North-West as a field for immigrants, and this is a step in the other direction. I have read this to show them that this year at all events they have nothing to complain of in the way of pleasing descriptions being given of their Province.

Mr. IVES. I would suggest that hereafter during this Session, if hon. gentlemen should find it necessary to read from books, as they did on a former occasion night after night, they should take up this report of the agent in New Brunswick, which would be much more acceptable to the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's taste. I never saw so much trash put into a Blue Book and printed.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). A report comes from Rochester that seven families left there for Canada in one week.

Mr. KING. I can endorse all the statements given in the report respecting New Brunswick; but I am surprised the hon. member for North Brant did not call attention to the contrast made between New Brunswick and Ontario. It has reference to my own county, and is perfectly correct. It is as follows:—

"Comparing this Province with the garden of Canada (Ontario) my firm conviction is that the soil here is equal to it, and that the climate is better. Since I came into this Province my health has been as good as ever it was. While in Ontario I was subject to headache. I was told that it was the want of salt in the air which caused headache, and that it is common for people from England to be so troubled for years. Whatever the cause, the effect was disagreeable. I like New Brunswick more than any place else, and should like to see a goodly number of a good class of immigrants come here from the old country.

"My opinion of New Brunswick as a home for immigrants is so high that I regret my inability to talk to, and to tell my fellow countrymen in Britain what I think of it. To contrast this beautiful Province with Britain is out of the question. While the one contains millions of acres of good land which can be had free, every yard of the other is held at exorbitant prices, even to rent. I like the climate here; the frost is more severe than in Scotland. Before I came here I read that it was so, but that people do not feel the cold more here than they do there. This I did not believe. I reasoned that the action of frost must be in accordance with its severity, and must be felt while people are capable of feeling I was wrong."

There is much more of the same sort. The hon. member for Brant did not do justice to New Brunswick and to my own country by quoting that part of the report. In view of the large appropriations made for immigration purposes, New Brunswick has not had justice done to it. I do not complain in regard to the agent at St. John—he perhaps does his duty; and I agree that it is to be regretted that we have not more immigrants. The principle underlying the immigrant expenditure is a wrong one. This country goes on spending year after year \$500,000 or \$600,000, but

some of the Provinces, such as New Brunswick, do not get their share. The expenditure should be made in proportion to the Provinces, and until that is done New Brunswick will never obtain its proper share.

Mr. WELDON. The report shows that 5,000 people more came into New Brunswick than left it. That is an entire mistake. Where did the hon. gentleman get his information? I observe that the number of passengers by the International steamers are not stated. I understand the company refuse to give returns.

Mr. POPE. We have the information in the report of the agent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). By whom was the New Brunswick pamphlet written?

Mr. POPE. I do not know. It was written by a person in New Brunswick, and was published by the Dominion. British Columbia, Nova Scotia and, I think, Manitoba had also pamphlets printed.

Mr. TROW. With respect to the agents at Winnipeg and Emerson: Was there not an agent at Emerson last year?

Mr. POPE. Yes, there was.

Mr. TROW. Who is the agent at Winnipeg?

Mr. POPE. Mr. Graham.

Mr. TROW. Was Mr. Hespeler dismissed?

Mr. POPE. No, he retired.

Mr. LANGELIER. Are all these officers under the agent at Emerson, permanent officers?

Mr. POPE. One of them is a permanent officer, and the other is not. The latter is not only caretaker, but he attends to the distribution of the immigrants.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is there an interpreter attached to the Brandon office?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What is the reason one is required?

Mr. POPE. These officers are needed especially to interpret for the German immigrants. They do not understand our language, and it is absolutely necessary to have some person able to direct them in their own tongue, as they know nothing about the country.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is there an interpreter at Winnipeg?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I see there is an interpreter at Qu'Appelle. Why is he needed?

Mr. POPE. He is a French Canadian. I had several parties of French gentlemen who went out there intending to form a settlement, and the first question they asked was if there was anyone there that could speak their language. It is necessary to have some person there who could speak their own language and would be able to give them directions.

Mr. WILSON. I see that in 1884, there were only 13 from Quebec and 20 from France, or 33 together. It seems to me that this is a pretty large expenditure for the results we are obtaining, and that we should have some information as to how many the hon. gentleman expects next year, and the reasons why this man is put there.

Mr. POPE. I gave the hon. gentleman the reason, and I may say he is to be moved further on.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the assistant messenger here might be employed as interpreter for French Canadians of whom there are many in the country, instead of paying a

man and giving him the rank of an interpreter and the salary of an interpreter. He would be perfectly well able to interpret, and to give directions to those of that nationality coming into the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We could not for the salary of an ordinary messenger get a man of the class required as interpreter.

Mr. LANGELIER. I believe this gentleman is not only an interpreter, but a poet, who writes effusions for the newspapers, singing the praises of the Government, and perhaps that is the reason why he gets the larger salary.

Mr. BLAKE. He is to be moved on, the Minister said.

Mr. POPE. Yes, I may say, whether he is a poet or not, he is an excellent man, who has a great deal of influence in inducing people to go to that country. He is well known in the older Provinces, and is well worth the money he gets.

Mr. BLAKE. Where is he to be moved?

Mr. POPE. To Medicine Hat.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). This may be a nice thing for the poet and the interpreter, but considering that all this expense is incurred to bring 96 men to the country, it is rather hard on the people who pay the money.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he moved to Medicine Hat because Canadian immigration there is expected to be greater there than at Qu'Appelle?

Mr. POPE. We do not know of course how many will go in, but he will have a larger field there. For instance, I have been pressed this Session by some gentlemen here to establish an agency at Regina.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he to be a poet too?

Mr. POPE. I should be glad to get another such poet.

Mr. WILSON. Will this man merely act as interpreter, or as agent and interpreter?

Mr. POPE. As agent and interpreter.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman yielded to the solicitations which he says were made to him?

Mr. POPE. No, I have not.

Mr. BLAKE. And he intends to be stern?

Mr. POPE. I do.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman intend to appoint an agent at Medicine Hat?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. TROW. Would it not be better to remove the agent from Qu'Appelle to Regina, and to appoint an agent still further west than Medicine Hat? There is very little settlement at Medicine Hat. There is every necessity for an agent at Brandon, but I do not see any necessity for one at Qu'Appelle.

Mr. BLAKE. Where is the agent of the North-West Territories to be situated?

Mr. POPE. At Calgary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is he a new man? The vote is \$200 less than that of last year.

Mr. POPE. He will be a new man. There was none there last year.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman have any agencies between Moose Jaw and Calgary besides Medicine Hat?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I am surprised the hon. gentleman does not make preparations for immigration into that fertile district.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to have an agent appointed in the North-West Territories this year, or has he been appointed?

Mr. POPE. No, he has not been appointed. It has been represented to me very strongly that there is a great necessity for one; if I find that necessity I will appoint him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister intend to keep the agent at Prince Arthur's Landing, now that the railway is completed?

Mr. POPE. Yes, he must be continued.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he does not consider the salary of \$1,000 for the agent at Victoria, British Columbia, totally inadequate to the service performed. For over nine years there was no agent at all in British Columbia. This is the only agent in that Province, and as everybody in this House knows, the salary of \$1,000 is about equal to \$750 in the eastern Provinces. With the rapidly approaching completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we expect a very large immigration into that Province, and the services performed by this officer are worth a good deal more than he is at present receiving. I should like to ask the hon. Minister if he could not find some soft spot in his heart, and give that gentleman a little more salary.

Mr. POPE. Is he a poet?

Mr. BAKER. He may be a poet, but he does not know it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the salaries of agents in Canada amount to \$27,329; last year they amounted to \$29,245. I really think this question of agencies in Canada should be gone over. I cannot see that there is any necessity for keeping up this large staff of agents at the different points. I admit that they may be required at Quebec and possibly at Montreal; but the idea of keeping an immigration agent continuously at London, seems to me absurd. I cannot see what duties there are for him to perform. I do not think that our people are prepared to continue to pay so large an amount for immigration agencies in this country. I think the entire expenses in connection with immigration should be very much reduced. In London alone \$7,008.99 are paid for agents, and the salaries in Europe amount to \$10,413.88. Our whole immigration policy has been a matter of great expense with very little accomplished. The salaries for agencies are: At Quebec \$4,530; at Montreal \$2,533.50; at Winnipeg \$2,932; at Qu'Appelle, \$2,200. I do not see why we should not be able to obtain efficient agents for very much less than we are now paying; it appears to me to be quite extravagant to retain a number of men at these large salaries when very little is accomplished. I think we should reconsider the whole question. In connection with printing there has been an enormous amount paid last year, and also in connection with the supplying of meals to the immigrants \$22,368.65 were spent last year. This amount has been mainly divided among two or three parties. I notice also that we paid Burland & Co., lithographers, \$29,917.30 for work done by them; the *Montreal Gazette* \$9,211.15, the *London Free Press*, \$6,075.60; the *Toronto Mail*, \$9,803.92; the *Hamilton Spectator*, \$6,593.26; H. W. Bennett & Co., \$6,941.65; or a total of \$81,667.06 for printing in Canada, besides \$32,437.49 for printing in England. For paper furnished for printing, we paid in addition \$27,661.79; or in all, \$109,327.85 for printing expenses in connection with immigration in Canada and in England. I cannot understand why we should continue such an enormous expenditure when it produces such small results. Five travelling agents cost us \$8,532.13, and for the special services of

persons from Halifax to Emerson, \$6,927.57. We paid also for locating immigrants last year, notwithstanding the fact that we had so many agents and interpreters, \$4,554.85; travelling and incidental expenses cost \$6,055.46, and contingencies in Canada \$28,719.23. The Auditor General, in his report, says that of this sum, \$26,062 is not properly accounted for, no vouchers having been given him. The travelling expenses of 11 agents in Europe cost \$23,829.63 or \$2,168.33 each. That appears to be a very large sum to pay for travelling expenses. These 11 agents must have been travelling all the time to spend this amount. I would like to know what particular duties they perform which warranted this large expenditure. Assisting immigrants cost \$101,178.14, and commissions upon 733 children brought into the country at \$2 a head, \$1,466. Bonuses for settling immigrants in British Columbia cost \$370. I notice in connection with Mr. Stafford's office, Quebec, the salary paid to him last year was \$1,650 and contingencies \$4,284.64. The incidentals for three months of his office were cab hire, \$114.16; meals \$95.50; ferry boat hire \$16.30; cash to poor immigrants \$17.50; scrubbing his office three months \$12.60. He must have his office scrubbed very often. I think some of these items require to be looked into. Mr. Donaldson's office cost in incidentals \$2,578, travelling expenses \$300, and the total expenses are \$4,478.29. I think this whole service should be overhauled before voting these large amounts.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. Minister refer to the Auditor General's report, pages 102 and 103, and state whether the vouchers and statements there asked for with regard to almost every one of the agents, have yet been obtained by the Department?

Mr. POPE. Yes, all of them.

Mr. FISHER. That statement is very satisfactory, as far as it goes, but I think it is very unsatisfactory to find the Auditor General reporting that not one of the agencies has furnished statements and vouchers.

Mr. POPE. They generally furnish them.

Mr. FISHER. I hope they do. But I only have to turn to the report to find that they did not last year. This is a very unsatisfactory state of things. Such a showing proves that these agents, though they may be proper immigration agents, may not be good business men. Some means should be taken to see that this does not occur again. The agents ought to be reprimanded for their neglect, and it is to be regretted that the Government knowing this to be the case continue asking the House to vote salaries for them. I find under the name of J. Smith, from whom sufficient vouchers were not obtained, that he had not only his salary of \$1,200, but also payments for which the vouchers were not correct. On page 101 of the Auditor General's report, Mr. John Smith is charged with \$100 on account of special expense. It does not say what it is, but he obtained this money apparently without giving vouchers for the expense. There was also special expense to counteract Dakota exhibit—whatever that means—\$62. There is also J. McGovern, who did not give sufficient vouchers, who was charged with a salary of \$1,000 at Port Arthur, and on page 100 of the Auditor General's report I find him charged with \$1,327.27, travelling and incidental expenses, for which apparently he did not furnish the vouchers. This was money which I presume Mr. McGovern paid out, Government money which passed through his hands, and I do not think it ought to have been advanced to him until he had shown that it was paid. I find also the name of Mr. W. C. B. Grahame, of Winnipeg, who did not supply sufficient vouchers. On page 101 of the Auditor General's report, I find him allowed \$101.95 for Icelandic transport, etc., and on page 100, I find him charged with \$512.67 travelling and incidental expenses.

I think the Minister should explain what those extra payments were which were made without the vouchers.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman should have read the explanation of the secretary in the same part of the book. On page 103 he says, under date of 20th October, 1884:

"In the case of the employment of any person whatever as a simple agent of the Department, the details of all expenses are always required to be furnished, and always given."

They may not be given at the very time, and in many cases I suppose they could not have reached the Department in time, but there is the rule of the Department. Moreover, there is a distinction to be drawn between those represented as agents and those represented in any way as travelling agents. The secretary says:

"Sir,—Referring to a conversation with you on the subject of certain payments in a lump sum for the consideration of combined services and travelling expenses, having for object the promotion of immigration to Canada, I have to inform you that payments of this kind are never made, except to persons who have a delegate capacity, or to correspondents of European newspapers who visit Canada for the purpose of reporting on its resources: and then such payments have always relation to the length of time in travelling and the extent of country visited."

"In the case of the employment of any person whatever as a simple agent of the Department, the details of all expenses are always required to be furnished, and always given."

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member has read a letter confirmatory of what I said, showing that such payments are never made except to persons who have a delegate capacity or to correspondents of European newspapers who visit Canada for the purpose of reporting on its resources. Does the hon. gentlemen mean to say that the paid agents of the Government are in any capacity of that kind? They are the people from whom detailed statements ought to be required and are required by the rule of the Department, but the Auditor General states that they have not been supplied to him. The secretary of the Department may say they are always given; he may have had them, but the Auditor General had them not, and he is the person to whom they should be given in order to compare them with the details of the expenditure in the Department. The secretary of the Department states:

"The distinction is between an employment, which constitutes agency, and paying for it as such; and the consideration of making a certain allowance on account of travelling expenses, in special circumstances, to particular persons, of the character above referred to, who happen to be in a position to render valuable services to the cause of immigration—services, moreover, which could not be otherwise obtained."

Does the hon. member mean to say that the services of these paid agents of the Government could not be otherwise obtained?

Mr. DAVIES. The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) evidently did not understand the nature of the complaint made by my hon. friend. He will see that the letter of Mr. Lowe does not refer to the complaint of the Auditor General at all, but to a conversation upon another matter. The case is almost worse than has been stated, because, although vouchers were given for these advances, in no cases were the vouchers correct. It is not that they withheld the vouchers, but that they did not account for the moneys they got, and in not a single case did the vouchers correspond with the moneys they had from the Department.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is not correct. The letter of the Auditor General does not say the vouchers are not correct; he says they have not received them.

Mr. DAVIES. I beg your pardon.

Mr. HESSON. I will read the letter:

"Sir,—Will you be good enough to provide me, as soon as possible, with detailed statements of the accounts and vouchers rendered by each of the undermentioned agents, in support of the moneys advanced them during the year 1883-84?"

"The vouchers already received by me in no case equal the amount of advances."

"The detailed statements would enable me to point out the vouchers required to balance the various accounts."

He does not say the vouchers were incorrect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HESSON. In reply to that, the secretary of the Department says:

"In the case of the employment of any person whatever as a simple agent of the Department."

These were simple agents—

"The details of all expenses are always required to be furnished, and always given."

Is not that a reply to the letter?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. HESSON. Then what does it refer to?

Mr. BLAKE. Why, the Auditor General was asking for the vouchers.

Mr. HESSON. No one pretends to say that he might not have asked for the vouchers in connection with the accounts which he received almost the next day. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that they presented accounts for which the vouchers were incorrect? They may not have presented the vouchers at that time, but they were afterwards given in. Can an agent put down the expenditure for every meal that he gives an immigrant? I presume that at some time of the year he might be called upon to make a return of the expenditures in connection with the advances made to him. In reply to that the secretary of the Department shows clearly that they demanded, as a matter of course, from their agents what advances are made to the agent, and the agent keeps a detailed list of the items of expenditure for the year, and he is called upon at the end of the year to make a return showing how that lump sum has been expended. He makes that return, and if the Auditor General is making up his accounts for a part of the year, and the agent may not have sent in his vouchers for that portion of the year, it is just possible he might have called for vouchers at separate times.

Mr. BLAKE. The accounts are up to the 30th June, and the year closes at that time. The Auditor's letter is written in October or November following. Certain vouchers, I suppose, had been sent in, and he points out that the vouchers do not balance the accounts. The hon. gentleman says a statement in reply is made to that request for the vouchers, which request is made for the three months after the expiration of the financial year. A satisfactory reply is made to these demands of the Auditor because the secretary of the Department says that vouchers are always required and always given. What the Auditor wanted was a statement from the Department that vouchers were always required and given; what he wanted was the vouchers, and what he did not get was the vouchers.

Mr. POPE. It has been a practice for many years that the vouchers are not sent until we have the bills, and then they are audited. There might have been some vouchers in the Department at that time—I cannot say; but I do say that as a rule, and I do not know that there is any exception, bills are furnished, and if they are right they are paid, and vouchers are given; if they are wrong, they are sent back and corrected.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). How can the Minister reconcile that statement with the fact that it appears in the Auditor General's report and the Public Accounts that advances have been made for work to newspapers, that work not having been delivered at the time? In the case of the *Ottawa Citizen*, during the last year, the Auditor's Account shows that a sum of \$1,500 was paid for work which was not delivered, and which was not finished, and the same is the case with the *Montreal Gazette*.

Mr. HESSON.

Mr. POPE. In a very few cases—and I found my predecessors had been doing the same thing—some advances have been made upon work of this kind. But it has been entirely stopped within the last year. Not one dollar has been paid out for which there were not vouchers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the Minister's attention to this letter:

"AUDIT OFFICE, OTTAWA, 15th March, 1884."

"SIR,—I have examined L. Stafford's statement of expenditure for the quarter ending 30th September last, and beg to draw your attention to the contingent expenses, which are as follows:—

Here follows half a dozen items amounting to \$256.06.

"This expenditure is not supported by a single voucher. It strikes me that no great difficulty should be found in procuring vouchers for most of the above expenditure. When they cannot practically be had, detailed statements with date should be supplied."

Now it strikes me that that letter hardly consorts with the statement of the Minister just now as to the practice of this Department.

Mr. POPE. Now, it is the Auditor's Department. It is barely possible that at that time, when there was not much going on at Quebec, the vouchers had not been handed into the auditor.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has admirable and wholesome general rules, but his practice is entirely different from them. He sets up the rule to us and we find the practice in the Blue Book. He says it might be possible that in a case like Quebec, where there was so much doing, there might be a little delay about the vouchers. Now, Sir, the vouchers were for the quarter ending the 30th September, and they were asked for in March following. The navigation of the St. Lawrence closed some months before the month of March. The city of Quebec is not a place to which many emigrants arrive for some months before March.

Mr. POPE. The agent at Quebec has a good deal to do with immigrants in the winter that come from Halifax.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware of that, but the winter is not his busy time, it is his slack time. He is busy when the St. Lawrence is open and immigrants are arriving from Quebec. His slack time commences just as navigation closes, and continues till navigation opens; therefore there can be no excuse made for him that he was too busy to furnish the accounts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has suggested, there seems to be regular employees of the Government who are paid for more than one service. Here are regular agents of the Government, J. Smith and A. G. Smith, whose services are supposed to belong to the Government, and there appears to have been something special for which they drew respectively \$100 and \$275. Mr. Lowe, the secretary of the Department, as I understand, takes the ground that for these special expenditures they are not bound to produce vouchers. I think the committee are entitled to some explanation as to why special amounts are given to regularly paid employees of the Government. I find, for instance, this item: J. Smith, special expenditure to counteract the Dakota exhibit, \$62. We should be glad to receive some information on this point, and as to why vouchers are not furnished.

Mr. POPE. They have been produced.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I can understand why Mr. Smith of Hamilton was not able to send vouchers in time. He was busily engaged for a considerable time when he should have been attending to his duties in getting up National Policy statistics for the Government in his section of the country.

Mr. FISHER. Was this special expenditure of \$100 paid to him for getting up National Policy statistics.

Mr. POPE. I often send John Smith to New York and elsewhere in the States. I remember a case when an attempt was made to induce our people to go to Dakota. I heard of it, and saw advertisements all over the country. I told Mr. Smith I wanted him to go and represent our side of the case, and see if he could not counteract the efforts which were being made to have our people go to Dakota. A Dakota exhibit was being made at Welland, I think; and I thought it my duty to take such action. In such cases I paid Mr. Smith's expenses. During the winter season, when the agents are not much employed, I have sent the agents at Montreal and Port Arthur; John Smith and others to different parts of the United States, where they have distributed pamphlets, talked with the people and endeavored to induce them to come to our country and to the North-West particularly. In consequence of those efforts we have received a good many immigrants and settlers.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the Minister's explanation with respect to the extra expenditure paid to these agents, it is quite clear that detailed statements as to how the money was expended should be furnished. If we are to allow our agents to travel all over the United States and then send in a demand for a lump sum without furnishing detailed statements, a great loop-hole for extravagance is created. The Minister has contradicted himself in his statement. The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has alluded to the letter written by the secretary of the Department of Agriculture on 29th October, 1884, as being a complete answer to the Auditor General's report. The Minister did not give that as a justification, because he knew it had no reference to the letter of the Auditor General, but had reference to a conversation which occurred between the secretary and the Auditor General. The difficulty of sending in vouchers could not be pleaded with respect to agents at Ottawa or Toronto.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman intend to say that the portion of the letter marked with asterisks does not refer distinctly to the letter?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Mr. HESSON. I think it clearly does refer to it. I only mentioned distance as a possible reason for delay in sending vouchers. I simply pointed out the fact that the Department requires its agents to furnish vouchers, and they are furnished.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister tell us whether this refers to it or not?

Mr. POPE. I have not seen the Auditor General's report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It might be as well to look at it as regards the hon. gentleman's own Department.

Mr. POPE. I explained several times that, for all papers we have vouchers, whatever may be the case with regard to this correspondence, which I have not seen. The vouchers are always sent in, and if the bills are incorrect, they are returned for correction.

Mr. LANGELIER. It is an extraordinary thing that the Department should have the vouchers, and that they should not be sent into the Auditor General. The secretary of the Department says it is a rule for the vouchers to be sent in, and the Minister now says the same thing; but what we want to know is, has the rule been followed? This item amounts to \$28,719, and those gentlemen who have sent insufficient vouchers cover nearly the whole of that sum. What has become of those vouchers? The date of the Auditor General's letter is the 13th of October, so that there was plenty of time to have them sent in. With

regard to the Quebec agent, I know that he is perfectly honest, but still it is a very loose practice to pay him so large an amount as \$2,864 with insufficient vouchers. The Minister says that he is very busy in summer time, and I admit he is, but by this date he should have sent them in, and when they are not sent in up to the 1st of July, it might lead to the conclusion that there was something wrong.

Mr. FISHER. The Minister of Agriculture said that these vouchers were returned, and I would now ask him when they are returned.

Mr. POPE. When the money is paid—that is the rule of the Department.

Mr. FISHER. I imagined in my innocence, when the Minister replied to me before, that the vouchers had been received since the report, and that the matter had been really looked after. From his last statement, I suppose that the Minister does not know anything about it, as he merely says it is the rule of the Department. The hon. gentleman has not shown that this matter is dealt with on business principles.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Under what head is the position of our agent, the Manitoba colonisation agent, to be found? He has been an official of the Dominion Government for seven or eight years. His headquarters are in Worcester, Mass., but I do not see his name on the regular list, whereas there is internal evidence in our reports that he has been our agent for the period I have mentioned.

Mr. POPE. I am not sure under what head, but I think probably the last item.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I see his salary, according to the report of the Auditor General, is \$1,200, and as he appears to be one of our regularly paid agents, he ought to have been placed on the regular list. I would also ask where the repatriation expenditure comes in, how is the money expended, and who are the officers through whom it is expended?

Mr. POPE. This is a certain sum to assist French Canadians to return to Manitoba, and it is paid to them when they get there. You will find the sum of \$1,600 or \$1,700 is put in for that purpose.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It was \$2,377 a year ago. Is that expended on French Canadians who remove to Manitoba?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is there any other agency except that of Mr. Lalime that takes charge of these repatriated immigrants?

Mr. POPE. He generally takes parties out there and travels with them; but sometimes, when there is a small number, they go without him.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In his report of last year he says:

"The total number of immigrants for 1884 is some 839. Of this number almost 55 per cent. were French Canadians; the others, English Scotch and Canadians, including also Irish and a few German and Jewish families. I am pleased to say that the great majority of these immigrants are of the best class, and were formerly agriculturists in Canada, having emigrated here only a few years ago, and who decided to emigrate to Manitoba on account of their increasing families."

Then, I presume, this expenditure of \$2,300 would really go to this 55 per cent of the 839 who went to Manitoba.

Mr. POPE. The expense is in reducing their passage and in the repatriation money.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to place in my hands a synopsis of the statement he intends to place before the House of the immigration to Manitoba for the calendar year 1884, from which it appears that the

total number of immigrants who entered Manitoba was 30,265, and the number who left 6,625, making a net settlement of 23,640, of whom there were reported at Emerson 10,488, at Gretna 8,301, at Port Arthur 10,476, and I suppose the estimate of those who entered along the frontier between Emerson and Benton is 1,000. As the hon. gentleman is making his arrangements for the immigration for the season, I think this would be a convenient time for him to state what the results of the immigration for the present season have been, so far, and particularly in the North West and Manitoba. Of course the immigration season for Manitoba and the North-West has, to a large extent, passed, by this time.

Mr. POPE. I will try and get the hon. gentleman the information. My impression is, that it is less than it was last year.

Mr. BLAKE. When we are engaged on a service of this kind, in respect of which the hon. gentleman says some changes are to be made, it is of some consequence that we should know what the current of immigration is, with the view of judging of the propriety of the vote. But of that the hon. gentleman is not able to give us any practical information just now. Inasmuch as it is long since the hon. gentleman ought to have taken this vote, I do not see why, at this late period of the year, he is not able to give us that information.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman knows that this is an exceptional year for immigration and everything else in the North-West. But because troubles have arisen there this year we cannot expect that they are going to continue, and I do not think it would be wise for us to break up our system.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not suggesting a break up; I am considering the vote for the year.

Mr. POPE. I think there is some falling off up to this time, and I think it is accounted for very largely by the difficulties that have arisen. A good many people have been induced to go to the United States who had passages for Manitoba. I know this, because it has been brought under my notice.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would like to ask the Minister what position our agent at Rochester occupies.

Mr. POPE. He is not a regular agent, but is only employed from year to year to distribute pamphlets and give information in that part of the country, which he has done very well.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the nationality of the interpreter at Winnipeg?

Mr. POPE. German.

Mr. FISHER. Is the \$800 for an interpreter at Qu'Appelle an addition to Mr. Miquelon's salary as assistant?

Mr. POPE. No; that is the same man and the same salary.

Mr. LANGELIER. I find in the Auditor General's report that the same Mr. Miquelon received \$100 in addition to his salary, and there is nothing to show the nature of that expenditure.

Mr. POPE. I had him to go through the older settlements of Quebec and explain to the people the country out there, and if they were going to leave to try and induce them to go to that country.

Mr. LANGELIER. To what portion of the Province of Quebec did he go?

Mr. POPE. Several portions.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not think it is of much interest to the Province of Quebec to know that Mr. Miquelon is

Mr. BLAKE.

allowed to take inhabitants from that Province to the North-West. If he were sent to bring them from the United States, I could understand the usefulness of his duty. It is like a man who would take money from one of your pockets and put it in the other, and obtain a commission for the work.

Mr. POPE. If people are going to leave Quebec, it is better they should be induced to go to the North-West than to the States. The hon. gentleman last night said they were going away in droves.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. gentleman said most distinctly yesterday that none were leaving for the United States at all.

Mr. POPE. I said nothing of the kind. I said it was quite true that people would go from our country to the United States, as people would come from the United States here, but I did not say our people went in droves as the hon. gentleman did. I am glad to say that in the last few years, more people are coming in from the United States than there are going out to the United States; and I believe that we will find the United States as good a field for us to work in as Europe, not only in bringing back French Canadians, but other Canadians and other people as well. I have sent our agents, when they have had leisure time, to the United States, and this accounts for some of the travelling expenses incurred. From many parts of the United States people are leaving for the North-West; we had quite a German immigration from the Western States.

Mr. LANGELIER. I take some interest in the work done by Mr. Miquelon, because I know he did me the honor of coming into my county during the election. He might try to deter some people from voting for me, but I am sure he did not deter any people from going to the United States.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to give us some information as to the Customs returns. I am aware there are certain classes of entries made by parties as settlers' goods, for the purpose of evading payment of the Customs duties. I observed these entries have increased very rapidly during the last few years. In 1881 the total number of parties entered with settlers' goods in the Customs returns was a little over 18,000; in 1883 it rose to 34,000; in 1884 to 35,000. Is this owing to the labors of our agents in the New England States?

Mr. POPE. Our agents, no doubt, have had a great deal of influence in inducing those people to come from the United States. With respect to these people, every person coming in with settlers' effects is entered at the Custom house, and return made to me. There can be no question about that.

Mr. BAIN. The total number of returns for the Province of Quebec in 1881 was little over 7; in 1882 it was 14,000; in 1883, 18,000; and last year 20,000. When I turn to the details I find they are a little peculiar. Take, for instance, the German element, for they are entered under the headings of the different nationalities. In 1881 there were 79 Germans returned to the Province of Quebec; in 1882, 185; in 1883, 9,318; and in 1884 the number shrank to 63. I confess I did think our men had been taking a leaf out of the American agent's book at Sarnia, when I saw these figures. The Canadians, for instance, show a very large increase, from 5,000 in 1881, to 14,000 in 1882; and the year we had the big return of Germans the Canadians fell to 600, while last year they rose to 18,500. I would suggest whether it would not be well for the Customs officers to look after these parties. A good many parties cross the boundary line from east to west for the purpose of finding employment during a portion of the summer, and then return at the end of the season to their friends in Quebec.

I should be glad to learn that 18,000 Canadians left the United States last year to take up their permanent homes in Quebec, satisfied it was a better place to live in than the eastern States. The difficulty is, these parties may be securing the free entry of goods under the name of settlers' effects to defraud the revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. Every immigrant coming into the country has to make a solemn affidavit that he has had all these goods in his possession a certain length of time, and that they have been in actual use. While the hon. gentleman is quite correct in his suspicion that on many occasions attempts are made to bring in new goods as settlers' effects, the parties are always pretty well watched, and unless the goods give evidence of having been in use for the time required by law, and the owners make the required affidavit, the goods are seized or the parties are compelled to pay the duty. From the number of cases constantly coming before the Department, the number of persons coming into the country, particularly Canadians returning, is much greater than formerly. As scarcely one of those families who returned fail to bring with them sewing machines and sometimes organs, we are constantly having application for free admission of those articles. The law provides they must have been in actual use by the families for a certain length of time; and as the inspection is very rigid, few of those people who are not *bona fide* settlers get off scot free.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am pleased to hear that these parties are so improving their condition as to be able to return with sewing machines and organs, and I am satisfied they are not adopting the process my hon. friend referred to, of being active free traders from sundown to daylight, and protectionists for the rest of the 24 hours. I was inquiring why, if the Minister had the information that the Canadians were so largely increasing in numbers, there was so much reason for making an exertion to bring them in.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is well known in the Province of Quebec that a number of French Canadians from the eastern States have been coming lately in very large numbers back to Canada, and I hope the influx will continue. We are working to ensure its continuance, not only by Government means but by other means, which are very useful also by the action of our national societies. It is true that a certain portion from the Province of Quebec go, during the hay season to work in the United States, and come back afterwards, but those are certainly not the persons my hon. friend refers to as coming back and entering their goods. They go with a carpet bag for a certain number of weeks, and they come back with the same.

Mr. FISHER. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that many French Canadians are returning from the United States. But he is in error in saying that all those who are going away now are going for haying purposes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say so. I regret that there are still too many going to the United States.

Mr. FISHER. I live on one of the main lines of railway, between one of the French parts of the Province of Quebec and one of the New England States, and I am sorry to say that even this spring, at a time when nobody thinks of going to hay, a large number of men with their families have been going to the States, at the same time that many have been returning; and I have no doubt that the one offsets the other very much. But those who come and go are very often visiting their relations on different sides of the line, and it is very difficult to judge of the numbers of those who come back and are repatriated in Canada as well as of those who go to settle in the States.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have means of ascertaining it, and I spoke knowingly when I said that the proportion is very large of those who are coming back to remain. Our colonisation societies lately have been working very well, and it is known, especially by the entries in the Custom house, that a large number are returning with their families and goods.

Mr. FISHER. When the hon. gentleman says "we," does he mean the Government?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; I mean we French Canadians.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose he means the colonisation societies?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And the St. Jean Baptiste societies.

Mr. FISHER. Does the Government know who the agents are and what they are doing?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. colleague has stated that Mr. Lalime and Mr. Gagnon and Mr. Belanger, and two or three others, were employed specially to do the good work of trying to persuade those whose condition of living in the States is far from being as advantageous as it would be in their own country to return here. I know those gentlemen, and I hope they will do their work well for the Government and for the national benefit of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that these men are to bring these people back to the Province of Quebec?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The work of our societies is in the direction of inducing them to come.

Mr. FISHER. Some of them, however, as I understand, are endeavoring to take these Canadians to the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Lalime, I think, is so engaged.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Those who desire to go to the Province of Quebec go there, and those who prefer to go to Manitoba are sent to Manitoba. I have some friends who are working very assiduously in this direction, and I know that the instructions were, that if these people wished to return to the Province of Quebec they should be brought there first, but if they did not desire to remain there, we should do our utmost to induce them at least to become Canadian citizens and to go to the North-West. Of course, I do not speak now of the Government agents, whose duty is to bring emigrants to Manitoba or the North-West, although I believe that by bringing back Canadians from the United States to our old Provinces is good emigration work, deserving the encouragement of the Government.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would draw the attention—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. This has gone beyond the point at which the committee arrived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In these discussions, it has never been attempted to restrain members in the discussion of an item which includes these various matters. If the Government would do as I have contended they ought, and divide these things into separate and distinct items, there would be force in the objection; but the Minister of Agriculture has chosen to group these all under one head, which, I think, is an inconvenient and an improper practice, but he has given a perfect right to everyone to range from one to the other.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). If this Government was furnishing the funds to these agents who were inducing the repatriation movement to the Province of Quebec, I would call attention to the fact that Mr. Lalime makes no reference to that in his report at all, but refers to the immigration to the Province of Manitoba and the North-West. I think he

is right in inducing these people, whether they be French Canadians or others, to go to the North-West.

Mr. FISHER. While we are discussing this question of the interpreter—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. This is not the time for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of the committee to the extreme impropriety and inconvenience of the practice of discussing these Estimates item by item. It was not the practice in former years, and it ought never to be adopted, in bringing down Estimates, to mass fifty or sixty distinct items, not necessarily having reference to each other. I never ventured to do that, and if I had the hon. gentleman would have taken me to task. Such items, for instance, as these, might be fairly put together: salaries in London ought to be a separate item; contingencies ought to be a separate item; travelling expenses and that last vote of \$300,000 ought to be a separate item. There is no doubt you are quite right in pointing out that it is an inconvenient practice, and it is highly desirable that the next Estimates should be amended.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am only trying to accommodate the committee in conducting the business as regularly as possible, and I have not the slightest desire to interfere with the fullest and freest discussion of any resolution; but when you take each item, it is impossible to preserve order and to confine the remarks to that item. Yesterday we had a full discussion on the whole vote. At the request of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side, item by item of this resolution is called, and I think that is the regular practice, and ought to be adhered to by hon. gentlemen, and not to go into a full discussion of the whole resolution again.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You are quite right; and it was before the hon. member for South Huron came in that I made the suggestion myself, as I thought it would help us to get on with the work. It was suggested that we should speak to any particular item, and when we had finished the agents, then remarks on the agency would be in order. It was an attempt on my part to provide that we would not be running into every subject, and branching off from one to another.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the Minister in regard to this interpreter at Winnipeg, Mr. H. J. Mâsse. I see that he is receiving payment for two services.

Mr. POPE. Mr. Mâsse is travelling most all the time among the Germans in the western States, in the winter season, distributing pamphlets and giving information. In the summer season he is engaged in locating people in Manitoba, and the expense is considerable.

Mr. GILLMOR. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if there are any agents visiting the States in order to induce some of our people who have gone there to come back to the Lower Provinces. I think it is quite as important that some of our people should be assisted to return, if they want to, as that the people who have gone from Quebec should be assisted to return. I am satisfied that from Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, more men have gone away than from any other part of the Dominion of Canada. They do not go into the North-West to any extent, but they go to the western States. If public money is to be expended in sending agents to induce those who may have left Quebec to return, and to pay their passages, I think it is only fair to the Maritime Provinces that the same rights should be extended to them, and the same assistance given to people who have gone from the Maritime Provinces to return there if they want to. I know that cannot be done for each Province, but when you take the population of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick combined, it forms a considerable part of the population of the Dominion, and a great many men have gone from those

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth.)

Provinces during many years, and they are continuing to go, I regret to say. I know that this whole question of how many goes and how many returns is vague and indefinite; anybody can say just what he likes about it. I am satisfied that very few know anything at all definitely about the matter. Now, I put it to the Minister of Agriculture, as a practical man, who knows what it costs to earn money and how it ought to be taken care of, if he really thinks that this enormous sum of money spent on immigration is being properly and profitably expended. Now, we are talking about agents going over to the United States and trying to induce people to come back to us. The Secretary of State says that he knows something that somebody else does not know: that they are coming back in great numbers; but he had to admit that many thousands have gone away. I am convinced that a great deal of this money ought not to be expended on immigration at all. When we look at the amount of money which is being expended for printing only, and when I hear hon. gentlemen say in Parliament that one member has received so much for printing in his paper, and another has received so much, it shows how much of the people's money is being wasted, and what confusion the whole thing has got into. When we find that \$90,000 or \$100,000 is paid out in the Dominion of Canada for printing information, such as I see before me, I am satisfied it is a waste of money, that it is doing no good, that we can dispense with this printing, and I am led to the conclusion that this whole thing has been a failure. I hear nothing about the great agency that was to be established by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hon. gentlemen do not now even allude to it. But we are told we are on the eve of some wonderful discovery; we are just ready to do something. The member for Cardwell, last night, cautioned us to be careful in our statements, because we are ready to have an enormous influx of immigrants; we are going to have a grand success, and there is nothing to stop us now. We were ready five or six years ago. The blessing is always to come; it is never here. The immigrants have not come, but the expense goes on all the same. I am satisfied that the whole immigration policy, or at least the greater part of it, is a failure. This idea of sending people into different countries to look after immigrants is absurd—to have them going over into the United States to see if they can get some people to come back is absurd and ridiculous, and a wilful waste of money. Large sums of money have been expended to bring immigrants into the country—whether they go to Quebec, Ontario, or Manitoba, no one knows, and no one knows where they are. Out of 400,000 people who are said to have come in here during the last two or three years the hon. member for East Grey knows where there are twelve. No other member in this Parliament, with its 212 members, seems to know whether there are more than twelve of those immigrants. I appeal to the Minister that he, as a practical man, should use the public money as he would his own. This system is the means of subsidising newspapers and agents, and no Parliament in the world would be satisfied with the explanations given with respect to the expenditure of this large sum of money. Those are my convictions. A word with respect to the information given in these pamphlets. I have looked over some of the pamphlets, and I find there is no information given with respect to New Brunswick that is suitable for intending immigrants. Here is a pamphlet by H. D. Small, which deals with the Canadian forests. I have looked over a little of it about New Brunswick. I do not want to say anything against any man; but I must say that the information was taken from records years ago, and the information is entirely incorrect. I believe 10,000 of those pamphlets, translated into German, were scattered over Germany. Everything the Germans would like to know is not in the book, while statements that are untrue are there.

I was in Montreal a few weeks ago, and saw a young man 25 years of age, who had been two or three years in Minnesota, who had returned to Norway and was bringing out about 30 as fine immigrants as I ever saw. I did not think to enquire why he went to Minnesota; but having found that country a good country, he seemed to have induced his friends to come out, in order to go there. A word more about New Brunswick. The information that ought to be communicated to agricultural immigrants is not contained in the pamphlet respecting that Province. I do not see a word there about any district where the land is fit for settlement. There is a great deal of public land in New Brunswick that is unfit for settlement, and many settlements have been located on poor land, and, as a consequence the people have become dissatisfied, and if they have remained they have made a poor living from poor land. There is, however, in New Brunswick, rich land, which will compare very favorably with land in the Eastern Townships or Ontario. I made my first visit to the Eastern Townships a short time ago, and I consider those townships possess good soil and agricultural advantages. We have hundreds of thousands of acres of Crown lands supposed to be equal in fertility with those lands, or with the rich lands of Ontario. Not only is this the case, but we have large districts as desirable for settlement as are the lands in Manitoba. I believe myself, from all I have heard, that although much of the soil in the North-West is fertile, there are drawbacks; otherwise there would be more settlers there. While I do not want to be local or sectional in my views, I must say we are constantly looking to the west, and we only look to the east when we want money. The population of New Brunswick is stationary, and the hon. member for Cardwell thinks we should be very well satisfied because it is stationary, and in that respect equals the census record of some of the New England States. I do not hold that opinion.

Mr. FISHER. Will the Minister state the reason for the increase of salaries in the London office?

Mr. POPE. There is a decrease on certain items of \$700. Two messengers have been appointed, and Mr. Colmer and Mr. Doré have received an increase of \$100 per annum respectively.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the Minister how it is that these two messengers are needed in the London office. I may say that I have conversed with people who have been in the London office, and they say that there are complaints—

Mr. POPE. It would be a curious thing if you did not hear complaints.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry to hear from the Minister that with regard to such an office it is natural that we should hear complaints. The complaints I have heard are not only from Canadians, but from English people, who have gone to the office to obtain information about Canada, with the intention of writing about Canada in England, and they found that they could not get the information.

Mr. POPE. That may not be the fault of the officers.

Mr. FISHER. I have always understood that the object of this office was to supply information to English people desiring to have information, and if they were not able to get such information I should think it a just cause of complaint against the office.

Mr. POPE. Perhaps it was information which could not be given.

Mr. FISHER. It was statistics with regard to Canada, with a view to writing articles in the English newspapers and magazines. I may say more, moreover, that I have heard complaints of inefficiency in the working of the office and

the state of the office, and that being the case, I cannot understand why it was desirable to increase the number of officers and the salaries of those officers. I would like to ask the Minister, who is in charge of the office?

Mr. POPE. Sir Charles Tupper, of course.

Mr. FISHER. He is High Commissioner, but I suppose there is somebody under him who is in charge of the office.

Mr. POPE. No; he is in charge himself.

Mr. FISHER. But does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that Sir Charles Tupper has charge of the details of the office?

Mr. POPE. Certainly.

Mr. FISHER. And that there is no official specially charged with that work, or who is obliged to deal with people coming to the office and to answer their questions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought to think for a moment. Sir Charles Tupper is there as High Commissioner to do all the duties required of him by the Government in their relations with the Imperial Government, and to attend to any matters which are specially entrusted to him by the Government here. He is, however, the head of the Immigration Department there, just as if he were an emigrant agent in London for Canada, and he attends to that duty with great assiduity; and when the hon. gentleman says that he has heard complaints, I must say that I believe that those complaints are utterly groundless since Sir Charles has been there, for a more active and energetic officer cannot be found. I know, for I was there for five weeks in November and December, and I was at his office every day. I know that he was attending to his work from morning to night, even attending to every detail, seeing every person who came. He has an exceedingly able man as assistant, Mr. Colmer. He is exceedingly well informed, and he is secretary to the High Commissioner. I can vouch for his attention to work and his assiduity in the office. Mr. Doré, another officer, is a good linguist, and Mr. Chipman, whom Sir Charles Tupper took home with him, was formerly an officer here. He is well known, and is a good and intelligent officer. I think if any charges were brought of inattention or incivility, those charges are unfounded, or the parties are very unreasonable in their expectations. I know Sir Charles Tupper takes great pains to get supplies of information from Canada, in the first place, from the Immigration Department. Everything which is published there he receives, and I know he takes great pains to press them for supplies of Blue Books and all other kinds of information published in the Dominion of Canada. They are supplied from here in as large quantities as the issue will allow, and I know that the Department of Interior supplies him with maps, plans, and all the information that Department can afford. Formerly, I believe, before that office was thoroughly organised, some complaints were made, which, perhaps, were in some degree justified, but I am quite satisfied that they are not at all justified now. Englishmen desiring to come to Canada have now two means of information, and they are fully supplied. They have not only the Government establishment in Victoria Chambers in the West End, but there is the Canadian Pacific Railway office in the city. That office is in charge of Mr. Harry Moody, a Nova Scotian, whom everybody knows, a man of very great ability, who is an enthusiast in his business, and the Canadian Pacific Railway spares no pains in distributing and disseminating information of every kind. I am satisfied that any person desiring to come to Canada would, between those two offices, have every possible information to enable him to make up his mind as to whether Canada was a desirable place for settlement or not.

\* Mr. FISHER. Of course, I had no means of judging with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway offices in London, and no right to discuss its arrangements, as the Government is not responsible for them. With regard to what I said about the London office, if it is possible, before concurrence, I will endeavor to get detailed statements from some of those persons and place them before the House. Some of them may not be in this country now, but I will write to them within the next day or two, and find out who the people were in the office of whom complaints were made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be very satisfactory to have that information. I do not say it is possible, because some of them were travelling through the country, but I will obtain the information, if possible.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The statements the hon. gentleman has made will be a surprise to every one who has had anything to do in travelling or getting information on England or on the continent. I have had occasion twice to be on the continent when I have heard about Mr. Colmer and Mr. Doré—who has since left the office for some other work. I have heard, in Paris, strangers who had been in London, and who did not even speak the English language, speaking with the greatest praise of the courtesy and efficiency of these officers and of the trouble taken by them to give and to spread information everywhere. Englishmen, Frenchmen and Germans would find every accommodation there, in the way of information, as Mr. Doré was well versed in these languages, and every attention was given to those seeking information. As the Premier has stated, the different Departments have supplied that office with a large quantity of books and documents giving the fullest information with regard to Canada. In my own Department there is not a week that passes that we do not send supplies of books and other information about Canada. I have taken the trouble, even, to send a complete set of books concerning the country, which have been prepared with great care by the Education Department of Quebec. I think it will be a surprise to everyone, not only in Canada, but in England and the continent, to hear that the agency in London is not one which has discharged its duties, and that does honor to the Government which has established this office in London.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was informed by a friend, a short time ago that in the first report of the Fisheries Exhibition Canada was not mentioned at all. If our agents in London are so efficient, I would like to know the reason for that.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. I wish to state that a gentleman, a retired officer of the British army, now living in this country, who went to London last winter and returned this summer, informed me that while in London he met some friends who spoke very highly of the Province of Quebec, and in order to corroborate some information he was giving them he went to the office in London to get more precise information. He found that the office was supplied with a great deal of information in regard to the North-West Territories, but he found almost nothing about the Province of Quebec. That was what this gentleman told me in conversation. He said it, not in a tone of complaint against the Government. I am ready to give his name to the Minister of Agriculture privately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is easily understood. In Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, all the lands belong to the Provinces, and they have their own publications and their own regulations for the sale of lands, and regarding their mines, and all their material interests of the Provinces. That information is not at the disposal of the Central Government in the same way as information about the material resources of the North-West. That country being directly under the Government here, information is obtained from our own officers; but the office in London is

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

anxious to receive, and asks for and does receive from each one of the Provincial Governments all their publications, which are distributed as well as the general information which is collected by the Dominion officers.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. I do not mention this as a matter of complaint; I only call the attention of the Government to it; and I think it would be very easy to procure any number of pamphlets or documents published by the Government of Quebec to supply to the London office.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that there are hundreds of pamphlets regarding the Province of Quebec in the London office, which have been sent there since at least three years.

Mr. WILSON. I think the Minister of Agriculture stated that the increase of expenditure for the London office is caused by an increase in clerks or messengers. We have had no report before us to show that the staff is not sufficient to accomplish all the work they have to perform, and it strikes me we ought to have a little more information from the Government before we vote on this increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For two messengers.

Mr. WILSON. It matters not whether it be for two messengers alone or not. Hon. gentlemen claim that there has been no neglect of duty in the office; the First Minister says the High Commissioner is constantly at his post attending to his duties, and that those under him are doing the same. If that is the case, why is it necessary to have these two extra messengers? I think the feeling of the House and the country is that the expenditure for immigration should be reduced, and if we desire to do away with the system of assisted passages, I think it is hardly reasonable that we should, at present, increase the expense of the office in England. I should certainly like to have a little more information as to why these two messengers are required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The messengers are to carry messages; that is their duty.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think that is a satisfactory answer. Is that the kind of information the House is to get when we ask for explanations as to the expenditure of money? True, it is about the same kind of information we generally get—very unsatisfactory and frequently very unreliable. Will hon. gentlemen explain why they did not need these messengers last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because there were not so many messages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Really, that is very preposterous. When there is going to be a smaller immigration this year, it does seem to me rather unnecessary to add 10 per cent. or thereabouts to the expenses of that particular office, because that is what it amounts to. If there was reason to expect increased work there might be need for more messengers; but so far from that being the case, the probability is there will be considerably less work to be done. In connection with that office I would take occasion to say this: I had hopes that the great distress prevailing in England would have tended to bring a considerable number of English farmers out to this country, but so far as my own observation and experience go, very few indeed of these people have made their way out here, or to have settled in those parts of Ontario I am best acquainted with. Some attempts were made a couple of years ago to bring out this particular class of persons, but as yet, I am sorry to say, these attempts have produced very little result. Has the hon. gentleman any definite information to give us on that subject?

Mr. POPE. Yes; the advantage of settlement here are constantly kept before those people, but you will never get

much information from that class. A good many of them have settled in Ontario. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about Toronto, he must know that men of large means of the class he has referred to have settled in that part of the country. Everything has been done that could be done, but we need never expect a large immigration of that class. We have, however, got a fair sprinkling of them. A good many have settled in the Eastern Townships and around Toronto and Hamilton and London, but of course they do not come out, as other immigrants do, in large numbers. I am sorry to say I do not know whether the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has seen any in his county, but I can say that if he, who is a practical man, would come out and aid us, and give some information about New Brunswick, we would be very glad to have his assistance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I have heard the hon. member for Hamilton say that quite a number of these immigrants have settled in his neighborhood. As I live in the same neighborhood, and am as well acquainted with those who settle there and take up farms as anybody else, I must say my experience does not carry out the hon. gentleman's statement. I would like him to give the name of any such person who has taken up a farm and has settled there.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). That is very like the hon. gentleman; it is very like the tactics he displays on the stump. I am not prepared to give the name of any individual; I do not carry the names in my pocketbook. If he has not heard of any of those people coming in, I am not responsible for that, but I have in my mind's eye some three or four comparatively wealthy gentlemen, who were tenant farmers in the old country, who came out and settled in Houghton and other parts near Hamilton. I do not know their names, but I know that is the case, although the hon. gentleman, because I do not give the names, will, no doubt, discredit my statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not expect you would have a very large number of immigrants of the particular class to which I referred, but the House will recollect there was a very considerable delegation of tenant farmers, men specially selected, sent here, who were put into communication with the Department of Agriculture and conveyed over different portions of this country at the public expense. That took place two or three years ago, and what I desire to know more particularly was whether any, and if so, what results had accrued to us from these persons' visits. I think it likely enough some of them settled in such places as Toronto, but I made enquiries in a good many of the rich western counties, where I should say these persons could be best located, and I have not heard of any having gone to these counties. Has the hon. gentleman, through his agents in London, put himself in communication with the Scotch or English tenant farmers, who are now looking very anxiously for some places where they can settle? Everybody who knows anything of the state of agriculture in England knows that at this moment there are literally thousands of farms being thrown back on the owners' hands, in sections which were formerly known to be the richest and best cultivated portions of that country, and a similar state of affairs exists all over Scotland. The persons who surrender those farms are, most of them, possessed of some means, which will enable them to settle comfortably here. I think particular pains should be taken to reach this class of immigrants.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not think there is a better field in the Dominion for such a class than certain portions of New Brunswick, for the reason that in different portions of New Brunswick the industry is wholly lumbering and the farms have been neglected in consequence. The lumber industry being now somewhat exhausted, and the young men on those farms not having been accustomed to farming, have left for

different parts of the United States, so that a great many farms in different localities could be purchased to-day at one-half what they were valued at twenty-five years ago. That class of immigrants would be of great advantage to the country; being skilled in agriculture, they would set an example to those who have not made a study of that, and I do not believe a more suitable location could be found for them than in many portions of New Brunswick. In the county I represent, a considerable number of that class could find opportunities to invest, near the seaboard, near the American markets, near railroads. Of course, in that locality, there is not room for a very great number, but forty or fifty who wanted farms ready cleared, or partially cleared, would have a great advantage for a very small sum. The families of those who occupied them have gone to the United States, and the old people have followed them, and the farms are practically useless, and could be obtained very cheaply, for \$400 or \$500 for 100 acres of land. I believe the same thing is the case in other parts of New Brunswick.

Mr. ROSS. I am in a position to say something about the tenant farmers who came out here in 1869. A number of them came to the North-West, and I went round with the greater portion of them, and spent two or three weeks in travelling through the country with them. After they went back, a number of them sent letters of introduction with farmers who came from the north of England and the south of Scotland, to me, in Winnipeg, and some of them settled in the southern part of Manitoba and in the North-West. What number has come in as the result of that I do not know, but many have settled in the west, and, no doubt, more have come than I have heard of. A considerable number have come, and some of them are relatives, nephews and brothers-in-law of the tenant farmers who came out that year.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). When the tenant farmer movement was originated some years ago, I had hoped that we would have been able to direct, to the older parts of the Dominion, that medium class of farmers, with a moderate amount of means, that would have been able to take hold of the older farms that were improved, and take advantage of the social facility that old settlements give to all these parties, as compared with new districts; but I have never been able to see any number of that class find their way into the section that I am acquainted with. I have heard statements made about them, but there is an indefiniteness about them, and I have not heard any one lay his hand upon these parties and say they are here. I had hoped that we would have seen some good results, because we have a good field in the older Provinces, as well as in the North-West, for that class; but in the face of the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture to-night, I am at a loss to know why we should be asked to pay \$600 more for the working of the London office. We are perfectly willing to pay officials, if they give some return for the expenditure, but in face of the decreased immigration of last year, and the internal difficulties which every one admits will reduce the flow of immigration to the North-West, at least for the present season, and that we have not been able to secure the class of tenant farmers for the older Provinces, it seems unjustifiable to ask for this increase for the London office, for less work than has been accomplished in the last two years. Our own agents admit that the field for immigration is being reduced, from local circumstances, in England, and for the first time this Session, the Minister has abandoned the system of assisted passages, and proposes to encourage only those parties who have enough independence and self-reliance to come without aid and earn their livelihood in a strange country. That will reduce still further the work of our offices in England. As to the reduced field for immigration, I would call attention to the report of one of our oldest

agents, one who knows the field better than even the High Commissioner. I refer to Mr. John Dyke, of Liverpool. He says:

"Of course, the efforts of your agent to secure British emigrants will not be relaxed; but there is no doubt of the fact that both tenant farmers and agricultural laborers are decreasing in number in Great Britain. They are migrating into the large towns rather than emigrating. This is consequent on the destruction of dwellings and the depopulation taking place on so many large estates, and the introduction of labor-saving machinery, and, more recently, through the serious depression in all branches of agriculture."

Then he quotes from a letter he has received from Joseph Arch, in which he refers to the fact that, in his opinion, the agricultural laborers have, in the last ten years, decreased one-half. He points out that the class of agricultural laborers—the only class the Minister continues to assist to come to Canada—are reduced very largely, and are rapidly leaving the country districts and finding their way to the cities and towns. Under all these circumstances, it seems unreasonable to vote an increase of \$600 to enable these men to do less work, according to the Minister's own statement, than they have been doing for two or three years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As to the vote of \$7,000 for salaries of agents in Europe, I see, in the report of the Auditor General, that the expense was some \$10,000 last year, and I should like to ask the Minister how he expects to save the \$3,000. Now, I see here the names, as agents, of Mr. O'Dell, Mr. Otto Hahn, Mr. W. Lukes, the Rev. R. Wilson and Thomas Olsen, who receive various salaries—Mr. Odell, \$973; Mr. Hahn, \$1,666; Mr. Lukes, \$600; Rev. Mr. Wilson, \$543; Thomas Olsen, \$400. I have been unable to find from the Minister's report, and I have looked it carefully through, any report from any of the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned. I thought, perhaps, they had reported to the High Commissioner in London, but I cannot find them there either. Does the Minister think he can save the \$3,000 which appears from these Estimates? And have the gentlemen I have named reported to him, and what services have they rendered? Are they in the employ of the Department now?

Mr. POPE. One of them, only. Mr. Olsen was an agent to Norway for four or five months. The Rev. Mr. Wilson went from New Brunswick for six months or so. He is not now our agent. His work was lecturing and distributing literature in England and Scotland. Dr. Hahn is working in Germany. Mr. W. Lukes is from Ontario, and he lectured there for some little time amongst the farmers, and distributed literature. These were all special agents, and I have had reports from them.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot find any reports, and when we are paying salaries to these men it actually looks a little suspicious that we cannot find any reports from them.

Mr. POPE. I am sure there are reports.

Mr. PATERSON. The Auditor General's Report shows that the salaries alone of the agents in Europe were \$10,413. Does it include the salaries of these special agents?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose the Minister intends to have no special agents this year, and he will keep within the limit?

Mr. POPE. You see there is an increase of \$200, \$100 each to Mr. Dyke and Mr. Grahame.

Mr. FARROW. The matter relating to the tenant farmers in the old country is a very important one. I rise, not to make any complaints against the Minister or against the Department. I suppose they know their business; if they do not, they ought to. But I would like to make a suggestion in reference to emigration. It is in the recol-

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

lection of this House that we gleaned certain information from the different Provinces, two years ago, as to the farms that were available for the tenant farmers who might wish to come from the old country into Canada. We had reports from nearly every county in Ontario, stating that there were good farms to be sold, such as my hon. friend from Wentworth has described, upon which these tenant farmers could settle—well cultivated farms, with beautiful brick houses, and with all the social advantages, such as churches, schools, railways, and so forth. These farms usually could be bought for \$4,000 or \$5,000. Well, Sir, so far as my own neighborhood is concerned, none of these tenant farmers have come over. I have cast my eyes over the whole of Huron county, and I know it perfectly well, and I do not find that we have got any of that class which we want to get. Now, here is the point I want to make: We have got a number of emigration agents in England, Ireland and Scotland—what are they doing?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Drawing their salaries.

Mr. FARROW. I got hold of a paper the other day, published in Lincolnshire, England, and what did I find in it? I found that an Australian lecturer was through my old county in England, the county of Lincolnshire, one of the finest counties in England for agriculture, and wherever you find a Lincolnshire farmer you will find a most prosperous farmer, because he is brought up to hard work and understands it well. Well, this lecturer did not confine himself to going to Boston, in Lincolnshire, or the county town of Lincoln. At a little village called Hogsthorpe, with which I am well acquainted, he said: "I am going through this county, and into every hamlet; I am going to let my voice be heard throughout the length and breadth of this county, as to the advantages of Australia." I am inclined to think that our agents only go to the principal towns, where a railway carries them. I have only heard of one lecturer going to Boston, and that was some years ago; and if that is the case, our agents may be sitting down at ease and doing nothing for their salaries. I want this question to be thoroughly understood and probed by the Minister. If these men are only going once in every four or five years to a particular place in the country, instead of going to the villages—I can name ten of them, now, where they ought to have gone—I say they are not doing this country much good. I believe, if these lecturers had visited the small villages of 200 or 300 inhabitants, and went among the tenant farmers in the county of Lincolnshire, they would have induced many of them to come to Canada. Why should we not get them into Canada? We can offer them greater advantages, even, than Australia, and it only takes seven or eight days to come from England to Canada. I know that I have brought several persons out from Lincolnshire by writing letters, and I think, if I were an agent, though I do not want to be one, I could make such a noise, and I could show them so clearly the advantages of coming to Canada, that I think there would be some results. I have no desire to take an agency, though I would like to revisit my old county, which I left thirty-five years ago, when I was a boy.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I would like to get some information from the Minister with regard to this Rev. Mr. Wilson from New Brunswick, who has been in the pay of the Government as agent in England. It appears he has made no report of the work he performed there, and from information that I have obtained with regard to him, I am curious to know how he came to be appointed. I have been informed that this Rev. Mr. Wilson was a very particular friend of the Finance Minister, that he was not in very good health, and it was thought necessary that he should take a pleasure trip to the old country for the benefit of his

health, and with that view he secured an appointment from the Minister of Agriculture to lecture in Great Britain on the advantages of emigration to Canada; that he went there and delivered no lectures but enjoyed his trip, and came back no doubt well satisfied with the pleasure he had enjoyed at the expense of the country, and without rendering any service for the money that was paid him.

Mr. POPE. Mr. Wilson was recommended to me by the Finance Minister, and I have every confidence in his recommendation of an agent to go to England, or of anything else. I do not think he is any the worse man for being recommended by the Finance Minister. He remained there six months, and delivered a great many lectures. He made his report and settled up his accounts with the High Commissioner. I think we must have his report in the office, if it is not here.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have failed to discover the report in the report of the Minister. My information is, that he merely went there on a pleasure trip for the benefit of his health.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I know, with regard to that gentleman, that he is a man of great ability, of great information, and is a very good speaker. He is somewhat celebrated as an eloquent lecturer, and from his character, I do not think he would undertake any public duty without discharging it to the best of his ability.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has forgotten to mention that the Rev. Mr. Wilson is an intensely strong political partisan, and well known to be such. It is rumored, of course there can be no truth in the rumor, that he was appointed merely for political reasons. He received \$1,245, and there is nothing in the public records to show that he did any work for that money. If he did, then in justice to the reverend gentleman the Minister should be prepared to tell the House what he did, where he lectured, and where his report is to be found. If he did the work of an immigration agent, no one can be to blame. He has a right to be paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. The First Minister says "hear, hear;" but the records do not show that the reverend gentleman did any work. All the country knows is, that he is a violent political partisan, who was in poor health and went to England, and that he received \$1,245 for going there, and did not do anything for his money.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not think it can be shown that the Rev. Mr. Wilson was a violent political partisan.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When we find sums like this paid for special objects and no report of the work done, we would be lacking in our duty if we did not call the attention of the Minister to it. As regards the appointment of political partisans: if hon. gentlemen opposite are to follow their own sweet will, and appoint any one they see fit, hon. gentlemen opposite can just as easily appoint ten as one. The same justification will apply. If Sir Leonard Tilley is able to recommend a clergyman, who may be an eloquent man, and send him over to lecture in England, where we have a paid staff and a High Commissioner, and can have paid him \$700 for travelling expenses and \$500 salary, without there being any report as to the work he has done, this thing may be repeated. There should have been, at all events, a statement given of the places where he had lectured and the work he had done for the money paid him. There is also Mr. Odell, with a salary of \$973, and travelling expenses \$223, and Dr. Hahn, who, I understood the Minister to say, is an agent, and Mr. Lukes, who was paid \$600, and travelling expenses \$787. I do not know that Mr. Lukes possesses any particular

qualities that fit him as an immigration agent. He was at one time a Liberal, but he lost confidence in their policy and he gave his confidence to hon. gentlemen opposite, as he had a perfect right to do. But I do not see why that should particularly fit him for special immigration services in the old country, without even making a report. There are thousands of dollars, also, paid for travelling expenses of these gentlemen, none of whom are our recognised agents, and there are no reports from them, so far as I can discover. But if there are any reports in the hon. gentleman's Department, I think he could bring them down before concurrence.

Mr. POPE. If I can find them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And if you cannot, I suppose you will not take concurrence.

Mr. POPE. I will consider that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It is hardly fair to the Minister of Agriculture to say that no results flowed from the visits of this reverend gentleman to Great Britain. My information is, that he enjoyed his trip very much, that he came back improved in health, and weighing some 25 pounds more than when he left.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Where did Mr. Loucks deliver his lectures?

Mr. POPE. In different places in England.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The practical result is that we have paid those two gentlemen between \$2,500 and \$3,000. I have no doubt they both had a pleasant time; but we added them to our regular staff, with the result that we managed to bring 3,000 less immigrants to this country last year than the year before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is Mr. Begg a salaried officer?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He just gives a report at the solicitation of the Minister.

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is also a report from Mr. O'Leary, and a payment of \$170. What is his position?

Mr. POPE. He took that trip to get information himself, and to disseminate it throughout the country. He is a very active man and a very careful writer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I believe he is so, but is he doing that as an agent of some immigration company in the old country, or as a writer?

Mr. POPE. As a writer. I do not think he was sent by any English company.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, as to these men engaged in special work in Great Britain and the continent, such as Mr. Brydges, and others?

Mr. POPE. Mr. Brydges has brought out a great many immigrants. These men are not employed. Mr. Brydges has devoted himself largely to immigration matters, and is a very good man. When he went out Sir Charles Tupper paid him something for his expenses but not otherwise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With regard to the travelling expenses of agents in Europe, I see that according to the Auditor-General's Report, Mr. Dyke is paid \$9,231 for travelling expenses, or about \$30 a day for one man. There must be some explanation of that. The total is \$23,829 for travelling expenses of the different agents.

Mr. POPE. There is a mistake in the Auditor-General's Report. The expenses do not exceed \$4 per day for the actual travelling expenses of the five agents—Dyke, Foy, O'Connor, Grahame, and a German agent. In the Auditor-

General's Report the item is made to appear at \$23,829, instead of \$5,683, as in the Public Accounts. The Auditor-General has included all the expenses of the British agents, besides travelling expenses, but those consist of printing, advertising, rent of halls for lectures, etc.

Mr. DAVIES. If we are misled by the Auditor General's Report, we ought to have some information as to what the travelling expenses of the different agents amount to.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that in the Public Accounts this sum is divided into two items: the travelling expenses are stated at \$5,683, but we ought to know what this special expenditure of the remaining \$17,000 is for. Over \$6,000 of it is charged to Mr. Dyke.

Mr. POPE. Printing, advertising and rent of hall for lectures.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It seems to me printing and details over there are a pretty heavy business.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the vote of \$1,000 of aid to the Montreal Women's Protection Immigration Society?

Mr. POPE. Some ladies in Montreal have established this society for the protection of females who come to this country, and this sum is voted to assist them in their work.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the character of their work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Single, unprotected women, coming to this country, congregate in large numbers in Montreal during the season, and these benevolent ladies have an asylum for them. They protect them from any contamination, and send them westward, if they want to go, to a similar institution in Toronto.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to say a word in confirmation of the remark made by my hon. friend for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), with reference to the results which flow from the appropriation of the sums of money we devote to immigration. That hon. gentleman stated, and I think correctly, that while the thoughts of the people of the country, and the attention of the Government, are largely and naturally directed to the North-West, it appears from the official reports we have from year to year, and from the statements of the Minister in this House, that an important part of the Dominion is entirely neglected and overlooked. An hon. gentleman opposite made some very pertinent remarks on this subject, with reference to the Province of Ontario. In the Maritime Provinces—and I speak particularly for the Province from which I come—there has been for years a startling emigration westward; farmers sell their farms and go westward, some to the North-West, and many, I am sorry to say, leave the country and go to the United States. In Prince Edward Island—and I believe the same is true of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—large numbers of farms are vacant, and a large number of others can be had at very low prices. It is acknowledged by everybody that there is no better field to which an immigrant could turn his steps to make a home for himself than those Provinces. I do not find that any attention is being paid by the Department to the dissemination of information as to the resources of those Provinces at all. Its attention seems to be almost entirely devoted to the North-West. Hundreds of tenant farmers with small capital can find homes ready to their hands in the Maritime Provinces. That class of men are not calculated to go into the wilderness or on the prairie and make homes for themselves. They want to go to a country where they will enjoy the social advantages described by my hon. friend opposite—where they can find churches and settlements, means of education for their children, railroads, and the other appliances and conveniences of civilised life. All these things can be obtained for them in the Maritime Provinces. The

Mr. POPE.

people of their own class who have settled there have become thriving and prosperous. It seems to me the people of those Provinces have a right to complain when they see half a million dollars spent every year for immigration, and no part of it is spent in disseminating information among that class of people whom we all desire to bring to the country. It will continue to be the case for years, that people will be leaving those Provinces and going westward. Their farms are becoming vacant, and we should place these facts before the tenant farmers. Very little expenditure of money would enable the Department to ascertain in each Province and each county just how many farms and the character of the farms to be had. Men who have \$2,000 or \$3,000 capital, immigrating to Canada, can go to no part where they can become more prosperous, if they are farmers, than to the Maritime Provinces. They can buy farms there at half their intrinsic value. There never was a time when farms could be had so cheaply in the Maritime Provinces as to-day. The circumstances of the Maritime Provinces are such that they require the special attention of the Minister, and the same remark applies to Ontario and Quebec, in some measure. While the money of the people in those Provinces is being expended and a large portion of it squandered in immigration, these Provinces do not receive any attention, all the attention being given to the North-West. I do not think it is desirable to ask the large class of immigrants who have not means to go to the older Provinces. They would do much better in the North-West; but, no doubt, in the older Provinces, there is a large field for tenant farmers, and if the facts were brought home to them a large number would settle in these Provinces. These facts will not be brought home to them by sending invalided Ministers, even if they are members of the Cabinet, to England, to lecture in the towns. There is no use going among the artisans in the towns; what has to be done is to go amongst the tenant farmers themselves. No one doubts that a large portion of our expenditure on immigration has been squandered, and that large numbers of those who come out here are mere birds of passage. It is of no use spending money in the endeavor to bring back men who have left this country and gone to the United States. If they want to come back they can do so, but means should be taken to secure a portion of the immigration of tenant farmers. Agents from Australia and New Zealand set forth the advantages of those countries to men having moderate means and possessing knowledge of agriculture, and we should emulate that example. We expend a large amount of money on agents who are not thoroughly qualified for the position, and in printing, and the question comes up, what class of literature are we disseminating. Are we spending money for the printing of the practical kind of information which will induce tenant farmers to come here? I say the literature you are paying enormously for is of a class not calculated to draw tenant farmers to the country at all. Let me show you this national policy book, which was published originally as a mere commercial enterprise, for the advertisement of a number of industries, but those who started the scheme, finding it was not going to pay, fell back on the public Treasury, and were subsidised to the tune of \$5,000 for this commercial undertaking, which should have stood or fallen on its own basis. It was hard to discover what they were paid. I find in the Auditor General's Report \$2,500 charged to immigration and \$2,500 more to Dominion lands for this work. What has the Dominion lands to do with it? This book comprises 176 pages, and has printed in large letters on the cover, "The National Policy of Canada." This is evidently one of the special industries which the National Policy supports. Of the 176 pages, which this book comprises, 50 pages are extracts taken from the Blue Books, and the rest consist of advertisements of private corporations, advertisements of private firms. The work has been illus-

trated. Among the illustrations is a large wood cut of the First Minister on the first page; then we turn over and find a group representing the entire Cabinet. Here is Sir Charles Tupper, and here is Sir Leonard, and here is Sir David Macpherson—some of them are very good photographs and some are very bad—here is the Postmaster General smiling genially at the top of the page, flanked by the Secretary of State, though I should not have known it was the Secretary of State if his name had not been placed under it.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Let us have something else.

Mr. DAVIES. You shall have something else. You have taken \$5,000 out of the Treasury for this, and if you do not want to know how it was spent, you can go home.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. We do not want photographs; we want something sensible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They are the photographs of sensible men, you must know.

Mr. DAVIES. We have the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the gentleman without a portfolio, the Hon. Frank Smith, but while we have their photographs, a great number had to be satisfied with their photographs and nothing more. The First Minister himself is described, and the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works are honored with short extracts from their Blue Books—but nothing is said about the Secretary of State—the intending immigrant would not know that he had a Department at all—he had to be satisfied with his photograph. There is nothing about the Minister of Inland Revenue either, nor about the Minister of Customs—not a word said about his Department, although that had something to do with the National Policy. There is not a word about the Customs duties, and so with the Post Office and the Indian Department, and the Department of Justice. What does the author say? He commences here with a short epitome of the history of Canada, from the year 1876, which covers one page, with a little sneering at the policy of the previous Government, proving that they were incompetents—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, asserting that they were incompetents; and he goes on to show that a new era had dawned upon Canada. He says:

"Many ventured to doubt the practical universality of the doctrine of free trade in those days; they saw that the geographical position of Canada differed so vastly from that of Great Britain that it was well worth considering whether the British fiscal policy was properly administrative in Canada."

I must confess that I have not been able to gauge the exact meaning of that phrase. Then he goes on to say:

"Not only in manufactures has this increased prosperity been promoted by the working of the National Policy, but agriculture has received an impetus as unexpected as grateful."

All from the National Policy. I have heard many silly statements made in this House in regard to the National Policy, but I have heard none so silly as this, contained in a book for which you paid \$5,000, a pamphlet containing a few extracts from the Blue Books, and the only part which has any reference to the resources of Canada is a laudation of the National Policy, and a laudation of the protective policy which these English farmers have been educated from their youth to abhor; and you sent this book home to them, and asked them to come to our country, because we have abandoned free trade and adopted protection. You could not have adopted a better policy to keep them at home, seeing that they had been taught all their lives that free trade is the policy under which a country must prosper, and you tell them, that if they come to Canada they must come to a highly protected country. You are doing your best in this way to prevent immigration instead of assisting

it. He states the amount that has been deposited in the savings banks, and adds: "Almost every dollar of this amount having been banked by the farming classes." That is not a true statement. We have had the opposite statements made. We have heard that the working classes have deposited most of these sums. Now we are told, by this \$5,000 book which you have paid for, that it is all deposited by the farmers. Then he goes on to make some laudatory remarks, too laudatory remarks, in reference to the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I have no doubt he would cheer these remarks if I were to read them. He says he is the author of Canada's prosperity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. He does not tell them that this is a fine country in itself, that you have got valuable lands, that you have got valuable mines and minerals, that it is a grand country for the farmer to live in; he does not tell them what grain or root crops you grow or can grow, or that any farmer has got wealth by following the trade of agriculture, but he says that, if this country has any prosperity, it is not due to anything inherent in the country itself, but to the right hon. gentleman; and what the right hon. gentleman would himself denominate as trash is circulated in England to induce people to come to this country. Then he has a few remarks in reference to the Department of the Interior, and the right hon. gentleman is credited with a wonderful prescience as to the North-West:

"With a careful prudence Sir John set about the work of shaping a policy for the settlement of the North-West, but before it could possibly be carried into effect sickness overtook the Premier—"

I did not know the hon. gentleman was sick—

"and the administration of the Interior was placed in the hands of the Speaker of the Senate, the Hon. D. L. Macpherson, already a member of the Cabinet, but without portfolio, who has continued to act. Certainly into no more competent hands could the work of the Department have been placed. A cool head, a large and practical acquaintance with business, an extensive knowledge of men, both from the older Provinces of the Dominion and from Europe, a clear insight into the working of measures and a keen perception of the requirements of the times were needed, and these were possessed—"

By the hon. gentleman who was appointed Minister of the Interior. The best commentary I can make upon that is to call attention to the facts as they exist, to the results which have flowed from his management of that Department, and to ask if hon. gentlemen think it is right and proper to publish a book at an expense of \$5,000, taken from the tax-payers of the country, to tell the people of England that the Department of the Interior has been so marvellously well managed, in the face of the rebellion there which we are to-day trying to suppress. Then he deals with the Department of Agriculture. He must, of course, say something about the hon. gentleman at the head of that Department, or he would not have got the \$5,000:

"With a keen appreciation of the resources of the Dominion, a patriotic desire to help the work of development, and the steady exercise of extraordinary ability, Mr. Pope has carried on his work to the satisfaction of all who, under any circumstances, could or would be satisfied."

The hon. gentleman may possess extraordinary ability, but, if so, he has an extraordinary ability for hiding it when he comes to give any information to this House, for the attempt to extract any information from him as to his Department, or any other Department, results in failure. Whenever he is asked a question, he keeps his mouth shut as close as an oyster, and we do not know whether his Department is well managed or not. So it goes on. The book does not say much about the Department of Finance. A good deal is said about the gentleman who is now High Commissioner. We are told:

"Long before Confederation Sir Charles (then Mr. Tupper) was well known in his Province of New Brunswick—"

Mark you, from New Brunswick. I did not know that before. His information must be very reliable.

"as a politician and orator. . . . Since then, time has audited his figures and found them correct, and confirmed his statement."

He goes on to describe the prophecies he made about the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, we are told, have since been confirmed by facts. This is in the face of the fact that only last year that gentleman was imported into this country to endeavor to convince the country that it was necessary to advance \$30,000,000 additional from the people's money to do that work.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is not true.

Mr. DAVIES. It is out of order for you to make that statement, in the first place. I am not speaking to you at all.

Mr. WOODWORTH. You are out of order now.

Mr. DAVIES. I say it is out of order for you to interrupt any one in that way.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a question of order, and I ask the hon. member to take his seat. When an hon. member addresses a member of this House in the second person instead of speaking to the Chair, he is clearly out of order.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). That is for the Chairman to say.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I ventured to interpolate the remark that the statement the hon. member was making, namely, that Sir Charles Tupper was imported into this country to give another \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was untrue. That was perfectly in order for me to say, and the hon. member was clearly out of order when he spoke to me in the second person.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman, I hope, has stopped. The hon. gentleman was clearly out of order, and he must have known it; and it does not lie with him or with any other hon. member of this House to tell an hon. member who is speaking that his statement is not true. It is clearly irregular and disorderly, and the hon. gentleman ought to have withdrawn his statement and apologised. I was referring to the fact that the statements in this book are incorrect; and I will repeat what I said, that Sir Charles Tupper was brought out to this country to induce this Parliament to give \$30,000,000 additional to build that road. The statements made in this book, in reference to the Railway Department, are about as true as many of the other statements. Then the author goes to the Department of Public Works. He does not speak so much of the ability of Sir Hector Langevin as he does of his aristocratic descent. He tells us—and I am very glad to hear it; I have no doubt it is quite true—that the hon. gentleman:

"Is descended from one of the old aristocratic French families in the Province of Quebec."

Then there are two or three pages of pictures, showing the Parliament buildings of Canada, but none of the other public buildings of the Dominion at all, except a few around the city of Ottawa. Is that the kind of a pamphlet to print as an emigration document? Then he refers to the Minister of Finance, and he does not do him justice at all. He does not refer to his ability, or enterprise, or any of his qualifications for the position he holds. Then we come to the Department of Militia, and he refers to the Minister of Militia in this manner:

"Mr. Caron is comparatively young for so important a position, but having been born and reared in the political arena, of an ancient and powerful family, plunging, while yet young, into the turmoil of political life, grasping popularity by that *suaviter in modo* and *fortiter in re* which always must command, he could but find an early prominence."

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks this is the kind of literature which will induce people to come to

Mr. DAVIES.

this country—a volume containing photographs of Ministers, of the Parliament buildings, and such like productions. I ask whether the payment of this \$5,000 can fairly be justified. The book is trash of the worst kind, and will do more to prevent people coming to this country than induce them to come. I hope this is the only pamphlet of the kind which the hon. gentleman has paid for, and that it is not a fair sample of the rest. I do not think I can do better than read another extract.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; by reading the book through.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must preserve order.

Mr. DAVIES. Am I to be restrained, and has the hon. gentleman who directly speaks to me to go free?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrogate me in that way.

Mr. DAVIES. I have a right to ask—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You have no right to ask such a question.

Mr. DAVIES. I am perfectly in order. I have a right to ask what the ruling of the Chair is—whether it is reasonable that I, alone, should be called to order, and not another gentleman, who spoke across the floor to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is a rule which you will observe as long as I am in the Chair—and which I will carry out with strict impartiality.

Mr. DAVIES. I will give another extract.

"As the result of this, and the friendly attitude of the Government towards the native Indian tribes, the North-West is absolutely free from turmoil and bloodshed, which so generally mar the frontier life in the western parts of the United States."

The facts of the last few months are the best commentary upon the statements contained in the extract. He winds up by telling the people that at a future time he is going to publish another edition of the work. Whether it will be at the expense of the Dominion he does not say. I hope no more of the public money will be expended in publishing works similar to this, and I call the attention of the House and the country specially to it to-night, in the hope that we will have no more money wasted, as this money has been wasted. I suppose no copies were circulated in Canada?

Mr. POPE. They were not made for here.

Mr. DAVIES. Where did the hon. gentleman circulate the 5,000.

Mr. POPE. Two thousand five hundred were sent to England. I did not suppose they were distributed among intending immigrants, but they were laid on the tables of hotels in different parts of England and Europe. I made this arrangement with a political friend of his own, and he afterwards made an arrangement with Mr. Bray. The pamphlets which I have circulated cost only about 3 cents each, this included among the rest. I think the hon. gentlemen will not find any great fault with the pamphlets, generally, I have distributed.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not know the political friend of mine to whom the hon. gentleman refers. I find in the Public Accounts that for 2,500 copies of a pamphlet on the National Policy Rev. Mr. Bray was paid \$2,500.

Mr. POPE. I made an arrangement with Mr. James Stewart, of Montreal.

Mr. DAVIES. The amount was paid to Rev. Mr. Bray and the Minister got a receipt before he ever delivered a copy of the book to the hon. gentleman. Has the hon. gentleman ever received 5,000 copies?

Mr. POPE. I have received every one I contracted for, 2,500.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope they were circulated all outside of England. If they were sent to Germany and France, being published in a language the people do not generally understand, little harm can be done.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is highly desirable we should endeavor to get a better class of immigrants. A large number of those who now come here are worthless. If they landed in the United States they would be sent back again, as was done with some immigrants this year. We have plenty of room in Ontario for a large number of tenant farmers. The best settlers for the North-West are Canadians, but before we can secure their transfer we have to find tenant farmers who will come and purchase their farms. In our section the price of land has fallen greatly, largely because we do not have farmers come in with capital to buy land. All possible information should be given, so as to secure a desirable class of immigrants. Much money has been spent in securing immigrants who have just passed through the country and gone to the United States. When untruthful statements are published in pamphlets, a feeling of distrust is aroused and harm is done. Tenant farmers should receive more attention than other classes of immigrants. It would be much better to make an effort to bring out this class than the poorer class which have come to our shores during the last few years. I was instructed to secure some harvest hands in Toronto last year. When I brought them and set them to work they were almost useless. They knew little about the work; some had been brought up in workshops and others were sickly. In regard to some of them, we had to pay their passage back to Toronto, and they went to the hospital. Such a class of immigrants is useless. If the poorer class will come we want the hardy, stout, strong young men, prepared to work and possessing physical strength to do so. A large amount of money has been spent on printing for immigration purposes. Much of this has been thrown away, for the purpose of assisting political partisans. In some of the pamphlets there is useful information, but in much of them there is mere trash. I do not think it is wise that these books should be published, unless they are really calculated to do good work, and I dare say that there are thousands of them which are not circulated, simply because they are old, and they may be used to light the fires, or something else. I think it is absurd to send out a book with a photograph of the Ministers as an immigration pamphlet, with the expectation that it will either induce immigrants to come or prevent them from coming. The writer shows an amount of silliness and fulsome adulation which is really deplorable. I know nothing about Mr. A. J. Bray. But the name is familiar. We have heard of the Vicar of Bray and we have heard of a quadruped that brays, but whether he belongs to the one class or the other I do not know, but I think he has exhibited more of the qualities of the animal that brays than anything else. I hope such expenditures as this will be put a stop to. Perhaps the First Minister has too many things to attend to to look into these matters, but somebody should examine these books before they are sent out. I notice that there is a reduction in the vote this year, and I am glad to see it. For instance, I think it is outrageous that we should spend \$30,000 on a lot of men in Canada, for the purpose of receiving immigrants, giving them directions and sending them forward. It may be necessary to have an agent with a fair staff where the steamer arrives, to give information, but to keep permanent agents at London, Ottawa and other places like those, is something I think ought to be considered, with a view of doing away with that system altogether. I hope that next year the Minister will have another reduction of \$150,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice that \$85,000 were paid for the transport of emigrants over the different railways, and \$101,000 by way of assisted passages to the different steamship companies. That is a large amount of money, and the question is, whether we have received value for it, and whether we are likely to receive value for the amounts which we are to spend for the same purpose in future. The hon. gentleman proposes a reduction of \$150,000 for assisting immigrants. Are we to understand from that that we may expect a less immigration than we have been getting hitherto? If so, we are maintaining the staff at as great an expense as ever, for there is no reduction in salaries or contingencies, except in this one item. I think there ought to be a reduction all round. I know that both Governments have followed, in a measure, the course we are now following, and though such an expenditure may perhaps have been fully justified in past years, it does seem to me that the condition and circumstances of the country are such that at present it is a question whether there should not be an entire reduction of the whole matter. I think that perhaps we might take the ground that we might entirely stop all the expenditure we are incurring—at all events, with the exception of those with reference to agricultural laborers and servant girls, for which there may be some justification. We find that those who are competent to speak in this matter, those who are interfered with by the importation of mechanics and laboring classes, have pointed out the evil results which flowed from it. This very week, if I mistake not, according to the published reports of the Trade and Labor Council of the city of Montreal, something like 116 pauper immigrants have come off the steamship *Parisian*. Is that a desirable class of immigrants to receive in our midst? Is it desirable that we should aid in defraying the expense of bringing any of these to our shores? We should be glad to welcome any who come here; but those who are landed in our large cities utterly penniless, especially at certain seasons of the year, are only here to suffer great hardships themselves, and to do us harm, in corresponding with their friends in the old country about their hardships. I find that Sir Charles Tupper himself pointed out this year what is a rather remarkable fact, that the emigration from Ireland has decreased at a wonderful rate—from 12,319 in 1853 to 4,513 in 1884; it had fallen one-third, while the emigration from England was 27,925 in 1833, against 23,434 in 1884, and the emigration from Scotland was 3,871 in 1883, against 3,166 in 1881. As Sir Charles Tupper puts it, the falling off is only 19 per cent., taking the English and Scotch emigration together. Not many years ago it was pointed out in very glowing terms here that we had great schemes on foot for, and great results were expected from, a greatly increased immigration from Ireland to our shores. But all that has apparently failed. I turned to see if I could find any explanation of that from the reports of our agents in Ireland—to see if they were less assiduous than our agents in other countries. Our agent in Dublin, Mr. Foy, lays stress on the number who have come out, and finds his justification for the less appreciable results of his work, in the fact that he made it a point to discourage any except those who were likely to do well and those who were in good circumstances. He says:

"Mechanics I did not use any exertion to send, as I feared that they might not improve their position sufficiently to send home encouraging letters."

He did a sensible thing in doing so, because these men must either displace our own mechanics, or become a burden on the country. He says, further:

"As respectable, industrious emigrants, by their letters, do incalculable benefit, equally powerful for evil are the reports of the lazy, drunken ne'er-do-wells, who expect to be fed without working."

There is no doubt that is perfectly correct. No better information can be sent abroad about the country than a

letter sent home, and letters going home from those who are not doing well, in which they denounce the country and point out the hardship they endure, will do, as Mr. Foy points out, incalculable evil. He says :

"I did not act as if my business was to be done in one year or two, and gather up all sorts from lanes and alleys in cities. I went to the country, and where I knew, through information from my relatives and many personal friends, that there were some families, or even one family, of really industrious, honest, respectable character, thinking of emigrating, I remained in that neighborhood until I succeeded in sending them to Canada. I knew when I sent them that their letters would be powerful in causing others to follow them. \* \* \* I have gone into this part of my report more fully than I intended, but I consider it mere justice to myself and my *confères* to explain that the unsuitable emigrants are not sent by us; that, as conscientious public servants, having the permanent good of the country that employs us as our paramount consideration, we do not burden her with emigrants to be a tax on the several national charitable societies."

These are sensible words, and Mr. Foy uses them as a vindication of himself for not having accomplished so much in the way of numbers. I agree with him; but by a parity of reasoning it is an adverse commentary on the work done by our other agents in the country who have been more successful than he in sending emigrants to Canada. We have had these pauper immigrants in our midst, mechanics brought out by the expenditure of the money of Canadian mechanics, to compete with them and drive them from their employment. That should be put an entire stop to. The hon. the Minister said he intended to do it, but I am afraid the work is going on still. I would ask him, by whose agency these people who have just landed by the *Parisian* have come? If they are in the position reported, they will have to be transported to all portions of the country. If farm laborers, they will find work to do; but I fear they are not of that class, and that they will go to swell the unemployed in our cities. The expenditure of \$300,000 this year, and \$450,000 last year, towards assisting immigration, and having no more to show than we have for it, is a serious question, and it is high time we should see if we cannot make an entire change. We were led to believe, I believe, we have a country so good in itself that we might fairly leave it to those who desire to better their condition to come out here on representations, fairly and honestly made to them, rather than bring out large classes whose conditions and circumstances are such that they cannot hope to enter on the race of life with fair prospects of success, and who, having to endure privations and hardships, will send letters home that will have serious effects in discrediting this country as a field for immigration. With reference to the North-West, we were led to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway would relieve us of the expenditure, as far as peopling the plains was concerned, but so far we have no evidence of any work having been done by them in this respect. I moved, last year, for a report of the money expended by them on immigration, but found there was no report of their having expended a single dollar on the work. I believe it is very desirable that we should induce tenant farmers to come out and settle here. We should call their attention to the fact that in the older Provinces they could take up farms and have all the comfort and enjoyments of the old country, if they do not care to engage in the pioneer work of the west. But these people do not need assistance; they have means of their own; they can buy farms of their in the older Provinces. On the other hand, the money which is now devoted to assisting immigration is being expended in assisting immigrants to come to our shores, who find themselves handicapped when they reach here, and who consequently have at the outset to encounter considerable difficulty and hardship. The reports of these men more than counterbalance any advantage gained by the efforts of our agents under the present system; whereas, if the proper class of people were brought out their reports home, which could not fail

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

to be satisfactory, would encourage a large and valuable class of immigration to Canada. I would like the hon. the Minister to answer the question as to whether he anticipates that a reduction of the amount by \$150,000 for the assistance of immigration will result in our having a less number of immigrants this year, and if so, what justification there is for maintaining a full staff, at full cost, to establish less work?

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad the item has been reduced by \$150,000, because I believe in the past a great deal of money had been wasted in this way. No doubt, some of the expenditure has done good; no doubt, all the pamphlets and information distributed by the Department are not of the class alluded to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I have seen some pamphlets which are valuable, and which contain information intending settlers would be glad to have; but I am sorry to say many of those pamphlets do not reach the hands of the people for whom they are intended. Reports have been frequently circulated, not by people concerned in the politics of the country, but by people interested in the matter, that very large amounts of this pamphlet literature are really lying in the various agencies, and have never been distributed at all.

Mr. POPE. You do not know anything about it.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps I do not, as the hon. gentleman chooses to tell me; but I have the information from gentlemen who are ardent supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. I had the information from one gentleman in particular, who has himself seen these books in the agencies in England. The question arises, what amount of good has been accomplished by means of this literature? Last year the Department of Agriculture spent as much upon this item as the year before, and I believe they profess to have distributed just as much of the literature as in the previous year, and yet the immigration fell off to an alarming extent, and having heard the Minister of Agriculture state that this literature has been working satisfactorily and accomplishing what it was intended to accomplish, I do not see why there should be this falling off. The hon. gentleman is chary of giving information. Perhaps he thinks it is not worth while at this period of the Session and at this late hour, to discuss the matter at all. I see in the report of the Montreal immigration agent some statements as to the points to which 805 persons have been distributed in the year 1884. He does not state who these people are exactly, but I presume, from other portions of his report, that they are the 805 indigent immigrants who came to that agency. I find that 58 of these are reported to have gone to my own county. It is not pretended that these are all the immigrants who went to that county, but I have compared that statement with some of my friends', who know that county well, and I have come to the conclusion that, while I do not deny that that number may have gone to that county, a very large number have, unfortunately, not stayed there. A large number of these men were men who pretended to be farm hands, and went for the purpose of working on farms; but after they had been there a few days, it was found that they were totally unacquainted with farm work, and had probably done nothing in their lives but handle pick and shovel, and, in other words, were navvies. Consequently, they went back to Montreal and tried to find other work. The Minister has stated that for a long time he has not assisted any but agricultural laborers. Of course the officers of the Department may have been deceived; but the information upon which these men have been assisted must have been very inadequate. The Minister of Agriculture acknowledged that a good many people were going back to England, and he gave, as a reason, that they were navvies who have been at work on our railroads, but many of these people had been assisted to come here and I have heard him say frequently that one of the great advan-

tages of our railway construction in this country was the establishment here of a number of men who would work on the railway construction and afterwards would settle in the country. A little while ago the Minister answered a question put by me as to the Finlanders, and I find by the Ottawa immigration agency report, that of 2,487 souls temporarily relieved, no less than 420 were Fins. The Minister intimated that these Fins were able to get along without any help, but I find that 420 of them were assisted, and were sent to Renfrew and to the district of Algoma, and other places along the Canadian Pacific Railway construction, and I have information that they were brought free to Ottawa and sent on by the Government, so that the contractors upon the Canadian Pacific Railway might be supplied with their labor. The Ottawa agent says:

"I have great pleasure in referring to the satisfactory foreign element that has passed through my hands this year, especially Finlanders and Scandinavians. These men are always in demand by contractors, and are preferred by them above all others. The number of this class has this year increased from 265—the pioneers of their countrymen—to 664."

The agent does not say that these men have been placed upon farms, or have proved satisfactory as farm laborers, but that they have proved satisfactory as contract laborers upon the railways. I think we may infer from that that these men are really navvies, and not farm laborers; but they were assisted by this Government. There always was and still is in this country a great lack of farm laborers, and I am willing to support anything that can be done to induce them to come to this country; but I do not believe it is the legitimate work of the Department to bring navvies here instead of those farm laborers. I alluded last Session to the Forestry Exhibition as a means of attracting immigrants, and I urged upon the Government that Canada should be properly represented at that exhibition. I find, in the report of Mr. Gray, agent in Scotland, these words:

"On several occasions I attended the Forestry Exhibition in Edinburgh, and found that the New Brunswick exhibit attracted a great deal of attention. Mr. Jack, who had charge of it, took great pains in imparting information to all those taking an interest in matters pertaining to forestry, as well as to those who wished to become acquainted with the leading features of the Maritime Provinces generally. I think a great opportunity was lost here in not having all the various Provinces of the Dominion properly represented. There can be no doubt that a great deal of good was done to Canada through the New Brunswick exhibit, and I took occasion, at this exhibition, as on all similar occasions, to have a large quantity of our printed matter distributed."

Here is a direct corroboration of the position I took last Session on this subject. The hon. Minister has said that he intends to reduce the expenditure this year by \$150,000. Would he tell us in what particulars he proposes to make that reduction?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I find we paid a commission on children coming to Canada of \$2 a piece, or \$1,516. What arrangement has the Department made in bringing out children, and how far is it the intention of the Department to encourage that? I find that the matter has been taken up by the Trade and Labor Council of Toronto, who have pronounced against it. They give their opinion that there are more orphan children now in Canada than are properly cared for. I see Sir Charles Tupper has stated, at a public meeting in London, that there is room for 100,000 of such children.

Mr. POPE. These children are brought out to this country by charitable people, and it is a good class of immigration. I do assist them to the extent of \$2 a head, and I intend to do it in the future. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), I may say that the amount of money that was paid this last year, \$59,448, for passages, was for passages of the year before. I think I can save that very well. For printing there was \$15,000 paid this last year of the year before, because we were short of money. We shall save, also, for inland passages, some-

thing like \$50,000 this year. That is the position in which we stand now. I do not expect quite as much immigration this year, on account of what has happened in the North-West. The hon. gentleman wants to know what I propose to do, and how I propose to keep up this staff. I propose to treat it as any business man would treat anything. We have taken hold of this work; we have got our agents on the other side, and I have no doubt that after this year we shall find as large an immigration as we have had hitherto, and I intend to work these men. Our publications will be as numerous and our work will be just as heavy. I propose to keep our organisations, and to bring out immigrants, as we have been doing hitherto. I may say to every hon. member that I will bring out farm laborers. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that we do not want farm laborers. There never was a time when we supplied the demand for farm laborers, and we are not doing it to-day. I intend to bring them to this country. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should only bring out men of large means, men who were born with silver spoons in their mouths, men who will come with capital to buy farms. Almost two-thirds of the men of Ontario came to this country without means and worked out their living. I expect hereafter that we shall find that the leading men were those who came here without a shilling. They knew how to work, and they worked out their living. There are many such men in this House to-day, and they are those who have brought this country up to its present position. Hon. gentlemen opposite may sneer at the men who have come to this country and talk about labor unions. Are we going to adopt a policy because the labor unions, whose views I am always glad to consider, say so? No; ours will be a better and a broader policy, one which I believe the country requires. Although there may be in Toronto and Montreal some labor unions, I am satisfied to appeal to the common sense of the farmers who want laborers, who will not believe in the nonsense of pandering to a set of men in the towns. I appeal to the farmers who want laborers and to those who came to this country without a farthing, and I ask them whether they do not want agriculturists to settle here. The interests of industrial labor and agriculture are one—and I respect each in its proper sphere—but hon. gentlemen opposite know very well, when they talk about the men who have built up the country and hewed down the woods and settled the land, that they were such men as we have brought here. They say our immigration policy has failed, and that we did not get as many last year. How many did we get last year? We got 103,000. If only one-half of those were good for anything, or if there were only 50,000 worth anything—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where are they?

Mr. POPE. Do you suppose that I can tell you where every one is and call him by name. It is frivolous nonsense to talk thus. I say those men came here, 103,000 of them; and if only one half were good settlers they were worth \$25,000,000 to this country. They were worth at least \$500 each, while on the other side of the line each immigrant is valued at \$1,000. So I say the money was not entirely lost. Suppose only one-fourth of them proved good settlers, and we threw out the other three-quarters, then they cost no more than the immigrants brought out by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in office. You may talk all kinds of theory, but let us see what has been the result of the operations. I find in 1875 our immigrants to cost us \$10.85 per head; 1876, \$11.12; 1877, \$6.78; 1878, \$6.23; 1879, \$4.35; 1880, \$4.71; 1881, 4.30; 1883, \$3.08; 1884, \$4.15. So in our time, in the very last year, although a considerable portion of that sum was paid for work done the year before, even if three-quarters of the immigrants proved worthless, yet the one-quarter of the number left did not cost us more than the immigrants brought out by the

late Government. So it has been a success, and I do not propose to reduce our agencies. I propose that every man shall do his work and do it well; and I believe if there is any one thing that is important to the country, that is going to build up and make a country for us, it is bringing people here and settling up our waste land. As far as I can, I will bring tenant farmers and men with means, but I do not propose to confine myself to those men. I intend to bring out agricultural laborers, and while the people in cities and towns may be led to imagine that they will compete for work and be afraid that they are going to take away their employment, the farmers and the common sense of the country must tell us that what I am doing is the right thing for the whole country, and I am perfectly certain they will support the course we are pursuing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the farmers will not feel very particularly pleased if the hon. gentleman brings out a certain number of mechanics. That is the class to which I was devoting my remarks. I did not say we should not bring out farm laborers. The hon. gentleman has brought out mechanics, and he says he intends to do so. He says he will pursue the same policy in the future.

Mr. POPE. I have told the hon. gentleman several times that last autumn I had put a stop, so far as I could, to that immigration, and I had advertised that no mechanics or navvies should be brought into the country by assistance or advice from my Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he would not be put aside by any trade or labor union, but that he would pursue the same policy in the future as he had in the past.

Mr. POPE. In bringing to this country that class of immigrants which the country required, that is agricultural laborers, and that I had stopped, so far as I could, bringing those not required, that is mechanics and artisans.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). *Hansard* will prove that the hon. gentleman in effect said he did not care what the trades and labor council represents, he would go on and bring them in. With respect to the item of \$124,000, the Minister has told us that it is a reduced estimate, because last year he asked for more because they wanted to close up the previous year's operations, on which there was a deficiency. When the hon. gentleman makes his *per capita* calculation on the cost of immigration to this country, he makes it on a basis of \$24,000 less than was paid.

Mr. POPE. That was last year. If it had been larger it would have been so much less than this year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But how much in that year?

Mr. POPE. About \$4.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will not enter into a discussion of this question, but he knows that we deny that on this side, and that these figures cannot be demonstrated. His own census shows that we have only 16 per cent. increase in Canada, while the natural increase alone should be 20 per cent.

Mr. HICKEY. Hon. gentlemen have said a great deal about mechanics, but I say that they make the best settlers we can have, for they not only work at their trades, but they make good farmers, and they are splendid laborers. Many of them are good farmers throughout the country, when they are not working at their trades. I do not think they ought to be despised or disparaged.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No one despises them, but we say that the money of Canada should not be expended to pay their assisted passages here.

Mr. POPE.

Mr. HICKEY. Why are you against them more than anybody else?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Because there is no employment for them.

Mr. HICKEY. There is.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There may be at odd times, but the reports from every city show that there is not in the winter months.

Mr. CURRAN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing a question which has been disposed of by the Minister, who says there are no assisted passages to-day.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister will not venture to say that no laborers have come to this country on assisted passages, other than farm laborers, since the orders have been given. They may have come in spite of his orders, but if they are a desirable class, why discriminate?

Mr. HICKEY. I say we should not discriminate.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the Minister is pursuing a wrong policy, according to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. After the Minister's explanation, there still remains \$25,000 of the vote which he has not attempted to account for, and he repeats the statement that he expects as large an immigration as before.

Mr. POPE. No; I did not say so.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite the contrary.

Mr. DAVIES. Then I misunderstood him. Does he account for the other \$25,000 by estimating for increased immigration. Am I right?

Mr. POPE. I did not say anything about it.

Mr. DAVIES. The Minister of Customs contradicted me, and told me I was wrong.

Mr. BOWELL. What the Minister of Agriculture said, and if he said it once he said it twenty times, was, that he did not expect as large an immigration this year as last year or the year before, and yet the hon. gentleman has repeated two or three times that the Minister of Agriculture expected as large an immigration.

Mr. DAVIES. I say he bases his estimates on as large an immigration. The hon. Minister will not state why he makes the vote this much less—he cannot, or he will not. If it is not on the ground of a lesser immigration, I suppose we may expect to discuss it at some length on concurrence.

Mr. POPE. If I do not use it, it will not be used; but I intend to take the same vote.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not the same vote; it is \$150,000 less. The hon. gentleman knows that he can explain it in a few minutes, and if he does not, I suppose there will be a long controversy on concurrence, and time wasted, in connection with the information which he is now trying to withhold from the House. We have a right to some information from the Department, and we have got very little to-night. The hon. gentleman threw a sneer across the House about some remarks I made in support of the hon. member for South Huron. Those remarks were not offered in a party sense, but I wished the Minister to recognise that there are other portions of this Dominion than the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. He ought to know that the classes of immigrants whose expenses he is defraying to this country are not the classes suited to the Maritime Provinces, and that there is

room there for a large class of tenant farmers that he sneers at, as men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths. Such language is uncalled for and indefensible. I call attention to the fact that there was a demand for a large class of small farmers. He says he does not intend to try to encourage that class of immigration. He sneered at it; he spoke of men coming to this country without a cent in their pocket and becoming millionaires. These men we all admire. But the time they came was suitable for them; but the country is not so suitable for them now.

Mr. POPE. Never so good.

Mr. DAVIES. He will not get any one from the Maritime Provinces to tell him that that class is desirable. But I think he should try to point out the advantages the older Provinces offer to tenant farmers with small capital. I suppose he does not care for them.

Mr. HICKEY. Write a pamphlet.

Mr. DAVIES. We are making statements which are just as good as pamphlets. I want no better pamphlet than the speech of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow), who spoke as I do.

Mr. McNEILL. The Minister said he wished to get them. The *Hansard* will show that he did.

Mr. DAVIES. He did not want that class at all. His great desire was to get those who had not anything; but there are many parts of the Dominion which are not suitable for them, and when he is spending so much money we had better have some information to put before the tenant farmers to induce them to come here, instead of going to Australia.

Mr. HESSON. One would suppose, from what the hon. gentleman has said, that it would be possible to prevent the desirable class the hon. gentleman refers to from coming here. What course does he want the Minister to pursue? Those agriculturists have the same information regarding this country as other classes. The hon. gentleman said the Minister was going to prevent men born with silver spoons in their mouths from coming to this country. The way is open to them also. It is true the Minister does not assist that class; but surely they are as able to pay their way as others who seek new homes for themselves in this country. I think my hon. friend asks a very unreasonable thing from the Minister when he asks him to point out absolutely every dollar of the expenditure which he will make out of this vote of \$300,000. It is impossible for the Minister to give the exact number of immigrants, within 100, 1,000 or 5,000, who will take advantage of the assisted passages. It is as well to vote a large enough amount, and if it is not used to assist that large and desirable class, we shall still have the money.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has not conceived the question aright at all. The Minister is not asking for a greater vote, and there is no exception taken to the vote. He is asking a less vote, and what he has asked was, whether he expected a less result, and if so, whether a smaller staff would be maintained. In this amount of \$330,000 there are some \$81,000 for printing. The hon. gentleman knows that that is a subject that ought to be dealt with thoroughly to-night. It may be right for an office in Prescott to get \$6,000.

Mr. BOWELL. It was fully investigated. Every item of the expenditure for printing was explained in another place, and vouchers and pamphlets were piled on the Table.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was not a member of that other place.

Mr. BOWELL. You read the newspaper.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Apart from that, I want to ask the Minister if he proposes that part of the reduction shall be made in the cost of printing?

Mr. POPE. No; I do not propose that there should be any reduction in giving information. I desire to give all the information I can, and as cheaply as I can; but I do not profess to know anything at all about printing. What I do is this: A pamphlet is to be printed, and the Queen's Printer fixes the prices that should be paid for it, under the present tariff of the Ontario Government. I do not think my hon. friend would ask me, while I am trying to enlarge the field from which we shall draw immigrants, to abridge at all the information I am giving.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this all pamphlet work?

Mr. POPE. Yes. With regard to Prescott, it was the only place we had to get German printing done at; I do not know the man who did the work.

Quarantine..... \$60,966

Mr. LANGEЛИER. I see an item, \$16,000 for medical inspection. Last year a certain number of immigrants attacked with measles and small pox were landed at Lévis, crossed over in the ordinary ferry boats to Quebec, and were brought in ordinary vehicles to the marine hospital. Owing to this want of the most ordinary precautions, the city ran great risk of being attacked by this contagious disease, and, as it was, one of the children of the hospital physicians died from the contagion. No real quarantine took place, as the immigrants came in steamers, which do not stop in quarantine. I would like to know what steps the hon. gentleman has taken to prevent a similar occurrence next year.

Mr. POPE. The steamers this year will all have to stop at quarantine, and if they have any sick on board they will have to remain at Grosse Isle. I made this arrangement, as I thought too much risk was run in allowing the steamers to come through to Quebec without being examined at Grosse Isle. There is an increase of \$10,000 in the item of public health. This is taken as a precautionary measure, in case we should be visited by cholera or other infectious disease. I hope I will not have to use it all, though probably I will have to use some of it, as there will have to be more expenditure in every port, whether it be a quarantine station or not, in the event of the advent of cholera. If not a quarantine station, the Custom house officer is a quarantine officer, and all vessels will have to be inspected.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2:40 a.m., Thursday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CARON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) to amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883. He said: The Bill is to take authority to increase the permanent corps. Under the Consolidated Militia Act of 1883, the limit fixed to the permanent corps, so far as numbers

are concerned, was 750. This Act takes authority to increase the force from 750 to 1,000 men. It is for the purpose of providing one school of infantry at London, and one school at Winnipeg—one-half mounted infantry and the other half the ordinary infantry corps. It has been considered necessary, in consequence of the recent events which have taken place, to supplement the organisation of the permanent corps by increasing the number of men from 750 to 1,000.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE STATISTICS.

Mr. ROYAL (for Mr. TASSÉ) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reorganise the system of statistics and to publish each year a volume containing a statistical summary in relation to the working of the several branches of the public service?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that this matter is receiving the special attention of the Department of Agriculture and Statistics, in order to see whether the suggestion made in this question should not be carried into effect.

#### COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH JAMAICA.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Whether the Government have had any communication from the delegates of the Island of Jamaica now visiting the Dominion, and if so, whether they can state the nature of the same? Whether there is any prospect of any basis for a commercial treaty between the two colonies being agreed upon before the departure of said delegates from this country?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has received a communication from the delegates from the Island of Jamaica now visiting the Dominion. The correspondence is now going on, and we cannot just now state the nature of the same, nor what may be the result of those communications.

#### DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTH-WEST—ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS.

Mr. ROYAL (for Mr. Ross) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish assistance to those settlers in the North-West whose houses have been destroyed, or who have been unable to put in crops during the present year in consequence of the rebellion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That subject is engaging the earnest attention of the Government.

#### EQUIPMENT OF THE 90TH BATTALION.

Mr. ROYAL (for Mr. Ross) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to compensate the members of the 90th Battalion for the expenditure incurred by them for clothing and equipment necessary to enable them to proceed to the front and which owing to the emergency of the service could not be obtained from militia stores in the usual way?

Mr. CARON. It is the intention of the Government to compensate the 90th for any legitimate and necessary expense incurred for clothing and equipment of the battalion, as was done in the case of every other battalion.

#### DOMINION LANDS SALES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What sum has been received up to date on account of sales of Dominion lands, for fiscal year 1884-85? What sum has been expended up to date and charged to capital account for  
Mr. CARON.

surveys of lands in the North-West, during the present fiscal year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That statement is not quite ready but it will be brought down soon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might explain that what I want is such information as you have in the Government books. The hon. the Minister will understand, of course, that there may be payments not yet received or notified at Ottawa. I only want what the books show.

Question allowed to stand.

#### DISPUTED BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to invite Parliament this Session to ask for Imperial legislation to give effect to the report of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, of the 22nd of July last, in reference to the disputed boundaries of Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government will be able to answer that question next month, or rather, next week.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to make an explanation which is due to the officers of the House and which it affords me great pleasure to make. A day or two ago, I called the attention of the House to the fact, as I supposed, that a question which I had put on the Votes and Proceedings had not been put on the Order Paper. I was misled. In looking at the *Debates* of Tuesday, I saw that a question was asked by Mr. Trow in reference to savings banks deposits and was answered, which I had before put on the paper and had withdrawn. As I had only one question to put upon the Order Paper I supposed this was the one, and the question I referred to was answered on the following day by the Acting Minister of Finance. I beg to retract all I said or any insinuation I may have made at that time with respect to a dereliction of duty on the part of the officials of the House. The Government was not only kind enough to answer the question once but to put on for me again a question that was previously answered. All the notices I have given have been regularly placed upon the Order Paper and answered.

#### ENQUIRY FOR A RETURN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to enquire from the Minister of Customs what about those savings banks returns. Generally the Minister of Customs is punctual, I am bound to admit, in redeeming his promises, but I have received promises from him which are considerably overdue about these savings banks returns.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very sorry I am not able to fulfil the promise I made the other day. I remember distinctly saying that if I could not get them complete I would give them to him in part. I may frankly state that I wrote a note to the Finance Department to have them prepared, and since that time I have forgotten all about it. I will see to it again.

#### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 131) further to amend "An Act for the better preservation of the peace in the vicinity of public works" and the Acts in amendment thereof.—(Mr. Caron.)

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 147) to authorise the grant of certain

subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned, said: At a previous stage of this Bill the leader of the Opposition reminded me that I had promised to add an amendment in order to state that these grants were to be made by the Government in accordance with the Orders in Council that had been passed relating to each of them. In Committee of the Whole I intend to move in amendment to add the following words to the 5th clause:—

And each of them, may be so made in aid of the construction of the said railways respectively, in the proportions and upon the conditions fixed by the Orders in Council made in respect thereof, each of the said enterprises being respectively subject to any modifications thereof which may hereafter be made by the Governor in Council; and except as to such conditions, the said grants.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 5.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the amendment above cited.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposal of the hon. gentleman is objectionable in this respect, that it proposes to neutralise all the other additions of the Order in Council at the will of the Government. I understood from the Government that they would ask Parliament to sanction the grants of these lands to these companies under conditions which had been finally settled.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amendment is necessary to give that power, because the object of Parliament in sanctioning these grants of land subsidies to these companies is that these railways may be built. We wish to avoid any obstacle being put in the way of these companies building these railways, therefore if, under the conditions of these Orders in Council any modification was required in order to facilitate the building of a railway, without, of course, going against an Act of Parliament, I think the Governor in Council should have the power to make that modification. The fact is some modification may be required at the last moment when they might be just on the eve of obtaining money to build the railway under this subsidy; and I think it would be regrettable if we were then to delay the company and say to them, when they came to us: No, the Act is positive, you must build exactly according to the Orders in Council, and not go beyond them, and we cannot modify them in any way—though it might be in the same sense as Parliament would wish it to be done. We must always keep in view that Parliament wishes these railways to be built and has set aside this quantity of land for that purpose. In that view I think the Governor in Council should have authority to modify these Orders.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to debate the question, but at the proper stage I shall offer an amendment to the hon. gentleman's proposal.

Bill reported with amendments.

Amendment read the first and second time.

#### THE NORTH-WEST TROUBLES.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 129) for granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,700,000 required for defraying certain expenses now being incurred in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give the House further information as to how the money has been expended.

Mr. CARON. When the matter was brought before the House by my hon. friend and colleague the Acting Minister of Finance, I was not in the House; but afterwards, from

my seat, I stated I would give to the House all the information it was possible to obtain in view of the difficulties which every hon. member will understand to exist, in procuring vouchers from distant districts, and it was impossible for me at that time to give the information which I now propose to submit to the House:

“Expenditure on account of North-West militia service, up to the 23rd June, 1885:

Pay and subsistence.....	\$249,491 54
Clothing, stores and necessaries.....	61,244 34
Arms and ammunition.....	50,433 40
Telegraph construction.....	23,094 44
Sums paid to the Hudson Bay Company.....	98,000 00

Total expenditure.....\$1,644,263 43

“Pay and subsistence include pay of officers and men. Supplies and subsistence of men—forage for horses and other incidental expenses, including field equipment.

“Clothing and necessaries include payments for blankets, water-proof sheets, woollen under-clothing, shirts, socks, boots, mitts, winter caps, mufflers, etc., etc.

“Arms and ammunition include payments for Gatling guns, revolvers and ammunition.

“Telegraph construction, payments for building telegraph lines.

“Payments to Hudson Bay Company, etc for supplies and transport service between Qu'Appelle and Clark's Crossing, Swift Current and Battleford, Moose Jaw and the Elbow of the Saskatchewan, Calgary and Edmonton, and other points in the Territories.”

The vouchers have been carefully examined by the principal supply officer of the militia, Lieutenant-Colonel Jackson, who is in charge at Winnipeg, and after examining them he reported they were perfectly satisfactory. Since the vouchers have been handed over to the Department here they have been audited by Mr. O'Meara, chief accountant of the Department, and they are reported to be perfectly accurate with the vouchers received. There is a second statement which I have been enabled to have prepared for the information of the House quite lately. It is as follows:—

#### “MILITIA ON ACTIVE SERVICE, NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

“Statement relative to the Hudson's Bay Company account with the Department of Militia and Defence.

The amount paid to the Hudson's Bay Company by the Department of Militia and Defence for supplies and transport furnished the militia field forces in the North-West Territories up to 8th May, 1885 was.....	\$460,000 00
The accounts rendered by the Hudson's Bay Company show an expenditure up to 9th May, 1885, as follows:—	
Expenditure as per statement with vouchers.....	297,531 48
Expenditure as per statement, vouchers not yet rendered.....	193,592 55
	\$491,124 03

“The whole of this expenditure is for the general supplies required for an army in the field, viz: For bread, meat, flour, bacon, forage, blankets, tents, horses, saddlery, arms, ammunition, transport, &c.”

Mr. BLAKE. While I think my hon. friend was right in asking the Minister of Militia to make some statement, a request which the Minister has complied with, I think it is too early a period to enter into an examination of the accounts or to criticise or to scrutinise them. Therefore, subject to a question or two on concurrence, upon which I think the Minister can furnish some information, I do not for my part propose to enter into any analysis of the statement he has made.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the arrangement made in the fall of 1883, and continued afterwards, arranged that as part of the security for an

advance, agreed that the money received for postal and transport service should be paid into the hands of the Receiver-General. I suppose this has been done; and I have reason to believe that the money for postal and transport services was paid into the hands of the Receiver-General until a comparatively recent period; but I desire to know whether any change has been made in that arrangement, and whether any arrangement is now in force by which sums which ought to have been placed in the hands of the Receiver-General have been transferred to the credit of the railway company and are included, so far as they apply to this service, in any recent financial arrangement made with the company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand it, the arrangement is strictly carried out; that the amount earned from the carriage of mails and other transport from the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is to be applied to the credit of the company according to the arrangement under their charter. A large sum of money has been expended by that company in furnishing transport, carriages, teams, and other means of transport across the unconnected portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and large supplies have been furnished, food, etc., for the subsistence of the troops going west. Of course, that is an unexpected war expense, which the company were in no way obliged to undertake. They collected teams, they took them from their own work, and they furnished to the troops food and supplies of every kind, in order to push them rapidly westward. An explanation has been made with respect to that exceptional service. With respect to that exceptional service the Government have paid and are prepared to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the expenses which have been incurred in those particulars. For the regular transport contemplated by the contract, the transport of the mails, is originally paid to them and carried to the credit of the company.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the exceptional arrangements in connection with the war service, or is it limited to the expenses incurred by the company in supplying teams and subsistence to get the men across the gaps, or to the expenses of the railway in carrying the men over the track?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it does not at all apply to that.

Mr. BLAKE. As these expenses were incurred at a comparatively early period, perhaps the hon. gentleman would give us an idea of the amount.

Mr. CARON. We have not been able to get a complete statement yet, because several of the sub-contractors had to use their teams, and so on, and had not been able to hand in their accounts to the company. A great deal of delay has occurred in consequence of the fact that these sub-contractors had to get most of their rations and supplies from a great distance from Toronto and Montreal. Accounts were thus delayed for thirty days or perhaps more for these exceptional expenditures, and as they are just coming in, the company cannot render a complete account to us. I can tell the hon. gentleman, however, that I believe that the amount of \$500,000 is much short of what that service will be. The whole expenditure for commissariat service, I may say, was furnished by the company, and from the excellent management of the different gentlemen who had sub-contracts on the line, we were able to expedite the forwarding of the troops without any possible delay, while if we had had to send our own supplies there would have been considerable delay.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will understand that I am neither condemning nor approving, but only asking for such information as he can render, without criticising

Mr. BLAKE.

the lack of information. I think that would be premature, but I thought that the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, having regard to the arrangement which had been made, demanded just that much enquiry. I think it would be premature even to criticise the statement of the First Minister on that subject. I suppose we will have the facts before us next Session, and I am quite prepared to delay dealing with them till then. There is another matter to which the hon. gentleman referred; he mentioned \$50,000 for arms and ammunition, and he said that included gatling guns, etc. I would ask him if it deals with a very large order of Martini-Henrys which was mentioned in the newspapers. I know nothing of it except from the newspapers, but I think they said that there were 10,000 stands. Were these embraced in that amount?

Mr. CARON. No. I may say that 10,000 stands were ordered, as I was authorised by Order in Council to order that quantity of arms. The bill was only returned to us by the last mail. In framing the Bill, asking for the credit which we did ask for, we could not provide for that expense, because we did not know exactly what the amount would be, as the prices vary from time to time, and the account was not rendered to us. This amount merely provides for the two gatling guns which were ordered, the ammunition and the harness required to make them complete so far as equipment goes, and also some revolvers and ammunition for them.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman state the amount of the account for the Martini-Henrys?

Mr. CARON. I can give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow, but I would not like to name the figure from memory.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is not unreasonable to ask on this occasion, as we are making provision for this amount, whether the hon. gentleman is able to give a further statement confirmatory or otherwise of the necessarily conjectural approximate estimate which the Minister of Customs gave when asking for this amount. That estimate was about \$4,000,000, including a very definite sum for indemnities of various kinds. I do not ask him for an estimate of the indemnities, I think it would be an unreasonable thing to ask, and perhaps prejudicial to the public interest, particularly upon that subject. Nor do I enquire with reference to the proposed grants which may be brought down as to any special indemnities for volunteers. I put all those to one side as they will form the subject of policy which no doubt we will hear of later on, and they may therefore be eliminated from my question. Omitting those questions, what is the hon. gentleman's present estimate of the cost of the war?

Mr. CARON. I have already pointed out to the hon. gentleman that, until we get the accounts, it is really impossible to form an estimate. I will mention one circumstance which will illustrate the difficulties that the Department has to contend with in framing anything approaching a definite amount to cover expenses in connection with troubles in the North-West. General Strange had, so to speak, an independent command in command of one column, and for weeks and weeks was without communication with the other portions of the forces in so far as regards sending in vouchers or accounts for expenses, which he is every day incurring; and up to the present time he has not yet been able to give the Department an idea of what his expenses are, from the simple fact that after incurring some portions of the expense he went off following Big Bear, and is now in the wilderness, I do not know how far from Fort Pitt. He has not been able to sign any of those vouchers which would authorise the Department to pay anything. Though I am very anxious personally, having the responsibility of the management of

the expenses, to get relieved of that responsibility as soon as possible, I am not really in a position to give definite information, and any information I could give would be perfectly useless because it would be unreliable, because I have not myself the accounts which would enable me to give the information.

Mr. BLAKE. We see occasional statements in the newspapers as to the intention to reduce the force in the North-West and send a number home. We would be enabled to form some idea of the basis on which these expenditures are to continue, so far as the number of men is concerned, if the hon. gentleman would make some general statement on that subject.

Mr. CARON. I have much pleasure in stating that the intention of the Major General commanding, from the dispatches we have received from him, is to reduce the force to the lowest possible minimum. He wishes to do so as far as possible, so far as I can make out, but that will depend on the news received from the column now pursuing Big Bear. But as far as I can make out, the intention of the Major-General is to leave only the permanent corps which we have sent up, from the School of Infantry at Toronto, and from "A" and "B" Batteries from Kingston and Queb. c. He considers that that force, amounting to about 450 men, along with the Mounted Police, which he is very anxious to see increased to 1,000, will be quite sufficient to provide for any emergency in the country. The balance of the forces will be returned to their homes as rapidly as possible, and the Major-General is using every possible means to expedite their return. He has broken up the depots at the various places, he is dismissing the whole transport service, and he intends to carry on the transport by steamers. Of course the expenditure which has been incurred cannot be affected by any reduction of that kind, but I hope within a very short time that we shall be able to effect a great immediate reduction of the large expenditure which has had to be carried on so far.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be of great consequence to the country that the temporary emergencies which now exist should not be suffered to interfere with a thorough examination and a proper selection of men for the Mounted Police force. The reports which are in our hands show that in times past there have been some mistakes made in recruiting a great many who have been too young in years. More than one of the majors of the force have pointed out that the work was very severe, and that a young fellow of 18 or 20 became invalidated very soon, which not only weakened the force but necessitated an hospital service as well. Of course, we have a specially favorable opportunity of recruiting that force, from the circumstance that there are a large number of men of somewhat military inclinations in the North-West at this moment; but I would like to see a portion of our other forces kept a little longer, in order that that force may be primed and picked. The Mounted Police force ought to be, in point of intelligence, training and coolness, more of the character of the men of the Irish constabulary than like the ordinary militia. I have one observation to make in regard to the Bill which I think the hon. gentleman will see the force of. He has stated that the expense of the war, direct and indirect is estimated to be \$4,000,000. The bulk of that expense has already occurred. We have now the statement that the vouchers up to the 1st of June show an expenditure of \$1,644,000. A very large number of the vouchers for the expenditure already incurred have not been brought in, under the circumstances the hon. gentleman so clearly explained. It is therefore palpable that the expenditure connected with the war up to the 30th of June will be very far beyond the \$1,700,000 provided for in the Bill; in fact, the hon. gentleman explains that there is a very large addi-

tional expenditure in addition to that, for which he has received vouchers. We have suspended all the rules on two occasions on account of the pressing emergency to get the cash to meet the expense. I think I should not be at all wrong if I said that \$1,300,000 in addition to the \$1,644,000, or \$3,000,000 in all, would be nearer the figure which will cover the expenses of the financial year about expiring than \$1,700,000. Under these circumstances I have been struck with great surprise to see the proposal in this Bill:

"The said sum or any part thereof may be so paid and applied in either of the financial years ending respectively on the 30th day of June, 1885, and the 30th day of June, 1886."

This money was asked for on the ground that it was wanted immediately, and we afforded the hon. gentleman every facility on that account, but it will only complicate matters to suggest that any portion of the vote is to be expended in the financial year that is to come. We have vouchers already for all but \$60,000, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will be honored with those in the course of the next week. But, even if he is not, our law provides that if they come in within three months after the 30th of June they may be still paid and charged to the account of the financial year which ends at that date, with the view that we should get the expenditure of the year paid out of and charged to the account of the year itself. It was perhaps a questionable measure to allow the payment to be made after the close of the financial year; but in making that provision Parliament felt that the possible abuse to which that provision was liable was more than counterbalanced by the importance, in a country like ours, where there is considerable difficulty, owing to the distances, in getting in the vouchers for the expenditure of the year, before the end of the year. None of these difficulties apply to the vote of \$1,700,000, but if they did they are solved by the Act. I therefore invite the hon. gentleman to omit that portion of the clause to which I have referred.

Mr. CARON. I think that might be fairly done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister said he had paid \$960,000 to the Hudson Bay Company for supplies.

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Had the hon. gentleman any other contractors to deal with besides the Hudson Bay Company, or did they take charge generally of the whole expedition in all its branches?

Mr. CARON. Yes, almost to the whole extent; but outside of the ordinary contracts which were looked after and entered into on behalf of the Government by the Hudson Bay Company, there were other contracts just as I have stated. The transport service expenditures incurred by General Strange, and in some other distant parts where columns had to be moved at a moment's notice, had to be provided for. There are other contracts for transport and subsistence for some of those columns which could not be reached from the supply office at Winnipeg, at the head of which is Colonel Jackson, who is providing for that expenditure in connection with the Hudson Bay Company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were those by the Hudson Bay Company, too?

Mr. CARON. Some were and some were not. General Strange telegraphed that he had to provide for some transport himself, and had to rely on the teams he found in the immediate neighborhood.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point to which attention was call by a question put in the name of Mr. Ross, and to which I would like to call the attention

of the Minister and the Government generally. The question was asked whether it was intended to compensate the members of the Winnipeg battalion for extra expenses, and the Minister replied it was intended to make them allowances similar to those which have been made to the other battalions. I know perfectly well that the officers are expected to make provision for themselves for an enormous number of articles in our service which it is not the practice in the regular service to compel officers to provide, and I know also, as a matter of fact, that a great many officers who joined these battalions incurred very considerable expense at their own cost to get themselves equipped for the field. Now, this being a special service, not the sort of service for which these men engaged in the volunteer force joined, they expected to be employed within their own or contiguous Provinces, it seems to me it would be rather unreasonable to expect them to meet, at their own cost, the special charges to which they have been put. The First Minister will no doubt understand, as well as the other members of the Government, that men called to go into the field at short notice were obliged to supply themselves with a considerable number of articles, and I think it would be in the interest of the public service that we should not apply the traditions of the English service, adapted to a totally different state of things, to the service, and a reasonable and fair compensation should be made to the officers and men who have incurred these expenses with the object of fitting themselves for taking the field.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman was quite right in saying that some of the officers have been put to great expense in equipping themselves for the field, but he must remember that over and above their pay according to rank, which I think is very reasonable, they are getting a field allowance, which is supposed to be given for the purpose of indemnifying the officers for such expenditure. However, that is a question which I do not like to take up until the Major General returns, when the advice of a man, experienced as he is, will be of great advantage in settling these matters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is quite true, but the hon. gentleman knows that the position of a great number of our officers differs very material from that of ordinary English officers, and the rules applied to the regular officers it would not be fair to apply to a great number of our people. There are cases enough in which the Minister knows our men can very well afford to make a moderate sacrifice for the sake of doing their duty, but there are a great many other cases in which a severe fine practically has been inflicted on a number of young officers which they are not well able to afford, for the sake of responding to the invitation of the Government to defend their country at distance; thousands of miles from their homes. These cases must be looked at from a common sense standpoint and not the standpoint of officers of the regular service.

Bill reported.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. POPE moved that report of Committee of the Whole on certain resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway be now received.

Mr. BLAKE. There was some information to be given on some points which we discussed in committee.

Mr. POPE. I stated the other night that none of the money for elevators at Port Arthur and at Fort William had been expended. I find on enquiry since that \$120,000 has been expended. Last autumn, when the winter was setting in, it was found important that the people of Manitoba should have an opportunity of bringing their grain out, and there was no means of getting it out unless elevators were

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

erected at these places. They made a proposition that they would build all the other buildings except those that had been built on certain conditions, and I think hon. gentlemen will find that it was in the interest of the country that we made the arrangement we did.

Mr. BLAKE. There are some explanations to be given in reference to some of the leased lines, especially the St. Lawrence and Ottawa. There were some others, stated in the accounts of Mr. Stephen and Mr. Miall, the expenditures upon which it was thought proper on both sides of the House that further information should be furnished at this stage.

Mr. POPE. There was evidently a misunderstanding or a misprint if you please, with respect to the items which I endeavored to explain to the House. There is an item put down of \$2,500,000 as not included, but it is intended that it is included.

Mr. BLAKE. If it be a fact—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has caused Mr. Stephen's original letter to be examined—that that is the fact, it alters the whole basis of the resolutions, perhaps more than the hon. gentleman has considered. I shall not criticise it further now, because there is another stage, but I hope he will see Mr. Stephen's letter, and see if really a misprint of that kind has existed since the 18th March. I admit it is not included and ought not to be included, but, if the letter means something so very different from what it appears to mean, we should like to know the fact.

Mr. CAMERON. (Huron). I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the merits of the question before the House, which have been so largely and so exhaustively discussed, at all events in regard to the question whether the agreement covered the leased lines. There was a difference of opinion upon that question. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) declared that, according to his interpretation, the leased lines were covered by this proposed security. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) declared that the security proposed to be taken by the Government did not include the leased lines, and the First Minister was not sure about it. The hon. gentleman said :

"The hon. member for West Durham is not correct in saying that I expressed my opinion that the leased lines were not included in this clause. I simply stated that whether the hon. gentleman was right or whether the hon. member for North Simcoe was right, it was a matter of discussion. I discussed it afterwards without reference to the legal construction of the clause, but I expressed no opinion myself as to whether the clause included the leased lines."

That question ought not to be left in doubt. It ought to be put beyond all reasonable doubt. We ought to know whether or not the proposed security covers the leased lines. While I think the security ought to cover the leased lines, I have no desire that the company should be hampered in extending or improving the leased lines, and therefore the security the Government should obtain should be subject to the right of the company to extend and improve the leased lines. I do not desire to prolong this discussion more than is absolutely necessary to bring to the attention of the House the following amendment, which I move :

That all after the word "that" be left out and the following inserted :—That the said resolution be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the same so as to clear away doubts by making express provision that the interests of the company in leased lines shall stand charged with the advances, due provision being made for the creation, if approved by the proper authority, of a prior charge on the company's interest in any leased line for the purpose of extending or improving the same.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain his amendment ?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I explained it very fully. I said that while we desire that the country shall have secu-

riety upon the leased lines, we have no desire to interfere with the power of the company to extend or improve their lines; any sum obtained for that purpose should have priority over the Government lien; the Government's lien shall cover the leased lines, and that lien shall be subject to any sum the company may require for the purpose of improving and extending the leased lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we take the leased lines and allow the company to expend on them any money they like for their extension or improvement, it is giving them a prior mortgage for the purpose of that extension.

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I think it is better as it is.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposal is one which is calculated to give us control of these leased lines, subject to approval of the competent authority, the Government of the day, without which no additional charge could be created. I stated the very case with reference to the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Company; I said it was quite possible that the company, in order to keep the extension of that line, might issue bonds on the 52 miles as well as upon the land grant, and I did not want to interfere with that line being further constructed, or the procuring of means for its further construction, but if so procured they shall enter into the line and shall represent value—as the hon. gentleman is always stating that what money they spend on the line will represent value. The hon. gentleman seems to suppose that an obligation is incurred by the company to redeem prior mortgages. No such obligation is at all incurred. What we want is to hold what are alleged to be by the railway company the vital parts of the national system; the Government and the railway company concur in the statement that without these parts the national system cannot prevail. The proposal of the Government is one which it is probable, after what has been said, will result in these alleged vital parts of the national system being severed from the national system altogether, if these resolutions pass in their present form. That being so it is proposed that it should be made clear that they are to be subject to the charge, and in order to allow such extensions and improvements upon them as the Government think proper, the means to be provided on the credit of the lines. My hon. friend proposes just what the hon. gentleman proposed as to the Algoma branch line, that a mortgage may be created on the branch line to complete it to the Sault; so with reference to these leased lines, securities may be created with the assent of the Government for their extension and improvement; then they will become the first charge and we will have the second. If a bad security is created it would be on the responsibility of the Government, but the Government assents to the creation of a first charge, and if the money is spent on the improved line, one may reasonably calculate that the value of the whole line would be improved, and that would be an improvement of the value of the first charge. The Government would have the right to redeem or not, to take the lines if they are worth the money or to leave them if they think they are not worth the money. That gives us a freedom to act, and does not leave us helpless and hopeless with reference to a mortgage on what are said to be important adjuncts to the national system.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the House met I had an opportunity of seeing the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway on this subject. I think the amendment of the hon. gentleman must be changed to a considerable extent. I move in amendment:

That the resolutions be not concurred in, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with power to consider the expediency of

amending the first resolution by adding, after the words "rate and profit," the following words:—Including the interest of the company in any railway lines now leased by it, and saving the right of the company to exercise any power granted to the leased lines by their charters which are at present sanctioned by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the meaning of those words.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amendment will settle a doubt which was raised the other day. There will be a lien on the leased lines as part of the personal property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; but no doubt in the charters of those leased lines power is given to issue bonds and so forth for the purpose of operating the road. It gives the right to the company to exercise any of the powers under the several charters, as they may be sanctioned by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. That is to say the special exercise of those powers is to be sanctioned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The amendment should indicate that there should be a special sanction for each exercise of such power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well. I propose the amendment in the following terms:—

That the resolutions be not now concurred in, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole to consider the expediency of amending the first resolution by adding after the words "real and personal" the following:—Including the interest of the company in any lines now leased by it, excepting the Algoma branch, and saving the right of the company to exercise from time to time any power granted to the leased lines by their charters, and vested in the company, which may be specifically sanctioned by the company.

I hope the hon. gentleman will accept this amendment as it is in the direction generally of the amendment he has moved.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am glad the hon. gentleman has conceded the principle of my amendment, but I think if he had accepted the words also they would have been better and clearer. However, as he has conceded the principle, I will ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not wish in any way to deprive my hon. friend of his resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand from the First Minister that this means that no issue of bonds can take place on any of those leased lines without the express consent of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It stands thus: That whatever interest the Canadian Pacific Railway have in these lines we have a lien on their leases according to their several terms. I do not know what the terms of those leases may be, but whatever interest they have or whatever powers, we have the power to exercise this right over them.

Mr. BLAKE. And the powers are to be exercised in each case with the sanction of the Government, so that the Government is responsible to the public as to each particular act the company performs.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron) withdrawn.

Motion (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Some hon. MEMBERS. Mitchell, Mitchell.

Mr. MITCHELL. Several hon. gentlemen are calling my name. May I ask them what they want?

Mr. BLAKE. We want the other property of the company included.

Mr. MITCHELL. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is, that if he calls me property he is very much mistaken. I am not in the pay of the Canadian Pacific Company. Can the hon. gentleman say as much for the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I can.

Mr. MITCHELL. Public statements and public admissions of mine cannot be brought against me as those of the hon. gentleman can be brought against him of being in the pay of the Grand Trunk. I am not ashamed of my advocacy of a great public enterprise like the Canadian Pacific, and I throw back the taunts and sneers the hon. gentleman has cast against me. Let the hon. gentleman get up and say that he is able to show as clean a record in connection with public companies as I am.

Mr. BLAKE. But always something to the prior mortgage of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not the slave of prejudice and party. I do not condemn the Government on all occasions. I have independence and honesty enough to support the Government when they are right. I do what the hon. gentleman dare not do in that, and I do more, I criticise them when they are in the wrong; and I challenge public opinion inside and outside of this House, whether there is any man who to-day occupies as independent a position as Peter Mitchell does, both as a representative of the people and as an educator of public opinion by his connection with his paper.

Mr. CASEY. It might be perhaps as well to consult the Minister in charge of this Bill in regard to this amendment. It does not seem to be worded exactly in consonance with the views he expressed on this subject the other day, and it would perhaps be as well to consult him as the hon. gentleman told us he had consulted the railway authorities beforehand. We have seen inspired persons apparently assisting in putting this amendment into shape, but the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill has not said a word about it. Perhaps the Acting Minister of Railways would kindly give us the benefit of his advice on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved to insert after the words "branch lines of railway," in the 8th line of the first resolution, the words:

And including the interest of the company in any railway lines now leased by it, except the Algoma branch.

And to add at the end of the resolution, the following:—

Provided the rights of the company to exercise from time to time any powers granted to the leased lines by their charters and vested in the company are hereby saved and excepted when specifically sanctioned by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CASEY. I understood that the idea was to include all the lines the company might in future lease as well as those they now hold. The company are looking to form new connections, which are also vital to the success of the road. It would be quite possible for the company to form, by means of future connections, a totally independent road from the Atlantic at least as far west as Chicago, and I think the intention of the resolution as it was first worded, as the right hon. First Minister has stated, was that it should include all of those as well as the lines now leased to the company. I think it would be better to leave the word "now" out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall "omit" the word now.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Committee rose and reported, and resolutions as amended read the first time.

Mr. POPE moved that resolutions be read the second time.

Mr. CHARLTON. The necessity for information as to the affairs of the Company is one that cannot be questioned on the part of any member of this House, and in dealing with this company, in voting to it the enormous sums that have been voted to it, this House has been acting hitherto without that amount of information that was necessary in order to arrive at a just and intelligent conclusion as to the necessity for making these grants. The right of Parliament for this full information has been denied by the Government heretofore. A motion was made last Session, when it was proposed to grant aid to the company by a loan of \$22,500,000, by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), asking that its affairs should be subjected to the investigation of a special committee. That motion was denied. Now, our information with regard to the affairs of this company is only such as the company chooses to give us. I do not charge the company with making false statements, but the company naturally refrains from making many statements with regard to its affairs that the members of this House might desire to have; and if we were in a position, if a committee were struck to look into the affairs of this company and an investigation held, no doubt much valuable information would be elicited. It is in the interest of the people that we should know more about this company's operation in stocks and in stock dividends. We know the nominal stock of the company is \$65,000,000; we know the cost of that stock is very much less than the nominal capital; we know that only the first \$5,000,000 stock were sold at par, that the next \$20,000,000 were sold at 25 cents on the dollar, and that at one time \$10,000,000 of the stock were pledged to a Canadian bank for \$4,950,000, and that afterwards this stock was sold at a price below that. There are many other matters in connection with the stock operations of this company upon which this House ought to have full information. With regard to its deposit with the Government, said to have been \$14,288,000 on the 1st of January last, was that deposit cash? or what was the nature of it? That is something which, in dealing with this company, we are interested in knowing, and which at present we do not know. With regard to dividends, also, we know that large sums in dividends have been paid. According to Mr. Stephen's letter of 18th March, 1885, \$5,378,000 was paid in dividends, and according to his letter of 15th January, 1884, \$2,128,000 was paid as interest on capital stock. There were suspicions and reports a year ago about construction accounts, about manipulations on the part of the company in the construction of the road, operations similar to the Credit Mobilier operations of the Union Pacific. We were led to suppose that arrangement had been made whereby \$45,000,000 of unissued stock of that company would be taken by construction companies, consisting of members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate, at a nominal cost, possibly not more than 6, 8 or 10 cents on the dollar. As to the outside equipment, we have no means of knowing what portion of the equipment of that line is chargeable to leased lines and extension lines. With regard to the leased lines, we have very little information. We do not know whether they are a burden on the company, or a source of revenue. All these are matters on which this House ought to have full information before we are in a position intelligently to vote or refrain from voting aid to this company. With regard to the real cost of the work we have no reliable information. It has been supposed that the cost of the work through the prairie section, the real cost, is not as great as the nominal

cost, or the cost given to us. I find in the report of the company issued on the 13th January:—

"In considering the financial condition of the company, it may be well to remind the shareholders, that at the beginning of the present year there remained in the hands of the Government an unexpended cash balance of \$8,633,082, available for the work under contract with the Government. This sum, as has already been officially stated, is sufficient to complete the work remaining to be done, according to the terms of the contract."

If there was in the hands of the Government a sum sufficient to complete the work, according to the terms of the contract, this year, it would be interesting to know why the company is now calling for further aid to complete the work. Then there is a good deal of information that we ought to have with regard to the character of the line. We hear reports as to the character of the line north of Lake Superior for which the company has drawn subsidy, reports of an unfavorable nature. We do not know whether the line is completed or not, or in what condition it is, or whether to attach credence to the report that there is a probability of the company building its line to the Sault Ste. Marie and making connection with the American lines, and making a practical abandonment of the line north of Lake Superior. Then as to the work done in the Rocky Mountains, we know very little about that. We are told the line will be finished in September, but it is a significant fact, if it is to be finished in September, and if the company is to draw its subsidy from the Government for the completed line, yet the line is not to be open for business till next year. It is quite possible the company will merely lay down a pair of rails, and that a great deal of work will have to be done, after all the subsidy to complete the line has been paid over. I do not accuse the company with withholding information, for the company has not been required to give information, and it is not in its interest to make bare to the public all its affairs; but when a capitalist loans money to a company, he has the right to know in what condition the affairs of the company are. If the people of this Dominion are to loan money to the company, it is the business of members of this House, who are the representatives of the people, who are their agents sent here to look after their interests, to learn about the affairs of the company, to possess more information with regard to its affairs than they do now. I have no desire or intention to detain the House in discussing this matter, but, having stated these few points as briefly as I could, I beg to move:

That all that the words after "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—Before this House shall be called on to grant further aids, and impair existing securities, for aids to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a select committee be appointed to make a full and searching enquiry into the condition and affairs of the company, and particularly as to its accounts, its operations in stocks, stock dividends, construction contracts and outside engagements; the real cost of the work done, the character of the land and the character and proper estimate of the works remaining to be done.

House divided on amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Guay,	Platt,
Blake,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Scriven,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Sommerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Sommerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
Charlton,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McIsaac,	Yeo—53.
Fleming,	McMullen,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Dundas,	McDougall (Pictou),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McGreevy,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Bell,	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Foster,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Orton,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Pope,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Campbell (Victoria),	Haggart,	Ross,
Carling,	Hall,	Royal,
Caron,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Chapleau,	Hickey,	Small,
Cimon,	Homer,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Hurteau,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Ives,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Jenkins,	Tupper,
Coursol,	Kaulbach,	Vain,
Curran,	Kilvert,	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maaki'ngé),	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westm'land),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth,
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wright.—91.
Dugas,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VAIL. I move the following amendment, which I think will follow from the amendment of the First Minister:

To strike out all after "now" and insert the following:—recommended to a Committee of the whole House with power to provide that, in case the proper authority permits the creation of a mortgage or charge on the Algoma branch, with or without its extension to Sault Ste. Marie, for the purpose of such extension, the whole branch line shall remain charged with the public advances, subject to such mortgage or charge.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman would accede to that proposition. As he knows, it is based upon the view that the Algoma Mills branch may become the means of the creation of an important line to Sault Ste. Marie, and there is a hope and expectation that a large traffic with the North-Western States will be developed by the creation of that line. I have already stated that I was heartily in sympathy with the proposal to assist in the construction of that line by means of the credit which might be obtained on the branch, but that I felt indisposed to consent to the branch, immediately it became valuable, being lopped off the trunk line and made an independent line. The company's capital has been engaged to the extent of \$2,400,000 in the building of that branch. I am willing that that should be used as a basis of credit to construct the extension, and that the extension itself should be used in the same way, which is the point the hon. gentleman himself desires to attain, but I am anxious that we should retain the power, in case the default is made on the mortgage and the line becomes public property, to take hold of that line as well as the other property referred to. You will thus get no further charge, because it is optional with you whether you pay the first charge or not, but you will have the opportunity of preserving the national line complete just as we have taken power to preserve it complete by including the leased lines in the company's charter. After the statement made by the hon. gentleman in committee, I expected that we would have acquiesced in this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the amendment may be accepted.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

Resolved, that if at any time a line connecting with the United States system of railways shall be in course of construction to a point on the river St. Marie and there be a probability of the early completion thereof, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall desire to continue the Algoma branch to a junction with such line, the Governor in Council may on their decision, and upon such conditions as they shall determine postpone the lien and charge thereon created by the said Act; and continued by these resolutions so that the claim of the Government shall rank on the said branch next after the mortgage hereinafter mentioned; and in case the Governor in Council should permit the creation of such mortgage for the purpose of continuing the said branch as aforesaid the whole branch line so extended shall be charged to the same extent as the present Algoma branch now is charged, but subject to such mortgage; but the Governor in Council may by such order authorize the company to exercise in respect of the said branch the power of mortgaging the same in manner and form as provided by its charter with respect to mortgaging the main line thereof, to such extent per mile as shall be fixed by such order, the proceeds of such mortgage to be applied exclusively to the construction of the extension of the said branch to such junction.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported.

On motion for the second reading of the resolutions,

Mr. CASEY. I think there is one point on which we shall all agree, but which has not, however, been provided for in the resolutions. The power given to the company to limit the rates of toll on the Canadian Pacific Railway as soon as the tolls shall have paid 10 per cent on the capital cost of building the road. It has been frequently alluded as a safeguard of some sort to the public who have to use that road. I am not going to discuss the intrinsic value of that safeguard, but to point out that whatever value it might have if the accounts of the company were properly arranged it has no value whatever so long as the receipts of the company from branch lines, leased lines, and extensions, are mixed up with those from the main line, and so long as the expenses on the main line are mixed up with those of the branches, the leased lines, and the extensions. I think that proposition is so self-evident that it does not require to be reasoned. We had a discussion the other day as to what the amount was upon which this 10 per cent, should apply. It was agreed that it should only apply to the amount actually spent by the company in the construction of the main line. It was never intended that it should apply to the capital account which they had incurred on account of branch lines and extensions, outside the scope of the original contract, and of course it was still less expected that it would apply to any expenditure they might incur in connection with leased lines. The necessary conclusion from all that, is that the Executive of the country and Parliament should be put in a position to ascertain with certainty when the limitation power could properly be exercised, when it comes into force and to ascertain how much of the total expenditures of the company have been incurred on the main line; how much on account of branches, leased lines, and extensions; and the same particulars with reference to the receipts. I move

That all the words after "now" be left out, and the following be inserted:—recommitted to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to provide that, as a condition of the proposed aids, and in order to enable Parliament and the Executive to exercise their statutory powers as to tolls, a separate account shall be kept and transmitted to the Government, of the capital expenditure on, and the gross earnings and the working expenses of, the main contract of the line, and the several branches, and extensions, and leased lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All this information can be got without the necessity for such a provision.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman made that statement. The other day when we were in committee he seemed to think that such a proposition was reasonable, and I regret also that the statement should have been made until we are more fully informed as to the mode in which

Mr. BLAKE.

the company keeps its accounts. For years we have been endeavoring to obtain statements with reference to the different portions of this enterprise, with a view of providing the basis which was all important as to the calculation of the tolls; first of all, that we should ascertain the amount of capital supplied by the company on the main line; and next, what were the earnings and working expenses of the main line. Several motions which were made were acceded to by the House, and an address was passed for the information. This time the address was moved and agreed to, and in answer we have a letter from the secretary of the company, dated the 30th of May, in which he writes as follows:—

"As requested by your letter of the 12th February, I beg to enclose for the information of the House of Commons, statements showing the gross earnings, expenses, and net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway for each month of the years 1883 and 1884, respectively, on the lines east and west of Lake Superior. Your letter asks that these returns may distinguish between the main line and the lines now worked under the leases from the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company. As the earnings and expenses of the lines operated by this company, east of Lake Superior, are, to a large extent, common to the different sub-sections of this portion of the railway system, the company has not in its account attempted an accurate apportionment of the earnings and expenses between all of the sub-sections and branches, as such accurate apportionment would involve a very large expenditure without any corresponding advantage to the company."

There is the statement. Now, I told the hon. gentleman what I now repeat to the House, that one of the great difficulties which is at this moment being experienced by the United States Government in its attempt to deal with its subsidised lines, with the Union and Central Pacific Railways, is due to the confusion of the accounts. But they have not done there what this company has done—assumed to treat all the lines as one line. They have kept an account of the branch lines, but the difficulty there has been the throwing of a considerable amount of traffic and special arrangements as to the shares of the profits, on the branch lines and off the main line, which alone is charged with the Government money. If that sort of thing is to go on, with a system of joint or unified accounts, it disables you from knowing what the operations of each part of the system are. It is quite certain that originally it was never contemplated by the company but that the accounts should be kept in such shape as to enable you to ascertain, first how much money supplied by the company has gone into the main line, and secondly what are the earnings, and what are the expenses of the main line. Of course, with reference to its own extensions, branches, and leased lines, just as with reference to any lines which may be connected, which cover a haul over more than the main line, arrangements are made as to the proportions of the haul. But, if the accounts are to be one, it is quite clear that as to the original expenditures, and still less, as to the earnings and expenses from which you arrive at a determination of what the profit of the main line is, and what you ought to do with the toll, there will not be that information which will enable Parliament and the Executive to discharge its duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it, that under the powers given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, every branch line they build, becomes a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, and the accounts of its extensions and branch lines will be the accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper. If there are any leased lines, accounts will be kept of them in consequence of the arrangements between the leasing company and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should think they would be kept, as a matter of course.

Mr. BLAKE. No, they are not kept. That is the very thing we ask for, but they do not keep it!

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events I should not like at present to assent to this amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Casey.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mills,
Auger,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Guay,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Harley,	Scrifer,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Springer,
Catwright,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Langelier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	Lister,	Watson,
Charlton,	Livingston,	Weldon,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Yeo.—55.
Fairbank,		

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allison,	Dupont,	McDougald (C. Breton)
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McGreevy,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	Massue,
Barnard,	Foster,	Mitchell,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Bell,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bryson,	Hall,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Royal,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Homer,	Small,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Ives,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Colby,	Jenkins,	Temple,
Costigan,	Kaulbach,	Tupper,
Coughlin,	Kilvert,	Valin,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Et. Ma'rice),	Macmaster,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Woodworth,
Dugas,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wright.—91.
Dundas,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to call attention to the security which is taken for the \$10,000,000 advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. By the wording of the resolution the security the country has for the payment of the interest on that money is the lands alone, and if the lands alone do not furnish sufficient money to pay the interest, we are not allowed to come upon the ordinary earnings of the company for the payment of the interest. The resolution expressly declares that the ordinary earnings of the company shall not be appropriated to the payment of the interest at all until after the whole of the lands are sold. We pointed out that many circumstances might arise to induce the Government to postpone a forced sale of the lands, and in the meantime we have no security for the payment of our interest. We pointed out also that no argument could be urged for appropriating the revenues of the company for the payment of dividends in preference to the payment of the interest on the money they borrowed on the road. I contend that the interest on the money the country advances should be paid out of the revenues of the road should the sale of the lands fail, before those revenues

are applied to the payment of the dividends of the shareholders. I would therefore move :—

That all the words after "now" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, to provide that the charge on the railways and its revenues for the sum of \$9,880,912 expressly charged on the land grant, shall become operative forthwith, in case the lands do not yield enough to meet after payment of prior charges, the principal and interest on the said sum as the instalments fall due, and shall not be deferred indefinitely as proposed by the resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This matter was fully discussed in committee, and I do not think it is necessary to occupy the time of the House upon it. I am opposed to the resolution.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose hon. gentlemen cheer at the prospect of again voting on a question on which they gave a very bad vote last year. It was proposed at that time that the accounts of the company should be audited by the Auditor General. The majority did not see fit to assent to that proposition. It seems to me that the events which have taken place since last year, and which have brought the company back for further assistance, justify this course being followed. I, therefore, beg to move :

To leave out all the words after "now" to the end of the question, and insert the following instead thereof:—recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, to provide as a condition of the proposed aids, that the accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be subject to the audit of the Auditor General of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept this amendment. I agree with my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) that events which have occurred since last Session should have caused hon. gentleman to perceive the expediency of something of this kind. We have had within the last few weeks a discussion with reference to the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have had various statements made, but no satisfactory detailed information, as to the condition of the company's accounts, or as to the causes which have induced them to come for further aid. We have had some light thrown on these things, but certainly not that light which should have been thrown had these accounts been subjected to a proper audit. Even today, the Acting Minister of Railways was obliged to admit that a sum of not less than \$120,000 had been practically misapplied between him and the company. We voted \$962,000 to be expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under a contract with us. The company claimed that certain specified works were to be done by the Government on the line between Winnipeg and Port Arthur in order to make it tolerable to them, and they offered to do these works, and the Government contracted with the company to do them for that sum. These works did not include an elevator and some other items in this account which I need not now refer to. Of the amount of \$962,000 which was voted by Parliament for the construction of these particular works, \$872,173 had been paid, and they have placed a sum of no less than \$120,550 to build other works altogether than those which the Government were liable to build, which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had contracted to build, and which were essential. The other works were essential, no doubt, and proper for the carrying on of the line, else the Government would not have been bound to supply them and the company could not have exacted them. The Government were bound to supply them and the company were entitled to exact them. The company contracted to build them, and the money which they were to be paid for the building of them was, to the extent of \$120,550, applied to the building of this elevator, which was entirely outside of those works. The company, in its application to Parliament, told us that among the extra

things it had to build was this very elevator, the money for which they have received from the Government under the arrangement made by the Acting Minister of Railways. They told us this was one of the financial difficulties they had been plunged in—this very obligation to construct this railway which has been built under this arrangement out of our money. Then they gave us a general statement of \$2,500,000 extra expenditure between Sudbury and Nepigon. The president told us in his letter that this is not included in the other items of the account. We discussed the whole question on this basis; we enquired what it was; the Minister gave us some vague information about it, and a week after he tells us he thinks there is a misprint, that in the president's letter the word "not" ought to be left out, and that this sum is included in other items. The Acting Minister of Railways stated this without having duly weighed all the consequence of his statement, because he finds he has got from bad to worse, and I fully expect a retraction from him of that statement. I expect he will tell us the letter is correctly printed. This only shows the importance of further enquiry. The hon. the Acting Minister does not know what has become of this large item of \$2,500,000; we do not know, at this moment, whether it is included or not in the financial arrangement to which I have referred. Besides the demand being reasonable, it is not without precedent. The neighboring republic, which granted assistance in money to two lines, and in lands to many railways, have found the necessity of creating an auditor of the accounts of subsidised roads. An Act of Congress was passed, entitled an Act to create an auditor of railway accounts and for other purposes, and it was approved June 19, 1878. I will read a few of the sections, to show what in the neighboring Republic, after a considerable experience of the operations of subsidised companies, they thought was necessary, in the public interest:—

"Sec. 3. That the duties of the said auditor, under and subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be, to prescribe a system of reports to be rendered to him by the railroad companies whose roads are in whole or in part west, north or south of the Missouri River, and to which the United States have granted any loan of credit or subsidy in bonds or lands.

"Sec. 4. That each and every railroad company aforesaid which has received from the United States any bonds of the said United States, issued by way of loan to aid in constructing or furnishing its road, or which has received from the United States any lands granted to it for a similar purpose, shall make to the said auditor any and all such reports as he may require from time to time, and shall submit its books and records to the inspection of the said auditor, or any person acting in his place and stead, at any time that the said auditor may request, in the office where said books and records are usually kept; and the said auditor, or his authorised representative, shall make such transcripts from the said books and records as he may desire.

"Sec. 5. That if any railroad company aforesaid shall neglect or refuse to make such reports as may be called for, or refuse to submit its books and records to inspection, as provided in section 4 of this Act, such neglect or refusal shall operate as a forfeiture, in each case of such neglect or refusal, of a sum of not less than one thousand nor more than five thousand dollars, to be recovered by the Attorney General of the United States, in the name and for the use and benefit of the United States; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior, in all such cases of neglect or refusal as aforesaid, to inform the Attorney General of the facts, to the end that such forfeitures may be judicially enforced."

I shall not quote extracts from the reports of the auditor of railway accounts, but will content myself with saying that I have reports here which show what valuable information was afforded to the people of that country by this means—information of which we are to be deprived.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, the Auditor General had only the right to audit the accounts of such railways as those in which the Government were entitled to receive a percentage of the earnings.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. I have read the Act. It applies to all railways to which subsidies have been given.

Mr. BLAKE,

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,  
Armstrong,  
Auger,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Bernier,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
Charlton,  
Davies,  
De St. Georges,  
Fairbank,

Fisher,  
Fleming,  
Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Guay,  
Gunn,  
Harley,  
Holton,  
Irvine,  
King,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingston,  
Mackenzie,  
McCraney,

McMullen,  
Mills,  
Mulock,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,  
Rinfret,  
Scriver,  
Somerville (Brant)  
Somerville (Bruce)  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wilson,  
Yeo.—55.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Barnard,  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Bryson,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Chapleau,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Curran,  
Daly,  
Desaulniers (Mask'ingé),  
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,

Dugas,  
Dundas,  
Dupont,  
Farrow,  
Ferguson (Welland),  
Foster,  
Gagné,  
Gigault,  
Gordon,  
Guilbault,  
Guillet,  
Hackett,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hanson,  
Hickey,  
Homer,  
Hurteau,  
Ives,  
Jamieson,  
Jenkins,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Langevin,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Mackintosh,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Picton),

McDougald (O. Breton),  
McLelan,  
McNeill,  
Massue,  
Mitchell,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,  
Orton,  
Pinsonneault,  
Pope,  
Riopel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Tupper,  
Valin,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
Wood (Westm'land),  
Woodworth,  
Wright.—89.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS moved:

To leave out all the words after "now," and to insert the following words instead thereof:—recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, to provide as a condition of the proposed aids, that any contracts to be let for the construction of any part of the works of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, whether on the main line, branches, extensions or leased lines, shall be left only after each published notice, and on such conditions as the Governor in Council shall approve; and that no director of the Company shall be directly or indirectly interested either as member of a construction company, or otherwise in any such contract.

He said: I need say nothing in support of this amendment. The principle is one that is well recognised. Every one acquainted with the construction of the Union Pacific, knows the frauds that were committed, and the improper manner in which the apparent expenditure of the company was increased by the construction company being composed in large part of those who were members of the Railway company itself.

Amendment negatived on the same division as the last.

Mr. WELDON. I beg to move:

That all the words after "now" to the end of the question be left out, and the following words inserted instead thereof:—Recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, to provide as a condition of the proposed aids that so long as any part of the advances dealt with by the said Resolutions or interest thereon remains unpaid, none of the resources of the company shall be expended in acquiring interests in railways or railway securities in the United

States with a view to an Atlantic Ocean Terminus in the United States Territory.

House divided on amendment.

YEAH:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mills,
Auger,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Guay,	Ray,
Burpee,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	King,	Springer,
Casey,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Langelier,	Vail,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Watson,
Davies,	Lister,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Wilson.—53.
Fairbank,	McCraney,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Dundas,	McLelan,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Barnard,	Foster,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gigault,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Haggart,	Ross,
Bryson,	Hall,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Small,
Carling,	Homer,	Stairs,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Taschereau,
Chapleau,	Ives,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Colby,	Jenkins,	Tupper,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Coursol,	Macdonald (King),	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St.M'rice),	Macmaster,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westm'nd),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Woodworth,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wright.—89.
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	

Amendment negatived.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. WATSON. I wish to move an amendment similar to that which I moved last year, inasmuch, as the Government, I believe, have it in their power to make terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as it has been claimed of late that, under the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they have the right to a monopoly of railways in Manitoba. I look on this question as one of great importance to the Province of Manitoba. I feel quite satisfied that the disallowance policy of this Government in reference to Manitoba has prevented a great many miles of railway from being built in that Province, particularly in Southern Manitoba. The charter for the Manitoba South-Western Railway was granted some years ago, and that line was prevented from being built in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have that direct from the First Minister himself. The other night he stated that, not only

were the Government alarmed at the idea of American capitalists investing in this road in South-Western Manitoba, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company became alarmed also. I think the Government and the people of this country ought to encourage American capitalists to invest in Canadian railways if they are going to open up the country, and I am satisfied that, if the Government had aided and encouraged the Manitoba South-Western, it would have been built years ago, and the remarks that fell from the leader of the Opposition would not have been called for when he stated that he believed farmers there had immense quantities of wheat in their granaries and still were hard up. I am sorry to say that is the case. It does not follow that a man is well off because he has 1,000 bushels of wheat in his granary, when he has no means of getting to market. The Government are aware of this, because they have had petitions from Southern Manitoba asking for liberal grants to the Manitoba South-Western, and last winter the delegates were here asking for aid from the Government and urging the necessity of having the road built, and they laid before the Government the facts as to there being thousands of bushels of grain in Southern Manitoba that could not be got to market. These people expected a road some years ago, and have not got it yet. From the statement made by the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company there is even yet some doubt as to whether they will have railway communication this year, even although the South-Western have a land grant given them. I believe they would have been satisfied if the Government had encouraged the South-Western company and had not shut off American capitalists as they did and as it was admitted in the House that they did. It is strange that when American capitalists desire to build a road in the Province of Manitoba for the purpose of opening up that country, they should not be allowed to do so. We find that there is now a proposition before this House to give the money of this Dominion for the purpose of constructing a railway through the State of Maine. Now if the Government of Canada feel that it is in the interest of this country to give aid for the construction of a railway through the State of Maine to make a short connection with the seaboard, I do not see why they should interfere with Americans building railways altogether in our own territory. I will read the remarks of the First Minister with reference to this South-Western Railway Company:

"It was known that a great many American speculators took an interest in the line. It was believed, in the old country especially, and believed generally, that the efforts to build a line on condition of getting certain grants of land were made in concert with certain railway influences, railway enterprises in the United States, which were hostile to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That conviction was strengthened by various circumstances which have sprung up from time to time, and there was a strong opinion, in which I myself for a time shared, that this was going to be used for the purpose of strangling the Canadian enterprise."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a direct statement that any Americans who wish to engage in railway enterprises in our own territory shall be prevented. For what purpose? For the purpose of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am sure that is a mistake, so far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned, and I believe it is a mistake in the interest of the whole Dominion. We have a statement by the First Minister that the Canadian Pacific Railway can carry freight at a cheaper rate than any other railway, because they have the whole road themselves under one management. It has been stated in this House that grain had to be shipped to Manitoba for the purpose of getting cheap rates over the Canadian Pacific Railway to the seaboard. If that is the case, we would surely expect that the Government, when they have it in their power, as at present, would change the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, in so far as disallowance is concerned. If that is to be the policy of the Government, let us know it, but do not let the

country be bound down for 20 years under that contract and prevent any other road from being built to the south. If the Canadian Pacific Railway can carry freight cheaper than any other road to the south, they will get the freight of those roads; and the branches, instead of diverting freight from the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be used to convey freight to it. We have other reasons for urging that this amendment should be adopted, in the statements of the Minister of Railways last year in this House, and also in statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite during the debate on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. I will read what Sir Charles Tupper said in 1883, when he was opposed to doing away with the monopoly clause:

"I say the interests of this country demand that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be made a success, and the man who does any act by which that success is imperilled takes a course which is hostile to the interests of Canada. But somebody may ask what about the interests of Manitoba? Are the interests of Manitoba and the North-West to be sacrificed to the policy of Canada? I say, if it is necessary, yes."

Now, that is the language of the Minister of Railways in 1883. In 1884 he made use of different language altogether, and apparently he was ready at that time, or in the near future, to revise the policy of the Government, and not only the policy of the present Government, but that of the late Government. In delivering his railway speech he made use of the following language with regard to the policy of disallowance:--

"I said that the present Government, when we came into power, adopted that policy; that we felt, as our predecessors did, that grappling with so gigantic a work as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we were bound to adopt every possible means of protecting our own line against having its traffic drawn to lines to the south; and, mark you, this was at a time when we did not contemplate at an early day carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway farther than Port Arthur. I said, further, that when we made it obligatory upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend the line at once north of Lake Superior, giving us an all-rail route from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, we felt obliged to give that company, upon which we imposed such onerous obligations, all the security that we had considered necessary, and that our predecessors in the Government had considered necessary for the protection of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I am glad to be able to state to the House that, although true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American railways to the south. Such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line, so far as it has gone; such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and by the inherent power of its own advantages to maintain its position, notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected. We are now in a position to review and to reconsider the policy of the late Government, and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any long period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition within the Province of Manitoba, and I am glad to be able to state to the House that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior the Government feel that it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say that I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work that the Government should not feel it incumbent on themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that statement was made by the late Minister of Railways when he was advocating the loan of last year. I look upon that statement as possessing considerable authority. At that time the whole Dominion believed the statement he made, that in the near future, when the road was constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government would no longer disallow charters to build railways in the Province of Manitoba, but that these roads should be allowed to be built. I am sorry such has not been the case, and that the policy of the Government foreshadowed by Sir Charles Tupper is apparently not to be carried out. I may say that the Emerson and North-Western Railway charter was disallowed by the Min-

Mr. WATSON.

ister of Justice because it came within the spirit of the contract. That was the reason given for the disallowance, not that the contract demanded that it should be disallowed. In the debate in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in 1880, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated that after this contract was ratified Manitoba would have the right to build railways to the international boundary line, and at that time there was actually a charter granted for the construction of a road in connection with an American line, and we were told that the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not interfere with it. We also have the statement of the First Minister during the debate on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, to the effect that railway construction in Manitoba could not be interfered with; that Manitoba had the right to grant charters for railways in that Province; in fact, to use his own words, they could not check Manitoba. Railway charters have, however, been disallowed. The Emerson and North-Western Railway charter was disallowed because it was against the spirit of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and, later on, during this Session, coming with the authority of the Government, through the Minister of Railways, a decision was given in the Railway Committee that a railway charter could not be granted to railways to connect at the international boundary line with other lines. This was given on the application for a charter made by myself to build a railway from Portage la Prairie to the Lake of the Woods. The reason why the charter could not be granted during this Session was stated in these words:

"With reference to the Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company, referred back to the committee for further consideration, they have agreed again to report that the preamble thereof is 'not proven' to their satisfaction, because the said Bill is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act 44 Victoria, chapter 1, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with the contract thereby ratified and made."

It has apparently become the belief of the Government, and they are not afraid to express it through their officers, that it is not only the policy of the Government to disallow charters for railways in the Province of Manitoba, but to recognise the fact that they are bound by solemn contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not to allow railways to be built south east in Manitoba. Now is the time for the Government to call upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make certain concessions, for the company are now asking further aid. We may not have an opportunity—I hope we shall not—of seeing the Canadian Pacific Railway asking for further aid; and this, therefore, is a favorable opportunity for having that objectionable clause struck out of the contract. We have had it stated by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, at different times, that there were strong reasons for believing that the monopoly clause would be struck out. The hon. member for Provencher stated that the reason why branch lines could not be built in Manitoba by companies independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was because that the company had full control of local companies, and branch lines would have to make terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We had also the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), during the discussion on the railway from Medicine Hat to the Galt coal mines, using the following language:—

"Then, when you get to Medicine Hat, you must remember it has to be carried on the Canadian Pacific Railway, thence to the point of consumption, Winnipeg, or Portage la Prairie, or any other point. The Canadian Pacific Railway has the power, by its control of the rates, to put on a position of equality all the coal dealers or producers in all that country."

It is wrong that any corporation should have power to control rates. I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman make the statement to which I have referred, because hon. gentlemen opposite have claimed that the Government have

a right to regulate the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I believe that on account of the watering of the stock of the company, and for other reasons, that right is unavailing, and the Government have no control of rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. member for North Victoria has apparently come to the same conclusion—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have full control of the rates over the road, and that it can regulate the prices at which coal can be transported over it. I am not giving my opinion as to the necessity of competition on account of through rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The rates charged on wheat to Montreal last fall were reasonable, but still we might have better rates if we had competition and more railways, local and independent roads in the Province. I desire to read a resolution passed by the Winnipeg city council, on 2nd June, which shows to some extent the manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is serving the people of Winnipeg, especially with respect to the southern travel. Even supposing the Canadian Pacific Railway is completed north of Lake Superior, and there is a steamship line running from Port Arthur east, still the people of Manitoba may wish to travel south, and visit St. Paul or Chicago. The resolution passed by the city council is as follows:—

“That this city, having bonused the Canadian Pacific Railway to a very large extent, feels that its citizens are entitled to some consideration at the hands of that corporation, and would therefore request that the said Canadian Pacific Railway do alter the running of their trains to the south, as will be more convenient for our citizens, in giving them closer connections with the trains at Emerson and Gretna, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to General Superintendent Egan.”

The resolution was moved by Alderman Pearson and seconded by Alderman Spencer, both of whom are Conservatives. Passengers could not make connection with trains going south at Gretna and St. Vincent, because of the change of time made by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Passengers for St. Paul had to lie over eight hours at those points, in consequence of the train of the Canadian Pacific Railway arriving four hours too late to make connection with the trains south. It is not right that the people should be subjected to such annoyances by this company. When this change of time was made another change was brought into effect, namely, that the company would not carry immigrants from Gretna to Winnipeg except at first-class rates. That is to be regretted, for we have the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that a great many people from the United States are going into Manitoba. But we find the Canadian Pacific Railway offering no inducements to immigrants coming from the south into Manitoba. For the reasons given, I move the following amendment.—

That all the words after “that,” in the said resolution, be left out and the following inserted instead thereof:—That, as a condition of granting the proposed aids to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company it shall be stipulated that the company shall no longer claim that no line of railway shall be permitted to be constructed within Manitoba south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except south of such lines as shall run south-west, or to the westward of south-west, and that no lines of railway shall be permitted to be constructed within Manitoba within 15 miles of latitude 49.

Mr. ROYAL. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has stated that the Premier of the Government has broken his promise; that the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of stopping the issue of charters for lines going in certain directions, shall be discontinued after the building of the line north of Lake Superior. Well, I do not see that the hon. gentleman's word has been broken. We all know that the line has not been built yet; that the line, no doubt, will be operated some time in the latter part of this summer, and therefore I do not believe that it becomes the hon. gentleman to say that the Government promise has not been fulfilled with regard to the branch lines south of the Canadian Pacific Railway and in Manitoba. One, certainly,

would have thought that the hon. member would have rejoiced in this fact, and would have thought it his duty to inform the House that the Canadian Pacific Railway have lately announced that they would construct the line of the South-Western Manitoba. Lately the Premier of the Province, Mr. Norquay, wrote to Mr. Egan, the superintendent of the eastern section of the road, to know whether the company were ready to construct that branch line, and the answer came, which has been published in the papers of Manitoba, that such was the intention of the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those who know the politics of our Province are aware that much has been said about the poor, down-trodden and long-suffering farmers of south-western Manitoba; but Sir, they say nothing of the news that the farmers will be relieved to that extent; that the South-Western will be built to Whitewater Lake, that is, north of Turtle Mountain. But consistency seems not to be one of the jewels which are treasured by hon. gentlemen opposite and their party. Here is a new departure with regard to the building of branch lines in Manitoba, which have been so long and so persistently advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and out of which they have tried to make so much political capital. We find that the *Hamilton Times*, which, I believe, is one of the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, in one of its latest issues, has the following:—

“When Governments pay for railways with land grants, the railways are constructed away in advance of settlement. These four railways—”

That is, those which are to be subsidised by land grants under these resolutions.

“These four railways now projected will run some hundreds of miles into the heart of the North-West Territories. There is no present need of such a thing. There is plenty of untilled land in Manitoba proper, within 100 miles of Red River. Had the Government furnished the cash to build a few short lines of railway from Red River, and allowed the land to be taken up by none but actual settlers, who should get it without any price down, but with the understanding that the land should always be subject to a direct tax for public purposes, Manitoba would be pretty well settled. Produce would not have to be hauled to market hundred of miles through uninhabited regions. There are not 200,000 people in the whole of Manitoba and the North-West. That population could be comfortably located on a tract 200 miles long by 100 miles wide, and 500 or 600 miles of railway would be ample to serve such a district.”

For these reasons the *Hamilton Times* opposed free grants of lands to the Manitoba South-Western, the Manitoba and North-Western, the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake, and other roads to which the Government decided to give material assistance in the shape of land subsidies. That is a new departure in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. After clamoring against the Government for not compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway to give us branch lines before the trunk line was constructed, now that we are assured of these branch lines, they say we do not want them, or if we need them, we need them only in certain directions. In other words, the population should be located along a certain line and we should compel the settlers to leave their farms and settle within a reasonable distance of the line already built. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has spoken of the resolution passed by the city council of Winnipeg. I really do not see that that resolution has anything to do with this question. We all know it is the interest, not only of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but also of the country at large, to prevent our immigrants coming through the United States. We all know very well what efforts have been made by the railway authorities on the American border to prevent our immigrants coming to the North-West. They have had recourse to all sorts of placards and denunciations, magnifying the troubles in that country for that purpose. Now that the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities are trying to prevent immigrants passing through that territory, we see hon. gentlemen opposite seeking to make some little capital out of the resolution passed by the city council for,

no doubt, a personal object. The object of the change in the time table of the Canadian Pacific Railway is evident to everybody. If by this change of time immigrants were subjected to a longer route, a greater loss of time, and greater cost for travelling, there might be something in the resolution passed by the city council, and my hon. friend opposite might have something to complain of. But, on the contrary, the only object of the change in the time table is to compel the immigrants who come from Europe to Canada to take our own roads, instead of being captured by the American railway authorities. As I have stated, the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities are giving the trip from our seaboard to Winnipeg or to any part of the North-West Territories for a mere nominal sum; and I challenge the hon. gentleman to say whether the American railway authorities are prepared to do the same thing. Even if they were prepared to do it, it is not only important to the Canadian Pacific Railway that its traffic should be increased, but it is highly beneficial and patriotic to Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman has tried to make out that the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway for transporting produce are extravagantly high. In fact, he said we wanted competition in order to reduce those rates. I suppose the hon. gentleman—and I do not blame him for it—wants to have his produce carried to the seaboard for nothing. I do not think that is the right policy. I think a healthy condition of the company requires that it should impose such rates as will yield a profit. We have the admission of the hon. gentleman himself that last fall, when the movement of farm produce was commencing, the rates were tolerably low. In fact, he said he had nothing to find fault with. Then, I do not see what is the object of the hon. gentleman's amendment. If it were carried, it would no doubt have the effect of destroying the resolution, which provides for a free grant of land and for the construction of branch lines of railway in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, which he himself and his party, in fact everybody, has been clamoring for during the past three or four years. I suppose I need not say that I am going to vote against the amendment, because I think it would destroy the very thing we most need in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Watson.

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Auger,	Fleming,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Guy,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Ray,
Burpee,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brace),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Langelier,	Trow,
Gasgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	Lister,	Watson,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McLissac,	Yeo.—51.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McLellan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Barnard,	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Bell,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Orton,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Pope,
Bryson,	Hackett,	Riopel,

Mr. ROYAL.

Cameron (Inverness),	Haggart,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Campbell (Victoria),	Hall,	Ross,
Carling,	Hesson,	Royal,
Caron,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Chapleau,	Homer,	Small,
Cimon,	Ives,	Smyth,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Temple,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Valin,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wood (West'nd),
Dugas,	McDougald (Pictou),	Woodworth,
Dundas,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wright.—93

Amendment negatived; and resolutions read the second time on the same division reversed, and concurred in.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 153) further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## SUPPLY—THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is put, I desire to say a few words on the subject to which I gave notice a few nights ago I would call the attention of the House. It is, I think, very much to be regretted that, among the other consequences of this unusually protracted Session, the question to which I am about to refer should not have been considered at an earlier period. It must be obvious to every hon. gentleman in this House, and to every person out of it, who has paid any attention to the subject, that the whole financial situation has changed very materially since the period at which the Minister of Finance made his usual exposition of the state of the country. It is quite clear, not only that we are likely to be subjected to many additional charges, which could not be foreseen at that time, and for which, from that cause, no provision was made, but also that a very considerable number of items of revenue on which the Minister relied can no longer be depended upon. Therefore, the whole position has changed in both respects, and changed materially for the worse. Now, Sir, in the first place, we have come so near the end of the year that it is comparatively easy for us to see what our actual expenditure and our actual receipts are likely to be. On the 1st June of this year I find that our total revenue amounted to \$29,633,000, and our total expenditure was given at the sum of \$28,204,000. Those hon. gentlemen who will take the pains to refer to the same return for the year 1884 will observe that on the corresponding date, the 31st May, the expenditure amounted to \$25,792,000; in other words, that our expenditure was \$2,400,000 more on the 1st June last past than the year before, while our receipts, taking into account the fact that we borrowed, by an expedient which was alluded to at some length the other evening, about a million dollars from the revenues of 1886—our receipts, making allowance for that addition, were almost identical with those of June, 1884, which were \$28,527,000, as against a revenue of \$29,633,000 on the 1st June last, including, as I have said, that particular million for which either the Government at large or the Minister of Inland Revenue is to be thanked, and which was effected by the judicious expedient of giving six or seven weeks' notice to the parties affected of the intention of the Government to impose

additional taxation on spirits. Now, the result of that is, that if we suppose that the expenditure up to the 1st July next be the same as the expenditure to the corresponding period last year, and there is no reason to suppose that it will be less—on the contrary, there is only too much reason to suppose it will be largely increased—our total expenditure, exclusive, apparently, of all the sums that are to be expended in the North-West, would amount, on the 1st July next, to the sum of about \$33,515,000. I am not in possession of such data as would enable me to make any accurate estimate of the portion of that expenditure which is charged on account of the North-West rebellion; but taking into consideration the fact that the Ministers did not deem it necessary to ask for more than \$700,000 prior to the 1st June, I suppose I would be doing ample justice if I allowed that \$700,000 as part of the expenditure up to the 1st June. Now, we know from the statement made by the Minister of Customs, that he expects that a sum of about \$4,000,000, at least, will be expended in connection with the North-West troubles; and if, as seems not unreasonable, we divide that sum of \$4,000,000 between the years 1885 and 1886, it is clear that, allowing for the \$700,000 of which I spoke, and adding the difference between that and the \$2,000,000 which I presume will be charged to 1885, our total expenditure up to the 1st July, 1885, cannot well be less than \$34,819,000. Now, in the same way, if our receipts during the balance of the year 1885 correspond to those that we received in the balance of the year 1884, it is equally clear that our total income, even including the amount so dexterously added to the revenue of the present year, cannot exceed \$33,000,000, and that there will be, as I intimated some time ago, a probable deficit of about \$1,819,000 on the transactions of the current year. Of course, in making those statements I am bound to call the attention of the House to the fact that I am making them on the authority and on the data supplied by the Ministers especially in charge of these Departments; but from what we know and from the experience of past years, it is tolerably evident those figures to which I have alluded are likely to be very nearly attained. If you chose to look back to 1882 you will find that on the 1st of June of that year our total revenue amounted to \$29,554,000, and our total expenditure as recorded in the *Gazette* \$22,553,000. Similarly, on the 1st of June 1883, our total revenue was \$33,330,000 and our total expenditure \$24,109,000; and, as I have already remarked, on the 1st of June last year our total revenue amounted to \$28,527,000 and our total expenditure to \$25,792,000; so that the House will see (if they take the pains to compare those figures with the total receipts and the total expenditure for the three years 1882, 1883 and 1884) that the estimate I make is a very moderate estimate indeed. It is to be remembered that this estimate includes the whole capital amount received during 1885 from Dominion lands, whatever that may be, and that it does not include the sum charged to capital account, amounting, apparently, to \$330,000 during the year 1885; so that, giving the Government the benefit of that very extraordinary proceeding, which has been initiated for the first time this year, of charging all the expenditures to capital account and of crediting all the receipts for Dominion lands to ordinary revenue, still even so, on the data presented to us by those hon. gentlemen, our total expenditure would amount to \$34,819,000, as against a probable revenue, apparently, of \$33,000,000 in round numbers, assuming, as I said, that precisely as much will be received in 1885 as was received in 1884, after the 1st of June; and I may add that in making that allowance I am dealing very liberally with the hon. gentlemen, because it is tolerably self evident that, after the enormous sum paid in on

account of Excise in the month of May, the odds are very great that the Excise in the month of June will show a very serious shrinkage. I may add that in addition to the expedient of borrowing \$1,000,000 from the revenue of next year, and in addition to the expedient of adding to capital account on the one side and crediting to revenue on the other, in the case of Dominion lands, these gentlemen have also added to capital account a very considerable number of items for rolling stock and other similar expenditures on account of the Intercolonial Railway, all of which, in a proper system of book-keeping, would, I have always contended, be charged, as they ought to be, to the ordinary expenditure of the year; so that, if you were to take into account the sum thus borrowed from the succeeding year, the sum improperly charged or improperly credited to revenue from Dominion lands, and also to make allowance for the sum improperly charged to capital account on the score of the Intercolonial Railway, the House will see that the large deficit which is apparently impending would be very seriously aggravated, and would amount nearly, if not quite, to the sum of \$3,000,000. Now, I am less concerned with that, because I am quite willing to admit that a very considerable proportion of that deficit is due to the extraordinary and unforeseen occurrences which have recently taken place in the North-West. I am not, therefore, censuring the Government on the score of that expenditure, although it is my duty to point out to the House that, if even one-half of that amount be charged to the ordinary expenditure of 1885, it will produce the results which I have spoken of, and even if we were to put that aside, unless the hon. gentlemen avail themselves of the expedient of borrowing this \$1,000,000 from next year's revenue, their account will show a very serious deficit for the present year. But it is more important to us to see how our accounts are likely to turn out for the year 1886. I take the statement of the Minister of Finance himself, and I see from that statement that, making allowances for certain additional sums which he expected to bring down in the shape of Supplementary Estimates, although these have not yet reached us, the hon. gentleman only expected to have a surplus of about \$700,000, and that surplus was entirely made up of the \$700,000 which he stated he expected to receive from Dominion lands. If that item, which I contend is quite improperly credited to revenue, be deducted, the hon. gentleman, on the 3rd March, 1885, barely expected to make both ends meet. Since that period, as everybody knows, there have been additional charges of very serious magnitude incurred in connection with the North-West and elsewhere. There have been very serious losses of revenue on which the hon. gentleman depended, which must be deducted from his prospective receipts. I will give in brief the details of the additional expenditures, as far as I have been able to estimate them from the statements made to us by Ministers, and I will then proceed to point out to the House the several items in which I think the hon. gentleman is likely to fall short of his expected receipts, and we will then consider what position we are likely to be placed in in dealing with our financial position for the ensuing year. It is well known to the House that the expenditure for the Mounted Police has amounted to very nearly \$500,000 a year; and if you double that force, taking into account the fact that they are likely to be compelled to move about to a very considerable extent, and that they must be maintained in a high state of efficiency, it is not too much to say that the additional 500 men, whom it is proposed to add to the force, will require a like sum, and that the total will amount, for several years to come, to very little, if at all, less than \$1,000,000 a year for the service of the Mounted Police. That will make an addition of \$500,000 a year to our permanent charges for next year. It is equally clear that the hopes the Ministers held out to themselves and us

of a large reduction in the expenditure for Indians are not at all likely to be realised. I believe that, so far from being able to save, as they expected, a matter of \$300,000 or \$400,000 in the charge for Indians, we must expect that the charge in future will at least equal, and probably considerably exceed, the sum we have heretofore paid. It will be necessary, I apprehend, to confine the Indians more closely to their reserves, and it will be also necessary and prudent not to drive these people to despair. I fear we must go on in the system we have commenced, of feeding them, and this will cost us at least \$500,000 more than (not the sum we have been in the habit of spending) but the sum the Minister expected to expend in the Estimates he laid before us for 1886. Then there is the question of the other forces, to which the Minister of Militia alluded this very afternoon. We have not the details, but I think I am not far astray in estimating the additional expenditure at \$150,000 or \$200,000. It may be more, but I take the smaller sum, and call it \$150,000. So far as I could understand, from the explanations given by the Minister of Customs, in passing the Manitoba resolutions, the additional subsidy to be granted to Manitoba will involve a future perpetual grant of \$150,000, or thereabouts. It is also quite clear that a very considerable addition must be made to the interest for which the Minister expected to provide when he made his statement to us in March last. He did not, apparently, expect at that time to be called upon to provide \$5,000,000 more for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In fact, as far as I understood him, he reckoned upon being able to receive a large sum from that company within a few years, and upon making it a basis for his financial operations. Now, in addition to that \$5,000,000 we will, according to the statement of the Government themselves, be obliged to provide for not less than \$4,000,000 more, to defray the expenditure we have incurred in the North-West. We have on the Table propositions to add \$80,000 a year to our permanent charge for a considerable number of years, in connection with our expenditure, for a single railway enterprises, and we have many other expenditures which will also involve a considerable addition to our permanent charge; but as these have not been passed by the House, I will, for the present, rather under-estimate than over-estimate the amount, and so I put down, as the approximate charge for interest that we will be called upon to incur, over and above the amount which the Minister estimated, \$140,000, being the interest upon the two sums of \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000, and the \$80,000 additional which is to be given to one of the various lines we propose to subsidise. Then we have another little item, the expenditure which will be incurred in putting into effect the Franchise Bill, if that measure should become law, and we have divers minor increases, some in connection with your own office, Mr. Speaker, some in connection with a variety of other offices, such as the appointment of two Librarians, and matters of that kind, all of which, I think, are not likely to be much, if at all, below the sum of \$200,000. Therefore, it appears that there is a very strong probability, to say the least, that we will increase our fixed charges by the sum \$1,940,000, over and above amounts which the Minister computed as likely to be incurred when he made his financial statement. Then, on the other hand, I do not think the Government themselves will contend that they are likely, in the ensuing year, to receive the \$700,000 as land revenue on which they counted. I am afraid that the certain results of the troubles in the North-West will be greatly to reduce the expected revenue from that source, and if we receive \$300,000 or \$400,000 it will be more than I myself should expect; and, waiving for the moment the question whether that sum should be credited at all to ordinary receipts, it is quite clear, I think, that we must deduct at least \$300,000 from the revenue expected from that source. Then comes another item of great

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

interest and of great importance—the \$1,500,000 which the Minister expected to receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as interest upon the loan to them at 5 per cent. I think we would do wisely, as prudent men, to strike that out of our calculation altogether. I do not myself believe in lending our debtors the money to pay us interest, and unless that is done by the Government, I have not the slightest expectation that, during the ensuing year, at any rate, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be in any position to pay us this large sum of money. So, Sir, the practical result is this: while our permanent charges are likely to be increased by \$1,940,000, it is only too probable that the revenue on which the hon. gentleman depended will be diminished by a sum total of not less than \$1,800,000 (\$1,500,000 on account of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who—by the way, were in default the other day on their interest—\$300,000 on account of lands) making altogether a sum total of \$3,740,000 of expenditure on the one hand and receipts on the other, in which, to all appearance, we will fall short. Now, Sir, you have got in addition to that to remember, that dividing, as I propose, the \$4,000,000 that our trouble in the North-West is likely to cost us between the two years 1885 and 1886, you have to add some \$2,000,000 further to the expenditure for 1886; and you will recollect that \$1,000,000 which properly belongs to 1886 has been already borrowed by the Government and applied to the service of the year 1885. Such is the statement on the face of it, and according to information that has been furnished by the Government themselves. But there are serious contingencies which have got to be taken into account before we can feel quite sure as to our future position. Sir, we know from experience that it may become necessary for us to sustain the Canadian Pacific Railway Company again. We are told that this is going to be a complete and final settlement; we were told so in 1881, when we first made our contract with that company; we were told so last year, when we came to their aid to the extent of 30 millions; now we are told so again. Sir, I shall be very glad indeed if it does prove to be a final and complete settlement; but looking at the whole position, looking particularly at the condition of things in the North-West, it appears to me that we run—and we cannot avoid taking it into our calculation—the risk of having further demands made upon us in the interest of that corporation, and that the Government may feel compelled to assist them still further. Then, it is also quite clear that the cost of working and operating the Intercolonial Railway is likely to become a source of considerable embarrassment to us. According to the statement made by the Minister, there is now a deficit of \$200,000 to \$300,000 between the expenditure and income of the Intercolonial Railway. There are certain measures which we are about to discuss which, if carried into effect, will contribute largely to render the Intercolonial Railway a still more unproductive piece of property than it is at present. However, as these are not likely to affect that road during the current or ensuing year, I merely call attention to the fact as being one which we ought to bear in mind in considering the probable future expense of conducting our Government. There is a third reason, which requires considerable attention at our hands. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government themselves have been spending, on the great works which have been under their charge, very large sums of money during the past three or four years. Now, Sir, that is coming to an abrupt termination. Very little more money, I presume, will be expended, either by Government or by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—certainly no such sums as have been expended in the past few years; and I need not tell business men, in or out of the House, that the cessation of so great an expenditure must make itself considerably felt on the imports and, consequently, on the public revenue which we will

receive during 1886. Then, in addition to that, we have got to remember that we have been obliged to make enormous additions—the largest additions, I believe, that have ever been made in one single year—to our public debt within the last twelve months. Wholly irrespective of the conversion of our 5 per cent. securities, it appears from the statement made by the Minister of Customs that we required to make \$65,000,000 of new loans within the last twelve months; \$25,000,000 were borrowed in July or June last by the Minister, and \$20,000,000 more are in process of being borrowed; and from the statement made, as I have said, at least \$20,000,000 more will require to be borrowed in order to put us in a position to meet the actual pressing engagements which the Minister, in reply to my question, enumerated the other night. Then, Sir, over and above that, there were certain ascertained liabilities given us by the Minister of Customs, amounting to about 10 millions additional, which, although not all due at once, are clearly ascertained liabilities which we owe and for which we must provide. Now, we know that on the 1st of June our total indebtedness amounted to \$258,711,000; 16 millions of that was floating debt, which is to be provided for by some of these new borrowings; but as we are to borrow 40 millions more, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, it is clear that, putting on one side the question of liabilities not yet incurred, our gross debt should be put down to-day, taking into account what we will have to provide in 1886, at \$282,711,000. And if, as you fairly might do in such a calculation, you take into account the liabilities which we have incurred, and for which provision must speedily be made, you could hardly place our total indebtedness at less than \$-92,000,000. Now, I abstain from considering what deduction should be made on account of net assets, and for this very plain reason: it would be utterly impossible for me to make any calculation which hon. gentlemen opposite would be likely to accept on this subject; part of them we might agree on, but the value of such assets as our advances to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under existing circumstances, we could not possibly agree on; therefore I enter into no calculation as to the actual net indebtedness. I am content with pointing out, according to the statements of the Government themselves, that our present indebtedness amounts to 282 millions, and our actual indebtedness, that is to say, our present debt, with the liabilities which we have incurred, cannot be computed at less than 292 millions. But even that, Mr. Speaker, makes no provision whatever for strengthening our reserves, which I believe to be quite inadequate in view of very serious liabilities we have incurred in borrowing through the savings banks from our own people, and in borrowing by the issue of Dominion notes to the amount which we have done. Those liabilities, as I have pointed out, amount to 47 or 48 millions, for which we have the altogether inadequate provision of a couple of millions and a-half in gold, and, I think, a couple of millions of English guaranteed bonds. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen may suppose that no serious harm has resulted from this, but I think, if they will consider the whole facts of the case, they will see that I am perfectly correct in stating that we have suffered very severely indeed in consequence of the improvidence which has compelled us to borrow these large sums of money, and also to provide for debts falling due at this particular juncture. It is quite true that a concurrence of favorable circumstances has prevented us from suffering any thing like the loss or anything like the inconvenience which we might possibly have been exposed to; but it is also true that the results of this carelessness in allowing all these great liabilities to mature together has been, that we are now compelled, and will be compelled for twenty-five, or it may be, fifty years to come, to pay some 20 per cent. more for the money that we borrow than we otherwise need have done. Sir, there can be no doubt whatever that with reason-

able prudence and care on the part of those to whom is confided the administration of the country, the people of Canada to-day could, with ease, have been borrowing money in London at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. interest. The interest of money has fallen very largely within the last eight or nine years. I am within the mark in saying that the interest of money, taking the world over, and especially in the great money centres, has fallen not less than 30 per cent. Now, Sir, nine years have elapsed since I myself negotiated a loan of Canadian 4 per cent's at 91. I see that Canadian 4 per cent's were sold by the Minister the other day at 99; our credit, therefore, is just 8 per cent. better than it was nine years ago; but, on the other hand, the average interest of money has fallen some 30 per cent., and we have failed entirely in obtaining the benefit which we ought to have obtained, which we might have obtained, and which, with common prudence, we would have obtained, in making these large transactions. Now, these transactions are of such magnitude that that fact becomes a very important one, and I shall proceed to show the House how very serious a loss has been inflicted upon us in consequence of that carelessness. In the first place, on the 25 millions which were borrowed in June or July last, it is quite clear that we have lost  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on the loan itself, and also that we have lost  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., practically, by consenting to issue a sinking fund on that. On the 25 millions which we renewed the other day at 99 we have sustained about an equal loss. On the 40 millions which we will have to borrow, if, as I am glad to hear, it is not found necessary or expedient to issue any sinking fund in connection with that, the loss will probably be only  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. But the sum total is this: that on these three transactions, on the 25 millions we borrowed before, and which are practically costing us, the sinking fund included,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; on the 25 millions which we renewed the other day and which are costing us a little more than  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.—something like £4 11s., I think, or 11s. 6d. per annum—and on the \$40,000,000 which we are now intending to borrow at 99, our total loss, supposing my calculation is correct, as I think it is—for we could easily have borrowed, and we ought to have borrowed, at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.—would amount to no less than \$700,000 a year for a period of 25 or 50 years, according to the length of time that these bonds may have to run. Now, Sir, it is true that a small portion of the sinking fund will be ultimately recovered, but you must remember that (although we seem to have forgotten it altogether in a good deal of our legislation) for every penny we pay out of the Treasury the people of Canada are taxed considerably more. One of the main reasons which I have always advanced against the unnecessary sinking fund we have maintained has been that in raising that money, even under the most economical system of taxation, you are obliged to take a great deal more money out of the pockets of the people than you put into the Treasury, and at present, and under existing circumstances, that evil is very seriously aggravated. Then there is another thing which I regret still more. After having put our  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent's on the market, it is very much to be regretted that circumstances have compelled the Government to recede from the position which they had taken. I can only look upon the position of the Government, in now being obliged to issue 4 per cent's, after attempting to introduce  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent's, as a distinctly retrograde step. I do not at the present moment feel disposed to criticise the thing itself. It may have been, possibly, the best course for them to adopt, but it is equally clear that it is only in consequence of their improvidence, of the injudicious advances they were compelled, or thought themselves compelled, to make to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that we have been obliged to pay a great deal more for our money than we ought to have paid, and obliged to abandon for a time the attempt to introduce the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent's on the

London market. As everybody knows, it is very difficult to retrace a step of this kind. If, after attempting to float a loan at the lower rate, you have to return to the larger rate which formerly prevailed, everybody can see that it would be very difficult for any person hereafter entrusted with the task of floating a loan to effect it successfully at the lower rate. But what I desire more particularly to call attention to is this. Here we have quite clearly and incontestably staring us in the face the fact that a considerable portion of the revenue on which Government depended is likely to fall off, that very large expenditures are going to be incurred, for which they have made no provision, and yet we find those hon. gentlemen not apparently intending to take any steps to restore the equilibrium between expenditures and receipts, which they admitted has been so seriously disturbed. Now, Sir, having dealt with the position, as stated by the Government themselves, I will take the opportunity—although the thing has been done before—of calling attention to the position in which we find ourselves to-day, after the lapse of some 17 or 18 years. Sir, it is well known to every hon. gentleman in this House that when Confederation was first formed, our total expenditure amounted to barely thirteen and a-half millions. It is equally known that within the space of about 7 years that expenditure had been raised to about \$23,313,000. It is equally well known that for four years the expenditure was kept practically constant, and that in 1878 it had only reached to 23½ million dollars. Since that time our expenditure has risen step by step, until last year it amounted to \$31,107,000, and until this year there is much reason to fear, as I have said, that it will reach at least \$34,800,000, and possibly, and very probably, to a still larger amount in 1886. Now, it is quite out of the question that those enormous increases, occurring, as they did, in two separate periods of seven years, should have occurred without very serious mismanagement on the part of the Government under which they were incurred. Over and over again the attention of the Government and the House has been called to the fact that we were increasing our expenditures and our debt without in the slightest paying any regard to the real advance in the resources and the population of the country. Sir, it has been contended, and very likely will be contended again, that there were special causes operating, between 1867 and 1874, and between 1878 and 1885, which rendered these increases justifiable, or, at least, excusable. In answer to that assertion, I merely point out that during the whole period from 1874 to 1878, in which no increases, on the whole, took place, in which, in 1878, we found that the total augmentation of the public expenditure amounted to barely \$186,000 over the expenditures incurred in 1874, there were charges of very great magnitude, additional and new charges constantly being incurred. There were very heavy public works, involving very large charges for interest; there were heavy charges on account of Mounted Police, which had been organised early in 1874; there were constantly increasing charges for Indians; charges for sinking fund, for post office; charges for operating a new portion of the Intercolonial Railway; charges for the Supreme Court, a new institution; and a great variety of other charges of a similar kind. Yet, Sir, notwithstanding all those charges—and be it remembered they were all exactly the class of new charges which were incurred by the present Government since 1878—notwithstanding all that, Sir, we find that during those four years to which I have alluded we succeeded ultimately in reducing the expenditure to precisely the same figure at which we found it when we entered office. Neither will it do to say that it is not fair to take the expenditure alone, because we find that the increase of taxation was in a precisely similar ratio. We find that in 1868 our total taxation amounted to \$11,700,000. Well, Sir, we find now that our total taxation amounts to about \$25,000,000, and that if provision were made for additional permanent charges,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

at least \$27,000,000 ought to be received during the current year. So that the percentage of increase in taxation has been just as great, relatively, as the increase in expenditure during that period. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say, looking at the enormous rapidity with which the debt has increased, looking at the enormous rapidity at which the expenditure and the taxation have increased, it appears to me that we have got into a position which requires the very serious consideration of every man who has the slightest regard for the credit of his country. The Government, apparently, are not disposed to make any provision for it, and that is all the more reason that we, on this side, should call attention to the state in which we find ourselves. I, myself, believe that it is the natural result of the policy they have pursued. They have chosen to disregard every rule and every lesson of their own experience, of the universal experience, I might say, of all communities similarly circumstanced to ourselves. It has almost become a rule that in countries like ours, after a period of considerable expansion, you are likely to be confronted with a period of great contraction; and if you allow the expenditure to run up, if you allow yourselves to use every accidental surplus as a justification for incurring enormous expenditures, you will be apt, after a little time, to find yourselves in just the position we are in to-day. I pointed out the loss of revenue. Nobody can pretend that we are likely to receive from public lands or from the Canadian Pacific Railway anything like the amount which the Minister of Finance expected to receive. Our increased expenditure is certain. Nobody can pretend that I have exaggerated or misrepresented the various items of expenditure I have enumerated, all of which are likely to be permanent additions, at any rate, for a considerable number of years, to our annual charges. It is equally clear to those who have studied the money markets that a very considerable additional loss has been inflicted upon us by reason of the unfavorable terms on which our recent loans have had to be contracted—unfavorable in this sense, that we have been unable to take advantage, to any material extent, of the great fall in the value of money which has taken place the last 6 or 7 years. It is equally certain, as any ordinary banker will tell us, that our present gold reserves are entirely inadequate to the enormous amount of debt we may be called upon to redeem at very short notice. It is equally clear that the Government are apparently not disposed, and perhaps are not able, at the present moment, to make any fair, adequate provision for meeting those difficulties with which we are confronted. I say to the Government that the possibilities are very grave. I say that the situation is strained to the uttermost. And there is another matter of considerable importance to which I desire to call the attention of this House; it is, not merely that our expenditure has increased enormously, but that the proportion of fixed charges has become enormous. When I come to examine in detail the amount of fixed charges, I find this has assumed proportions far greater than I should have supposed, and very much greater, I think, than hon. gentlemen opposite are aware. Taking the charges as I find them in the Estimates—which, be it remembered, are considerably below the real fixed charges, as I shall presently show—I find, for debt and sinking fund, and charges of management, our expenditure for 1886 is computed at no less than \$10,878,000, including the sinking fund on the recent exchange of 5 per cent. The charge for subsidies amounts to \$3,962,000. The charges for what are called collection of revenue, in which are included, of course, expenses for the working of the Intercolonial Railway, will amount to \$7,507,000. The expenditure for Indians, mostly under treaties, will amount to \$1,100,000 or more, or a total for these items of \$23,448,000, without taking into account the appropriation of \$440,000 for additional interest, and the Manitoba subsidy, amounting to \$150,000 more. So that, practically, we find ourselves in

this position: that our fixed charges for 1886 will amount to about \$24,060,000. That is considerably greater than the total expenditure for all purposes in 1878. The absolute fixed charges now inflicted on the people of this country are very nearly half a million more than were the total charges for all purposes in 1878. That is a circumstance which I think the Government would do well to lay to heart. It is a very grave circumstance. It is a circumstance which involves very serious consequences, because it shows quite clearly that we are working on a margin, and a very small reduction in our total receipts would involve very considerable results to the efficiency of our service, which, as I have said, is required to be conducted entirely on the small margin between the fixed charge of \$24,000,000 odd and the amount we expect to receive from all sources, and which, apparently, cannot exceed \$33,000,000. That is an immense proportion. I do not know—I would be glad if Ministers are better informed than myself, if they will point out any case—of any instance of a country of equal size and population with our own in which the fixed charges have swollen to anything like such a proportion of the revenue. If hon. gentlemen object to this, if they say, as they may possibly say, that amounts should be credited on both sides, that we have receipts from railways as well as expenditure, receipts from the post office as well as expenditure, all I can point out is this: whereas the Finance Minister computed the revenue from taxes at about \$24,000,000 or a little more, and whereas I believe myself that \$27,000,000 will be required to be raised from taxes, if we are to make both ends meet next year, if you choose to deduct those items which appear on both sides, you will find the total fixed expenditure which is borne and covered by absolute taxation would amount to something like \$18,000,000 out of the \$24,000,000 we expect to get, or \$27,000,000, which I think we ought to raise by means of taxation. I say that is entirely a disproportionate charge. It is one of the most unfortunate circumstances connected with our position that these fixed charges should have so enormously increased as they have increased by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us make a comparison. Hon. gentlemen object to a comparison with the United States; so on this occasion I will vary the comparison. I will compare our position with that of England. Their income is about fourteen times ours. Everybody knows that the available wealth of England is very much more than fourteen times as great as ours, our potential wealth we are not in a position to estimate. Our position, comparatively, is this: Were the English Chancellor of the Exchequer to come down to the House of Commons and inform that body that during a single year it had become necessary to borrow £200,000,000 sterling, £150,000,000 of which was for entirely new loans, forming a permanent charge in addition to the public debt, if he were further to inform the House that there was an apparent deficit of £5,000,000 and another deficit of £10,000,000 was impending; that owing to the disturbed condition of India or Ireland, as the case might be, it would be necessary to add largely to the military force of the country, we would have a situation almost exactly identical with that in which the people of Canada find themselves to-day. But what would be thought in England, if, under such a state of things, the First Minister were further to add that, holding it expedient to avoid discussion on this matter, he thought it desirable to introduce a measure to disfranchise his opponents throughout England, and invited them during the balance of the Session to give their earnest consideration to the details of this measure. I admit that it is difficult for us to comprehend what this enormous increase of our debt really means. Here we find that, taking into account the liabilities ascertained and known, we have increased, in eighteen years, the gross debt of Canada by \$200,000,000. In 1868 or

1867 our gross debt was some \$93,000,000 or \$94,000,000. In 1885 our debt, with the addition of these ascertained liabilities, will be \$292,710,000, being, as nearly as possible, an addition to our gross debt of 2,000 millions during those 18 years, very nearly at the rate of \$12,000,000 a year during all the time Confederation has existed. An equivalent to that would be an addition of \$2,000,000,000 to the debt of England, or looking at the relative population of the two countries, to an addition of \$2,600,000,000 to the debt of the United States during the same period. During the same interval we have added to the taxation nearly \$1,000,000 a year, an amount equivalent to \$170,000,000 added to the taxation of England, or \$220,000,000 added to the taxation of the United States in the same period. And for all that what have we got to show? What have we got to show to the people of Canada for an increase of \$200,000,000 to our debt, and for very nearly trebling our annual taxation. Practically, we have got this: we have got two railways, one of which might be valuable and which therefore we have graciously given away; we have paid for it, or are going to pay for it; at any rate, we have pledged our credit for it to the tune of something like \$100,000,000. It is a road, I believe, with very considerable future possibilities before it, and therefore, Sir, this road, which might be valuable, we have given away. But we have got another road, the Intercolonial Railway, which nobody, I believe, wants to take off our hands at present; and as it shows very clearly how exceedingly judiciously and wisely a large part of this debt has been incurred, I would like, for a moment or two, to call the attention of the House to the history of the Intercolonial Railway, as recorded in our Public Accounts. Hon. gentlemen have boasted that the Intercolonial Railway has been so successfully managed under their wise administration, that whereas my friend the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had serious deficits in connection with the working of that railway, these gentlemen are able to show a surplus of no less than \$10,000 on the last year's working of the railway. Sir, I want to show the House a little of the value of these balances, a little of the actual results which have been attained in the working of the Intercolonial Railway. First of all, I find that when my hon. friend, the member for East York, went out of office, the total capital account of the Intercolonial Railway stood at the sum of \$36,091,000; and if you take into account the sums contained in the Estimates for 1885 and in the Supplementary Estimates which have been brought down for the same year, you will find that our capital account for the Intercolonial Railway amounts to \$45,177,000. This railway, which has been managed so well as to produce a surplus of \$10,000 a year, has in that interval of seven years had \$9,000,000 and more added to its capital account, the annual additional interest, taking into account the rate at which it was borrowed, on which is considerably in excess of \$100,000. So, Sir, we have, as the practical result of the successful management of the Intercolonial Railway, the capital account increased by \$9,100,000 in seven years, a deficit on the working, as stated by the Minister the other day, of a quarter of a million, and there are proposals now before the House to add for 20 years a quarter of a million and more to the annual charge of this country, for the purpose of cutting the throat of the Intercolonial Railway, and making it a very much less productive work than it is at present or than it otherwise would be. Now, if hon. gentlemen choose to sum up the total results of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, they will find, when they make allowance for the charge for interest on this \$45,177,000, for the probable deficit, and for the subsidy for the rival lines, that, adding all these matters together, the annual charge to this country, over and above all we are likely to receive, would be very little, if at all, short of \$3,000,000 a year, which is very near the interest on \$100,000,000.

I give that as being not only in itself an exceedingly fine specimen of the brilliant results of the wise policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, but one of the best illustrations I can possibly present to the House of the way these \$200,000,000 have been, to a very great extent, fooled away; for there is no other term that would accurately describe the way in which the Intercolonial Railway has been managed, from the day of its inception to the present moment. Sir, I said just now that I would give roughly a comparison between our present position and the position in England. I will also, even though hon. gentlemen dislike the comparison very much, give a very brief comparison with the position in the United States. In 1867 the population of the United States was computed at \$3,000,000, its effective debt at \$2,508,000,000, and its necessary expenditure at \$360,000,000. In 1885 the population of the United States had risen to 56,000,000, its debt had been reduced to \$1,408,000,000, and its necessary expenditure to \$244,000,000. In Canada our computed population in 1867, less Indians, was 3,400,000, our net debt \$75,000,000, and our necessary expenditure was \$13,500,000. In 1885 our population, less Indians, as far as I can ascertain, is about 4,400,000, our net debt, making a very liberal allowance for our present assets, amounts to about \$240,000,000, and our necessary expenditure was given by the Finance Minister at \$32,850,000. So that you have got these results: that, taking into account the necessary taxation in each country—and by necessary taxation I include the necessary sum required for discharging the business of Government—and allowing, in the case of both countries, for cross-enteries which neutralise each other, we find that the position stands thus: The United States, in 1867, required to raise by necessary taxation, \$324,000,000, so that their necessary taxation per head amounted to \$9. In 1885 their necessary taxation amounts to \$220,000,000; their actual taxation is more, because they are applying about \$100,000,000 a year to the reduction of their debt; but their necessary taxation merely involves a charge per head of \$3.93, as against \$9 per head eighteen years ago. In Canada our necessary taxes in 1867 amounted to \$11,700,000, being an average of \$3.44 per head. If hon. gentlemen choose to impose such taxes as will apparently be required to make both ends meet, our necessary taxation would amount to \$27,000,000, being a charge of \$6.14 per head of population, as I estimate it, Indians deducted. In the matter of debt, the computation would be as follows: The interest *per capita* in the United States amounted, in 1867, to \$3.84; in 1885, according to the report of the Secretary Treasurer, it amounted to 82 cents per head. The average amount per man in the United States, in 1867, was \$69.76; the average amount in 1885 has sunk to \$25. In Canada, without taking into account this recent increase, our interest amounted to \$1.32 in 1867; in 1885 it amounts to \$2.15. The average amount per head, in 1867, was \$22.00 on the net debt, which I have been obliged to take for the purpose of comparison in all these cases; whereas, to-day, in 1885, it will apparently amount to not less than \$55 per head. This is taking into account the loans which are now in process of contraction, as stated by the Minister opposite me; \$240,000,000 is the amount of our net debt, as far as I can ascertain; our gross debt, as I have said, appears to be \$282,000,000, now incurred, and \$10,000,000 liabilities known and incurred. Now, the hon. gentleman will remember this, that whether the assertion be correct or not—and I am not going to enter into that discussion here—that the people of the United States have not to provide for a considerable number of items of expenditure which we have undertaken, on one point there can be no doubt: that this comparison, as between ourselves and them, is perfect, as between our position eighteen years ago and our position to-day. We have not incurred new liabilities since then; our position

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

relatively to the United States and relatively to their expenditure stands just the same to-day as it did eighteen years ago. It would be utter folly for us to disregard this. I propose to examine briefly the pleas which have been advanced by the apologists of the Government for this enormous increase. First, they advanced the plea of necessity. They say: for the purpose of keeping our Confederation together we have been obliged to incur this expenditure, which we admit to be enormous; for this purpose we have been obliged to add to our debt and to increase our taxation and ordinary expenditure. In part, I admit that may be true, but I maintain, as I have always maintained, that the more of this expenditure they show to be necessary the more clearly they prove they were compelled to spend a portion of money, the stronger the case they establish against themselves in this respect: that, knowing as they say they knew, our position was such that we would necessarily be obliged to add largely to our debt and taxation, they were trebly bound to take care that no unnecessary expenditure be incurred and no debt increased that could possibly be avoided. But as to the plea also brought forward, that this expenditure has produced adequate results, I take issue with them altogether. Not merely has it not produced adequate results, but that excuse is in exact opposition to the fact. To say we have had adequate results is to state a thing which is the exact reverse of the truth. I contend, and it can, I think, be very clearly shown, that the result of this reckless extravagance, this enormous expenditure, this huge increase in debt and taxation, has been, to a very great extent, to counteract all the advantages which we might fairly have looked to deriving from our Confederation. I contend that its effect has been greatly to hamper and imperil our future progress, and to put obstacles in our way, which it may be impossible for us to remove for generations to come. The practical result of it is this: The Government, both in their present term of office and their previous term, have incurred the greater portion of this expenditure simply and solely by the necessity they were under of constantly buying support. The very great outlay which the Government have made, and more especially of late, has been made a pretext and a plea on the part of sections of their supporters, for the purpose of extracting further large donations from the public purse. And if it be the case that our debt has increased \$200,000,000, and our taxation 150 per cent.; if it be the case that in every possible way our expenditure has been swollen, it has been because the Government and their supporters are equally to blame in this matter; that whenever the Government brought down a measure which was a little unpalatable to this or that section of their followers, the Government, sooner or later, have found it necessary to gild the pill, by making large grants to gratify this or that particular section. The result followed which always follows this way of carrying on Government, that they have created very serious jealousies among the different Provinces, among the different sections of their supporters, and that ultimately every dollar so granted has involved further outlay to satisfy the jealousies which their weak compliance, in the first instance, created and caused. Let me recapitulate the position in which we find ourselves. Here we have a most enormous increase, both in the public debt and the taxes. What is our position? Our population in these years has increased 1,000,000 or thereabouts; our debt has increased, speaking of the gross debt, by about \$200,000,000. Our population has increased 1,000,000; our annual expenditure has increased at least \$20,000,000, if not more; our population has increased 1,000,000; our nominal taxation has increased \$16,000,000, if we make fair provision for the wants of the future year we are now invited to discuss, and we must remember that our real taxation is vastly in excess of our nominal taxation. Our population has increased 30 per cent., our debt 200 per cent.; our population has increased 30 per cent., our expenditure 150 per cent and our

taxation 150 per cent. These are very serious considerations, and none the less serious because it is apparent that if our accounts are honestly and properly kept for the current year and the next year it is scarcely possible but that heavy deficits should be incurred. For a portion of this, I am quite ready to admit that the Government may plead that they could not have foreseen the recent outbreak, though I do not know they can plead that that outbreak was not very largely due to errors of management and serious misgovernment on their part. That I will leave to be discussed on a future occasion. I call attention to this: that the Government are apparently having recourse to expedients, which I cannot consider creditable, to conceal the present state of affairs. It is not creditable to us that we should find in the current year \$330,000 of expenditure charged to capital account on the score of Dominion lands, and apparently \$500,000 of receipts intended to be placed to credit of revenue from the same source, for the purpose of forcing a balance. It is not creditable to us that we find attempts to borrow large sums from the revenue of the future year for the service of the present year. It is not creditable to us to find perishable articles, such as rolling stock, which ought, in all conscience, to be charged to ordinary expenditure, credited, again and again, to capital account, for the purpose, apparently, of creating an unfair comparison in favor of the present Government as against the management of their predecessors. It is not by any means wise for us to shut our eyes to the fact that there are large contingent liabilities created by the policy of the Government. I call attention to this plain fact: So long as the Government make it manifest to their supporters, whenever they have a disagreeable measure to put through, that if their supporters will only show a certain amount of hostility to the proposition of the Government they may obtain for particular sections or regions large grants. There is a two-fold danger in that. Not merely does that policy entail much large and unnecessary additional expense, but it opens the door to a whole host of fresh demands, which will most assuredly be made on the Government, from time to time, many of which it will be almost impossible for them, in view of the jealousies they have aroused, to avoid satisfying. Then the huge fixed charge, whether you look to the proportion it bears to annual taxation, or to our total expenditure, is larger than the hon. gentleman can show to exist in any other civilised country. Then we have the failure, consequent on the policy of the Government, to get the benefit of the great reduction which has recently taken place in the rate of interest, whereby a very large and unnecessary additional charge is going to be imposed on the people of the country for the next twenty-five or fifty years. Besides that, they are fast bringing the people of this country, at any rate in the older Provinces, into a stationary, it may be into a retrograde, position; and, as I said, the last and worst thing with which I charge them is this: that by this system which they have introduced they are tending more and more to make an honest, straightforward mode of carrying on the government of this country a practical impossibility. I will give the House a practical illustration of the cost of this system of government. It may well be wondered at how it is, in a country like this, that we could possibly have contrived to add \$200,000,000 to our gross indebtedness in a period of seventeen or eighteen years, but if we take the case which has occurred, not only in the last years, but within the last few days, it will become tolerably patent to the House how these huge charges may be incurred. As I have said, every advance which hon. gentlemen have made to the Canadian Pacific Railway has practically cost us treble. We have, first, to make the original advance; we have next to propitiate certain sections and obtain their leave to make that advance at great further cost; and, last of all, we have to bear a very considerable

additional loss on the loans which we contract, and which could have been contracted on very much more favorable terms if we had not embarrassed ourselves by the necessity of making these advances at a very unfortunate time. Within twelve months we have advanced, or are to advance, two sums, one of \$30,000,000, the other of \$5,000,000, to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Take the additional subsidies which we were compelled to grant and the additional favors which we were compelled to give to certain parties in this House and elsewhere, to obtain their leave to advance this \$35,000,000, and I believe that, if fairly computed and set down, you would find that we had to pay \$30,000,000 or incur liabilities to that amount, for leave to lend that \$35,000,000. You will find that we have incurred in all an additional charge of something like \$700,000 a year—a sum which would pay the interest on \$20,000,000—because we chose to make that advance at a time when it was quite clear that the doing so would most materially hamper our financial transactions abroad. That is another illustration of the ways in which, as I have said, the money of the people has been fooled away. A great many of these sums are sums which I know quite well experienced business men, as some of the members of the Government are, would never have dreamed of giving, unless they had been compelled to do it for the purpose of getting those particular measures through; and that, I say again, is one of the results of a thoroughly bad system of government, of what is little better than six years of government by bribery: that is the result of extravagance and incompetence and corruption. Now, it is an utter fallacy to say that we can go on doing this without very seriously injuring the whole future of this country. I hear these gentlemen talk as if the addition of \$200,000,000 to our gross debt, trebling our taxes and trebling our expenditure, were a matter of mere insignificance to a great and growing country like Canada. I will apply a practical test, to which I call the attention of the House. The nominal taxation which we exact from the people of Canada to-day, which ought to amount to \$27,000,000, according to the average rate of wages given by the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, would maintain one family in eight of our whole population; it would keep the largest part of the population of the Maritime Provinces without doing a hand's turn of work from one end of the year to the other. If we take into consideration the real taxation which our people suffer the proportion would be very much greater, and it is clear that we are producing by this excessive expenditure something like a stationary state over a great portion of the country. It is not so apparent to us who reside in the large and prosperous cities of the Dominion, but it is very apparent to those who go into the rural districts and consider the state of the case all over the older Provinces. I turn to the census; I take the census returns of Canada, which have recently been furnished to us, for 1881, and what do I find? I find that, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, out of six constituencies not one single constituency, during the ten years that that census records, has been able to maintain its natural increase. I turn to Nova Scotia, and I find that, out of its twenty-one constituencies, barely two have been able to maintain their natural increase. I turn to New Brunswick, and I find that, out of its sixteen constituencies, scarcely three have maintained their natural increase. In the Province of Quebec, out of sixty-five constituencies, in those ten years hardly eleven have maintained their natural increase, and in a great many of them there is an absolute and positive decrease of the population recorded. I turn to Ontario, and I find, out of her eighty-eight constituencies—the number she had at the time this census was compiled—only twenty-eight have been able to maintain their natural increase, and there, as in other places, there are, unfortunately, a considerable number of constituencies

where the population has absolutely decreased. Now, it is impossible for us to shut our eyes to the significance of these facts; it is quite impossible for us not to see that in a country which cannot be said to be rapidly advancing, in a country in which, at any rate, the population is rather losing than gaining ground, relatively speaking, in that we are not able to keep our own people here, when we find that, with the aid of immigration, we are not able to show an increase equal to the natural increase of the population, it is scarcely possible to excuse the conduct of the Government, which has contrived to treble the public burthens within the space of 18 years, or, to be more correct, within two periods of seven years each, one beginning in 1867 and terminating in 1874, and the other beginning in 1878 and terminating in 1885. I say the action of the Government has gone very far to imperil the foundation of our Confederation. I say that, as regards a very considerable portion of the people of this country, it is unfortunately only too true that all that Confederation has done for them has been to bring them far heavier burthens without any sort of adequate return; I say, what is worse, that the whole tenor of the existing policy of Government is to prevent the several Provinces from exercising any wholesome self-reliance. We are constantly training these Provinces to believe that all they have to do is to send a delegation here to support the Government of the day, and that, if they do that, sufficiently determinedly, then, let that Province be as extravagant or as corruptly managed as it pleases, whatever that Province wants will be given to it, that it will be relieved from its embarrassments and will be free from the disagreeable necessity of attempting to raise revenue by means of direct taxation, and that everything will be made straight for it out of the public Treasury. I say you cannot carry on Confederation on any such basis, and I warn, again and again, the representatives of the people here and the people themselves, that so surely as we proceed on this vicious system, so surely the end of Confederation will not be far distant. It is really too bad. Here we are in a new country. We have no navy, we have no army, to be called an army, although we have a gallant citizen soldiery, who have responded very nobly to our call when there was real occasion for them to show the metal they were made of; but, in comparison with older countries, our necessary burthens were very small, and yet we have at this moment a taxation which, in its incidence on the people, is quite as great as the incidence of the taxes paid, at any rate, by the great bulk of the people in England, and that in spite of the fact that, over and above that taxation, there is, in a great portion of Canada, a great burden of municipal taxation, which exacts a further amount of the earnings of the people. Sir, the question is being put in many places, and rightly put: is it possible for us to struggle through under such circumstances? Although I, myself, have not lost faith in the future of Confederation, although I believe that in spite of what has come and gone we may be able to struggle through, still I cannot help seeing that the whole tendency of our present legislation is to take away from the people of Canada a great deal of the most valuable elements which go to constitute a nation. I say that if this thing goes on it will be day by day growing more doubtful whether we will, after all, be able to maintain ourselves. One thing is not doubtful, and that is, that there has been a serious moral and political degradation going on all over Canada for a number of years back. One thing is not doubtful, and that is, that we have thrown away most superb opportunities, which are not very likely to recur to us. We started out in the race of national life with great advantages. We were not merely lightly taxed, but we had great advantages at that time over our chief and most formidable competitor, who, from circumstances well known to us, was very much

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

hampered in the struggle. The one thing we needed we obtained almost on the very threshold of our national existence—we obtained control of a great and fertile territory, which supplied to our surplus population the opportunity of making homes on Canadian soil. All that we required was a little prudence, a little patience, a little honesty and a little common sense, to have made proper use of those great opportunities. We might and ought to have used them to very much greater advantage. I say that nothing has been done by us which ought to have prevented us from being to-day a very lightly taxed country; and with common prudence, instead of having to-day about \$200,000,000 of additional indebtedness, \$100,000,000 would have sufficed. I say that it is the fault of our Government that we have not at this moment a populous and prosperous west of our own; and what is perhaps equally important, that our older Provinces have not been educated to a right conception of the relation in which they stand to the federal power. Our people have not been kept in our own country; the advantage with which we started over the United States might easily have been maintained, and the basis of a great nation might have been infinitely more firmly established than it is to-day. Sir, looking at the whole circumstances, bearing in mind the facts I have stated, bearing in mind the circumstances which everybody knows have occurred in this country, who can wonder that to-day we find that one million native-born Canadians have sought homes in the United States? Who can wonder that within the last few years, out of 500,000 immigrants whom we have brought to our shores, our own municipal statistics appear to show that we have not succeeded in keeping 100,000 of them here? Who can wonder, when we look at this state of things, that we have had two rebellions within a dozen years in the Province which ought to have been a source of strength and prosperity to us, instead of being, as it is at this moment, a source of serious expense and trouble? Who can wonder that under these circumstances heavy deficits should have occurred? And what is worse, who can wonder that while this policy is in vogue the Parliament of Canada should appear to have made up its mind to abdicate entirely its proper function of controlling the expenditure of this country, and to be fast sinking into something very little better than a convention for the division of the spoils among certain powerful sections. Sir, I say again that I defy hon. gentlemen to show any country of equal size with our own, any country which has not been subjected to some very severe ordeal of war or some similar calamity, in which they can point out to such a state of things as that which I have pointed out to-night; and in order that our views on this subject may be put on record, I beg to move:

"That all the words after the word "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:— the total annual expenditure of the Dominion was \$13,486,092 in the year 1868.

That the said expenditure had increased to \$23,316,316 in 1874, being an increase of \$9,830,224 in the 7 years from 1st July, 1867, to 1st July, 1874.

That the expenditure was \$23,503,158 in 1878, being an increase of \$186,842 in the 4 years from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July 1878."

That the expenditure for the year ending 1st July, 1884, was \$31,107,706.

That it was estimated by the Minister of Finance that the expenditure for the year ending 1st July, 1885, would amount to \$32,850,000, being an increase of \$9,346,842 in the 7 years from 1st July, 1878, to 1st July, 1885 (irrespective of any expenditure incurred in suppressing the recent revolt in the North-West).

That the taxation of the people has increased as follows:—

From 11,700,661 dollars in 1868	
to 20,120,185 do 1874	
to 17,841,938 do 1878	
to 25,483,199 do 1884	

That the gross debt of Canada has increased as follows :—

From	93,046,051 dollars in 1867		
to	141,163,165 do	1874	
to	174,957,268 do	1878	
to	258,711,088 do	upon the 31st May, 1885,	independently of many liabilities for which provision must be made shortly.

That the increase in the debt, taxation and expenditure above mentioned have been in excess of the requirements and resources of the country and have interfered with its progress and development, and that stringent measures should be taken to reduce the expenditure and to lighten, as far as possible, the burthen of the people."

Mr. McLELAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman would think it scarcely courteous to a member of his position if some few remarks were not offered to the lengthy speech he has addressed to the House. I do not propose to detain the House at any very great length, but briefly to refer to some of the points he has presented. And I cannot, at the outset, refrain from expressing surprise at the tone and manner in which the hon. gentleman has delivered his speech, so different from that of speeches upon similar questions which he has previously delivered in this House. I remember having heard the hon. gentleman deliver his Budget Speech on several occasions. To-night he was depicting the position of the country and prophesying that in 1885 and 1886, and for many years, we would have a deficit,—that we were in an almost hopeless state of embarrassment; and yet the hon. gentleman did not manifest that exuberance of spirits which, in old times, when he was the midst of deficits, he manifested when making his Budget Speech. He never seemed happier than when he was delivering a speech at a time when he had deficits behind and deficits before him. I have here a short extract from a speech he delivered in 1877, when he had left a deficit of \$1,389,000 in 1876, and when there was a deficit before him of \$1,000,000 odd. Upon that occasion the hon. gentleman said :

"I think the country may be congratulated that so dangerous a crisis in our affairs has passed without our sustaining any very serious loss. I hold that equilibrium is now being restored. Our credit has been sustained, and more than sustained, and despite our deficit and the difficulties with which we have been loaded, our securities have obtained a better price than ever before, and unless another such misfortune as the last overtakes us in the present summer, we will be able, without very much difficulty, to weather the storm. If we are disappointed, the Government knows its duty and it is prepared to do it. Canada has yet ample resources untouched to enable it to meet its engagements."

The hon. gentleman at that time was hopeful, and he was jolly, although surrounded by deficits; because he had some faith at that time in his country, and declared that Canada had resources which were yet untouched. The hon. gentleman to-night did not seem to be in that peculiarly happy and jolly mood which he was in in 1877, when he was in the midst of deficits; and I was at a loss to know why the change in his tone and manner, why the speech he delivered, was in that solemn tone and that quiet manner so unusual to him. It would be uncourteous for me, perhaps unparliamentary, to say or think that he was delivering a speech which he knew could not have its effect upon the other side of the water, and prejudice the loan which the Finance Minister is about to negotiate next Monday. It would be unparliamentary for me to say that if the hon. gentleman had been permitted to deliver that speech in time for such an effect he would have manifested more satisfaction in painting in the blackest possible colors our position, and presenting the brazen side of the shield to the money lenders of England. How different was his manner to-night from the manner which he exhibited when he attempted to deliver that same speech on a former occasion, just when our Finance Minister had left our shores, and as soon as it became public that he was to negotiate a loan and make an exchange, on that occasion it required all the rules of the House to restrain him and to keep him within bounds. He was as impatient as a hound in the leash, struggling to seize the escaping game. The hon. gentleman has referred to

the expenditure of the present year and the expected expenditure in the incoming year. He has given us an estimate from which he fancies that there will be, in the present year, a very considerable deficit. Now, the figures which the hon. gentleman should have given to us for the present year, so far, I may state to the House are that we have received, up to the present time, according to the last returns, \$31,242,000. We have paid out, including the North-West expenditure of nearly \$1,000,000, \$29,802,978, or, deducting the North-West expenditure, which I do not think should be fairly chargeable to this year, or to any particular year—for it is customary in all countries that extraordinary expenditures such as that occasioned by these unfortunate circumstances in the North-West, should be distributed over a series of years—but deducting that amount, there is a balance to our credit of \$2,304,503, which may, when all the bills come in, to the 30th June, be considerably reduced. But the hon. gentleman insists that there will be a deficit in 1885, and he goes on piling up all the possible accumulations of 1886 and 1887. He tells us that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not pay its interests, and that Dominion lands will not yield as much as is expected, and he says that on the whole we must face a deficit of \$3,740,000. Then he asks us what we are going to do, under the circumstances. Why, we have only to go back to his tariff of 1874 and 1875, which we found in existence in 1878, and to his estimates, in order to provide for the whole of that sum which he has accumulated, without putting burdens on the country which would be very seriously felt. The hon. gentleman left office in 1878 with a duty on tea.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; that is true. When the hon. gentleman went into office he found no duty on tea, but he placed a duty on that article, and the hon. gentleman, who always talks about the large increase in taxation that has been placed on the country by the present Government, ought to remember that from 1868 down to 1873 there were continual reductions of taxation under the management of the leader of the present Government; and when the hon. gentlemen took office the taxation of the country had been reduced from 13·62 per cent. on the total value of goods entered for consumption, dutiable and free, down to 10·20 per cent. When he came into office the first thing he did was to increase the taxation to the extent of \$3,000,000, and he went out of office, after increasing the taxation from 10·20 per cent. to 14·03 per cent. Yet, notwithstanding that increase of taxation, there were deficits year by year, from which it took two or three years of the administration of the present Finance Minister to recover. The hon. gentleman, when he talks about the large increase in the debt of the Dominion, from 1868 to the present time, ought not to forget that some six or seven millions of that amount, at least, stands for no valuable work, but to meet the ordinary expenses of the country occasioned by the maladministration of the hon. gentleman. He should not forget that in that increase of indebtedness there are not only his deficits, not only the loss that he incurred by the sale of his 4 per cent. loan in 1874, amounting to \$1,500,000, but there is about \$30,000,000 of the indebtedness of the older Provinces which had been assumed by the Dominion since 1878. But the hon. gentleman asks: How are you to provide for that \$3,700,000 which is staring you in the face? We can go back to the tariff the hon. gentleman left us in 1878, and if we take the imports of tea in 1884, and put the same duty upon that article that the hon. gentleman left upon it, it would give us \$980,394. If we put the same Excise duty on tobacco that the hon. gentleman had upon it the consumption of 1884 would give us \$800,000 more. Then, go back to the

stamps on newspapers, and you will get \$200,000. We have had a large expenditure on public works. We found that there were many necessary expenditures to be made in the country for public works. The hon. gentleman says that the Government has only existed for corruption and bribery; that every public work that has been undertaken and carried to completion in this country has been for the purpose of corrupting some member of this House. Why, Sir, there have been public works undertaken by the Minister of Railways and others which have received the vote and the sanction of hon. gentlemen opposite; but that did not corrupt them or destroy their party allegiance, and it is an insult to this House and to this country to say that any member of this House is corrupted and bought, and only held to his party by an expenditure for a public service in his constituency. All this expenditure for public works has been in the interest of the country and for its development, and was sanctioned and approved by the people in 1882; and when the question is again submitted to the people in 1887, the Government will not be condemned because they have undertaken various public works throughout the Dominion. But if we reduce our expenditure on public works to the same amount hon. gentlemen opposite expended in 1878, we could save \$1,910,000 from the amount in 1884. In 1884 the amount expended on public works charged to consolidated revenue was \$2,908,851; and the amount expended in 1878 was \$998,554; so that, if we are compelled by circumstances to reduce our expenditure on public works, we can effect a saving of nearly \$2,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. McLELAN. Well, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman, and it will be just as well to wait till I get through. Then the hon. gentleman expended on immigration, in 1878, \$180,000, and in 1884 we expended \$575,000. The opinion has been expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite that that large expenditure on immigration could be avoided and ought to be avoided. Well, there may be something in this, that with the great development the country has undergone since 1878 that of itself should be a sufficient immigration agent, and that we might very largely reduce that expenditure; but, Sir, is it not necessary, I ask the House that when we have members of Parliament high in position, and whose names are known abroad, making such statements to the world as have been made to-night, is it not necessary that we should have some system of working throughout the different countries of the world to counteract the influence of such speeches? Therefore, until hon. gentlemen opposite abstain from presenting the brazen side of the shield, until they abstain from painting this country in all the blackest colors possible, and depicting it as a God-forsaken country, it will be necessary to incur a very large expenditure on immigration, in order that the truth may be disseminated—in order that the antidote may be administered when the poison goes abroad; and the hon. gentleman himself is chargeable in a great measure for the necessity of this very large expenditure for immigration purposes. Now, Sir, if we reduced that expenditure down to what it was in 1878, and if we took the other figures I have given, we should have \$4,385,306 to set against a possible \$3,700,000, which is the total amount the hon. gentleman, with all his ingenuity, has been able to figure up. I might go over our expenditure and show many other cases. The expenditure on militia and defence in 1884 was \$371,000 more than it was in 1878. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will consent to reduce the expenditure on the militia service. Hon. gentlemen opposite feel a great and sudden interest in the volunteers, and there has been a great deal of discussion, inside and outside the House, about the volunteers having

Mr. McLELAN.

been neglected, and about their trousers not having been of the proper pattern or the proper material.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Perhaps the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) might suggest some economies in the clothing of the militia. I remember taking up an account for the equipment of a couple of companies in the North-West by the hon. member for Bothwell, and it was done on a very economical scale in one sense and on a very extravagant scale in another sense; and if the hon. gentleman would propose to equip our volunteers in that way, perhaps we might save a very large amount. The hon. gentleman, in 1878, I find, uniformed 102 Indians, whose equipment was not exactly like that of the Mexican cavalry, a shirt collar and a pair of spurs, but there were no trousers. The account ran something like this: 102 pairs of boots, \$4 apiece; 102 flannel shirts, \$2 apiece; and 102 silk pocket handkerchiefs, \$2 apiece; and that was the whole of the uniform of these 102 Indians whom the hon. gentleman organised. However, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will be so economical in the clothing of our volunteers, especially when his leader thinks there is so much valor in the trousers, although other people think it is in the sword. But should we go back to the tariff the hon. gentleman left us in 1878, on those few items which I have given we have sufficient and more than sufficient to meet all the obligations he was able to conjure up as likely to fall upon us in the future. But the hon. gentleman should also bear in mind, notwithstanding all his lamentations and all his municipal statistics, that this country is growing and improving, and that our population is increasing year by year; and from that source we shall derive an additional strength. He has talked about the population of this country being depleted; but we know that there is nothing of the kind, as an actual fact. The same old story is being re-enacted all over this Dominion; love is being made in the frosts of winter and in the sunlight of summer; the orange blossoms are being worn, and marriage bells sounded, and new homes are being formed from one end of this land to the other. We do not take up a newspaper but we find that a new home has been founded, and by-and-by, in obedience to the great command to be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, there will be a new cradle put in the new home, to be added to the 200,000 cradles in this Dominion which are now rocking young Canadians who will grow to Canadian men and women and give their strength and their energies to the development of this country, to enable us to meet the deficit which the hon. gentleman has conjured up to-night. In addition to this, notwithstanding all the hon. gentleman has said about the exodus, our population is increasing from immigration. Why, Sir, all around me I see the fruits of immigration to the Dominion of Canada. I go down to my own county, where, a few generations ago, a handful of immigrants came in and settled, and the descendants of those men have multiplied and increased until there are 30,000 people in the county of Colchester, whom I have the honor to represent in this Parliament; and that county, which stands among the foremost counties in the Dominion, was started by a few immigrants. From England, Ireland, Scotland and the continent of Europe, there are immigrants coming into the country, who are just repeating what has occurred in my county and in all the counties of this Dominion, and who will help to strengthen and increase the resources of the country, and will help to meet the bugbears which the hon. gentleman has conjured up to-night. The hon. gentleman has said that all this increase of expenditure is due to maladministration, and he gives, as an illustration, the Intercolonial Railway, which, he says, has increased its capital account, since 1878, some \$7,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nine million dollars.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway has gone on increasing from the time of its construction until the cost of the Intercolonial Railway to the Dominion is \$45,000,000, seeking to convey the impression that this Dominion, since Confederation, has expended on that road \$45,000,000. But that includes the expenditure made by the Province of Nova Scotia and the Province of New Brunswick for the length of line that was built by them previous to Confederation, and which was brought in and now forms part of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman says that since his Government went out, in 1878, the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway has been increased \$9,000,000, and he would convey to the House the impression that this has all been caused simply in the working of the road as he left it. He omitted to tell the House that the road from Rivière du Loup to Lévis had been purchased since then; that the St. Charles branch has been built since; that the Eastern Extension of 80 miles has been purchased since, that various other branches have been built, and that important and necessary works at the various termini have been built, in order to make the road a complete line and meet the requirements of the country. But he sought to create the impression that in order to show a balance of \$10,000 this year we have been adding the necessary expenses of the road to capital account, and that by this means we ran the capital account up to \$45,000,000. The hon. gentleman should have been moderate; he should have been honest in the statements he made to the House and to the country. He says we have run up an enormous debt since 1878, the increase being, something like \$200,000,000. I have already stated that the hon. gentleman has gone beyond the figures which were submitted by the Acting Minister of Finance the other day, a very considerable sum; but I have not now time to detain the House with particulars. The hon. gentleman does not mind a million or two; judging by the way he piles up figures, a matter of \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 is nothing to him. Supposing that our debt has been increased by \$200,000,000; supposing all the obligations we have incurred were realised and placed upon the country, as I have stated, about \$30,000,000 of that was caused by the assumption of local debts since 1878. What have we got for it since 1868? Why, there is \$30,000,000, and there is \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 that the hon. gentleman knows that we have nothing for during his administration of the Government from 1873 to 1878. He says we have got two bits of railways, the Intercolonial and the Pacific. Why, we have got British Columbia, that came with an indebtedness which has been assumed and forms part of this; we have got Manitoba; we have got the North-West Territories; we have got Prince Edward Island, and we have got, in addition to the two bits of railways he speaks of, the several portions of railways which I have enumerated; we have got, also, very large expenditures upon the canals of the country; we have got public works here and there, spread from British Columbia to the easternmost point of Nova Scotia, all necessary for the development of the country—all called for by the wants of the people; and all these expenditures have been approved and sanctioned by the people at large. Let me say a word or two about the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman says we have got that. We have almost got it, and we have got it by assuming a large indebtedness at a period very much earlier than we expected. We have got that railway for this indebtedness six years in advance of the time that we contracted to have it completed, and the question comes to this:

Were we justified in assuming that indebtedness, in making that expenditure and increasing the indebtedness so largely before 1891? We undertook the construction of that work to be completed in 1891, believing that the natural growth of the country, and its increase, particularly under the policy which was adopted by the people in 1878, and sustained by the people in 1882, would warrant an expenditure so large as was to be incurred upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, year by year, up to 1891, that the growth and ability of the country, year by year, would be sufficient to meet the added expenditure upon that railway, and that we would reach 1891 with a completed railway and without any burden upon this country that the people were not willing and able to bear. The proposition came to us to have that railway completed six years in advance of the contract time, and it became a question for us to consider: Shall we gain sufficient by taking the liability and loaning the company \$30,000,000 and paying the subsidy six years in advance of the time named in the contract? Our expenditure on the portions of the road that were to be completed by the Government itself would be about \$40,000,000 in the surveys and the construction of the portion in British Columbia, and that portion from Lake Superior to Selkirk. That was money well expended for the development of this country, and we expected that it would return to us, when the whole system was completed, more than 4 per cent. of interest. Until the completion of the entire line, we do not get any advantage, or at least we get only a partial advantage, from the expenditure of that \$40,000,000. That was one of the elements which entered into the calculation. We have \$40,000,000 of expenditure which will be comparatively idle and useless until the whole line is completed, and we will lose the interest on that amount at 4 per cent., which, in six years, amounts to \$9,600,000. Then, so long as we had not all-rail communications with Manitoba and the North-West, the people of the North-West were compelled to deal largely with the people of the United States, and for six months of the year all their intercourse was with them. During those six years we believed that there would be commercial relations formed by the people of Manitoba and the North-West that would continue and last through a generation; and that the older Provinces would be deprived of the full benefit of trade and commerce, and intercourse with the North-West during that period, if the communications were not afforded. That was another element which entered into the consideration, that we should, at the earliest possible hour, place the people of Manitoba and the North-West, and the people of the older Provinces, in direct communication all the year round. Then you take the means of communication which the want of that railway forced upon us. For six months of the year we were obliged to travel through the United States. The distance from Montreal to Winnipeg, through the United States, is 1,698 miles; of this, 654 miles are on Canadian territory, so that every Canadian who desired to reach Winnipeg had to travel for 1,044 miles upon American lines. He had to pay the fare on American railways, and patronise American Pullman cars and American restaurants, and, perhaps, would stay over a day or two to see the country. Therefore, every man passing to and fro for six or seven months was compelled to travel over the American railways, and contribute to support them. What does that amount to? I have looked at the returns of the various railways, of the number of people passing to and fro, but the number of people going to British Columbia and coming from British Columbia would lead the older Provinces and Manitoba—we will say 20,000 people a year would have been compelled, during six years, to pass to and fro over 1,044 miles of American

railways. Now, what would each passenger have had to pay? I have ascertained from enquiries that the amount would have been at least \$50 each for railway and Pullman car, for restaurant and various other incidental expenses; so that you have a contribution by the people of old Canada and the North-West to American railways of \$1,000,000 a year. Then we have to take into account the freight for which the American railways have a monopoly for seven months in the year, during which we send at least 25,000 tons of freight to and fro from Manitoba to the older Provinces, and putting the average price at \$20 a ton, we were paying half a million dollars a year. Then for passage money and freight, going to and fro between Manitoba and the older Provinces, we were paying \$1,500,000 a year to the support of American railways, to say nothing of the commercial connections that would have been formed by our own people. Now, Mr. Speaker, in six years that amounts to \$9,000,000. We find that for the bare freight and passage fare that we should send through that country our people would have expended for the support of American railways \$9,000,000 in six years. That formed an element in the consideration of whether we should advance that money and have the road built six years earlier, in order to save that sum of money amongst our people. Then we are going to save 278 miles in travel, as the distance through our own territory, 766 miles, is 278 miles shorter than through American territory. By lessening the distance by that amount our own people would save in passage money \$400,000 a year, and in six years \$2,400,000. All this sum we have saved by opening this railway six years earlier than was proposed by the contract. Take only the lake shore route of 766 miles, and if you go beyond that and into the mountains, the difference will be much greater; but I shall be content to consider only the road around the north shore of Lake Superior. Now, 766 miles of railway require a large number of men to operate it, to watch the track, to run the locomotives, to attend to the machine shops, and keep everything in order. The average number of men employed per mile on railways is  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , so that upon upon the 766 miles this railway affords employment six years earlier for 3,452 men. These men have families, so that this railway affords employment and subsistence to a population of 13,803 for six years earlier than would have been the case under the old contract. Now, the Acting Minister of Railways tells me, and the superintendents of other railways tell me, that the average wages paid to railway men, from the trackmen to the highest mechanic in their employ, is \$50 a month; that would amount to \$172,600 a month, or \$2,681,200 a year, and for the six years \$12,527,000 that will be expended in our country and among our own people for the maintenance of this 766 miles of railway. All these advantages we secure for our own people by finishing this railway six years in advance of the time fixed by the contract. In this way we get the full value of the 40 millions we have expended upon the British Columbia sections and the Lake Superior sections, even assuming that the bare interest is worth \$9,600,000—and, of course, it was worth more than that to this country to have that money expended; otherwise, I do not suppose the people of Canada would have undertaken that work. But certainly indirectly it was worth more than the bare interest. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we felt justified in assuming this indebtedness six years in advance of the time named in the contract. I think when you look at the results that will be obtained, when you look at the bare saving that will be effected in keeping the expenditure of money in our own country, it will be admitted that circumstances justify the assumption of that indebtedness by the people of Canada. I have shown the hon. gentleman, who has employed all his ingenuity in filling up the indebtedness and the interest thereon, that if we only went back to his tariff of 1878 we would more than meet an increased expenditure'

Mr. McLELAN.

which the hon. gentleman is able to conjure up. But the hon. gentleman grows aghast at the fact that since 1868 we have increased our expenditure by an amount of \$24,000,000. Why, Mr. Speaker, he did not tell us that since 1863 British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the North-West Territories have been added to the Dominion, and have involved a largely increased expenditure. Then he would have us dwell particularly on the fact that from 1873 to 1878 they had not increased the expenditure in any way. Nothing could more condemn the management of the late Government than the fact that for five years they had done nothing more than hold their own, almost to a dollar.

Mr. VAIL. Oh, oh.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for Digby laughs. The mummies in the catacombs of Egypt have not increased the expenditure one dollar in five years. Hon. gentlemen opposite were afraid to increase the expenditure. They were like the steward who went and hid his talent in a napkin. They were afraid to put it out, to employ it for the benefit of their masters, the people; and when they went to their masters, in 1878, they met with a similar answer to that given to the steward, to whom were applied whips and scorpions. If it is a great crime to increase the expenditure of the country, why almost all the rest of the world, except some dead countries and some completed countries, are guilty of it. If you find a country which has not increased its expenditure during the last five years it is some completed country or some dead country.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the United States?

Mr. McLELAN. I will show hon. gentlemen what the United States has done. Hon. gentlemen are fond of quoting the United States, and I will show that there is hardly any country which has increased the expenditure for civil government more than the United States has within the last five years. The following are statistics of governmental expenditure:—Austria: 1879, £47,116,365; 1884, £51,491,937, an increase of £4,375,572, or 10 per cent. Hungary: 1879, £25,643,638; 1884, £32,920,023, an increase of £7,277,385, or 33 per cent. Belgium: 1879, £10,944,258; 1884, £13,154,370, an increase of £2,210,112, or 20 per cent. Germany (Prussia): 1879, £35,692,889; 1884, £54,152,894, an increase of £19,460,005, or 54 per cent. Great Britain: 1875, £74,328,040; 1879, £85,107,789, an increase of £11,079,749, or 17 per cent. Greece: 1879, £2,145,670; 1884, £3,432,584, an increase of £1,286,914, or 57 per cent. Italy: 1879, £61,423,937; 1884, £62,227,073, an increase of £803,136, or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Netherlands: 1879, £9,607,605; 1884, £11,938,314, an increase of £2,330,709, or 22 per cent. Russia: 1879, £64,389,225; 1884, £80,200,000, an increase of £15,810,775, or 25 per cent. Spain: 1879-80, £32,263,638; 1883-84, £32,053,999, a decrease of £109,639, or 33 per cent. India: 1879, £63,031,070; 1883, £69,418,598, an increase of £6,387,520, or 10 per cent. Japan: 1879-80, £12,063,515; 1883-84, £15,121,211, an increase of £3,057,696, or 25 per cent. New South Wales: 1879, £4,570,720; 1883, £7,791,088, an increase of £3,220,368, or 75 per cent. Queensland: 1879, £1,678,931; 1883, £2,242,971, an increase of £564,340, or 33 per cent. South Australia: 1879, £1,768,167; 1883, £2,330,079, an increase of £561,912, or 33 per cent. Western Australia: 1879, £145,312; 1883, £240,566, an increase of £95,254, or 65 per cent. Canada: 1879, \$24,455,381; 1884, \$31,107,706, an increase of \$6,552,325, or 23½ per cent. United States: 1845, \$21,895,369; 1850, \$37,165,990, or 76 per cent.; 1855, \$56,316,197, or 49 per cent.; 1860, \$60,056,754, or 7 per cent.; 1878, \$134,463,452; 1883, \$206,248,006, an increase of \$61,784,554, or 46 per cent. Decrease in interest charges, \$43,340,743, leaving a total of \$105,125,297, or 77½ per cent., without interest reduction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Every penny of which went to reduce the debt. The expenditure of the United States decreased 50 per cent. within the last 17 years.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says that the amount has been expended in reducing the indebtedness, and they have reduced the interest payment. I have shown that the increase was 46 per cent., notwithstanding the reduction of interest. The United States were paying \$43,000,000 less interest in 1883 than 1878, and yet the other expenditures for civil government ran the whole up to 46 per cent. If you take out the interest, for the benefit of the hon. member for Digby and the hon. member for South Huron, the increase is  $77\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say they have reduced the expenditure 50 per cent. in 17 years. The statements of the hon. gentleman are incorrect.

Mr. McLELAN. We have increased our indebtedness, and to cover the interest on that increased indebtedness our annual expenditure has been increased  $23\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; but the United States, taking away the saving they have made in interest, have increased the expenditure  $77\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is wholly in error.

Mr. McLELAN. Then all the books that contain the returns of the expenditures of the various countries of the world are in error. Everything seems to be wrong that does not aid the hon. gentleman's own particular argument; and perhaps it would be unparliamentary to say that the hon. gentleman wishes to show this country in the blackest possible light. And, therefore, in everything that does not tend to show that the country is going to ruin, that we are all becoming bankrupt, there must be some error in it. He will not even admit that any of the public records of this country are correct, unless they make for his own particular views. After the hon. gentleman had piled up that prospective indebtedness, he said we will have an indebtedness of \$55 a head. I have gone over a number of these countries, and I have shown how great an increase there is in the expenditure of the progressive countries of the world, and now I will refer to their indebtedness. That of Austria is \$65 a head, Hungary \$55 a head, Belgium \$75 a head, France \$129 a head, Great Britain—that country from which we obtain our moneys—\$102 a head, as against our \$55. You have in France and Great Britain nearly completed countries, in which there is not that room for development, growth and progress that there is in the Dominion of Canada, and there you find double the debt of the Dominion of Canada. Take, next, the Netherlands, which is \$105 a head; take New South Wales, which has increased its expenditure of last year 75 per cent.—its indebtedness per head is \$123, or more than double ours. Queensland, which increased its expenditure 35 per cent., has an indebtedness of \$250 a head. So I do not think that the hon. gentleman should alarm us very greatly by counting up our prospective indebtedness, and making it \$55 a head, when I have shown that almost all the countries of the world are increasing their expenditures very rapidly, and have a much larger debt per head than the people of Canada. But I have referred to the prospects we have for relief, for reducing that indebtedness and for meeting that expenditure. The hon. gentleman knows that when he has piled upon us all this indebtedness he has laid upon the people of Canada almost all the indebtedness it has been necessary for them to incur for a number of years. With the Inter-colonial system completed, with all those various lines which we have subsidised, with the Canadian Pacific Railway completed, the hon. gentleman knows that there need not be for a number of years any very large expenditure by the people of Canada on capital account. And, Sir, with the

natural increase of our population, with the increase that there must be through immigration, provided the hon. gentleman will cease from making speeches defaming, decrying and belittling our country, we have nothing to fear. The people of this country are as enterprising and energetic as any in the world. The hon. gentleman prophesied, in 1878, that we were going to dry up the fountains of trade by the National Policy; that we would have no trade with the outside world, and no international trade. The hon. gentleman knows, from the returns of trade, that there has been an enormous increase of our trade with the world abroad, and that it has largely increased since 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The returns do not show it.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows that when he was in power, from 1873 to 1878, the hand of trade turned backward on the dial, and that all our industries were paralysed. But if you compare Canada with the countries of the world, you will hardly find one that has more trade outside of herself, while her interior trade compares favorably with that of any country in the world of the same population. Our external trade places us in a proud position.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Take New South Wales. It has \$100 to our \$18.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is very fond of going to the United States. He was there half a dozen times tonight, and I suppose the hon. member for North Norfolk will take us there a dozen times more. He will make all his comparisons with that country. Let us go to the United States. In Canada, our trade with the outside world was \$53 per head of our population in 1884, while that of the United States was \$30 per head. France was \$47.60; Canada, for her population, exceeded the United States, exceeded France, exceeded Brazil, which was \$19.65, exceeded Spain, which was \$15. Great Britain was \$103, and our standing on the list I have mentioned was ahead of France, ahead of Spain, ahead of Brazil, Italy, Portugal, Mexico, Russia, Prussia and the United States. I say that with the room for development which we have at home, with the uses we are making of these, and with the facilities we have for commerce with the world, there is nothing in the remarks of the hon. gentleman to cause us alarm. The hon. gentleman complains once more, for perhaps the hundredth time, that we have been driving people out of this country—that but for our impolicy we should have a prosperous North-West.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for Bothwell says "hear, hear," just as if he had made the North-West. Five years his Government were in power, and what did they do for the North-West?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We had peace and good government there, and did not provoke a rebellion by brutal misgovernment.

Mr. McLELAN. No; but I tell the hon. gentleman that an Opposition on the stump and in Parliament and through their press can do more to provoke a rebellion than a Government; and if the hon. gentleman will go over all the utterances which have gone from this House and from the platforms of the various meetings he and his colleagues and associates have addressed, which have been taken up on the wings of the press and been scattered through the North-West and reached the half-breeds, and taken root in their hearts, and have led them to believe that we were ready for a rebellion, and that all they had to do was to rise and there would not be a man from any part of the Dominion who

would go to put them down, he will find that an Opposition can do more to create a rebellion than can be done by a Government. But the hon. gentleman says we have had a prosperous North-West. Why, Sir, what did they do towards making a prosperous North-West? During the five years they were in office they attempted to get connection with the North-West, and open up and develop that country by that famous water stretch system—by running a little piece of railway from Fort William, for 114 miles, and using Rainy River, the Lake of the Woods, and the Fort Frances locks, and by building another 114 miles to Selkirk.

An hon. MEMBER. The Neebing hotel.

Mr. McLELAN. The Neebing hotel did not contribute very largely to the success of the North-West, unless it contributed to the defeat of that Government, and to bring into power a Government that administered the North-West in a proper manner. After reaching Selkirk they proposed to go by the lakes and by the Waterhen River, and up the Saskatchewan for 700 or 800 miles to the Rocky Mountains. I say that hon. gentlemen opposite never intended to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a Government work, beyond Selkirk. It is in the record. I have been advised by my hon. friend not to refer to the record, or to enter into that question; but we are ready to show that they never intended to go beyond Selkirk; and while they are blaming us for not doing enough for the North-West, the proof is in the record that they did not consider it worth while to deflect the line to Winnipeg for 7,000 or 8,000 people, but they wanted to go direct up into the North-West and carry the railway into a swamp. These hon. gentlemen taunt us and say that but for mismanagement we should have had a million people in that country, although they left it, according to their own admissions, with scarcely 30,000 of a population. Under the changed system of making rapid and direct all rail communication to that country, on the change of Government, the people saw that there was to be a country worth going into, and they believed that the Government would perform the work they had undertaken; and, Sir, from 30,000 the population has increased in five years to a very large number. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) this Session, I believe, just before the rebellion broke out, moved a resolution here that there should be a new Province formed out of the Territory of Alberta, as its population had increased so largely; and when hon. gentlemen speak of the Farmers' Union they speak of 150,000 farmers as belonging to it; and yet the entire population of the country when they left office was not over 30,000. The hon. gentleman should not taunt us and say there are not enough people in the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taunted us, time and again, and challenge us to point out a single sentence they have uttered condemning that country. Why, that is only part of a scheme to defame that country. They want us to gather up all they have uttered against the country and put it in *Hansard* again and give it new circulation. It is not enough for the railway agents of the United States to take their utterances here on the floor of Parliament and print them, illustrated by pictures of those hon. gentlemen, but they must challenge us now to say what they uttered against the country. They wanted to have new circulation, that it may contribute to the damnation of that country. We are tempted to go over the record, to take the speeches and the language and the writings of those hon. gentlemen, to show how they have devoted, from time to time, their efforts to belittling and degrading this Dominion. Were it not that injury would result by new circulation being given to these utterances, were it not that these utterances would have their effect on capitalists abroad, we might go over their record; but capitalists abroad would

Mr. McLELAN.

be disposed to give these utterances some credence; they could not suppose that men holding responsible positions would attempt to decry their own country; they would not believe that in any country or city, since the destruction of Sodom, could be found men who would concentrate all their energies to degrading and belittling their own country. Therefore, we refuse to accept their challenge, not wishing to give new circulation to what has already fallen from those hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentleman says that our course has tended to reduce our credit abroad and prevent our borrowing at 3½ per cent. Well, it may be we are not able to borrow at so low a rate as some countries; but if it be true that there are men high in position here who are continually representing to the capitalists of other countries that we are an insolvent and ruined country, how can we expect our credit to increase. The hon. gentleman knows the advantage of presenting the silver side of the shield to the money lenders; he knows the effect in the English market which a bad speech, a speech pointing out that the finances of the country are in a deplorable condition, would have upon the money lenders; and he knows the effect of presenting the silver side of the shield to the capitalists, assuring them that we are in a prosperous condition and that all the expenditure we have incurred has been for works of a remunerative character. But there is another consideration for the money lender. It may be that he will consider that the revenue will meet our expenditure and interest; it may be that he will look to the permanency of the country; and when he takes up the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, what does he find, that might induce him to consider the Dominion is stable and permanent? He finds the hon. gentleman advocating independence, stating that the time is near at hand, probably long before the bonds we are offering will be due, when the Dominion will be an independent country. Again, he will see by those speeches that in all parts of the country there is disunion and that Confederation will not continue, that there will be secession here and secession there, and that the whole thing will fall apart like a rope of sand; and the effect upon the money lender will be that he will not make investments in this country without being assured of the permanency of its institutions. But the hon. gentleman knows that our credit, despite his speeches and those of his colleagues, is bound to increase; that, taking into account our indebtedness per head, and our room for development, and our progress and our prospects, the Dominion is better security than Great Britain herself; that it offers a more secure investment than Great Britain herself. Look at the Dominion and the development she is making. Take the worst picture the hon. gentleman can present—that there is \$55 a head of indebtedness upon us; and go to Great Britain. There you will find a large expenditure and a large indebtedness per head, and you will find that Great Britain has not that room for development and progress which is to be found in Canada, while in Great Britain there will always be heavy expenditure for the army and navy, to maintain the position she occupies in the world. Therefore, if you could persuade capitalists to keep away from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite the capitalists of Great Britain would be led to believe that in Canada there is a safer investment than in any country in Europe, Great Britain not excepted. The hon. gentleman has referred to the rebellion. I believe it will have this effect upon our credit, that it will prove the lie has been given to the utterances of those who have been preaching secession, who have been saying there is no feeling among the people in favor of preserving Confederation intact. The rebellion has shown the world that there is no desire for secession and separation, but that there is a determination among the people and a readiness among the people to preserve this Union intact. The result will be, I believe, that capitalists

abroad will have greater faith in Canada hereafter ; they will see that there is not only a determination on the part of our people to preserve Confederation intact, but that we have men among us who have surprised the world by the readiness with which they took up arms and the courage they exhibited during the rebellion. We knew we had a large number of volunteers of whom my colleague (Mr. Caron) was very proud, but there remained the test of fire to be applied to prove their quality. The test has been applied, and the result has shown that we have in our volunteers the stuff of which soldiers are made. We have the proud satisfaction of knowing that not one man flinched or faltered in his duty, though they were in the most trying position in which soldiers can be placed, that of fighting against a concealed foe. Now we reckon heroes, where, two short months ago, we only counted men. The result of rebellion will be beneficial abroad. Capitalists abroad who are loaning us money will have faith in the Dominion of Canada and our credit will thereby be improved.

Mr. MILLS. You want another rebellion to improve it more.

Mr. McLELAN. I have to apologise for having detained the House so long. The hon. gentleman has, I fancy, done his best to present the finances of the country in a deplorable condition. I believe the effect will not be very serious. The hon. gentleman has a marked ability for making the worse appear the better cause. The hon. gentleman exhibits a wonderful ingenuity in proving what he desires. He asks us why a million of people have gone out of this country and are in the United States, but he forgets that he was Finance Minister for five years, and that half a million of the people who are out of the country and in the United States have stated, as was read by the hon. member for West Durham, last Session, that they went out in 1876 and 1877.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nothing of the kind ; that is entirely incorrect.

Mr. McLELAN. It is stated upon the responsibility of the member for West Durham, and you must settle it between yourselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was quoted. Produce your authority.

Mr. McLELAN. At any rate, the hon. gentleman knows that he was five years in power ; he knows that there was no employment for people in this country, and that people will go where there is employment to be had, and that people went abroad and sought employment that they ought to have had at home. The hon. gentleman, in an elaborate argument, attempts to prove that there has been a great exodus, and that our whole population is being depleted, is running out of the country, and he takes up the municipal returns in one or two districts, and thinks he has the whole thing proven. If it would accomplish any party object, I believe the hon. gentleman, with his great abilities, with his great ingenuity, would go down beside the River St. Lawrence and elaborate a great argument to prove that it was running backwards. He would look at some of the circling eddies, he would look at some chip that was driven upwards by the wind, and on these little circumstances he would elaborate an argument to prove to the satisfaction of his own mind that the St. Lawrence was running upwards into the mountains and lakes. But we, who do not look at the eddies and the currents, but at the broad river itself, know that it is running downwards to the sea and increasing in depth and volume as it goes on. So, when he wants to prove that our population is leaving us, and that we are becoming day by day impoverished, he takes hold of some little circumstance, and from that

elaborates an argument to prove that we are growing poorer year by year, while the facts and circumstances prove, as the waters that widen and roll down the St. Lawrence prove that the river is broadening and increasing, our trade and commerce and the investments of our people on every hand and in every savings bank prove that the prosperity of our country is increasing and growing and deepening and widening, and that we have nothing to fear from the prognostications and prophesies made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall not detain the House long. It is not necessary to add to what was said by my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and all I shall ask the indulgence of the House for is a reply to a few of the points made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That gentleman, at the outset informed us that the member for South Huron on former occasions, when in office and when dealing with the question of deficits, was happy ; that he presented those financial statements to the House without that feeling of apprehension which he evidently entertained to-night. There was a good reason for the difference, if the difference existed, between the attitude of the hon. gentleman then and now. When presenting his statements, I do not know that he had special cause for alarm. He knew that the temporary difficulties under which Canada labored would pass away. He knew that the commercial depression that then rested upon the country was a matter of a few years, and would end. He knew that all the Government had to do in order to place Canada in the proper position was to husband the resources, keep down the expenditures, and administer the public affairs honestly, and that if the Government did this, as they did, if they strictly curtailed the expenses and economised our resources, he had but to bide his time, and all would be well. He knew that the tariff of 1876, upon a return of commercial prosperity, would give to this country an ample amount of revenue ; and the experience of the United States in that connection proves that the anticipations of the hon. gentleman in regard to that were well founded. In 1879 the United States derived from Customs the sum of \$137,250,000. Without any change in the tariff whatever, they derived from Customs, in the year 1882, \$220,000,000, an increase of over 69 per cent. in the brief period between 1879 and 1883. The change in commercial affairs which led to that great increase in the revenue of the United States, without any change in the rates of duties, would have led to an increase equally as great in Canada, if the tariff had not been changed, and if the increase in this country had been in proportion to that in the United States. With the continuance of the tariff he put upon the imports in 1876 he would, in 1882, have had a large surplus from the revenues derived from the duties imposed by that tariff. He had good reason for facing the future without alarm, for he knew he had only to keep the expenditures within reasonable bounds and give us an economical government, and the return of prosperity would give him ample funds for carrying on the affairs of the country. But what is the position of things to-day ? Why does my hon. friend look upon the future now with more apprehension than he did then ? Because we have a tariff that is not likely, under any circumstances, largely to increase our revenue ; because we have a Government that is not husbanding the resources of the country, but who, on the contrary, are reckless in their expenditure, and if I must use the expression, regardless of the interests of the people, who are increasing the expenditure by over \$1,450,000 a year.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman proceeded to insinuate that the hon. member for South Huron was purposely guilty of seeking to affect the credit of the country in the loan that is about to be effected in England. Sir, my hon. friend has forborne to make any criticism of the financial administration of this country until he can no

longer wait, and do so during this session of Parliament; he has purposely refrained from the criticism that he made to-night, fearing that it might, possibly, have an unfavorable effect upon our credit—knowing, at all events, that whether it had or not, he would be charged with unpatriotic conduct in doing so. Then, the hon. gentleman claims that it is unfair to take into account the extraordinary expenditure of this year in the North-West. That claim will not stand. The Government are obliged to meet the expenditure that it is necessary to incur from year to year, and in meeting our ordinary expenditures this year it is evident that we shall have a deficit.

Then the hon. gentleman proceeds to criticise the fiscal policy of the predecessors of this Government. He says that when the hon. member for South Huron went out of office we had a duty upon tea. Well, Sir, when he went out of office we had no duty upon coal and no duty upon bread, and I think that a comparison of the fiscal states of the two Governments will be infinitely in favor of my hon. friend. He tells us that the expenditure of this country largely increased under the administration of the predecessors of this Government. Well, Sir, I propose briefly to review the management of the financial affairs of this country under the Mackenzie Administration; and I venture to say that no Government of any civilised nation can present a financial record more honorable to itself than that of the Mackenzie Government. It came into power in 1874, when the general expenditure of this country had been run up from \$13,486,000 to \$23,316,000, and when we had a net debt of \$108,324,000. It is true that that debt was increased; it is true that the net debt, which stood on the 1st of July, 1874, at the figures I have named, was \$142,990,000 on the 1st of July, 1874; but it is furthermore true that the Mackenzie Administration were not responsible for anything more than a very small fraction of that increase. When they assumed the seals of office they were compelled to carry out contracts made by their predecessors, which rendered it necessary for them, during five years, to spend \$17,645,000 upon miscellaneous public works, including the enlargement of canals, not one dollar of which they were responsible for nor had contracted. They had to discharge further obligations contracted by their predecessors to the extent of \$11,052,000 upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to expend a further sum of \$5,286,000 in the completion of the Intercolonial Railway, or a total capital expenditure, during their term of office, of \$33,984,000, not one dollar of which they had contracted or that they could have avoided; so that, against a total increase of debt of \$34,666,000 they had this \$33,984,000 placed upon them by the acts of their predecessors. But in consequence of the financial years overlapping each other, they coming into office in 1874, when part of the financial year had run its course, and going out of office in 1878, when part of the financial year had also run its course, the comparison I have made with reference to the debt is less favorable to them than the facts justified, because they were actually responsible for the increase of the public debt to the extent of \$100,000 only, to wit, the sum expended upon the St. Peter's Canal.

Then, Sir, I will take up the question of controllable expenditure. You know, Mr. Speaker, that we have fixed charges upon the revenue, and we have also an expenditure which we call a controllable expenditure, and it is only upon this latter class of expenditure that the Government can exercise economy. The fixed charges must be paid; the charges upon revenue for the management of public works, for post office expenses and the expenses of the Excise Department cannot be changed in any material degree. Now, let us see what the record of the Mackenzie Administration was with regard to the controllable expenditure. The controllable expenditure of the Macdonald Government

Mr. CHARLTON,

during the first period was as follows: 1867-68, \$3,630,298; 1873-74, \$3,324,076, or an increase eleven times faster than the population of the country. We come to the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues. Starting with a controllable expenditure of \$8,324,076 it was reduced, in 1878-79, to \$6,941,577, or a decrease of \$1,382,499. Then we come to the second period of the Macdonald Government. Commencing with a controllable expenditure of \$6,941,577, it has been increased; until in 1884-85 it reaches \$12,289,625, an increase of \$5,348,048, or seven times faster than the population, with supplementary estimates and unprovided items yet to come. The following is a comparison of the total consolidated fund expenditure: First period, 1867-68, \$13,486,092; 1873-74, \$23,316,316—increase, \$9,831,224, or an annual increase of \$1,305,036. Second period: 1873-74, \$23,316,316; 1878-79, \$24,345,389—increase \$1,139,065, or an average annual increase of \$227,813. I may add, too, this increase was apparent rather than real. The real increase was actually very much less, because when my hon. friend went into office as Finance Minister he found that the estimates of Sir Leonard Tilley had been taken for \$23,685,000 for the current fiscal year. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) spent only \$23,316,000. Sir Leonard Tilley cannot claim that he would have spent less than his estimates. The estimates of Sir Richard Cartwright for 1878-79 were \$23,669,000. He only remained in office a short time after the commencement of the fiscal year, and was succeeded by Sir Leonard Tilley who held office for more than three-fourths of the year, and spent \$24,455,381, exceeding the estimates of Sir Richard by \$786,381; for that excess Sir Leonard Tilley was responsible. In view of these facts the actual increase during Mr. Mackenzie's administration was really \$353,000, or an average of \$70,536 a year. With respect to the expenditure chargeable to the consolidated fund, in 1878-79 it was \$24,455,381; 1883-84, \$31,784,235., which includes unprovided items for 1883-84, \$676,529 contained in the Estimates just brought down. The Estimates for the coming fiscal year are not yet complete enough for purposes of comparison, but were roughly stated by Sir Leonard Tilley at \$32,850,000. The increase between 1878-79 and 1883-84 was \$7,328,854, or an average annual sum of \$1,465,770. That is a sufficient answer to the charge that the Mackenzie Administration had been guilty of maladministration of the financial affairs of this country. There was a large decrease in the controllable expenditure under that Government, as against a large increase under their predecessors—eleven times more than the increase of population during their first term of office, and seven times more than under their second term. There has also been a large increase in expenditure chargeable to the consolidated fund, amounting to more than \$9,000,000, during their first term, and \$7,000,000 during their second term as against an actual increase of \$353,000 during the five years' term of the Mackenzie Administration.

The hon. gentleman resorted to an attack on the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) because he alleged that the Government had resorted to measures to secure support that were little short of bribery. That is known to be a fact; it is a matter of history that the Government have been obliged to buy support, that the Government have reconciled heterogeneous and conflicting elements, that the Orange is going hand in hand with the Bleu, and other dissimilar elements are united by buying their support. They could only obtain the support of the Bleus for the Canadian Pacific loan last year by imposing a further burden on the people to benefit local interests by granting railway subsidies. The Government has supported itself in this manner, it has made this practice part of its policy, and it has resorted to expedients of this kind in order to continue its term of office.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). How did the Government buy Orangemen?

Mr. CHARLTON. One way in which the Government is buying Orangemen is by giving Indians in East Hastings a vote. I do not think, however, that Orangemen have been so exacting as some of the other elements supporting the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman would like to see them fighting. They have, however, too much sense to be misled by his clap-trap.

Mr. CHARLTON. I admit that instead of the lion and the lamb lying down together, I should prefer to see them showing their natural tendencies. The hon. gentleman who addressed the House claimed that the record was sanctioned by the people in 1882. Had hon. gentlemen opposite evinced any confidence in the verdict of the people before they went to the election? Did they not, in order to make sure of a verdict, commit one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated in any country. They showed by the Gerry-mander Act of 1882, by that base re-arrangement of ridings, that they had very little confidence in securing the verdict of the people. No doubt the hon. gentleman will claim that their conduct will be sanctioned by the verdict of the people at the next election. What steps are they taking to secure a favorable verdict? It will be sanctioned, perchance, by virtue of the decision of the revising barrister; it will be sanctioned, perhaps, by the trampling down of the fundamental principles of free institutions, by taking from the people the power of fixing their own representation, by putting in the hands of the creatures of the Government the power and the duty of forming and revising the electoral lists of this country, of giving barbarian Indians votes which may result in returning the hon. member for East Hastings and other supporters of the Conservative Government to seats in this House.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I was here before you, and will be here after you.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has made some financial statements to-night, and I find it difficult to give credence to some of them. He says, for instance, that the Government are about to effect a saving of \$1,900,000 on public works next year, out of a total vote of \$1,500,000.

Mr. McLELAN. I said, if the necessity arose, it might be done.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not see what necessity could enable the Government to save \$1,900,000 out of \$1,500,000. If you can bring a pressure which will enable a man to do that, I should like to know how it can be done.

Mr. BOWELL. Just as you accused the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway of stealing eight millions out of six.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not remember that occurrence. Here is a summary of the Estimates for 1885-86, and I find—

Mr. McLELAN. My whole statement was on the expenditure of 1884-85—the full year.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman. Perhaps he will tell us what are the Estimates for 1883-84.

Mr. McLELAN. I was talking of the expenditures.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman spoke of saving \$1,900,000 out of \$1,500,000 on public works. Then, Sir, he drew a very pleasant picture of the progress being made by this country in populating it; of orange blossoms; of nuptial wreaths; of cradles which were being established; and he said all this talk about the depletion of the population was imaginary, that nothing of the kind was occurring. Well, Sir, it is a lamentable fact that notwithstanding the rose-colored picture he drew we are losing a large

number of our native-born Canadians; it is a lamentable fact that they are going from the country by thousands. Whether the exodus can be prevented or not is a question I cannot answer, but it is folly to deny that such a state of things exists. It is folly to charge on the Opposition any responsibility for that exodus, or that anything in the shape of the facts produced by their speeches leads to that exodus. The exodus is created by the condition of the country at the present time, and it has been largely accelerated since hon. gentlemen came to power. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that during the administration of affairs by the Mackenzie Government half a million of people left this country. Sir, the American statistics show that during the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie 134,000 Canadians left this country for the United States, and the same statistics show that since hon. gentlemen came into office that number went up to 450,000, or three times greater per year under the present Administration than under the preceding one.

The hon. gentleman proceeded to criticise the statements made by the hon. member for Huron with regard to the Intercolonial road. He asserted that the hon. gentleman misled the House in not stating that the capital account was increased \$9,000,000 under the present Administration, and he referred to the fact that the River du Loup branch had been purchased and added to the road. I do not think that makes any particular difference. The capital of the road has been increased; the burdens of the country have been increased; and it yields a revenue of \$10,000 on an investment of \$45,000,000. Then he referred to the deficit of the previous Administration; but he forgot to mention the payments into sinking fund by that Administration, amounting to a sum almost if not quite great enough to counterbalance the deficits; and that if we take the payments into sinking fund, we have left a very light deficit, if any at all. He asks, what we had to show for our increase of the public debt, and he said we had public works. True, we have. He mentioned the Intercolonial Railway, which was said to have assumed the form of a Grecian bend to accommodate the hon. gentleman himself, and from which we got a return of \$10,000 on an investment of \$45,000,000. The money invested in the public works of Canada, all told, yield a revenue of about one-fifteenth of 1 per cent. Some of them are works of utility, like the canals, but the money spent on the Intercolonial road was squandered. The money invested in the Canadian Pacific Railway was millions and millions in excess of the amount required to secure the purpose aimed at; and if we sum up our investments in public works, we shall find that at least \$70,000,000 to \$80,000,000 of the debt of Canada are for investments in public works, with very little to show for them.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). If you go to the North-West you will not think so.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may go to the North-West a thousand times, but I shall never be convinced that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway secured, at a cost to this country of nearly \$100,000,000, was a benefit to this country, when it could have been secured for one-third of that amount, or that that investment was a wise one.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Better men than you have thought so.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman should not indulge in these interruptions.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman dealt at great length, and apparently with peculiar pleasure, on the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He dwelt upon that portion of the policy of the Government by which the completion of this road was secured six years in advance of the terms of the contract, with a degree of unctiousness which clearly showed that he supposed the Government had done

something worthy of approval in this portion of their policy. He asked, triumphantly, were they justified in their course? I say they were not. I say they were not justified in the mode in which the contract was first made; that the Government should have invited tenders from the capitalists of the world. In the second place, I say they were not justified in pushing the contract through when they found that better terms could be made. In the third place, they were not justified in their conduct with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in having failed to exercise a close supervision over its affairs, and to compel the company to use the money they received from this Government for the purposes of their contract. They were not justified in the efforts they made to secure the completion of this road six years in advance of the contract, because they secured it at a largely enhanced cost, without commensurate advantages to the country through which it was built. The hon. gentleman tells us that the development of the country is due to the rapid construction of the road. What growth is there in that country, that stretches to the Rocky Mountains and through the mountains? The population in the country between the base of the Rocky Mountains and Winnipeg could be located on one-third of the distance; it might be settled on 300 miles of that line and its branches. The line has been pushed through the prairie section faster than the necessities of the country required, though at an enhanced cost, and without conferring advantages on the country in any particular sense. If the original policy had been adhered to, of building the road slowly, and only so fast as the wants of the country required, it would have been better for the North-West, for the company and for Canada at large. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the great importance of having direct communication with the North-West by the road north of Lake Superior. Well, I am not disposed to question that the construction of the line north of Lake Superior is a matter of importance to the country. The Opposition never questioned the propriety of ultimately building that section of road, but what the Opposition contended was, that the financial strain upon the country was too great, the increase in the debt of the country was too rapid, and the obligations the country had incurred were so onerous that we should seek rather to economise our resources than to rush ahead heedlessly and incur a vast amount of debt. Reasoning from these premises, we contended that a line running south of Lake Superior and connecting with the lines to the west at Sault Ste. Marie would serve all the practical purposes of the country in the meantime, without straining our financial resources to the extent to which they have been strained. I believe that was the true policy. The great bulk of the trade of the North-West will be transferred at Port Arthur from the railway to steamer and be carried to eastern ports. I do not believe that in the summer the traffic will, to any extent, traverse the line north of Lake Superior. Then the hon. gentleman speaks a good deal of the advantages of opening those 760 miles of road. He told us the actual labor employed on that section will amount to \$2,000,000 per annum, equal to \$8,000,000 paid to trackmen and laborers over the whole line. I believe his estimate was very extravagant, and even if it was not, Canadians will not derive a great advantage from that expenditure, because the company seem to have a preference for Americans. They have an American general manager, and an American division superintendent at Winnipeg; nearly all their contracts have been performed by Americans; American engineers have located the different portions of the road; American drivers and conductors are employed on their trains; in fact, it is an American company, under American management and supervision, and any advantages that accrue to laborers are not likely, if the present system of management is continued, to accrue largely to our own people. Then the hon. gentleman makes very little of the increase in our

Mr. CHARLTON.

expenditure, and says that the annexation of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and the North-West has given us an acquisition of population which will fully counterbalance the increase in the expenditure. That is an absurd statement. The population of British Columbia was some 10,000 or 12,000; the population of Manitoba and the North-West was but a few thousands, and the population of Prince Edward Island is about 100,000. To say that this population of some 200,000, all told, out of a total population of about 4,500,000, could account for all this increased expenditure, amounting to \$9,100,000 in the first term of office of hon. gentlemen opposite, and nearly \$8,000,000 in the second term, is absurd.

Then, Sir, in this most wonderful part of this singular medley, the hon. gentleman, after having arraigned the late Government for its maladministration of affairs, and for increasing the public debt, proceeds to condemn them on the ground that they had not increased the debt during their five years of office. He says they are like the man told of in the Scriptures, who buried his talent in the earth—that they did not develop the resources of the country or increase the expenditure, that they did not embark in the Pacific Railway and other public works. They did spend large sums of money on public works, but they economised in all directions, wherever they could; and while they carefully avoided increasing the expenses of the country, they administered the affairs of the country efficiently; and I defy the hon. gentleman to show any interest in this country which suffered under the administration of the hon. Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues, in consequence of parsimony on their part or their refusal to spend money where necessary. The hon. gentleman drew comparisons between the increase in the expenditure of Canada and that of the United States, and I cannot find in the statistics of the United States anything that will warrant the statements made by the hon. gentleman or the conclusions arrived at by him. I find, on enquiring into his statements, that the expenditure in the United States has increased less rapidly than in this country. For instance, under the head of Civil Government, the United States spent, in 1868 \$58,177,000 and in 1883 \$68,678,000, being an increase of \$10,000,000, not a higher percentage than the increase in population. Coming down to the total net ordinary expenditure of the country, including interest, I find that in 1874 the United States expended \$194,118,000 and in 1883 \$206,248,000, or barely \$12,000,000 of an increase in ten years.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Take the statistics for 1884. The hon. gentleman will find the amount is \$244,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was spoken of was the necessary taxation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have only the almanac for 1884, which gives the returns for 1883.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have it for 1885, which gives the returns for 1884, and these returns show an increase of about \$40,000,000 in that year.

Mr. CHARLTON. The net ordinary expenditure in 1816 was \$23,373,000, and in 1852 \$40,389,000. If you take the Treasurer's report of the United States, giving the net ordinary increase every year since 1816, you will find the average rate of increase very much less than our own. Then the hon. gentleman made a comparison with other colonies, but there is this difference between our own and the Australian colonies, that we keep a capital account while they do not. In their expenditure the hon. gentleman has figured up loans, capital expenditure and ordinary expenses. But supposing we had figured up, as a part of our expenditure this year, the \$60,000,000 we are borrowing, what kind of exhibit would that make? That shows the comparison is wholly unfair and unreliable, and my hon.

friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) reminds me, with reference to the volume of trade in the different countries, that the exports of New South Wales were \$100 per head and those of Canada only \$18 per head during the last fiscal year.

The hon. gentleman proceeds to inform us that no further increase in our debt is now necessary. I should be very loath to trust the present Administration in any promise they might make to refrain from increasing our public debt. It would be something new for them to refrain from increasing our debt or unduly increasing our expenditure. That would be at variance with their whole past history since 1867, and I cannot give them credit for any such repentance until they show the fruits of their repentance by actual deeds. From \$13,500,000 in 1867, hon. gentlemen opposite have run up our expenditure to \$32,800,000 in the next fiscal year. A government which has so largely increased the controllable expenditure, a Government which has increased the public debt by \$200,000,000, being six times faster than our increase in population, a Government with this record, I would not chose voluntarily to administer the fiscal affairs of the country for the next term of office. I would not trust them in any promise they might make that they would not increase the debt of the country. They cannot avoid increasing it, for if they hold power it is by means involving, necessarily, an increase in our debt. They retain office by virtue of the policy depicted by Petroleum V. Nasby, by virtue of plunder, by subsidising their supporters whenever they find themselves in a tight place, whenever any section of their supporters hold a caucus, in No. 8 or elsewhere, and determine to make fresh demands on the Government, in return for new demands of the Government on their allegiance. The very circumstance in which the Government are placed, the very conditions under which they hold power, the very measures which are necessary to reconcile the conflicting elements that form their following, render it imperative upon them to continue the course they have been continuing for years past. Many of the things with which they are charged they have not been guilty of voluntarily, but because political exigencies rendered it necessary they should sacrifice the interests of the country to retain office. The very reasons that compelled this Government to administer the affairs of the country in the way they have administered them, the very reasons that compel them to increase our debt and our expenditure as rapidly as it has been increased—these very reasons will work the same effect and produce the same results in the future as in the past.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries made what might be called a Mosaic speech, his transitions were so very abrupt from one section to another, and I must perforce make the same abrupt transitions in following him. He next proceeds to charge the Opposition with having provoked the rebellion in the North-West. Their utterances, he says, reached the half-breeds and the Indians. I wonder if they took the daily papers and watched the progress of events in this country.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Their leaders did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Gabriel Dumont is said to have been a subscriber to the *Minerve*. Probably he derived his ideas and inspirations from that source.

Mr. WOODWORTH. One of the leaders, named Jackson, was a correspondent of the *Toronto Globe*.

Mr. CHARLTON. This criticism of the Opposition has not a single element of fairness in it. The Opposition have done nothing to provoke rebellion in the North-West, but the difficulties that existed in the North-West and culminated in a rebellion were due to the supineness and indecision of the Government, which failed, for months and years, to grapple with them. By their mismanagement, by their

land policy, by their colonisation land company policy, by their policy with regard to pasture lands leases and coal land leases and timber limits, by their policy of bartering away and dividing an empire among their followers without competition, in a manner subversive of all the principles of free government—by these means the difficulties in the North-West were created and fomented, and, in consequence of the utter incapacity of the Government to deal with these questions, or to attempt to enquire into the grievances these men complained of, the rebellion burst upon us. The Opposition had nothing to do with it; on the contrary, they protested against the indecision, the lack of ability displayed by the Government. We pointed out the weak points in their whole policy; we showed up the evil results of this land policy, and the continuance of the policy by which the Government granted timber limits, and of their policy with regard to pasture lands leases and coal land leases—all the items in the Government policy which produced the results, the hon. gentleman most unfairly attributed to efforts of the Opposition, we protested against; and had our representations been accepted and the course we advised been followed, this catastrophe, which finally burst upon the country, would have been averted. The hon. gentleman asked tauntingly why did we not open up the North-West when we were in office. But we did so; we constructed the line of railway from Emerson to Selkirk; we had in process of construction a line from Port Arthur to Selkirk; we had made arrangements for continuing the construction of that system of railways west of Red River, as fast as the needs of the country required. The then Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) had conceived and was carrying into operation a broad and comprehensive policy with regard to the development of the North-West. If this Government had carried out this policy, if this Government had built the road from Port Arthur to Selkirk and continued the construction of the road in the prairie section as fast as the wants of the country required, governing themselves by the wants of the country, this country would have been saved, in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at least \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 in cash and the entire land subsidy. It is to be regretted that the wise policy pursued by the Mackenzie Administration in the development of the North-West has not been pursued by their successors. Then the gentleman proceeds to say: They challenged us to gather up what they had said about the North-West, in order to put it in *Hansard* and secure damnation to the country. That is rather a strong expression, and he says: We will not accept the challenge. No; no matter how often we hurled it in their teeth they will not accept it; they will not gather up the attacks we made on the North-West and our attempts to belittle the North-West. Because they cannot; because such charges do not exist; because the charge that we have engaged in any such attempt to belittle or traduce the North-West, or to attempt to divert the stream of settlement from that country or injure that country, has no foundation.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. If I furnish the hon. gentleman with statements made detrimental to the country, not only by the Reform press, but by hon. gentlemen opposite, will he read them to the House?

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, if the hon. gentleman wishes to read any extracts at this late hour he can have permission to read them. I do not deny that letters may have appeared in the *Mail* and the *Globe*, and other papers, giving expression to views in reference to the North-West; but, as a party, we have nothing to do with the expressions of individuals. If the *Mail* says a terrible frost has visited the North-West, and has carried bankruptcy and destruction in it, we are not responsible for that. If some writer in the *Globe* says there are alkali lands in the North-West, we have nothing to do with that. We have never attempted

to belittle the North-West or to prevent settlers from going to the North-West.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman has challenged members to give these statements to the House. I will hand him the articles, if he will read them. I said nothing about the *Mail*, and refer to speeches made by leading Oppositionists and articles in Liberal newspapers. I would like to get the extracts incorporated in the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. CHARLTON. You will have a little difficulty in doing that. So much for the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It is not much, any way.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, it is not much. It reminds me of an old stanza in Col. John Hay's collection, descriptive of a Mississippi steamer stranded on a sand bar. My hon. friend may not have been on that river, but they have spars which the crews set upon the bottom and by means of which they lift the boat a little and set her ahead with her engines—then another pull with spar and tackle and another heave ahead, till the boat is released or the task abandoned. The stanza is this:

"And she hove and sot, and hove and sot,  
And high her rudder flung,  
And every time she hove and sot,  
The wusser leak she sprung."

That is just the character of the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is in *Hansard* three or four times already.

Mr. CHARLTON. I admit that I used it once before in the House, but knowing the hon. gentleman's fondness for poetry I have given it to him again. In conclusion, the hon. gentleman gave my hon. friend to my right a compliment. He said he was capable of presenting the financial position of the country very ably, and had done his best to present the finances to-night in a deplorable light. I do not think the criticism was deserved. The speech of my hon. friend was a most temperate speech, and his statements were warranted by the facts he produced. I do not think that the statements made by the hon. gentleman were not the truth, and ought not to be presented to the whole of the people of this country. They were intended to show the whole people what was the financial condition of this country, with the alarming burdens which are being piled on the people. The only apology for this state of things, which was tacitly acknowledged by the hon. Minister, was that we were no worse off than some other countries, and he referred to the old effete despotisms of Europe, Austria and Germany, and Spain and Belgium, those old countries where the land is of great value and they have a larger debt per head than we have. We have a large enough debt in this country. If the public debt amounts to \$250,000,000, as it does allow for the shrinkage which must have taken place in our assets, the share the hon. gentleman's native Province has to bear is \$25,000,000. If that is the share of Nova Scotia, there are 188,644 acres of improved land in that Province, and the share of Nova Scotia amounts to \$14 per acre, which, I am told by those who are familiar with the value of property there, is as much as the value of the improved land in that Province. If that is true, when the hon. gentleman goes back to Nova Scotia and explains to the people why the Government, of which he is a member, have placed that mortgage on every acre of improved land in the Province, I think he will have some difficulty in persuading the people of the correctness of their action. A debt of \$55 per head, whether it be less than the debt in some of the European countries or not, is more than double that of the United States. We are side by side with the United States; both countries are presenting their claims to immigrants from Europe, and it is necessary to convince immigrants that they will have a good Government and light taxation; and if we are obliged to confess

Mr. CHARLTON.

that our public debt is three-fifths greater than that of the United States, we are placed at a very great disadvantage at the outset.

In the discussion of this question we are accused of a lack of patriotism because we present fairly the state of public affairs in this country, because we warn the Government that their course is not in the interests of the people; because we demand of the Government that their course shall cease and the steps they are taking shall be retraced. We would fail in our duty as an Opposition if we did not protest against what we believe to be false policy and reckless conduct, and, whether patriotic or unpatriotic, we believe it is our duty to seek to protect the people and their interests from the recklessness of those who show no sign of having the interests of the people at heart.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hon. members say "hear, hear." Everything is serene. But what are our immediate liabilities to day. We owe in Government notes, upon demand, \$14,998,000. We owe to depositors in the Government savings banks, on demand, \$17,148,000. We owe to depositors in the post office savings bank, \$14,492,000, payable on demand. We owe, in the shape of temporary loans—I do not know exactly what we do owe. By the statement of my hon. friend, the amount is \$15,819,000, but by the statement made a few days ago as to the floating debt being \$62,000,000, and taking from that the amount of Government notes and the amounts on deposit in the savings banks, we have a floating debt unaccounted for of \$17,500,000. We owe—perhaps, I ought not to count this, as it may have been arranged for by this time—\$25,000,000 in maturing loans. We have to provide about \$3,000,000 for Indian war expenses very soon. We have to provide for the Canadian Pacific Railway the balance of the subsidy and the loan authorised last year, \$6,000,000, almost immediately. We have got to provide for the balance of expenditure upon capital account for the year ending 30th of this month, as brought down in the Supplementary Estimates, of \$1,328,000. That amounts to \$99,497,000 of immediate liabilities. In addition, we are about to loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company \$5,000,000 more; in addition to this, we are to spend in the next financial year upon capital, \$10,497,000. Then, in addition to this, out of all the millions we have voted as railway subsidies for the purpose of conciliating these conflicting elements that the Government have to keep in hand, we have to expend on these subsidies, within a year, probably \$2,500,000, making in all \$117,464,000. This is a beautiful record. No pent-up Utica contracts our powers in the matter of incurring debt, but the whole boundless continent is ours. Now, Sir, our financial position is so desperate that we have had to send a sick Finance Minister and his deputy to England, in the midst of the Session, with his Estimates practically untouched, in order to borrow money. That fact alone shows that the country is in desperate financial straits, that something had to be done and done quickly. If we continue this course there is imminent danger of our finances breaking down. Our circulating notes now amount to \$14,998,000, and there is danger of increasing that amount to an indefinite extent, and making them a legal tender without a basis of gold reserves at all. There is danger of an irredeemable fiat money in this country; and many prudent, careful men, to my knowledge, have not loaned a dollar upon mortgage for years past without making it a condition in their mortgages that payment shall be made in gold or its equivalent, fearing and foreseeing that the day will come when the legal tender of this country will be a depreciated currency. Sir, our Dominion liabilities, in the shape of notes, that are liable to be presented for payment to-morrow, amount to \$14,998,000. Our deposits in the Government savings banks are \$31,640,000,

or a total of \$46,678,000, payable upon demand, to meet which we have \$2,887,000 in specie and about \$2,000,000 in guaranteed English bonds. I say that if any bank in this country had liabilities in the same proportion to its resources as this Government have, that bank would inevitable fail; a statement of its affairs would destroy public confidence in it. Yet, Sir, in the midst of this desperate condition of affairs, the Government of this country, instead of seeking a remedy, instead of seeking a means to diminish the expenditure, have allowed things to drift, until here we are, on the 25th day of June, with the Estimates in such a condition that we cannot possibly get through them during this financial year. The Government have been neglecting this important duty, and for two months have been trying to put a measure through this House for the purpose of taking from the people of Canada the power to exercise their free choice to elect representatives to this House. Sir, the highest duty that devolves upon us as members of this House is to seek to secure a country that is well governed, a country that has a moderate taxation, a country that has simple and just laws. We should seek to make our land one that will be attractive to foreigners. The time is coming when a vast emigration will pour into this country. The time is coming when the public lands of the United States will be occupied; and, Sir, the interest of this country will be greatly promoted, immigration will be greatly increased, the prosperity of this country will be greatly increased, by the exercise of wise caution upon our part, and prudence in the character of our legislation. In furtherance of these objects we, the Opposition in this House, devote our energies, and if we can secure that result we shall have placed Canada in a position where she will increase in prosperity, wealth and population in a very much greater ratio than she will do under the reckless administration of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Fleming,	Platt,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffriou,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Guay,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Springer,
Cartwright,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Kirk,	Trow,
Charlton,	Lister,	Vail,
Davies,	Livingston,	Watson,
Edgar,	Mills,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mulock,	Wells.—42

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Desjardins,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dickinson,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dodd,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,	Mitchell,
Barnard,	Dundas,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Dupont,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Farrow,	Orton,
Benoit,	Fortin,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Pope,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Guillet,	Ross,
Bryson,	Haggart,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hickey,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Taschereau,
Carling,	Jamieson, <sup>1</sup>	Taylor,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Wallace (Albert),
Cochrane,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wallace (York),
Colby,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),

Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Daly,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),  
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),  
Macdonald (King's),  
Mackintosh,  
Macmaster,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McDougald (Picton),  
Wright.—79.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Militia—Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff... \$819,800

Mr. CARON. With respect to the salaries, military branch and district staff, \$19,800, I desire to strike off an amount of \$600, being payment for the deputy paymaster. The vacancy has now existed for some time, and it is not intended to fill it, as our storekeepers are now acting as paymasters.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:05 a.m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when the House adjourns this day it stands adjourned until Tuesday next, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. BLAKE. I regret that the First Minister should have put this notice on the Paper if he did not intend to persevere in the first one, and if he did not intend to persevere with the first one, that he should not have communicated his intention to the House; because it would have added very much to the convenience of members to know what the intentions of the Government were, as, after seeing this first notice on the Paper, many gentlemen had made their arrangements accordingly.

Motion agreed to.

### SUBSIDIES TO MANITOBA.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That the capital sum on which the Province of Manitoba is entitled to receive half yearly payments of interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, as fixed by the Act 33 Victoria, chap. 3, and as readjusted or increased by any subsequent Act, shall, from and after the 1st day of July, 1885, be calculated on a population of 125,000, at the same rate *per capita* as was allowed on the estimated population under the Act 23 Victoria, chap. 3, and shall be charged with such advances as have been already made to the Province, and with such expenditure as has been made therein by the Dominion for purposes of a strictly local character, and with a further sum of \$150,000, which the Dominion Government may advance to the Province to meet the expenditure of constructing a lunatic asylum and other exceptional services.

2. That the grants of land and payment, authorised by these and previous resolutions, shall be made on the condition that they be accepted by the Province (such acceptance being testified by an Act of the Legislature of Manitoba) as a full settlement of all claims made by the said Province for the reimbursement of costs incurred in the government of the disputed territory, or the reference of the boundary question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and all other questions and claims discussed between the Dominion and Provincial Government, up to the 10th day of January, 1885.

3. That the sums authorised to be paid by these resolutions may be paid out of any moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

### FISHERY ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the subject of the Canadian fisheries. It appears by statements coming from American sources that a correspondence has been going on between the Hon. Mr. West, British Minister at Washington, and the American Government, in relation to the fishery question. A proposition is made that the question of the rights of Americans on the one hand and Canadians on the other to the free use of the fisheries of each country shall remain in abeyance until Congress meets. Of course, the statutory law of Congress provides for the imposition of duties after the expiration of the fishery clause of the Washington Treaty on the 1st of July next. The First Minister stated the other day that negotiations were going on with a view to arrive at some arrangement, and it appears that a mutual arrangement was arrived at, namely, that that portion of the fisheries clauses shall be continued until the meeting of Congress, when Congress will have an opportunity of considering whether any arrangement can be made satisfactory to both countries, with a view to the continuance of the mutual right, I presume, to prosecute the fisheries in the waters of either country. Now, Sir, there is one feature of that, as stated in the American correspondence, that is of great interest to the people of Canada, and it will be—

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has a question to ask let him ask it, but I must invite him not to bring in any subject which will lead to a discussion. It must be simply a question, and it is irregular to have a debate on this subject now.

Mr. MITCHELL. My object is to establish the point clearly to the Government, with a view of getting the opinions—

Mr. SPEAKER. That leads to a discussion. I think the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, this is not the first time that the leader of the Opposition has chosen to make a suggestion which has interfered with getting information for the people.

Mr. SPEAKER. Orders of the Day.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I will put the question then: Whether or not, after the 1st day of July, the fish caught in our waters going into the United States territory is to be subject to duty or not; and, further, if it is subject to duty, whether any arrangement is made in the negotiations which have been proceeded with for getting a return duty. I hope that will satisfy the right hon. gentleman, who is so very particular, and who takes up so much of the time of this House on unnecessary questions.

Mr. ABBOTT. Not the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will take back the right—the hon. gentleman; I do not know that he deserves that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is rather inexpedient to answer a question of that kind under present circumstances. As I mentioned to my hon. friend, the other day, the Government is anxious to bring down all the papers, but some of the papers are of a quasi confidential nature, and could not be sent down without the consent of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Governor General applied for that leave, but in the meantime the expiry of the clauses had taken place, and I can only account for the delay of the answer by that fact. I hope it will be satisfactory. All the papers are ready and waiting consent. Unless they are

Mr. BOWELL.

all brought down, I do not think the House will be in a position to judge of the course taken by the Government. In the meantime, however, I would say, in answer to one of the questions of my hon. friend, that Canadian fish going into the American market from and after the 1st of July, will be liable to duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. I supposed so.

### LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 147) to authorise the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned, being read.

Mr. BLAKE. There are some propositions which I have to submit to the judgment of the House, with reference to this measure. The first is with reference to the question as to whether, when we are now adopting a plan of giving free grants of land in aid of railways, we should not make some provision which will ensure those lands being opened in reasonable areas to intending settlers, on conditions of actual settlement and at prices within a maximum price. I do not intend to enter into any lengthy discussion on the subject. My views upon it are known. My opinion is, that it is important, when we are proposing to add in effect to the reserves of the North-West 4,262,000 acres of railway lands, which comprise some of the most available portions of the country, for settlement, that we ought to take warning from the lessons of the past and minimise, so far as we can, the obstacles to settlement which have resulted from former arrangements; and I believe that this can be done without injury to the prospects of the companies, and as calculated to obtain money upon those grants. Nor is my proposal without precedent. This subject has been considered in the neighboring Republic under similar circumstances, and I will read you extracts from some of the laws which have accompanied grants of lands in aid of railways in that country. The Act of Congress of 1862, which was an Act to aid in the construction of a railway and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and providing for a grant of land, reads as follows, in the third section:—

“And all such lands, so granted by this section, which shall not be sold or disposed of by said company within three years after the entire road shall have been completed, shall be subject to settlement and pre-emption, like other lands, at a price not exceeding one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, to be paid to said company.”

The Act of 1869, being an amendment to the Act granting aid in the construction of a railroad from the Central Pacific Railroad, in California, to Portland, in Oregon, contains this provision:

“And provided further, that the lands granted by the Act aforesaid shall be sold to actual settlers only, in quantities no greater than one-quarter section to one purchaser, and for a price not exceeding two dollars and fifty cents per acre.”

The Act of 4th May, 1870, of the Oregon Central Railroad Company, chap. lxix., reads as follows:—

“And be it further enacted, that the said alternate sections of land granted by this Act, excepting only such as are necessary for the company to reserve as depots, stations, side tracks, wood yards, standing ground, and other needful uses in operating the road, shall be sold by the company only to actual settlers, in quantities not exceeding 160 acres, or a quarter section, to any one settler, and at prices not exceeding two dollars and fifty cents per acre.”

A resolution, being the effect of an Act of Congress, authorising the Northern Pacific Railroad Company to issue its bonds for the construction of its road and to secure the same, etc., etc., passed 31st May, 1870, reads:

“\* \* \* \* \* Provided, that all lands hereby granted to said company which shall not be sold or disposed of or remain subject to the mortgage by this Act authorised, at the expiration of five years after the completion of the entire road, shall be subject to settlement and pre-emption like other lands, at a price to be paid to said company not exceeding two dollars and fifty cents per acre; and if the mortgage hereby authorised shall at any time be enforced by foreclosure or other legal proceeding, or the mortgage lands hereby granted, or any of them, be sold by

the trustees to whom such mortgage may be executed, either at its maturity or for any failure or default of said company under the terms thereof, such lands shall be sold at public sale, at places within the States and Territories in which they shall be situate, after not less than sixty days' previous notice, in single sections or sub-divisions thereof, to the highest and best bidder.'

An Act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Company &c., &c., of 3rd March, 1871, reads at chap. cxxii:

"And provided further, that such lands so granted, by this section to said company, which shall not be sold, or otherwise disposed of, as provided in this Act, within three years after the completion of the entire road, shall be subjected to settlement and pre-emption like other lands, at a price to be fixed by and paid to said company, not exceeding an average of two dollars and fifty cents per acre for all the lands herein granted."

I have enumerated some of the Acts of Congress which show the recognition of the principle I desire to see attached to these grants; and without further remarks I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with power to provide, as a condition of the free grants of 4,262,000 acres authorised to be made to railways, that the ordinary agricultural lands so granted shall be open for sale in suitable areas, on conditions of actual settlement at prices not exceeding a fixed maximum.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know what the policy of the Government is; but the policy pursued by the hon. gentleman opposite during the present Session has been to obstruct and decry everything connected with the interest of this country. I wish to express my opinion as to what the effect of the amendment will be. We know how difficult it is to get capitalists to invest in the North-West, how difficult it is to get railways built there; and when we have succeeded in getting capitalists to invest their money and commence railways in that country, the first thing we find is that the hon. gentleman seeks to obstruct this measure with a view of paralysing the capitalists. What object have British capitalist in going to the North-West? They place the value of lands perhaps far in excess of the value estimated by ourselves, who know the great quantities of land there are; and I could quite understand the necessity of adopting such precaution as is proposed, provided the lands were limited in extent and the quantity was such that the public could not get that facility of settlement to which they are fairly entitled. But I can quite understand the disastrous effect of such an amendment as has been moved in regard to people who have put their money in good faith in those railway enterprises, depending on the promise of the Government to give the lands unconditionally as a bounty for building railways, some of which are in process of building to-day. We find the hon. gentleman ready to decry everything connected with the country, and he has decried Canada from the beginning of this Session; he has decried the Canadian Pacific Railway, and ran down our railway enterprises, and sought to paralyse this country. I am not surprised, therefore, that the hon. gentleman should have chosen his present course in respect to these enterprises; it is quite in keeping with the course he has pursued this Session. I am not astonished that the hon. gentleman should attempt to defeat the efforts of those capitalists in building railways in the North-West by the means followed by the amendment which he has moved. What the Government's policy is, I say, I do not know. I hope they will take the view that having held out the promise to those companies to give them grants of land untrammelled with conditions, they will decline to accept the hon. gentleman's proposal to add conditions now; that they will resist his motion, and tell the hon. gentleman that they will not allow him to imperil the good faith of the Government in the proposals made to those companies abroad, and which have been induced by those proposals to enter into those enterprises, and will not have their efforts paralysed by adopting such conditions as are now proposed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government and the third party are in accord.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear it; it will teach that gentleman a lesson.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the measure before the House holds out hope to those railway companies while this amendment would simply destroy. The proposition made by the Government, which they submitted to Parliament for its sanction, is that free grants of land shall be made to those railway companies on a certain condition—that the companies were to build the railways. Any extra condition beyond those imposed by the Government would defeat the object Parliament has in view in sanctioning the measure. It is with a great deal of difficulty that these companies, with all the advantages the Government may give them by these land grants, will be able to raise the money, and if it is provided that they cannot use those lands to raise the money out of them, except subject to the condition of actual settlement within a fixed time, they will not get a farthing of money upon those lands. In the United States, to the legislation of which the hon. gentleman has alluded, the circumstances are and have been somewhat different. They have in the United States in the first place a large population moving westward. Of the immigrants from the European world, a considerable number have gone to the United States. They knew there was a steady flow into the Western States of that European immigration, and the migration from the east to the west in the United States. In the North-West we know there is a sparse population. We know that these roads are to be built, not to meet the wants and desires of the present population, but for the purpose of inducing a future population to go in there. The companies which are interested in those roads, the companies that have raised the capital for them, will expect, of course, to pay dividends, or a considerable portion of dividends for a considerable time, out of the sales of those lands. They cannot expect that a road running, for instance, from the Canadian Pacific Railway due north to Edmonton, or Battleford, or Prince Albert, or any of those places, going through a large section of country utterly without population, will pay those dividends without assistance from the land. They can only hope to meet the working expenses and pay reasonable dividends from that source, and unless there is a prospect for reasonable dividends within a reasonable time they will find no investors. It is only out of the proceeds of the lands that for some few years they can work the road, and give a sufficient security to the investors that they will receive the interest or the dividends on their investment. So that this provision would be equivalent to withdrawing the whole use, the whole benefit and advantage of the appropriation of those lands. If they have lands they must sell them as fast as they can, to find purchasers, in order to build the road; they must sell them to pay working expenses and maintain the road in good working order, and to give a reasonable return for the capital invested by the shareholders. That, Sir, is a sufficient security, in all conscience, against the land being hoarded up to the disadvantage of settlement. This condition that the lands should not be sold except on the condition that settlement would actually destroy the whole advantage, the whole merit of the arrangement made by the Government; and fixing the maximum price is liable to the same objection. The first lands sold will have to be sold very low; they will have to be sold under the competition with the Dominion Government—competition with public lands given away for nothing to actual settlers. This will keep the prices low, and they can only hope in the beginning to sell the lands at a very small price indeed; and it is only when their line is being settled, when the construction of the line has brought in a population to the lands, that the company can only expect eventually, after a long deferred hope, to get a reasonable compensation for the capital they put in. There is no fear, Sir, that the price of

these lands will be unduly kept up. In the Province of Manitoba they have the power of taxing the lands. At this moment, I am not sure whether the North-West Council has this power—I cannot speak positively from recollection—but, at all events, there will be no difficulty in conferring on the North-West Council, which is now rapidly becoming a representative institution—the power of taxation. Under these circumstances, I think it would be exceedingly unwise to adopt the amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In one important particular, the hon. gentleman is misinformed in his statement. He stated just now that with respect to these railways they run through a country in which there were no inhabitants.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The greater portion of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to the Manitoba South-Western, as respects the entire length with which the resolutions are concerned, the country is and has been settled for a considerable number of years, and nothing but the absence of railway communication has prevented it from being very fully settled. The same is true, for, I think, about 100 or 120 miles, as regards the Manitoba and North-Western, which runs from Portage la Prairie towards Prince Albert. There have been very considerable settlement there, for the obvious reason that settlers took up grants along the line through which the Canadian Pacific Railway main line was expected to pass, and the line of the Manitoba and North-Western goes nearly over that line. The consequence is, that there are very considerable settlements all along there, as the hon. gentleman, as Minister of the Interior, must be aware. That alters the position materially, I may add that with regard to some of these railway corporations the objection was not to the Government fixing the maximum price of the land, as my hon. friend proposes, but to the dollars which had to be previously paid to the Government, and which they allege, and with truth, as an exceedingly formidable obstacle to their placing those lands in the market. Now, we propose to give these people 6,400 acres per mile, or practically 10,000 acres in the case of the Manitoba South-Western, which is now practically the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That amounts, in the one case, to a maximum of about \$25,000 per mile, if the land can be sold at the rate my hon. friend named, and in the other to something like \$16,000 per mile, a sum which, if it can be realised, would be amply sufficient to build the roads through such a country as they will traverse. The object of both parties, as I understand, is to facilitate the construction of branch lines, and there is no doubt that there is and has been considerable difficulty, that is if the companies are allowed to keep large blocks in their hands, and parties are not allowed to settle; there is no doubt that the progress of the country may be materially effected and affected for the worse. One of the serious obstacles to the settlement of the country, as the hon. gentleman knows has been, that the land is placed by the present regulations practically between each homestead, and that becomes a serious consideration in a sparsely settled country as regard the maintenance both of schools and churches, and a great variety of other matters. By giving the actual settler, along the inhabited portion, at any rate, the right to buy at that maximum, that difficulty might be avoided to a considerable extent. Now, I speak with knowledge of the facts, when I say that many of these people who are settled there would be glad indeed to bring out their friends and relatives if they were sure of obtaining the land at a moderate price. It may be, and I hope it will, that the railroad companies will deal very liberally with all those classes of persons, but it would facilitate settlement if they were assured on the authority of the House and the Government that they would be permitted, at any rate for a moderate

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

space of time, to obtain possession of these lands. There is another point on which I desire to know if the Government have any assurance, and that is whether they are prepared to tell the House that these companies to which we are making these concessions, will positively undertake within the space of the next twelve months to construct a reasonable portion of the lines for which these grants are made. The correspondence laid before the House, puts considerable doubt upon that question. Now, I contend that this is a matter, particularly in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which ought to be clearly ascertained before the Government consents to part with its control over the lands. They ought to pledge themselves definitely to build a portion of the road within a certain fixed time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When I alluded to roads running to a great extent in unsettled districts, I spoke particularly of roads running from the Pacific Railway north in the direction of Battleford, Edmonton or Prince Albert. I know that the Manitoba South-Western road runs through a pretty well-settled country; even as far as White Water Lake, there are a good many settlers, but the district is not fully settled. Then the hon. gentleman will see that the conditions under which the companies get the free grants are fixed by Order in Council, and Parliament will only sanction these grants under those conditions. If they fail to carry out those conditions, the grants lapse of themselves without new legislation by Parliament; so that the matter is quite under the control of Parliament if the companies do not carry out the conditions of the Order in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A statement was published in the Manitoba prints recently, purporting to be a communication from the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Premier of Manitoba, stating positively that one of these roads would be pushed forward this season. Are the Government able to say, from their communications with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that that will be done? I think that is a point to which, if they have not positive information, their attention might well be called, because it is a most cruel hardship to the settlers of that region if such communications are publicly made without due authority. The settlers have been disappointed for four or five years successively; and such statements, apparently authorised by the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, should the people be disappointed again, would seriously damage the whole section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. gentleman that any delay in extending the south-western branch to White Water Lake will be a great disappointment to those people. The hon. gentleman has seen the assurances given by the company, the Government have had the same assurances. I believe the company are as fully alive as the settlers themselves are to the necessity for the construction of that road with all convenient speed; and we have had the general, and I may say the specific assurances of the company that they will press the construction of that road with all due speed, and as announced in one of those letters, so as to be used for the fall crop this year.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I cannot understand exactly why this amendment should be made. I understood that it was the policy of the Opposition, as expressed by their leader, by members of their party, and by their press, that these resolutions should be carried out, and that the free grants should be given, and we understood that they were writing letters taking credit for this very thing; and now to move an amendment to emasculate all the advantages derived from the Bill is something I cannot understand.

Mr. BLAKE. May I be permitted to say that as early as the debate on the Address, I expressed my satisfaction at the announcement that free grants were to be made, but I

directed attention to the very proposition I make to-day as an essential condition to be imposed in connection with these grants.

Mr. ORTON. I cannot but regard the amendment as a direct blow against the advantages sought to be obtained by these free grants. I know that a great many settlers are looking forward with extreme anxiety to the early construction of these roads. A larger crop has been put into the ground this year than last year, and this resolution, if adopted, would have the effect of seriously impeding the companies in obtaining the money required for the construction of the roads. Some of them have already entered into negotiations with capitalists for the necessary means, and if new obligations are imposed on them, their efforts must be considerably thwarted. We all know the animosity the hon. leader of the Opposition has displayed in the past towards the progress of the outlying Provinces of this Dominion and his extreme opposition to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to British Columbia, and we find him constantly by every possible means encouraging everything that will operate to the detriment of the North-West in this House and the country; and to-day when the people of that country are waiting anxiously for railway facilities, and when measures are being taken by which they are about to get that benefit, he comes forward and seeks to place obstacles in their way. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman should have moved this amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. The restrictions proposed by my friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) are not calculated to place obstacles in the way of the interests of the settlers in the North-West. The object of the amendment is to protect the settlers, and the charges made by almost every speaker on the Government side of the House in criticising it are most unfair. If there is a champion of the interests of the people of the North-West in this House, he is the hon. member for West Durham, who has always stood up and vindicated their interests against the schemes of speculators and corporations to enrich themselves at the expense of the people of that country. It is in that line that this amendment is made. The experience of the United States in regard to these land grants to railways is a most suggestive one, and one which we can profit. There is scarcely a railway company in the United States which has been subsidised by a free grant of land, that did not receive vastly more than it was entitled to or than was sufficiently necessary to construct the road. The railway companies were first subsidised without restrictions, and although the opening of the roads should have benefited the people of the country; in almost all the cases the companies have manipulated their land grants in a way not in the interest of the country. The experience of that country shows that it is proper to place restrictions on railway companies in connection with grants of land, and it also shows that it is not wise to make free grants of land to railways at all. It is now the fixed policy of the United States that these grants should not be made; and those familiar with railway construction in the United States, will acknowledge that at least one-half of those grants were unnecessary, and that it would have been in the public interest to have withheld them, because the roads would have been built by private capital as fast as the need of the country required. Now, the proposal to provide that Parliament shall fix a maximum price on these lands is a proper one. That maximum price is to be subject to the approval of Parliament, at all times. If the mode in which this amendment deals with the companies is not a proper mode, it is subject to change by Parliament at any time. It simply leaves in our hands the control of this matter. It leaves in our hands to say what is the maximum price these lands at any time shall bring—a power we may exercise in the interests of the people *versus* the railway corporation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who would invest?

Mr. CHARLTON. These grants of lands fixed at a maximum price by Parliament, a price proposed subject to the approval of Parliament, at all times, and which may be varied by Parliament at pleasure, will build the branch lines of the road. Six thousand four hundred acres of land to the mile, at \$2.50 an acre, will build and equip the ordinary branch lines in the North-West. The hon. gentleman says these roads are to be built for the future population. It is unnecessary to build roads for the future population; it is bad policy to push railways into the wilderness in advance of the population. What we want is roads to supply the wants of the population as they come in, and not for a future population to follow years after the roads are constructed. The hon. gentleman says there is no fear that the price put upon these land grants, placed absolutely in the hands of railway corporations, will be too high. I say there is fear in this case, as in the cases in the past of railway land grants, that lands will be taken by speculators, persons interested in the railway corporations, and held until the adjoining lands are filled up; I say there is fear that these lands will be held by speculators at high prices, to the detriment of the interest of the people. The whole experience of the past in subsidies by land grants warrants my hon. friend in assuming that it is necessary to place some restriction of the kind, in the interests of the people. I acknowledge it is not in the interest of the railway corporations, but they will take care of themselves; and if we make them land grants sufficient to construct the railways, without expenditure of capital, that is all they require. I think the motion should be cheerfully accepted, since it merely leaves the control of prices in the hands of Parliament, instead of putting it beyond our control and jurisdiction forever.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Blake,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Platt,
Burpee,	Harley,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Scrivner,
Cartwright,	King,	Somerville (Brant),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Catudal,	Langelier,	Springer,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Davies,	Lister,	Vail,
Edgar,	Livingston,	Weldon,
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Wells,
Fleming,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—46.
Forbes,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bryson,	Hall,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Royal,
Carling,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Caron,	Homer,	Small,
Chapleau,	Hurteau,	Smyth,
Cochrane,	Ives,	Stairs,
Colby,	Jamieson,	Taschereau,
Costigan,	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Coughlin,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Coursol,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Curran,	Langevin,	Townshend,
Daly,	Lesage,	Tupper,
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Valin,

Desaulniers (Mask'ngé), Macdonald (Sir John), Vanasse,  
 Desaulniers (St. M'rice), Mackintosh, Wallace (Albert),  
 Desjardins, McCallum, Wallace (York),  
 Dickinson, McDougald (Picton), White (Hastings),  
 Dodd, McDougall (C. Breton), Wood (Brockville),  
 Dugas, McLelan, Wood (Westmoreland),  
 Dupont, McNeill, Woodworth.—86.  
 Farrow, Massue,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) should have voted on this question; he has taken great interest in these leased lines.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. member for Marquette is not in the House.

Mr. BLAKE moved :

That the said Bill be not read the third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with instructions to provide, as a condition of the free grants of railway and coal lands to the Coal and Navigation Company, that the Governor in Council shall have special powers with reference to tolls for coal, so as to prevent the practical monopoly which might otherwise accrue to the company in respect of the superior coals found near the proposed terminus of the aided line.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There is not the slightest danger of the forebodings of the hon. gentleman being fulfilled. At the Medicine Hat mines, coal can be taken out at a very low figure indeed; coal is also found at Crowfoot Crossing in large quantities, where no doubt mines will be opened up, and at Calgary and in the Rocky Mountains there are large deposits of coal, so that the hon. gentleman need not have the slightest fear of a monopoly being established. He should take the advice of his former leader and go out to the country and see it for himself. He would then form a better idea of it than he has of its resources, and not cover the Order Paper with these resolutions, compelling the House to waste valuable time in discussing and voting on them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This regular hauling of this company over the coals, if it had the desired effect, would prevent the company hauling coals over the railway. We must oppose this resolution. The Government have all the power required for regulating the tariff, and the company cannot carry a bushel of coal, except on the tariff fixed by the Government. There is no necessity for this motion. In one respect the Coal and Navigation Company owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. gentleman for moving this amendment, since in it the hon. gentleman has given them a certificate of character by saying their coal is of such a superior character that there must be special legislation to prevent the company making too much profit out of it. In this respect I do not know but that the remarks of my hon. friend from King's, N.S., (Mr. Woodworth) who took a little gilt off the gingerbread by saying that they had no such mine of wealth, might not have been as well omitted; for if it is in the interest of the country that the Coal and Navigation Company should be enabled to raise funds by which it may change its road from a narrow gauge to a broad gauge, this resolution, speaking so highly of the superior coals to be found in their mines, will be of great service to them. I cannot allow the amendment to receive the sanction of the House if we can help it.

Amendment negatived on the same division.

Mr. BLAKE moved :

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the clause 5 by providing that any alteration in the Orders in Council affecting the conditions of the land grants, shall be subject to the approval of Parliament.

Amendment negatived on the same division.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 147) to authorise the grant of certain Subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.  
 Mr. CHARLTON.

### THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST— SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. BOWELL moved the third reading of Bill (No. 149) for granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,700,000 required for defraying certain expenses now being incurred in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

### LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 134) respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the first clause be amended by inserting the words "by the decision whereof a copy is in the schedule hereto annexed."

Amendment agreed to.

On the schedule,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), I desire to call the attention of the First Minister again to the statement that I made when this Bill was before the House some weeks ago. I pointed out that, in the county of Huron, a county which has adopted the Scott Act, the hon. gentleman's Board of License commissioners have been actively engaged in the discharge of their duties and have licensed twenty-nine tavern keepers, while they have refused to give a license to any of the druggists in the county, and the men they licensed were not the very best class of tavern keepers in the county. After I made that statement the hon. gentleman said that, if that was correct it was intolerable. I am prepared to affirm distinctly the statement I made, and I have the strongest confirmation of its truth, if it is necessary to give it. I knew what I was talking about. I think the hon. gentleman ought to make provision in this Bill to do away with that extraordinary state of affairs. I will read a letter I received from a gentleman who knows something of the condition of affairs in the county of Huron. It is dated on the 15th April, 1885, after the Board of Commissioners had issued these licenses. It is to the following effect:—

"I just returned from attending a large county convention in Huron, and I find the following state of affairs: First, the Dominion License Board are all opposed to the Scott Act; the inspector ditto; the county crown attorney ditto. The board filled up the whole number of licenses allowed under this Act. Eleven druggists applied for license; all were refused. Twenty-nine tavern keepers and other liquor sellers have been appointed, and no license fee is charged; all free. I have written all these facts to Professor Foster. Huron is no exception in this respect. The Scott Act cannot be enforced with Dominion machinery. In fact, they do not want it enforced. We may just as well throw up the sponge."

This letter is, of course, written by a person who is a temperance man, a person by the name of Young.

"Will you find out from the Government why no license fee is charged for licenses when the Act is in force, and let me know. I am frequently asked this question."

I should like to know, also, very much by what authority the hon. gentleman's Board of License Commissioners have issued twenty-nine licenses in the county of Huron, a Scott Act county, and have charged no fee in any single case. In the first place I contend they had no right to issue those licenses in the way they have, and, if they had the power, it was an exceedingly injudicious exercise of that power. I may tell the hon. gentleman that his own commissioner, the deputy judge of the county, appointed in the town of Goderich, his own brother, a tavern keeper, as the first man who was appointed to sell liquor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That man is not worse than an infidel, at all events.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Perhaps not. I only desire to point out that it is manifest that these commissioners are utterly unfit for the proper discharge of their duty, and I think the hon. gentleman ought, at the earliest opportunity to remove these men from the position they occupy. They are making the enforcement of the Scott Act a farce. In fact, it is utterly impossible to enforce it in that county if the Dominion board of License Commissioners are to be at liberty to do as they think fit. Early in the Session I moved for a return of the number of licenses issued in Scott Act counties, and so on, and I find that the hon. gentleman's board in the county of Huron has made no return; at all events there is no return from that county contained in the papers submitted to Parliament, though every other county, with one exception, has made a full return such as was called for by the Order of the House. I think the hon. gentleman ought to call the attention of the Board of License Commissioners in that county to their conduct in that respect, and ought to adopt some measure to restrain them from the improper, unwise and injudicious exercise of the powers that are vested in them. There is another point to which I wish to draw attention. In the statute of 1878, section 99, sub-section 3, provides for the sale of liquor for sacramental purposes without any license or certificate; and sub-section 4 provides for the sale of intoxicating liquors for medicinal purposes upon a medical certificate, and for the sale for arts and other purposes upon a certificate before two justices of the peace. Now the Act of 1883, in section 86, provides that intoxicating liquors may be sold in any county for medicinal purposes up to six ounces without a license, and in any quantities with a license and with a medical certificate. Now, I apprehend that that being the last expression of the will of Parliament, the 86th section overrides section 99 of the Act of 1878, and that, in fact, now liquor can be sold in Scott Act counties to the extent of six ounces without a license and without a certificate, and over six ounces with a certificate and with a license. Now, in order to prevent the License Commissioners acting as they have done in the county of Huron, the hon. gentleman ought to provide that in Scott Act counties no liquor shall be sold for any purpose except by the druggists in the county, and if there is no druggist in the county or municipality, then somebody else. As it is now, under the interpretation put upon this statute by the hon. gentleman's board, in the county of Huron they contend that every druggist in the county has a right to sell liquor to the extent of six ounces under section 86 of the Act of 1883, and that they have a right to license vendors and others who are not druggists, to sell liquor in the same county. Now, if that be the meaning of the statute, I think the hon. gentleman ought to put a short clause in this Bill restricting the sale of liquor, in Scott Act counties, to druggists, where druggists are to be found, and where there are no druggists in the municipality, then somebody ought to be authorised to sell. In the county of Huron, according to the contention of the hon. gentleman's board, there are 11 druggists who sell liquor without a license, and 29 to whom licenses have been granted who are not druggists—40 persons entitled to sell liquor in the county of Huron. It is nonsense to talk about the will of the people prevailing if 40 persons are at liberty under the law to sell liquor in a county which has carried the Scott Act by a majority of over 1,600. I propose to the hon. gentleman that he should repeal the 4th sub-section of section 99 of the Act of 1878, and section 86 of the Act of 1883, and put another section in place of them, allowing the sale of liquor for medicinal and arts purposes in Scott Act counties upon a license being obtained from the Dominion Board of Commissioners. I have prepared an amendment in that sense, and though I have not consulted any of the advocates of the Scott Act in the House in reference thereto, I believe my amendment will

meet the difficulties which I have pointed out. It is as follows:—

Sub-section 4 of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, and section 86 of the Liquor License Act of 1883, are hereby repealed, and the following substituted for said sub-section 4:

Provided also, that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes, or for *bona fide* use in some trade, art or manufacture, shall, in counties where the Act respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors has been, or will be, adopted, be lawful only by such chemists or druggists as may be thereto specially licensed by the board mentioned in the Liquor License Act of 1883, the number not to exceed one in each township, parish, or incorporated village, nor two in each town; and in cities, not exceeding one for every 4,000 inhabitants; and in case there are no chemists or druggists in any such township, parish, village, town or city, then by such other vendor as may be thereto specially licensed by the said board, subject to the limitation aforesaid; but such intoxicating liquors, when for medicinal purposes, shall be sold in packages of not more than 6 oz. at any one time, to be removed from the premises and to be sold only on the certificate of a medical man having no interest in the sale by the chemist, druggist, or vendor, affirming that such liquor has been prescribed medicinally for the purpose named therein; and when such sale is for use in some art, trade or manufacture, the same to be made only on a certificate signed by two justices of the peace of the *bona fides* of the application, accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant that the liquor is to be used only for the particular purpose set forth in the application, and it shall be the duty of such chemists, druggists or vendors to record in a book to be opened to the inspection of the commissioners or other inspectors, every sale or other disposal by him of liquor; and such record shall show, as to every such sale or disposal, the time when, the person to whom, and the quantity sold. And the purpose for which sold. And it shall be the duty of such chemist, druggist or vendor to file and retain such certificates and affirmation, and they shall be opened to inspection as aforesaid; and in default of such sale or disposal being so placed on record, and in default of such certificates and affirmations being so filed and retained, every such sale or disposal shall be *prima facie* held to be in *contra sanctionem* of the provisions contained in the 83rd and 84th sections of the Liquor License Act of 1883, and of the Act respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors. And it shall be the duty of such chemist, druggist or vendor to make an annual return of all such sales or disposals with names of vendors, the purposes for which sold or disposed of, the names of the medical man or justices of the peace who signed such certificates, and the quantity sold to each vendee before the 31st day of December, in every year, to the collector of Inland Revenue within whose revenue division the county is situated, who shall at once return the same to the Minister of Inland Revenue. And any person who violates any of the provisions of this sub-section shall be liable, on summary conviction, before any justice of the peace or other person having authority to hear cases summarily, to a penalty of \$ for the first offence, and to a penalty of \$ for any second or subsequent offence.

I move this amendment in order to cover the difficulties I have suggested which have arisen in my own county.

Mr. FARROW. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman has chosen to picture the hotel-keepers in his own county as such black characters. The hon. gentleman is well acquainted with the county, with the hotel-keepers in his own town and with those in the smaller towns and villages. He has taken a very strange course in thus characterising them. He would not like to say in his own county what he has stated here with respect to those honorable and respectable men. He has stated they were utterly unfit. I do not know any better men following that pursuit—of course we have no hotel-keepers in Huron who are dealing out liquor. The united testimony goes to show that the hotels are observing the law. As a proof of this, I may mention the fact that Mr. Johnston in the village of Bluevale, who has a general license to dispense, was entertained by the Presbyterian and Methodist congregations at a social, for which they charged a quarter admission, held at his own place, in order to make something up for him. They all said he was fulfilling the law and carrying it out to the letter. This is one of the men whom the hon. gentleman chooses to stigmatise—a man who has a good character from the Presbyterian and Methodist congregations who know him well. I wonder if that testimony is as good as that submitted by the hon. member for West Huron. I would rather have it. The hon. gentleman states that those men are utterly unfit. I suppose their characters are very black, very vicious, they must be notorious men; but the hon. gentleman will have rather hard work to answer those charges when he gets out in the county of Huron. The hon. gentleman

stated that in his own town one of the hotel-keepers lived a mile from the centre of the place. They have measured the distance. It lacks 1,500 yards of the mile. There are 1,760 yards in a mile, and deducting the 1,500 yards would leave the distance 260 yards. That is about as near the truth as the hon. gentleman can get at it. I know most of the hotel-keepers who have been granted licenses, and I would be sorry to say here or elsewhere that those men were mean, or such characters as they have been described. More honorable men, so far as I know, are not to be found following the same business in any part of Canada. Why did the commissioners select these men instead of giving the license to the druggists? My opinion was that the druggists should have had them. But the commissioners said: Here are a lot of men who have had all their means in hotel property, and if we give them some position to help them in a legal and legitimate manner, we would rather give it to those men who have lost so much, than put it in the hands of druggists. Liquor is not dealt out in the hotels. Each of those men has built a little place to contain liquor, and when a man comes with a doctor's certificate, he goes to that building, and the hotel-keeper fills the prescription. Is there anything wrong about that? Why should not an honest hotel-keeper be allowed to have liquor in quantity as well as a druggist? The testimony I obtained when I was home was that they were dealing it out according to the law; and as a proof of that there is the fact that the ministers with their congregations united in giving the man I spoke of a social, charging 25 cts. apiece, the congregations patronising the social, and the man thus making something like \$40. They said: You are an honest man, carrying out the law, and we will back you. I thought it was my duty to rise and state a few facts as I know them.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) The hon. gentleman has said that I pictured the hotel-keepers as black characters. I did not. I said that the commissioners, in proceeding to select persons to whom to give licenses, did not, as a general rule, select the best men, but the worst. The hon. gentleman knows such is the fact in the town in which I live. Mr. Cox of the British Exchange, who has spent from \$10,000 to \$15,000 on his hotel, did not get a license, and it was the same with some others who had invested large sums in hotel property. Why not? The hon. gentleman says that the druggists ought to have got the licenses, but they were given to tavern keepers because they had invested considerable sums of money in erecting and fitting up buildings, and they were entitled to consideration. How is that principle applied in Goderich? Do the two men who have licenses own the houses in which they carry on business? No. The hon. gentleman will not say they do. One of those who got a license was Mr. Craig on the square, who has a rented place, and who does not own a foot of ground on which his place of business stands; and the other was Mr. Doyle, who is in a similar position. But one is a brother and the other is the friend of the chief commissioner. Cox, Martin and Bailey, all of whom have invested considerable sums of money in their property, were refused licenses. Mr. Jordan, Mr. Rhynas, and Dr. Whitely, druggists, were also refused licenses, while two tavern keepers, who do not own the property on which the business is carried on, but one of whom has a saloon and the other a summer hotel, got licenses. I say that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred in that county they have not appointed men who are the best qualified to have licenses. The First Minister declared that if my statements were correct, the condition of things was intolerable. I say it is intolerable; I say that the Scott Act, which was passed by a large majority in that county, is not being enforced there. I do not know what may be the state of things in the village of Bluevale. I do not know anything about Mr. Johnson, but I have no doubt he may be a very good man, and that he is endorsed by the

Mr. FARROW.

Methodist and Presbyterian ministers. I do not say anything about that, but I say in a large majority of cases the best men are not selected. The men who have invested money in acquiring and improving property are not selected.

Mr. FARROW. What about Clinton, near your own town?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understood that a widow got the license there, and if it will do her any good, I have no objection.

Mr. FARROW. Has she not as much invested in that kind of property in Clinton as any person there?

Mr. CAMERON. Perhaps she has; I do not say she has not; but I say there are two druggists there, at least, and that the law never contemplated that liquor sellers should be appointed to sell liquor for medicinal purposes. The hon. gentleman knows that there are now twenty-nine liquor vendors in the county of Huron, who are still selling liquor, and though there may be some cases where the letter and the spirit of the law is observed, in my own town that is not done. I know there have been cases before the mayor in my own town for infraction of the law.

Mr. FARROW. They do not sell the liquor in hotels, but in separate buildings.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). So much the worse, for that is the spot where they will resort to. They have not a separate establishment in Goderich, so far as I am aware of, or at least they had not a month ago. The liquor was sold in the old place, and that is where they went to get prescriptions made out. But that is not the point. The point is that it is not within the spirit and intention of the Legislature, in passing the Act, that in counties where the Scott Act has been adopted, and especially where it has been adopted by an overwhelming majority, that almost every tavern-keeper should have a license to sell liquor for medicinal or art purposes. Any person can see how easily the law can be evaded under those circumstances, and I say that the chances for evading the law are not so great when the liquor is sold by druggists by whom other medicines are sold.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether this is a proper time for this discussion, but as the hon. gentleman has referred to me, I wish to say a word or two upon this question. I have had some representations made to me, as they have been made to the hon. gentleman and to others, from that county, and I believe that so far as I can judge, the state of things there is not as it ought to be. So far as the law goes, I think the commissioners are not excluded from appointing any person, the words of the Act being "druggists or other lawful vendors"; but I am strongly of the opinion, that if there are druggists in a place, the druggist is the man that should be appointed, and that it is not in the spirit of the law, although it may be allowed by the letter, that druggists should be passed over and other vendors appointed. The argument in favor of appointing druggists is simple, and I think it is cogent. They are the dispensers of medicine, and a person who wants a prescription filled for alcoholic liquors generally wants some other kind of medicine, and it is not for the convenience of the public that they should have to go to one place for one medicine and to another place for the other. The reasons why hotel-keepers should not be appointed are also strong and cogent. In the first place, it takes away the confidence the people will have in the law being observed. In the second place, I think hotel keepers, from their large acquaintance, and from the number who have been in the habit of frequenting their places, will be continually open to solicitations that druggists will not be open to, and that the law will be very

frequently violated. My hon. friend sitting behind me (Mr. Farrow) said the reason assigned by the commissioners for appointing these men was that they had a good deal of money invested in the business, and that some return would be made to them in this way. Now, if they honestly adhere to the provisions of the law, to sell to none but those who have fair prescriptions, they will not make enough money to pay for their trouble, so that is really not a valid reason why the commissioners should overlook druggists and appoint the hotel keepers. That is not a matter of temperance against non-temperance; it is simply a question as to whether the law of the land shall be put in as good a condition as possible to be carried out. And I hold when commissioners make such a wholesale departure from the spirit of the law as, I think, it has been fairly established they have done in Huron, it is not for the benefit of the law in question, or the benefit of law in the abstract. It gives a chance for continued and repeated violations of the law, and is a strong argument which can be used by the opponents of this law, that the law cannot be enforced. I should like that some such provision as this should be inserted—though I do not know whether this is the place for it or not—that druggists shall be appointed for the purposes contemplated in the Act, and that only in the case of regularly certificated druggists not being available, other vendors might be appointed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman made a statement the other day which he has repeated as to the state of things existing in Huron. As I have stated already it is intolerable that that kind of thing should be allowed. The intention of the Department of Inland Revenue has however been called to the matter by the statements of hon. gentlemen, and that Department will see that the provisions of the Act are carried out in full integrity. This resolution does not however properly bring up or reopen the whole question of the Scott Act, which we have already discussed in this House. The Bill is simply a measure to declare that those clauses of the McCarthy Act which have been declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court, shall be suspended pending the decision of the Privy Council. That is the simple proposition standing by itself, and it has nothing to do with the principles of either the Scott Act or the McCarthy Act, or the administration of those Acts. It is simply a suspensory measure, to prevent the working of those portions of the Act which the Supreme Court has declared beyond the authority of this Parliament, and if the higher authority do not reverse the decision of the Supreme Court, they will still be considered beyond the competence of this Parliament.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is one point the hon. gentleman said nothing about—as to whether this board had made any return to the Government during the last year of the fees collected by them, and also by what authority they gave those licenses without exacting any fees whatever from the present vendors. It is quite clear from the letters I have read to the House, that the board had given indiscriminately 29 licenses in the county without exacting any fee. I think that is an extraordinary proceeding, and this board ought to be called to account for their conduct in this respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. However, I cannot do that in the Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He can prohibit them from licensing vendors all over the county where there are druggists. He can carry out the spirit of the McCarthy Act, which provides that liquors shall be sold for medicinal purposes by druggists only; but these men are licensing others than druggists to sell in Scott Act counties.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have not put the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron because I do not think it

is relevant to the scope of the Bill. I cannot put it without the consent of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to move a clause to be added to this Bill. As is well known, there have been a great many applicants for licenses under the Liquor License Act, and although in some cases the commissioners have granted licenses, under the law as it is at present interpreted, these licenses have been considered worthless; so that we may consider that up to the present time no applicants have received any value for the fees they have paid, and if it were in order for me to move a clause requiring the Government to recoup those persons, I should do so. However, I have been informed, on consultation with one of the authorities, that such a motion, as it affects the revenue, would have to originate with the Government. Therefore my motion does not extend that far; but I hope, as far as it does go, that it will be considered in order. I received a communication this Session from a druggist in the county of Simcoe, where the Canada Temperance Act is in force, stating that he had applied to the license commissioner for a license, and had deposited his fee of \$10, and the only reply he received was an intimation that his application had been declined. There was no inspection of his premises, and therefore the commissioners rendered no services for the fee. It seems to me very unreasonable that a fee should be exacted under such circumstances, because the commissioners did not even take the trouble to inform themselves whether he was a proper person to receive a license or not. So much for the past. With regard to the future, I think it is unreasonable that an application for a license, whether a hotel, a druggist's or any other form of license, should be obliged to pay the fee when his application is refused; and my motion is to deal with that point. Section 16, of the License Act of 1883, enacts:

“The applicant shall with his application deposit a fee of \$10 to cover the expense of inspection and advertising.”

That Act does not provide what shall be done with the fee in case the application is refused. I, therefore, propose to repeal that section and re-enact it so far as it goes, with the addition of these words:

Which shall be returned to such applicant if his application is refused.

I have no doubt the merits of that proposition are so strong and cogent that the leader of the Government will accept it as germane to this Bill, and I think the Chairman will be able to see no objection to it unless it is pointed out to him, and I hope the hon. First Minister will not point it out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The same remark applies to this amendment that I made with regard to the last, that it is not germane to the scope of the Bill, and it therefore cannot be put without the instruction of the House.

Committee rose and reported Bill, with amendments.

#### SUPPLY—THE FISHERIES.

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

Mr. DAVIES. Before that motion is adopted, I wish to call the attention of the House to the remark of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), which he made when the Orders of the Day were called, with respect to the negotiations which have been going on with reference to the expiry of the fisheries treaty. He was prevented from making the remarks he intended to make at that time, and I thought it was unfortunate he attempted to make them, because it excluded others from taking part in the discussion. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) attempted to take part in the conversation of the other day but was called to order. In common with others interested in the question, I have read with no small interest the telegraph

reports in the morning papers of the negotiations going on between Great Britain and the United States with reference to the fishery question, and I think that now the result of these negotiations has been made public through the press of the United States and Canada, Parliament is entitled to some further information than it has had on the subject. What position do we appear to stand in by the arrangement made? As far as I can understand from the column and a half of the despatch which appears in this morning's *Citizen*, and which purports to convey an account of the memorandum of agreement between the British Government and the American Government, that agreement is as follows. The telegraph despatch says that:

"Under date of 12th March last the attention of the new Administration was called to the fishing question in the following memorandum sent by Minister West to Secretary Bayard \* \* \*

If the telegraph report of that memorandum is correct, the memorandum certainly does contain some most extraordinary statements which, to my mind, demand explanation on behalf of the Government. That memorandum goes on to say:

"It has been represented by the Canadian Government that much inconvenience is likely to arise in consequence. Unless some agreement can be made for the extension of the period when the time comes (1st of July next), American ships will be actually engaged in fishing within the territorial waters of the Dominion. The vessels will have been fitted out for the season's fishing and have made all their usual arrangements for following it up until its termination in the autumn."

Then the despatch says further:

"It has been, moreover, suggested on the part of the Province of Newfoundland and of the Dominion of Canada that, in view of the mutual benefit and convenience of the present local traffic, consisting of the purchase of ice, bait, wood and general ship supplies by the citizens of the United States engaged in fishing from the inhabitants of the British American fishing coast, the usual operations of the fishing season of 1885 should be continued by the fishing vessels belonging to citizens of the United States until the end of the season of that year, and that the local authorities of Newfoundland and of the Dominion of Canada, in a spirit of amity and good neighborhood, should abstain from molesting such fishermen or impeding their progress or their local traffic with the inhabitants incidental to fishing during the remainder of the season of 1885."

It is perfectly plain that some representations were made by the British Government, with the sanction and approval and at the instance of the Canadian Government. As far as I can gather from the despatch, the Canadian Government have sought from the United States the arrangement contained in this telegraphic despatch. Having voluntarily thrown open, this year at least, our fishing grounds to American fishermen, without our receiving or asking any *quid pro quo* further than this, and that is what I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to particularly, so that he may state to the House whether it is true or not:

"The President of the United States would be prepared to recommend the adoption of such action by Congress with the understanding that in view and in consideration of such promised reconsideration, there would be no enforcement of the restrictive and penal laws and regulations by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada or the Province of Newfoundland against the fishermen of the United States resorting to British American waters between the 1st of July next and the close of the present year's fishing season, the mutual object and intent being to avoid any annoyance to the individuals engaged in this business and traffic and the irritation of ill-feeling that might be engendered by a harsh or vexatious enforcement of stringent local regulations on the fishing coast, pending an effort to have a just and amicable arrangement of an important and somewhat delicate question between the two nations."

From all I can gather from this lengthy despatch, the practical effect of the arrangements come to is to throw open to the fishermen of the United States our fishing waters, so that they may use them in common with ours, and we will get nothing in return. It does not appear to be stipulated, nor has the President, I think, the power to agree, that the duties which will come into force on the first July on Canadian fish can be remitted to our fishermen. As far as we can see from this despatch, the whole of the fisheries of this Dominion are thrown open to our American cousins, who will come in and use them, as they did until the Washing-

Mr. DAVIES.

ton treaty was made, without our obtaining anything in return. If this is carried out, it simply means that our fishermen will have to compete, side by side with Americans, and be handicapped in the only market that is open to them, as far as mackerel is concerned, by \$2 a barrel. Handicapped to this extent, our fishermen will be ruined, for it will be impossible for them to compete with the American fishermen against such odds. Had the arrangement included the refunding or non-imposition of this duty, there would be some ground for it, though I would prefer, as I frequently said, that the whole subject of these fisheries should be made a special matter of discussion, so as to rearrange all the trade relations between the two countries. But to admit American fishermen to our waters without compensation, while the United States exact \$2 per barrel duty on our fish going to the United States, would be so to handicap our fishermen that they may as well give up their occupation. What I complain of is that the Government has been inactive and sluggish and regardless of the public interests in this matter. So late ago as March, 1883, when the United States gave notice of their intention to abrogate the fishery clauses of the treaty, Lord Derby sent a despatch to the Canadian Government informing them that joint resolutions of Congress and the Senate had been passed, that notice under these resolutions had been given that the fishery articles would expire the 1st July, 1885, and asking the Government what they were going to do about it. Nothing was done; the Government did not inform his lordship of their views or whether they intended to take any action. In May following, Lord Derby again called the attention of this Government to this matter, pressed its importance upon them, and asked for an expression of their views, but the Government gave no expression of their views. In January, 1884, Lord Derby again pressed for an expression of the views of the Government, but no expression appears to have been given; and in December, 1884, the First Minister tells us, in his interview with a New York reporter, that nothing had been done and it was not his intention to do anything. We complained in this House last year that the hon. gentleman was allowing valuable time to slip by, that he should take time by the forelock and utilise it in endeavoring to bring about negotiations with the United States, that it was dangerous to allow the fishery articles to expire without some effort being made to place the fishery question on a sound basis. We urged upon him that it would never do to let them expire without some effort being made to come to a satisfactory agreement, for if we did we would be brought face to face with the very serious question—which the hon. gentleman treated in a trifling manner then, but of which, subsequent events show he has realised the importance—so serious that we would be obliged to protect our fisheries at the muzzle of the gun, that we would be obliged to send an armed force to protect those fisheries, and drive out the Americans unless we made some arrangement with them, which everyone desired we should make. But the matter has been allowed to drift, and no steps were taken, as the hon. gentleman acknowledged, until a late period. In the month of December, 1884, he said that no steps had been taken, and he intended to do nothing. This very Session we brought the question up again, and said that already valuable time had been lost. Even in the month of March, it was almost too late to begin negotiations, but better than never. We got no satisfaction from the hon. gentleman. Nothing was done, and now we find that, very lately, the hon. gentleman has been moving in the matter with the only result which I think he could have hoped for as the consequence of his very late negotiations. The Americans have him at their mercy. He could not do anything. He was not prepared to carry out the belligerent policy which at one time was foreshadowed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In the early part of the Session blood and

thunder was spoken of in very loud tones here, but, when we came to approach closely to the date when we had to carry out our threats, we began to see how serious the matter was, and the whole negotiations appeared to have collapsed, unless the public are misinformed in the United States and in Canada. We are not to protect our fisheries; the Americans are to use them as they please, and we are to be met with a duty when we send our fish into their market. I contend that the hon. gentleman, when he said the other day, in reply to my friend from Digby, that he should not press his question because it might interfere with pending negotiations, was not perfectly frank, because those negotiations had been closed; the memorandum of agreement had been signed between the British Minister and the United States Minister, so that nothing we could say or do could affect the negotiations. The memorandum of agreement is dated on the 20th of this month. The matter was brought to the attention of the United States Government on the 12th of March last, and the memorandum was sent by Minister West to Secretary Bayard on that date, and, if this telegraphic report is correct, the hon. gentleman made in that memorandum the proposition to which I have referred. I think this Parliament is entitled to more information from the hon. gentleman. He says the papers have been ready for some time, and he is waiting for some telegraphic authority to bring them down to this House. The people of the United States are informed of the matter, and the Canadian people, through their press, are informed of the matter, and the Parliament of Canada alone are to be kept in ignorance. In conversation with members of Parliament to-day, I have heard them say that it is not possible that the hon. gentleman could have agreed to this without securing the free admission of our fish into the American market; that it would be the ruin of our fisheries. I hope that is true, and my object in rising now is to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of dealing more frankly with us and telling us whether this report in this morning's *Citizen* contains a fairly accurate state of affairs as they exist, whether arrangements have been made and whether the fishermen who are now engaged in the investment of their money in the prosecution of their fisheries for this season are to go on or not? because it is no use for them to go on in the hope of the successful prosecution of those fisheries, if the Americans are to come in and use our waters and we are to be met with a duty on that side. In that case, we shall be placed at such a disadvantage that it will be impossible for our men to carry on the fisheries successfully. I protested last year against the inaction of the Government, against the policy of the Government, and the hon. gentleman said then that he was not going on his knees to the United States, he was not going to take any steps which would be undignified. Now we find that, so far as we have any information, the hon. gentleman has been obliged to go to the United States, and that the initiative was taken by Minister West, who says, as the representative of the Canadian Government, that the inconveniences are such that it is desirable to make a temporary arrangement and allow the Americans to come in and purchase their supplies and use our waters, and that we will depend upon the results which may flow from a representation of the facts by the President to the American Congress at their next Session. I was sorry to see in this statement what purports to be an extract from an official document, that the object of the President is to obtain a settlement of the much vexed legal questions which surround this matter of the fisheries, hinting that the matter is not clear, that the rights of the parties are not defined, and that the whole subject must be reopened and reconsidered. I hope nothing of that kind will be done. The rights of the parties are defined by the treaty of 1818 clearly and distinctly, and, although there may be some question as to the meaning of

the word "bay," in that treaty, that is a matter for judicial interpretation, and, apart from that, their rights are clearly defined. I shall be exceedingly anxious, and I am sure the country will be anxious, to hear from the First Minister a clear and a distinct statement upon this matter. The negotiations are closed; no harm can be done; Parliament has a right to know; and I am sure the First Minister will tell us whether the statement in the newspapers is correct, and what position our fishermen are in with reference to the rights of the Americans to fish in their waters and their rights to send fish into the American market.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already explained the reason why the papers have not been brought down before. Circumstances beyond my control have prevented their being brought down, and until I got the assent to which I have referred they cannot be brought down, and the House cannot discuss the matter until the papers are brought down; but before the House meets again I have no doubt the assent will be given and the papers will be brought down. I will not be dragged into a discussion now, and I will only say that the hon. gentleman's statement of the case is altogether inaccurate.

Mr. MITCHELL. At an early stage to-day I endeavored to get some information about this matter, and I think, considering the very short time that I have occupied the House this Session, considering how very little of the time of the House I have taken up, it was certainly not very much out of place on my part to preface the question which I intended to ask of the Ministry by a few preliminary remarks, in order to enable my constituents, when they got the answer of the Ministry, to understand the object of the question and the position in which they stood. I was, by the interference, by what I call the improper interference—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I have submitted to the hon. gentleman's observations before without remark, but, if you, Mr. Speaker, without rebuking him, will allow him to refer to a previous debate, and to allude to me in that way, I think it may be right for me to call attention to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I called the hon. gentleman to order. He was clearly out of order, and I hope he will not refer to any previous debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman from Durham thinks to conceal himself behind the fact that the remarks were made in a previous debate, all right.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall take another opportunity to attend to that gentleman when he chooses to interfere with me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, you may "hear hear." I am not afraid of his bullying, not a bit of it. I rose in regard to a matter which affects the interests of my constituents very deeply. They do not know to-day what position the trade is in, whether the fish that they catch now goes into the American markets free of duty or not. I rise in the exercise of my duty as one of their representatives, and properly rose, to ask the Government for some information, and I was stopped because I made a few preliminary remarks to enable them to understand what had been done. I agree with the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island that this thing ought to have been taken up last year. I stated so in the House, and now that it has been taken up I find the position to be this: That in the face of the fact that the treaty is about to expire, the Government of the day have informed this House, and individual members have obtained the information outside, that negotiations have been going on between Her Majesty's Government on behalf, I presume, of Canada, and the Government of the United

States, with a view to come to some solution of the fishery question. Everybody knows that that is a most desirable thing to accomplish, and that this question has caused trouble for the last century between these two great nations of a kindred race. What have the Government done in relation to that? The tongue of the right hon. Premier is tied in this matter. He is not at liberty to bring down the papers unless he gets the permission of Her Majesty's Government; he has not yet got that permission, and consequently we have to take such information as we can get from the papers published in the United States. The matter is this? Failing any arrangements having been made, and looking to the fact that a change of Administration has taken place in the United States which is looked upon throughout Canada as favorable to friendly relations between the two countries, to an increase in trade and commerce, and to a settlement of the fishery question, the Government in that case have chosen to open negotiations through the British Government, or directly with the authorities at Washington. We are yet unformed as to what course has been taken. What we now wish to know is the exact position of that transaction. We want to know whether the fish that are caught after the 1st July and sent to the United States market, will be subject to the duty which the termination of the fishery clause of the Washington treaty would call into existence. The right hon. Premier has informed us that although an arrangement has been practically arrived at by the use on the part of the Canadians of the American fisheries on the one hand, and of the Canadian fisheries on the part of the American fisherman on the other hand, still, in addition to that, the right hon. Premier has informed us that Canadian fish, exported to the United States, are to be subject to a duty. Of course anyone who understands the actual position of affairs, knew what the answer would be. We know that no disposition on the part of the President of the United States or his Cabinet could alter the law of that country or suspend it. That can only be done by the joint action of the Congress and President; therefore we know that while the Washington authorities may have authority to suspend the operations of that treaty in relation to fish in Canadian waters, and while our Government may have power to suspend the operation of the fishing of Americans in the waters of Canada, they have no right to interfere with the statute law of the United States, which is imperative and must be carried out. Therefore the fish of Canadian fishermen is liable to duty until some action is taken by Congress which will allow it to go in free. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island has referred to the fact that the Government ought to have taken this thing in hand last Session. I maintain they should have done so, but not having made any preparation for the protection of the fisheries, the next best thing to be done is to endeavor to secure, by a friendly arrangement, some settlement of the question, and the only course open to the Government of Canada to-day is to adopt the arrangement which has been made, and to allow the Americans, from now until the meeting of Congress, to occupy the fisheries in Canadian waters, while our fishermen shall have access to American waters, the fishermen of each country to occupy the fisheries of the respective countries without molestation and without exercising those rights of removal, and allow everything to remain as if no such arrangement had been arrived at. Sir, it may be said that in that arrangement the people of Canada are placed at a disadvantage. I admit they are. It is a necessity of the circumstances in which they are placed. If steps had been taken last year during the existence of an Administration which was not very favorable to Canada, it is probable we should have met with a rebuff, as we have done on former occasions, and that we would not have succeeded in bringing

Mr. MITCHELL.

about a favorable result. But, fortunately for the people of Canada, in my opinion, and fortunately for the people of the United States, a change has come over that great country, and an Administration has come in which, if we are to believe the statements made in their press, are favorable to friendly relations between the two countries and to a settlement of this vexed question which has so long been a source of trouble between the two countries. Under all those circumstances, as their press and public men have shown a disposition to meet us half way, I think the Government of the day have done the only thing they could do in consenting to the suspension of the exercise of any rights, and any powers that we possess to protect rights which are specially our own within Canadian waters. It is there that the Americans get the benefit of our fisheries and compete in their own markets with the fish caught by our own countrymen, and that our countrymen are therefore at a disadvantage in the markets of the United States. But if by the temporary suspension of that arrangement we can hope in the future to secure an arrangement which will settle for all time the question of the fisheries, and which will, I hope, bring about a reciprocity not only in the fisheries, but in all our trade relations, and allow our own productions to go into the United States free of duty—I feel that if that object can be gained it is well worth the sacrifice for six months of our valuable fisheries. There is one thing that struck me in reading the correspondence to-day, that ought to have been attended to by the British Minister, and that is that he should have added to that correspondence this feature: that while the President of the United States, without the authority of Congress has no right to enter into any stipulation to allow our fish to go in free of duty, there might have been a suggestion which would have led to a return of any duties which were collected on fish going from Canada into the United States until such time as some definite arrangement was made as to the future. The complication of the fishery question by the introduction of reciprocity is a very doubtful policy. We all know how sensitive the people of the United States are respecting protection on the one hand and free trade on the other as they exist in the United States to-day. We know that it is quite possible by advancing an argument which involves the question of free trade or of protection to imperil the making of a satisfactory arrangement with respect to the fisheries. I am quite willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Government now that their attention has been called to it in Parliament. I am sure they will not overlook this fact. If no arrangement is arrived at with respect to the fisheries, with or without reciprocity—I would rather see it with reciprocity—I hope the Government will let the Government of the United States understand that the arrangement arrived at by Mr. West is an arrangement only for six months, and is only a temporary arrangement, and that we will not allow the matter to drift along year after year, as was done on a former occasion. I remember in 1867 when we occupied a similar position in regard to the fishery question, that the whole influence of the British Government was brought to bear on the Government of Canada to induce them to forego any question of the fisheries and allow the matter to drift along, the argument used being that time would bring an arrangement, and if we allowed the Americans to participate in our fisheries with our people, in course of time we would get reciprocity and the matter would be amicably arranged. We deferred to the British Government, and put a duty of 50 cts. a ton on American vessels. I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the time, and I gave the matter considerable attention. Next year, there being no disposition manifested by the United States authorities to give us reciprocity, we advanced the duty to \$2 a ton; but we found no effect from it. We advanced it further, to \$4 a ton; and when

that ceased to have any effect, and the Americans ceased to regard the rules and regulations established, and when seizure after seizure was made by a force enrolled to protect the fisheries, we found the matter had reached such a crisis that the Americans, seeing that we were determined to protect our fisheries, came in and, under the pressure brought to bear, the Washington conference was held, and the result was the Washington Treaty, which has lasted eleven or twelve years. I hope that a similar result will be reached. We do not want a money compensation from the Americans for our fisheries—at least that is my own opinion. What we want is community of trade, is a general and free intercourse between this country and that country, whose peoples, institutions and spirit and everything that tends to make up the great Anglo-Saxon race are akin and between whom friendly relations should exist; that they should accept what we have to give them, and we should get compensation from them in trade. I hope when we are dealing with the matter it will not be from the standpoint of pounds, shillings and pence, but from the standpoint of national interest, we endeavoring to maintain our rights on the one hand, and on the other hand willing to give full compensation to the Americans. I approve of the temporary arrangement made, maintaining the position of the different nationalities in the several fisheries for the six months which will elapse before Congress meets; but I warn the Government to-day that their duty is, if no arrangement is arrived at, to take steps to place such a force of police vessels on our fishing grounds next year as will compel the recognition of our rights and protect the fishermen of our own country. For six months we allow Americans to enjoy our fisheries, and we can forego the value, which according to the values established by the Halifax commission would be about \$500,000. But while we are anxious to create a feeling among the Americans that we are generous and fair in our treatment of them, and do not want to take any advantage from the circumstances that the treaty expires during the middle of the fishing season, while we are willing to be fair and generous towards them and to receive their approaches in a courteous spirit, yet we are determined to protect our rights. Some arrangement should be arrived at whereby reciprocal trade relations would be established, and we could send our raw productions into the United States, from which we would receive a benefit, and the Americans get the benefit of our fisheries. I can frankly say that reciprocity in regard to fisheries amounts to nothing. When the Americans talk about Canadians enjoying their fisheries as compensation for Americans enjoying our fisheries, it is a delusion; it is a misrepresentation of values so far as the American fisheries are concerned. Their fisheries are of no value to us. Our fishermen do not want to go to the United States coast to fish; they do not want to leave their own fisheries to go to fisheries that are overfished. There is no reciprocity in that, but I am willing for the present to accept the position so as to enable the Government to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion before Congress meets.

Mr. VAIL. I am rather astonished to hear the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) say that he is quite satisfied with the arrangement referred to in the telegram from Washington made known yesterday. If he is satisfied with that arrangement he is satisfied with very little, for I do not see that we get anything in return for having given away our fisheries for the next six months.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not said that. I said I was willing to accept it as a temporary arrangement.

Mr. VAIL. I am not satisfied with the temporary arrangement. If the statement published is correct, we have really given away our fisheries and got nothing in return. I do not feel disposed to-day to discuss the ques-

tion after what the First Minister has said. What I complain of more particularly is that we have not had this information earlier. We have a High Commissioner in England and a member of the Government has been there for the last month or two, and between them they might have made enquiries at the Colonial Office, got the requisite permission and cabled this Government, so that they would have been in a position to inform the people of the Maritime Provinces exactly where they were in regard to the fishery question. This subject is one of vital importance to the Maritime Provinces. Fish is one of our most valuable exports, and any arrangement made with the United States which will enable the Americans to come within our three mile limit and fish, and anything with respect to the sending of fish into the United States, affects our trade very materially. I hope the First Minister will not lose any time in getting the necessary information from the other side, and that he will lay it on the Table, so that we may know exactly where we stand. I hope that the statement published in newspapers is not correct. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say it was not correct. I hope such will prove to be the case, and that some better arrangement may be made than that fore-shadowed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When I said the statements were not correct, I referred to the fact that some of the statements made which have been read are very incorrect. A portion of a dispatch from Mr. Bayard has been read, and it is very incorrect. But I would say that the final acceptance, the final arrangements, only took place on the 22nd. They will no doubt be before us by the time the House meets again. With the permission of the House, and only with that permission, I desire to make one remark, and I hope the House will understand the spirit in which I make it. It will be remembered that the President is a Democratic president, and that the Republicans are in a majority in the Senate. The Democrats are in the majority in the House of Representatives. I believe the present American Government are sincerely anxious to enter into rather extended relations between the two countries, but with only one of the chambers in accordance with the general policy of the President, the matter is a very delicate one. The whole matter has to be brought before Congress and get the assent of both branches of Congress, and therefore, and as the fructuation of the treaty is in the hands of the Senate, which is a republican Senate, I would throw out the hint—no harm has been done certainly by any remarks which have been made to-day—but I merely throw out the hint that it would be very expedient, in any future discussion of this matter in the House that we should not afford by any discussion here, any opportunity for the enemies of extended relations in Canada, to use statements as against us, or perhaps arouse feelings against us. The House will quite understand the spirit in which I make that remark.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say that I cannot but feel that it is extremely unfortunate that these papers were not brought down earlier. Of course I understand the reason assigned by the hon. gentleman and it is a valid one provided every effort has been made by the hon. gentleman to avoid the delay which has taken place. My opinion is, having regard to the period of the Session, to the imminence of the change, and the importance of the subject, that it was the hon. gentleman's duty to have made arrangements with the Imperial Government, or to have endeavored to have made them, in advance of the formal conclusion of these negotiations, which would have authorised him, the moment it was concluded to place it before the people of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada, whom it so vitally affects. And now as the hon. gentleman several times told us that the Ministerial crisis in England has taken place between the

Liberals and the Conservatives of that country, which prevents the people of Canada from knowing what their fate will be in this regard, while their Parliament is sitting, as those papers have become public in some shape or other, perhaps in a distorted shape, in the newspapers of the United States, and the newspapers of Canada, there is therefore an additional reason for their being brought down at once, so that the real facts may be made known to us. I may say I felt, while the hon. member for Northumberland was speaking, that it was a little unfortunate that in the course of the discussion such as this which we know to be a delicate and a critical discussion, there should be any allegations hostile to the inclinations of one of the great political parties of the United States, particularly when that political party was in the majority in the very Chamber which possesses decisive power with reference to the making of treaties. I think there could not have been a more unhappy declaration of war, as it were, against one of the political parties in the United States, than we have to-day. I think we have no right to assume that either of the political parties is hostile to this country in that regard. I see no signs of it myself, and I think it is unfortunate that the party which is in power in the treaty-making body of the Congress of the United States, should have been spoken of in the terms in which it was spoken of to-day. I think we have a right to expect fair play from both parties—from the Senate whether republican or democratic—from the President whether he belongs to one party or the other; and let it be remembered that it is not by suggestions that our hopes of a fair negotiation rests upon the preponderance of the party which is at this moment in a minority in the Senate, that we can expect to accomplish very much in the direction of extending our relations with the United States. I shall not say a word with reference to these papers, except to say that the fact that they have been made public, perhaps in a distorted shape, forms an additional reason why the free Parliament of Canada should know at the earliest moment, what has actually been done with reference to this matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a personal explanation. I wish to say that I never made any reference to the preponderance of the republican or the democratic party in the Senate or in Congress. I referred to the fact, which is very well known, that the treaty was terminated by the party which is not now in power, as a justification for the Government in not bringing it up at an earlier day before the people of the United States or the Government of the United States. Therefore the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) are entirely uncalled for, as applied to myself. I will say that if he means to imply—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is making a personal explanation, and he cannot go on to make a general reply.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely want to say it is not true; it is false.

Mr. MILLS. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Northumberland says, I believe that the late President, Mr. Arthur, was as sincerely anxious to secure reciprocal trade relations with Canada as the present President, who is now chief executive officer in the United States; and I think it is greatly to be regretted that when notice was received two years ago, of the intention of the American Government to terminate those clauses of the Washington Treaty, that no steps were taken by the Government here, for the purpose of coming to an understanding with the United States, with reference to our fisheries and our trade relations. I believe that the opportunities were just as good under the presidency of Mr. Arthur as they are under

Mr. BLAKE,

the presidency of Mr. Cleavland, and if the hon. gentleman succeeds before the next meeting of Parliament in securing a better understanding with the people of the United States with reference to our trade with that country, he will simply have accomplished what might have been accomplished at a very much earlier period. We all know that the hon. gentleman has expressed views somewhat different from those of the hon. member for Northumberland. That hon. member rejoiced at the success of the democratic party, and he wished it well. The First Minister, as reported in an interview which took place in New York, while the election was pending, expressed his anxiety for the success of Mr. Blaine, and he gave as a reason for his anxiety for Mr. Blaine's success, that Mr. Blaine was like himself a Protectionist, while Mr. Cleavland leaned in the direction of free trade.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot be responsible for anything that may be stated about me in that way. The hon. gentleman must know that I never made such a remark.

Mr. MILLS. Then I think it is exceedingly unfortunate that the hon. gentleman did not contradict that statement at an earlier period. His friends believed, and I am sure I did, that that was a fair representation of the hon. gentleman's views. We know the views he expressed on our commercial relations at Washington, and it was natural to conclude that the opinions attributed to him were those which he undoubtedly entertained. There was a very strong impression, not merely in Parliament but out of it, that the hon. gentleman's delay in dealing with the subject of reciprocity, although it was brought under his attention by a formal dispatch, was due to the fact that he believed it was not in consonance with our interests that more intimate trade relations should exist with the neighboring Republic. The hon. gentleman's notion was that we should have Canada for the Canadians, and the failure of the Treaty of Washington, and the closing of the ports of the United States to our fishermen was another step in carrying out the commercial views of the hon. gentleman, and it does seem to me that the hon. gentleman's views clearly indicate why it was, that no active steps were taken to renew the fishery provisions of the Washington Treaty or to establish what some of us could regard as satisfactory commercial relations with the neighboring Republic. However that may be—and I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the subject on its merits so long as the papers are not before us—the fact remains that no steps were taken, and that the fisheries of Canada are open to the United States at least for the coming season, without any corresponding advantage being secured to our people.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have only a word to say with regard to a remark made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who rose for the purpose of denying that he made any allusion to the republican majority in the Senate of the United States, and in the course of that allusion made a very ungentlemanly remark with reference to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), accusing that hon. gentleman of saying what was false. The hon. member for Northumberland, in referring to the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty by the republican party, did convey the idea, by inference at least, that that party was opposed to the Treaty; and I hold that the criticism made by the hon. member for West Durham of the hon. member's remark was quite proper. The Reciprocity Treaty, which was abrogated by the American party in 1865, is a treaty that no party in the United States would renew. We need never hope to renew a treaty like that in the United States. I most heartily concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that there has been nothing in the attitude of the republican party for years past, to warrant us

in the belief that they have been opposed to receiving proposals for a new reciprocity in the past, and I believe the Government have not made the efforts they should have made for obtaining a reciprocity treaty with the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it is necessary for me to reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, because they have been already replied to. The hon. gentleman has said nothing new, nothing that calls for any remark from me—nothing worth notice.

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

(In the Committee.)

Militia—Salaries, Military Branch and District  
Staff ..... \$19,800

Mr. VAIL. I would like to ask the Minister if he has reduced the staff of last year?

Mr. CARON. The only reduction in the staff is the reduction I announced last night of \$600 for the district paymaster. I explained last night that that position had been vacant for some time, and that the policy of the Department was to place the paymastership in the hands of our storekeepers, doing away with one salary. That is the only reduction in the staff.

Mr. VAIL. The expenditure last year was \$24,524, and it is hardly worth while to take a vote of \$19,800 if we are going to spend the same amount as we did last year.

Mr. CARON. The whole expenditure last year was \$19,800, and the Estimate for last year and that for this year is the same amount.

Mr. VAIL. Of course the hon. gentleman asks the same amount this year as he did last year, but he expended last year \$24,524, according to the Public Accounts.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read the page in the Public Accounts, he will see that that sum includes various other items. The item to which the hon. gentleman is referring now is salaries; contingencies are provided for in another part of the Estimates.

Mr. VAIL. Why are these included in the Public Accounts under the head of salaries and expenses of the district staff?

Mr. CARON. When the hon. gentleman himself was in the position I now occupy, the same headings were adopted. I do not know how the hon. gentleman can find that upon these services, most of them provided for by statute, we could have exceeded the vote. I cannot have exceeded the vote of last year, as I find in the Estimates the same amount as I estimate this year.

Mr. VAIL. My hon. friend must not think I am finding fault. I am simply asking for information. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating the service is carried out now as formerly, but what I wish to point out is that the Public Accounts should agree as far as possible with the amount set apart for that particular item in the Estimates, and the Public Accounts and the Estimates do not agree.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will look a little further down he will find in item 57 an allowance for contingencies \$38,000 out of which these allowances are paid.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). As the hon. gentleman for Digby (Mr. Vail) states, the Estimates and the Public Accounts do not by any means agree and they are consequently confusing. The hon. member for Digby draws attention to this fact, because it is generally presumed that the vote in the Estimates is generally represented in the Public Accounts by an expenditure which covers the same purpose. As a fact, the salaries of the military branch and district staff are represented in the Public Accounts as being

\$24,000, while the vote last year and the one now asked is merely \$19,800. I can understand the explanation of the Minister that the contingencies are provided for in another Estimate. Clearly then, the fault is in the preparation of the Public Accounts, to this extent, that they do not follow the Estimate of the year, and it would be convenient, in examining these accounts, that the same principle should be followed and the same headings, as is the case in almost every other instance. The Department contemplates the separation of the salaries paid to the military branch and district staff from the allowances, while the Public Accounts include the allowances under the same heading. If that is understood, we reach a practical explanation, but I think it would be convenient that the same system which pervades the Public Accounts generally were followed in this particular.

Brigade Majors' salaries, transport, etc..... \$13,900

Mr. CARON. I desire to reduce this by \$2,400, being the salaries \$1,200 each of two brigade majors. The position of one, whose headquarters were at Kingston, has been vacant for some time, and I understand that, without interfering with the efficiency of the service, his office can be dispensed with. I have also abolished the similar position in New Brunswick. There I have followed the system which has been productive of great results, that of making our school of infantry the headquarters of the district. The commandant of our infantry schools at Fredericton, Col. Maunsell is now also the acting deputy adjutant general, or the officer in command of the whole district. I have been trying to make a school as much as possible the military centre for the district, and it has given so far much satisfaction.

Mr. WELDON. Has an additional allowance been made Col. Maunsell?

Mr. CARON. The reduction is merely a reduction of salary, and I give Col. Maunsell the allowance of \$360 additional which formerly went to the brigade major. The salary of brigade major was \$1,200 and \$360 allowance, and I give the \$360 to Col. Maunsell the acting deputy adjutant general. Last year, the estimate was \$16,300, and in the Public Accounts the Auditor General's report shows an expenditure of \$14,363.

Mr. VAIL. What is the cause of the reduction?

Mr. CARON. The reduction I have explained is in the saving of the salaries of 2 brigade majors. We estimated last year for two additional brigade majors, and did not fill the vacancy, and that amount remains over.

Ammunition..... \$55,000

Mr. LANGELIER. I see by the Public Accounts that \$5,000 worth of powder was purchased from a firm in Quebec. I should like to know whether any tenders were asked for. The firm is a very respectable one, but it is a firm of hardware merchants, and I do not think they are manufacturers of powder. I should like to know why this purchase was made from a firm of hardware merchants instead of directly from the powder manufacturers, and why tenders were not asked for?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman is quite right. We got the powder necessary for the cartridge factory at Quebec from the firm of Beaudet, Chinic & Co., who are, as the hon. gentleman has stated, a very respectable firm. The reason for it is that we wished, as much as possible, to have the cartridge factory run altogether upon what could be found in Canada. We wanted to use Canadian powder manufactured in Canadian factories instead of going to England, as heretofore, to get the powder. The powder company that furnished us with the powder is the Hamilton Powder Company and the firm of Beaudet, Chinic & Co. are the agents for that

company. The company gave us to understand that our orders would be sent to them through that firm without any additional cost, and it has been done in that way since the cartridge factory was started.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. Even if the powder is supplied by a Canadian factory, which is very proper, there is another manufactory in the Province of Quebec, in the Eastern Townships, not far from Richmond. I do not remember the name of the place, but I think it is Windsor. I am quite sure there is one much closer to Quebec than the Hamilton Powder Company. I do not object to the powder being got from the Hamilton company if it is cheaper, but I think an attempt should be made to get the powder at the cheapest rate possible. I am told by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) that there is also a powder factory in Nova Scotia, and I think, when there is such a number of manufactories of an article required by the Government, they should ask for tenders when they want such a quantity as \$5,000 worth.

Mr. CARON. I did exactly what the hon. gentleman is suggesting, and I am glad to see that our views correspond so closely on this point. We asked for samples to be sent by the Windsor company, and they did not send them, and the Hamilton Powder Company, who have been furnishing that powder ever since we introduced the system of employing Canadian manufactured powder, naturally got the order.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what is the cost per thousand of the cartridges manufactured at the Quebec factory, compared with the cost of the same article imported from England? I am quite ready to admit that even if there was a difference of cost in favor of the foreign article it would be better to use the home article, but it would be of some interest to know how the prices of the article imported from Great Britain compare with the prices of the article manufactured at the cartridge factory? I do not pretend that there is any extravagance, but I only ask it as a matter of information for the public.

Mr. CARON. The estimate of \$55,000, is made up in this way: Manufacturing 2,000,000 rounds of Snider ammunition cartridges, ball cartridges 1,000,000 rounds, estimated at \$20 per thousand, \$20,000; ball cartridges, 500,000 rounds for extra issue to militiamen, \$10,000. I will explain how this ball cartridge extra ammunition is issued later, and how the Department is recouped for that amount which is served out to the force for the purpose of their annual rifle competitions and practice. Blank cartridges, 500,000 rounds, at \$10 per thousand, \$5,000. The hon. member will also see an amount, over and above that for the cartridge factory, that we have estimated for ammunition, including artillery ammunition. The artillery ammunition we have to import, as the hon. gentleman will readily understand, from Woolwich. It would be impossible, unless we had a regular factory here, to undertake the making of this heavy ammunition. Artillery ammunition from Her Majesty's Imperial stores, for 18 field batteries, at \$400 each, \$7,200, and for 47 garrison batteries, at \$270, \$12,800. This makes altogether \$55,000. Now, as to the cartridges imported from England, we have not imported any for some time, but, as far as I remember—I have not got the prices here, because we have kept that completely out of any consideration in the Department, from the fact that we manufacture all that we require—the last year we imported them the price was \$15, \$16 or \$17 in England. The quantity of ammunition we manufactured up to the 1st December, 1884, was 1,816,570 rounds. We had in process of manufacture, to be completed during the year 1885, 1,500,000 rounds. During the events which have taken place in the North-West I considered it advisable to double the number of men employed in the factory, and to work night and day

Mr. CARON.

during that period. We manufactured, from the 4th March to the 12th June, 1,147,720 cartridges. After the Batoche battle the staff was immediately reduced, as we considered that we had a sufficient reserve for all we required. The quantity ordered to be manufactured for 1885 and 1886, being double the annual quantity, is 3,000,000 rounds, including the quantity I have spoken of as being manufactured to provide for the emergency in the North-West.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. Does the Quebec factory manufacture ammunition for the Martini-Henry rifle or only for the Snider?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will remember that the cartridge factory was established by my predecessor, the present Lieutenant Governor of Quebec. The order then given was only for the Snider-Enfield rifle. From the experiments which were going on in England with reference to rifles and small arms, I deemed it advisable, before the machines came out from England which had been ordered, to provide that they could be adapted so as to make our cartridge factory available for the manufacture of the Martini-Henry rifle. However, the problem is not yet solved. There are strong believers in the Snider, and from the information in my possession, and the reports of competent riflemen at the front, there are very many in favor of the Snider; in fact, they prefer it to the Martini-Henry. However, if it is deemed advisable at any time to change the Snider for the Martini-Henry, the cartridge factory can be made available for the manufacture of that ammunition at a very small cost, I think \$4,000 or \$5,000.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. I would ask whether, in order to keep in employment the trained hands we have at that factory, it would not be possible to manufacture cartridges for other countries than our own? There would be an economy in such an arrangement. Formerly, we imported cartridges from England, showing that they manufactured cartridges for exportation; and could not our factory be utilised in a similar manner for the manufacture of cartridges for importation?

Mr. CARON. That suggestion could not be carried out, as it would necessitate the purchase of quite a different set of costly machinery. The machinery we have at the present is adapted to the manufacture of only one kind of cartridge. I may mention, in regard to the extra ammunition, that we have served out over 700,000 rounds of ball cartridges as extra ammunition. It is served out to order, and the parties pay the cost price for such ammunition. During the year of 1883-84 we served out 711,546 rounds, for which the sum of \$12,041 was paid into the Treasury.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Complaints are constantly made of the quality of the ammunition which is served out at the various rifle matches. Now, nothing is more practically important than that our militia should be taught to shoot properly; and it is becoming more apparent every day that a moderate number of men, as I am assured by officers who have served in the North-West, who know how to shoot, are very much more formidable than a large number of untrained men. I can inform the Minister that I have been informed from a number of quarters that the quality of the ammunition which the parties who contended in the rifle matches, with the object of making themselves good shots, has been very bad indeed. I can specify particularly the matches at Toronto during the autumn of last year. I was informed by some of the experienced riflemen who were there that so bad was the quality of the ammunition served to the marksmen that in one case the balls would hardly go 300 or 400 yards. I can inform the hon. gentleman privately of the names of several volunteer officers and privates who made these complaints to me.

Mr. CARON. I had not heard any complaints about last year's cartridges.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that they were last year's cartridges. I presume the cartridges were of considerable antiquity.

Mr. CARON. So anxious was I to guard against any possible mistake in the manufacture of cartridges, that two years ago I formed a board, composed of experienced officers, for the purpose of investigating the subject, and the board reported as follows:—

"The board are of the unanimous opinion, first, that the process of manufacture of Dominion cartridges is perfectly satisfactory, from the great care taken in testing the component parts of such cartridges, by which the slightest defect or blemish must be immediately seen. The powder used is such as is used at Woolwich.

"The board are of the unanimous opinion that the Dominion ammunition gave a better result than English No. 9 of the years 1877-82, from a fixed rest at 500 yards, as shown in the accompanying diagram. The result of the independent shooting at Levis at 200, 500 and 600 yards by 16 men of "A" Battery and a like number of the 8th Rifles endorsed the strength and quality of the Dominion ammunition. Therefore, the board have no hesitation in recommending the Dominion ammunition for general use in Canada. The board have much pleasure in testifying to the superior qualifications of the superintendent."

Lieut.-Col. T. J. DUCHESNAY, D.A.G., Mil. Dist. No. 7, *President*; Lieut.-Col. E. B. BEER, 7th Batt.; Lieut.-Col. E. G. SCOTT, 8th R.R.; Major C. J. SHORT, B.B., R.S.C.; Capt. H. F. PERRY, H. Q. Staff; Capt. G. H. BALFOUR, 8th R.R.; Capt. E. A. MACNACHTAN, C.G.A.

I may also say that at the Dominion Rifle Association matches the ammunition used was our Canadian ammunition, and last year it gave satisfaction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was at the rifle matches here?

Mr. CARON. Yes. This, however, is such an important subject that I will have an investigation instituted, so as to ascertain the facts, and if the hon. gentleman will let me have the names of the gentlemen mentioned, I will communicate with them and ascertain what the complaints are which they have to make.

Mr. VAIL. What is the relative cost of cartridges manufactured here and those imported?

Mr. CARON. I have already stated that the cost of our Canadian cartridges is about \$20 per thousand. The cost of imported cartridges—we have not imported any for a considerable time—was, the last time we purchased any, between \$16.50 and \$17 per thousand at Woolwich.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). What charge of cost is made to the force by obtaining such ammunition as is required for rifle practice from the cartridge factory?

Mr. CARON. We charge cost price to the force.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Then, do I understand that the force is charged more since the cartridge factory has been established than previously?

Mr. CARON. I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to know whether the force getting our Canadian cartridges pay more than they paid when we imported English cartridges. We have charged the force exactly the same price as members were charged when we were importing English cartridges. If the price was \$16.50 or \$17 they got Canadian cartridges at that price. I thought it desirable, in the interest of the force, that we should give them the cartridges at the same price. What we may do for the future, I have not decided.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have noticed some complaints made in the public press as to the ammunition supplied to the force on active service in the North-West. We know that in the opinion of some of the officers in the active force the ammunition was defective, and I may be pardoned for saying that we are bound to see that the ammunition manufactured here is of first-class quality, ball ammunition particularly, and that the ammunition put in the hands of the force on active service shall be the very best. One of the complaints was that the ammunition prepared at our cartridge factory was not reliable; that the same ammunition did not always cover the same range, because the

powder was of different strength. That is a fatal objection to ball cartridge. While I have looked with some care at the report of the Minister of Militia for last year, with respect to the experiments made, I cannot refrain from drawing attention to the fact that complaints are made as to the quality of the ammunition served out for practical use. The experiments made with the ammunition at Quebec were thought to be very satisfactory. Nevertheless, it is the fact that a number of complaints have, to my knowledge, been made, as to the character of the ammunition put into the hands of the volunteers. Has the Minister considered the question of establishing a system by which ammunition which had remained in store for a length of time would be converted into blank cartridge? We know that the character of the powder will deteriorate by time, and the attention of the Department should be directed to the advisability of utilising cartridges that may have remained in store so long as to be of no practical use.

Mr. CARON. I have endeavored to ascertain by writing and telegraphing during the present campaign the facts in this regard, and I have not heard a single complaint from headquarters. I saw in the press some complaints about the ammunition. In one newspaper it appeared to be in respect of heavy ammunition for the guns. In another newspaper there was some complaint about the small arms ammunition. But so far as I have been able to ascertain, there have been no complaints as to the ammunition sent to the front. Previous to our getting our cartridge factory into perfect running order we had to keep a large reserve of imported ammunition. The reserve was added to year after year, owing to the fact that we did not require it, for we were in times of profound peace. Not once but on several occasions when competitions took place at headquarters, or at the Dominion Rifle Association matches, this ammunition, which had comprised our reserve, on being served out turned out to be very defective. The system we follow at our cartridge factory and Government stores is that all ammunition which is condemned is turned over to the blank cartridge department and is converted into blank cartridge, the ball being extracted and used in making new cartridges. The hon. gentleman remarked that the quality of the powder was unequal. I can tell the hon. gentleman that we imported from England the most precise and perfect instruments known to science, for the purpose of testing the powder, an instrument which is used in all the great arsenals, such as Woolwich. The powder which is used for manufacturing cartridges is put to every possible kind of test, chemical and otherwise. Major Prevost, the superintendent, who has been a close student, who studied at Woolwich, and is known to be a great authority, makes a specialty of that subject. He is constantly testing the cartridges and the powder, and there is no more efficient officer in the service. Nothing is accepted or paid for by the Department unless the material which enters into the manufacture of the cartridges has been accepted by him. We have taken every precaution which can be taken, and I hope what the hon. gentleman said about the inequality of the cartridges, will turn out to apply to some of those which compose the reserves that have been served out. In any case, I shall have the matter investigated without delay. I hope it will be found that our Canadian cartridges are as good and as perfect as the report of those skilled marksmen and riflemen indicate that they are.

Mr. LISTER. It is gratifying to know that such care is taken, but I may say that during the last year I heard myself many complaints in London that the cartridges were not of the quality which should be given to our volunteers. I would ask the Minister whether he has imported any small arms from the United States or elsewhere, or arms of any description.

Mr. CARON. We imported, quite lately, that is since the outbreak in the North-West, I think between 100 and 150 Winchesters, for the purpose of placing them in the hands of the scouting party which was organised. Most of these men have been living for years in the west, and they were accustomed to that arm, and asked that it should be supplied to them.

Mr. LISTER. Was the ammunition used in the North-West manufactured in our own factory?

Mr. CARON. Yes; for the Sniders.

Mr. LISTER. I see that last year the vote was \$55,000, while the Auditor General's Report shows that only \$24,044 were expended.

Mr. CARON. My attention has not been called to that particular item in the Auditor General's Report, but I fancy it refers to \$12,000 which were paid to the Receiver General for ammunition which was served out to the forces.

Mr. LISTER. Was the ammunition furnished to our volunteers for small arms the same as that furnished to the North-West Mounted Police.

Mr. CARON. Yes. I forgot to tell the hon. gentleman that besides the Winchesters, we imported about 1,000 Colt's revolvers. We had no revolvers in our stores, and it was necessary to get them on short orders. The ammunition for the Winchesters was the same as for the Mounted Police, and so was the ammunition for the revolvers.

Mr. LISTER. You manufacture no small ammunition?

Mr. CARON. No.

Mr. LISTER. One would suppose so, from this item.

Mr. CARON. That refers to small arms or rifles as distinguished from artillery or cannon. All the cartridges manufactured for the Martini-Henry or Snider are called small arms ammunition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman considered the expediency, in view of the importance of encouraging good marksmen to train themselves at our ranges, of supplying, at somewhat below cost price, a reasonable amount of ammunition to be furnished under proper precautions to the members of rifle associations. Those who desire to make themselves good shots now-a-days are obliged to take a considerable amount of time, and the amount of ammunition they require is probably vastly greater than many of us suppose. I find that those who have any pretension of becoming good shots require to expend as much as 1,000 or 1,200 rounds per annum. Many of these men are privates in the ranks, and in addition to devoting a considerable amount of time to this practice, there is a tax amounting to \$16 or \$20 a year imposed upon them, for the purpose of making themselves qualified to be of use to us if their services were called for. It appears to me that the Government would be well justified in supplying a certain quantity of ammunition at moderate prices to these men, with, of course, due precautions against abuse.

Mr. CARON. I may say that we have been working in that direction. For two years we have been paying the cost of the transport of ammunition and supplying the ammunition itself at considerably below what it costs us. As the hon. gentleman knows, we give it considerably below what it costs us. But it is a very important matter, and I think we cannot do better than increase the number of our riflemen. Twenty good riflemen with good arms are better than a hundred men who are not efficient in the art of handling the rifle.

Mr. VAIL. Did the hon. gentleman import ammunition for the Martini-Henri rifle?

Mr. CARON.

Mr. CARON. Of course, I am ready to give the hon. gentleman any information we possess, but I do not want to mix up in this discussion matters connected with the outbreak, because these are matters that will have to be discussed on quite a different basis; but we had to import about 3,000,000 rounds, which we could not manufacture in time.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman's estimate of last year was similar in amount to the estimate we are now discussing, while the expenditure was something like \$24,000. I have no recollection of having heard the hon. gentleman say what additional expenditure he proposes incurring this year to justify his asking the same vote as last year, which was largely unexpended.

Mr. CARON. Last year Parliament voted a sum of money for the purpose of enabling the Department to get out new field battery 9 pounder guns. When we come to the vote I shall explain to the hon. gentleman how we were successful in getting twelve guns instead of eight with the money voted. Owing to the pressure at Woolwich, these guns were sent very much later than we expected to receive them. Consequently, the amount of money we had voted for artillery and ammunition was not fully expended, but we estimate for it now, because we consider that, with the amount which has been carried over from last year and the amount voted this year, we shall be only getting what we require for the two years to serve our purpose.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). So that, practically, the vote for next year will be \$55,000 plus \$20,000?

Mr. CARON. Yes; exactly.

Clothing and great coats ..... \$90,000

Mr. LISTER. Are these manufactured by tender?

Mr. CARON. Yes, by tender, largely advertised. The estimate is made up for 5,500 suits of uniform clothing, at an average cost of \$10 per suit, and 6,000 great coats, at an average cost of \$5.83.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do the officers in the field say of the character of the clothing they have had in the late campaign?

Mr. CARON. I have had no complaint at all, and the General, who is a good judge, says, so far as the great coats and the tunics are concerned, that he never saw anything approaching the value of the cloth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope it is Canadian cloth.

Mr. CARON. Yes; all Canadian cloth.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is the same clothing served out to the forces at the front as to the volunteers in their annual drill?

Mr. CARON. We had nothing to draw on, except what remained in our stores, outside of the ordinary uniforms. I ordered some light homespun coats, which, if the campaign had continued for any length of time, would have been very necessary for the men, being much lighter than the heavy tunics; but with the exception of 2,000 or 3,000 suits of this homespun, we had nothing to give to the troops at the front but what we served out to the whole force.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Were these tendered for?

Mr. CARON. Yes; all tendered for.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There have been complaints made as to the character of the clothing furnished; and while I have no doubt every member of this committee will sympathise with the disposition to procure as much of this clothing as possible in the country, still I think our first duty is to our volunteers. Some of the Deputy Adjutants

General complain of the clothing as being very poorly put together, and one officer suggests that each officer commanding a corps be given a special allowance to provide for his sewing each button on the clothing. That is an evidence, in itself, that the character of the clothing is not such as we should like to see it.

Mr. BERGIN. I think I have had an opportunity of knowing something of the character of the clothing served out to the volunteers, and my observation during the last two or three years is that the clothing has very much improved in quality. The difficulty with me is how those people can furnish clothing of so good a character for the price. The great coats, I believe, are not equalled by those of any other service.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I, of course, defer to the opinion of the hon. gentleman; but I think W. H. Jackson, Deputy Adjutant General of Military District No. 1, is also a good authority. He is at the front at present, and is in control of this department in the force now on service.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Before you left the Chair, Sir, I was drawing your attention to the character of the clothing furnished the service. I stated that the report of the Minister for the last financial year indicated that some of the clothing was not of a character suitable to the purpose. I then referred to the report of Col. Jackson, Deputy Adjutant General of No. 1 Military District, who states, under the head of equipment and clothing, that much of the equipment is very old and worn. The forage caps issued by the Department, he says, cause many complaints, on account of their being quite unsuited to the climate, either in summer or winter, and many men, willing to volunteer, decline to do so on being shown the caps. Complaints are also made of bad clothing, and of the make of the trousers and the bad sewing on of the buttons. The character of the clothing has more than once attracted attention through the press; and while I am willing to concede to the Minister the desire to have the clothing manufactured in the country, the first necessity should be that its character is durable. Our volunteers make considerable sacrifices, and it is certainly discouraging that the clothing should be of the character described in the report of the Adjutant General. It must have been a matter of observation, too, that when corps come into camp their uniforms are, in very many instances, very badly fitted. Of course, I know the difficulties that exist in that respect; I know that when clothing is purchased by contract it is impossible to get that fit which volunteers desire. I know that in some instances captains commanding companies have, out of their own pockets, paid a tailor to make such alterations as were deemed necessary. Whether the Department will think well to make an allowance to the captains of companies to meet this particular case, I cannot say, but certainly there are a good many complaints. There are also complaints resulting from the fact, easily accounted for, that there is such a large proportion of volunteers who are new men at each camp of instruction, some of the reports indicating that the number of recruits is as large as 90 per cent. I cannot indicate how that difficulty should be overcome, but I think it should receive the attention of the Department, to see whether some means could not be taken by which the men enrolled would be retained at their different commands for their entire term of three years. We know that they are enlisted for three years, but that the Act is very seldom put in force, and it is worthy of consideration whether some means, such as an increase of pay, would not obviate that difficulty.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is rather unfortunate, I think, in residing in the only district from which there is any complaint as to the character of the clothing in the past year. I have read the reports of officers commanding military districts, and I have failed to find any complaint from any officer, except the officer commanding the No. 1 Military District. All the others, who refer specially to the clothing, pronounce it to be good and almost invariably in good condition. I notice one exception, and that is where the inspecting officer says the clothing was not in good condition, owing to its having been stored by the officer commanding the corps in a damp place. It is impossible for the Militia Department here to look after every store that is in charge of an officer commanding a corps or a company, and it sometimes happens the storehouses are not suitable. In this case, I have no doubt it was inevitable, because it was in one of the districts in Manitoba, and no other building could have been had at the time. Now, I have had almost as long experience of the militia as any man in the country. For many years I have had the honor of commanding a corps, and I can venture to say, without contradiction, based upon fact, that the clothing of the militia in this country is exceedingly good, far better, during the past few years, than it ever was before. I am proud to say that since the clothing has been made from cloth manufactured in this country it is very much better than when made in the old country. The objection made by Col. Jackson to the caps is tolerably well founded, so far as the hot season of the year is concerned; but it is a most comfortable cap at almost any other season, and if I were disposed to be critical, I would say that Col. Jackson, when penning those lines, penned them with no disposition to ask men to volunteer. It is a most extraordinary reason to be given for the refusal of men in this country to join the militia, that the shape of the cap does not suit them. I did not think there were many man-milliners in the volunteer force, and I never, until I saw this report of Col. Jackson, heard it mentioned as a reason for not joining the militia service. The men are satisfied—have good clothing, and the caps furnished them are of good material. They are, perhaps, not fitted for walking down Broadway, if a man is disposed to be very particular as to the style of his dress, but they are comfortable and serviceable, and not at all injurious to the health. There is another objection offered? The hon. gentleman admits it is an objection that cannot be met, namely, that the clothing supplied from the Department will not fit every man who volunteers, at the moment he volunteers; and the hon. gentleman has himself supplied a reason why the Government ought not to permit the clothing to be changed or fitted to each volunteer, because it is the custom not to prosecute men who fail to complete the full term of their enlistment in the service, and there are many young men who, owing to various causes, very often, at the period of camp, are obliged to go to other parts of the country. They leave their clothing behind them, to be used by other men who take their places, and if the Militia Department were to permit the cutting up of clothing, so as to suit each man each time he volunteered, they would be, in a little time, without any clothing. The consequence is, that men are obliged to wear clothing a little too large for them in some cases, and in others a little too small; but it is in the interest of economy that these should not be cut up and made over for every man who wears them. In the cities, where the corps are of a more permanent character and the men are more apt to remain during the full period of enlistment, it is the custom to alter the clothing to suit the men, and I believe that in no case has the Militia Department suffered any loss by it, the corps having, generally, where there was the loss of a tunic or a pair of trousers, in consequence of the change, made it up. If no more substantial objection can be made to the clothing furnished by the Militia Department than this very curiously-worded

paragraph of Lieut. Col. Jackson's, the only one in all the military districts who says the clothing is not of good quality, I think the hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied that there must have been some mistake made by Col. Jackson, and that the objection is not very well founded.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Assuming that Col. Jackson is the only officer who has any fault to find with the clothing supplied by the Department, we must not forget that, according to the number of military districts in the Dominion, he represents one-twelfth of the whole number of volunteers, and besides, his command is much larger, numerically, than many others of the twelve Deputy Adjutants General. But there were other complaints made, privately, of course, and perhaps they are not entitled to the same amount of consideration as this. I do not assume that, because the changes are frequent, the volunteers' clothing should not fit him. I think it would be a doctrine very prejudicial to the success of our volunteer force to assume that the clothing was to be invariably a misfit because somebody else might come along afterwards who might be compelled to wear it.

Mr. BERGIN. You say invariably; I say occasionally.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). My view of it is, that it results very largely from the fact that, in the country battalions the changes are very numerous, and the attention of the Department should be drawn to the fact, with a view of remedying what is a pernicious state of affairs, not only as far as the clothing is concerned, but in regard to the well-being of the force. It must be clear to every member of the committee that twelve days' drill is not sufficient to secure to the country that value for the expenditure which we expect. If some course were adopted by which the volunteers were kept in the ranks for the full term of their enlistment, the clothing could be altered to fit them, and it would not be argued, as a reason for change, that some one else would have a misfit in the following year. I think a larger fraction of the very fair amount which we expend on the volunteer force could be appropriated to giving the men a few cents more per day. I find that where the municipal bodies have implemented the pay of the volunteers by 25 cents a day, the character of the battalions is markedly in contrast for the better to those where they are only paid 50 cents a day. Perhaps the Minister will find in that direction the means of overcoming the difficulty that the hon. gentleman, as well as myself, admits to exist.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman was quite right in drawing my attention to these matters. When the uniforms were imported from England the complaints were just as numerous, and, I think, more numerous, than they are to-day. There were just as many buttons dropping off occasionally when the uniforms were manufactured in England as there have been since they have been manufactured in Canada. The hon. gentleman states that some means should be adopted to enforce the enlistment of the men who join the force for the three years of their service. We know that, in a country like Canada, men, for the purposes of their own business, go about from one place to another, and I think that so far the system has worked very well. These men may be serving to-day in one battalion in one part of the country and next year in another battalion in another part of the country, but whenever we have required them we have found them ready to fight the battles of the country, and they have done it most effectually.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). According to last year's Public Accounts, we have paid a very fair sum for a thorough inspection of the clothing, between \$1,100 and \$1,200, and I think that Col. Jackson's complaint really should not lie, when that amount has been expended in the inspection of

Mr. BERGIN.

clothing, and in seeing that they are received from the contractor in good condition.

Mr. LISTER. I think it would be expecting something from the Department of Militia which we have no right to expect, if the uniforms given out to the volunteers were expected to fit them. The least that can be expected is, I think, that something should be done to make them as good as possible. I think the hon. gentleman from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) is unjust in his reference to Col. Jackson. Col. Jackson is an officer of the Government, and I think it is his duty to report to the Government the condition of affairs exactly as they are. If he did not do so he would be remiss in his duty. I have not the pleasure of knowing Col. Jackson, but I believe he is a very efficient officer, and I have no doubt that he has reported the condition of affairs as he found it. He represents that the clothing was not good and was not properly made up. I think the hon. gentleman from Cornwall was unjust in his reference to Col. Jackson, because that officer did what it was his duty to do. It is not pretended that the statement made is not strictly accurate, and if it is true, then he would be remiss in his duty if he did not bring it to the attention of the Minister of Militia. In looking over the report, I find that there are other complaints, so far as other portions of the service are concerned. There are complaints as to the arms from several of the commanding officers—serious complaints that the arms are old-fashioned and inefficient, and although there are no other complaints as to the clothing, there are abundance of complaints, as far as the arms are concerned. I think these gentlemen would not be doing their duty if they did not bring these matters to the attention of the Department. How can the Minister of Militia be expected to have an efficient force unless the officers bring to his attention everything pertaining to it, everything calculated to make it more efficient and more fit to discharge the duties it is expected to do. The hon. gentleman says that the clothing is better than was imported from England, and on that point I admit that he ought to be a better judge than I am. But we have seen reports in the newspapers that, when the volunteers arrived at Port Arthur on their way to the North-West, the uniforms were in a very dilapidated condition indeed, on account of the inferior material of which they were made. Now that the matter has been brought before the attention of the Minister, I hope he will see that all just cause of complaint is removed.

Mr. McCALLUM. An hon. gentleman has complained that the volunteers do not serve their whole time of three years. My opinion is, that just as soon as a volunteer has learned his drill he should step out and let some other man take his place. It is in the interest of the country that as many men as possible should be acquainted with drill. Now, in regard to the clothing, there always has been and always will be complaints. The question is: Are the clothes made for the men, or are the men made for the clothes? But take it all in all, I am satisfied that the uniforms furnished the volunteers, that are made in this country, are as good as any that you can find in any other country in the world.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I find that R. J. Webb & Co., of England, supplied clothing for the value of \$15,776, while the amount paid for military clothing in Canada is \$25,000. It may be that it is the English cloth that is at fault; I am only drawing the attention of the Minister to the fact that complaints have been made by the volunteers themselves, and that these complaints have been substantiated by the report of an officer of the Government.

Mr. CARON. I may state, in regard to the clothing imported from England, that the hon. gentleman knows, from previous discussions which have taken place in Parliament, that we import from England the scarlet tunics because we cannot get in Canada a scarlet cloth in which the color

would hold. On account of the small quantity of cloth which would be required for militia purposes, it would not pay to construct a factory for the special purpose of manufacturing that cloth in Canada. The dyeing process, more especially, would make it very expensive. But outside the scarlet tunics and the scarlet cloth, all the other military clothing is manufactured in Canada.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister is quite right in taking that course. When I was at the head of the Department I found it impossible to get scarlet cloth here, so that the color would stand; it lasted but a very short time. I see the amount asked for this year is \$90,000, the same as last year, but it does not appear whether the balance between the \$47,740 expended and the \$90,000, the estimate of last year, and granted by the House, has been expended.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will see that it is one vote, and the vote was transferred over. All the accounts covering the expenditure have not been paid up. The amount has been carried over, so as to meet the contracts which were given.

Mr. VAIL. I observe the unexpended balance carried forward is \$7,676 for ammunition, clothing and military stores.

Mr. CARON. This is one vote, and the whole of that vote was carried over. It cannot be divided, and so it appeared in the report as having been transferred for the payment of one particular class of goods, and no other. But the contracts have been given out, and the money will be required for the purpose of paying these contracts. The whole \$90,000 will be expended.

Mr. McCALLUM. I understood the Minister of Militia and the late Minister of Militia to say that we manufactured all the cloth necessary for the volunteers in this country, except the scarlet tunics. Now, I think we might discontinue altogether the scarlet color in the clothing of our volunteers, because it makes a too conspicuous mark. There is no better target and no better color for an enemy to shoot at than a scarlet tunic, and I hope the militia authorities of this country will consider the expediency of changing that color to some other—say, grey or green—and if we can manufacture it in the country, so much the better, and then we would be able to keep that industry, at least, at home.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It gives me pleasure to be able to coincide with the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), who has just spoken, in reference to scarlet as a color for uniforms. I believe that some other color would be much better for the purpose of our volunteer forces. I have an opinion that, for purposes such as our Canadian volunteers are likely to be used, for skirmishing and scouting work, the red uniform is an objectionable one. While I know there is a very strong feeling in its favor, on account of its associations, yet, in the interest of our volunteers, we can very safely abandon that feeling, and furnish them clothing adapted to the circumstances of the case. I have had that opinion for several years, and it is strengthened by the fact that scarlet clothing is very hard to keep clean, and that after a little use it has not the appearance that dark green has. It would be decidedly advantageous to the volunteer force if scarlet tunics were abandoned.

Mr. CARON. The question of scarlet versus other colors is not a new one. It has been discussed by high authorities, and the result of the experience of those who have made a special study of the matter is that scarlet is the best of all colors. It is a well known fact that if you take a rifleman uniformed in green he makes a better mark at almost any distance than a man wearing scarlet. I do not wish to interfere with military critics who have made this a special study; but this question has been so often discussed that it is now considered settled, and the result of all the discussion is, that

scarlet is, after all, the best color. The fact of scarlet being retained in all the great armies of Europe must necessarily indicate that it cannot be so bad as the hon. gentleman fancies it to be.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Those who have accompanied the forces in the field have criticised the scarlet uniforms. I have seen references to the fact that it was thought that corps uniformed in red offered better marks, and it was suggested that their losses resulted, to some extent, from that fact. I know they did not suffer very severely, but we must remember that those who were uniformed in other than red were those who were most actively engaged. I am not aware that it has been so definitely ascertained that scarlet is the preferable color, as the hon. gentleman indicates. I certainly will defer, however, to the hon. gentleman's judgement, in a matter of this kind, which must necessarily engage his attention more than mine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had occasion, some years ago, to look into this question, and I read something about it; and I have read, not the whole of it, but I have looked through the report of the late commission, with respect to the volunteers in England. There is a general consensus of opinion among military men that red is a much safer color than rifle green. I had occasion some years ago, to look at a large body of troops in review, and those with red uniforms appeared as a blurred red line, while the men in dark green, with the sun light behind them, stood out with marked individuality. There can be no doubt that red is a much safer color than the rifle green. So much is that the case, that the authorities are making all the volunteer force in England change their rifle uniforms to red, and they are doing it very rapidly. The only question that is still not quite settled is as to whether a light grey is not a safer uniform than red. But notwithstanding that question, which, I believe, is not yet decided, the recommendation of the commission is that all the volunteers' uniforms, and they are principally grey, shall be given up, and red adopted as the uniform of the volunteer force.

Mr. PLATT. What is the average time during which a great coat and tunic is fit for use?

Mr. CARON. Up to three years ago we issued great coats every five years. From the superior material which we have secured in our Canadian factories, I believe we will be able to save two years upon each great coat. There is no doubt that in ordinary times great coats and uniforms will last five years. It is intended, when the men at present at the front return, that they shall be provided with a complete new outfit.

Mr. PLATT. The condition of great coats might be materially improved if arrangements were made by which they would not be used as bedding. In camps of instruction both great coats and tunics are more abused in the tents than outside. Complaint has been made that this arises from a scanty supply of blankets. It might be that a great saving would be effected if more blankets were supplied, and the great coats and tunics were put carefully away. Volunteers lie on the ground in their great coats and cover themselves with blankets. During wet weather the great coats get into a very bad condition, and are not fit for parade. The trouble about buttons being rubbed off arises from the men sleeping in their great coats. Is it made imperative that great coats shall be taken to the stores after camp?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. That is one of the regulations that is not carried out. It is not an uncommon thing to see a volunteer drawing wood in a military great coat, and laboring men wearing great coats and pants. In many cases where

battalions are not fit for service on account of the bad state of their clothing, the explanation is that the men have been wearing it at all times, and have not taken care of it. I think if regulations were made compelling the commanding officer to take these uniforms immediately after camp and have them properly cleaned and stored, a great saving would be effected. From my experience, I have noticed, particularly with regard to the accoutrements of cavalry men, that they are frequently taken home and left in a barn or stable, and when collected they are unfit for service or inspection. I think, supplying two or three blankets, if necessary, to each volunteer in camp, would also be the means of effecting a great saving in clothes.

Mr. CARON. At every camp we usually supply two blankets per man, which, in June, should be sufficient, and at the camps of instruction, in September, we have issued one extra blanket, so that there is absolutely no reason why the great coats should be used for bedding. We cannot, of course, send bedsteads to the camps, but as the men have plenty of straw, as well as their blankets, there is no reason why the great coats should be put to the use to which the hon. gentleman refers. Our blankets are some of the very best that can be found, and if coats are used as bedding it is the fault of the commanding officer, as it is his duty, when the camp is over, to take care that the uniforms, accoutrements, etc., are returned to him. As to the use of military uniforms outside of military service, the hon. gentleman knows that after five years these uniforms are disposed of, and it may be that some of them, after being cast off, are used in that way. I would sooner see the old ones returned when they are replaced by the new ones, but that has not been the practice heretofore.

Mr. PLATT. With regard to head dress, I hope the hon. gentleman will not send the volunteers to drill this year with the forage cap for June or September drill, as there is great complaint on that score, owing to the fact that many of the volunteers, not being accustomed to long exposure to the sun, get their faces so blistered that they have to be sent to the hospital, being unfit for drill. I know that I have myself given certificates allowing them to be put on the sick list. Some battalions are purchasing helmets themselves from England, and if helmets or some cheaper article could be supplied, a change in the head dress would be very desirable.

Mr. CARON. I may say that that question is now being considered, as we have had complaints with regard to it, and I hope we will be able to find a head dress which is suitable to our climate.

Mr. PLATT. I may mention that some battalions have been calling on their friends, and have been raising money by concerts and other ways, to pay for their helmets, and I think, in such cases, the Government should at least pay one-half.

Mr. CARON. I may say that we allow the value of the forage cap to those battalions which import helmets.

Mr. PLATT. Does that apply to battalions which had forage cap, last year, and are buying helmets this year?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. With regard to this item of military stores, could the hon. gentleman give us any idea of the quantity of stores on hand?

Mr. CARON. I could tell the hon. gentleman what we are estimating for. There are 5,000 sets of accoutrements, including haversacks; 5,000 blankets; 500 tents; material for repairs of artillery, etc.

Mr. VAIL. Is the regular quantity sufficient for this year?

Mr. PLATT.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that, having to meet an emergency this year, we had to purchase a good many stores to complete what we had on hand. The vote taken every year is merely to keep up a force of about 32,000 men, and we have very little surplus over what was required for the ordinary wants of the forces.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Are any of the stores included in this vote, those that are supplied to permanent corps?

Mr. CARON. Yes; this covers not only the ordinary volunteer forces but the permanent corps—the batteries and the schools of infantry and cavalry.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Then the cost of the schools of infantry and cavalry has been increased by the amount they withdraw from these stores yearly?

Mr. CARON. Yes; of course.

Public armories and care of arms, including pay of storekeepers, caretakers, storemen and armorers .....	\$60,000
--	----------

Mr. LISTER. Was the whole vote of last year expended?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Drill pay, and other incidental expenses connected with the drill and training of the militia.....	\$250,000
--	-----------

Mr. VAIL. Will the Minister kindly tell us what he proposes to do the coming year—how many men he proposes to drill, and whether any additional amount above the \$250,000 vote was expended last year?

Mr. CARON. The estimate for this year is for twelve days' drill of city corps and brigades of garrison artillery. The estimate is for 9,500 officers and men, at an average cost of 72 cents each per day, \$77,760, and 385 horses, at \$1 per day for twelve days, \$4,620, making \$82,380. We also estimate for 1,222 horses and 10,000 officers and men, at an average of \$1.10 each per day, which covers rations and pay, \$132,000; transport is estimated at about \$3 per man, \$30,000, and camp contingencies, \$5,620; making the estimate of \$250,000. We intend this year holding the camps of instruction and having the usual drill which we have had during the past four or five years.

Mr. VAIL. I observe, that while the vote for 1883-84 was the same amount, \$250,000, the expenditure was \$314,000. It seems to me we ought to keep a little nearer the vote. If the hon. gentleman wants more money it would be better to have it voted.

Mr. CARON. Last year, at the beginning of the season, there were some battalions called out for drill which, for some reason, could not turn out and did not turn out. The Adjutant General, fancying that we should drill as many men as possible, not exceeding the vote of Parliament, we took some other local corps. Later in the season the corps which had been called out for drill went through their drill, and the consequence was that the vote was exceeded. But the hon. gentleman will see that the expenditure for the present year has been below the vote. Of course, we do not know yet whether it will come up to the full amount of the vote, from the fact that a good many of the battalions drill very late in the year, and they have the right to drill up to the last day of this month. Consequently, a good many of the battalions have not been paid, and it is impossible for us to know how far the vote can go.

Mr. LISTER. I think it would be well for the Minister of Militia to consider whether the system which has been in existence many years past is really one in the interest of the militia force generally. Many people contend that the present system of bringing the different battalions

out into camp once every two years is of no advantage to the force. We know that the volunteers enlist for three years and that the law requires that different battalions shall drill for twelve days at least every two years. It is possible that many of the volunteers may only attend camp once in three years, and we know that in practice they have only six days for drilling, because we must allow two days for going and coming, and two Sundays in the twelve days. Without any additional instruction, if the volunteers are to depend on the instruction they receive at those camps it is impossible that a man who has been in camp only eight days can receive any instruction that will be valuable to him two or three days from that time. I do not know whether the Minister of Militia has taken means to ascertain how many men of the different battalions attend camp more than once. I fancy that if that information were sought for, it would be found that the rural battalions, at any rate, do not attend more than once. If that is so, it will be seen that the instruction the majority of our volunteers receive there can be of no benefit to them at all, and we cannot expect that they will be at all efficient. Therefore, I think it would be well for the Minister to consider whether the system cannot be improved—whether we should not have a more efficient force, if the number of the volunteers were reduced and the length of the drill extended. The cost of this annual drill is very large, some \$250,000, a large tax on the people. I believe that if the number of our volunteer forces were reduced to about one-half, and the drill were doubled, we should have a more efficient force of volunteers, which would be quite ample in time of danger to preserve the public peace. There is another consideration connected with this subject. If the Government insist on expending this amount of money the pay of the volunteers might be increased. It seems to me that the pay granted for attending these camps is ridiculously small—50 cents a day. That fact is of itself sufficient to deter a very large number of the most desirable young men of the country from going into camp at all. It is no compensation for a man's absence from his business or his situation, and I think, depending upon the volunteers as we do and must do, that the force ought to be made as attractive as possible, and that the men who enter the force should be paid as fair a rate of wages as this country is able to pay them. In the State of Michigan I know that the volunteers, while out in camp, receive \$1 a day and their rations, and I think, myself, that is little enough when you consider the fact that the men are taken away from their labors and are, perhaps, losing wages to a much greater extent than they are receiving from the Government, besides undergoing much inconvenience. Unless you see your way to compensate them for the trouble, inconvenience and loss they are put to, you must expect to have our volunteer force, to a certain extent, inefficient. Men who ought to be trained and on whom the country could depend when called on, find substitutes to go into camp, so that often, instead of the regular volunteers, the other men turn out. The only remedy for this is better pay. If our volunteers were paid better I believe we would have altogether a more efficient force than we have to-day.

Mr. CARON. I am glad to see the interest the hon. gentleman takes in the force. The suggestions he has made are really very important. The hon. gentleman knows, as far as the city corps are concerned, that the men really serve out the 3 years of service, but in the rural corps he is quite right in saying that it is very much more difficult to get the men to complete their term of service. I merely express, not my own views, because in matters of that kind I do not pretend to be a military critic, but the views which have been expressed by every commanding officer, every general who has been in command of our militia force, when I say there is no doubt that the camps of exercise works wonders in

increasing the efficiency of the force. I believe if you get a number of battalions together in camp you get more drill out of the men, from the fact that the competition of the different battalions with each other creates a spirit of emulation, which contributes very much indeed towards improving the men. Personally, I am strongly in favor of camp exercises. Of course, I cannot help admitting it would be a very great advantage if, instead of every two years, we were to drill our men in camp every year, because the more drill they get the more efficient they become. But hon. gentlemen must not forget that this year we are under very heavy expenses, owing to the events which have taken place in the North-West; and I should not like to recommend a change of system; but the question is one which will have to be considered shortly. So far, our system has worked very well; our volunteers in active service have done wonders, considering the fact that they had never been previously called upon to take the field. It would be much better if we could adopt the system of having yearly camp exercises, but the cost would be very much greater than what it is at present.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I merely rise with regard to the statement of the hon. member for Lambton, as I have some knowledge of the feeling of the force. Naturally, their disposition is, when they get out to camp, that the drill should be productive of as much permanent benefit as possible; and it is generally conceded that the few days spent in camp are of very little benefit, as regards permanence. If we are going to pursue the present system, I fear it will not produce as many benefits as we could reasonably expect. Of course, I realise the force of the Minister's statement, that having spent so much money this year and having so many volunteers under arms necessarily cripples the Government in their efforts to give the volunteers better drill; but we must not forget that those men who have been in the North-West have practically been securing the very best experience, and that they will return trained soldiers. But a large fraction of the force which has not had these advantages cannot be said to be in the same state of efficiency. I am satisfied an addition of 10 cents to the *per diem* allowance of the volunteers would produce a very decided advantage. In the report, it is a subject of very general remark that the corps in the rural districts do not keep their men for the full time. One of the Deputy Adjutants General remarks that something like 90 per cent. of the entire force is recruited between each camp. A slight increase of pay, I believe, will remedy this. It does not, I think, follow, that there is a greater migration of population in the rural districts than in the city. Of course, we know that there are circumstances which tend to keep the volunteer forces in the cities together to a degree which cannot be secured in the country, but still I believe that a slight increase of pay would have a great effect in making the country corps approach nearer the city corps, as regards the soldiers completing their full term of service. I would draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that one of the Deputy Adjutants General, in making his criticisms on the different battalions in one of the camps of instruction, remarked that the pay of one of the battalions, the battalion from the county of Bruce, was implemented by a grant from the municipal council of that county, and that this materially tended to bring in together a much better class of men. This is proof evident that were the Government to increase the pay very satisfactory results would follow. But we would get men to turn out the second year who had attended the previous year's instruction, and consequently were better able to form into line and do military duty than those who turned out fresh for military service.

Mr. PLATT. With respect to camps of instruction, I agree in part with what the hon. gentleman has already said,

As to the payment of the volunteers the pay of the rank and file should be slightly increased, not largely increased, as that is not necessary. The slight increase given by various municipalities has invariably had the effect of sending the best company from the municipality which paid the highest figure. As to the character of the drill, I have always been of the opinion that two drills out of three should be at battalion headquarters and the third drill at brigade camp. I am not satisfied that brigade camp is the best place for a raw recruit. He will not learn so much drill there as at company headquarters. Perhaps the best way to arrange the drill would be to have one drill at company headquarters, one at battalion headquarters and one at brigade camp. I hope the Minister will select some good camping ground. I have no sympathy with the idea that certain towns should be selected. I believe claims are put forward by one town and another, some offer to do this and that, in order to get the camp there, and a selection is made without regard to the ground on which the soldiers have to drill. In the 3rd Military District the only suitable ground is at Kingston, but the camp has not been there for many years. Last year, at Trenton, the ground was very rough and unsuitable. I do not accuse the Minister with selecting those grounds in order to favor the residents of particular towns, but it is not necessary, where we have such a ground as at Kingston, that the camp should be held at any other place. Last year there was a division of the brigade camp in the 3rd District, one-half being at Trenton and the other at Kingston. It did not give satisfaction, and increased the expense, while it did not give the soldiers an idea of brigade drill. As to the length of time which the force should be in camp, that is a matter of dollars and cents. If there were plenty of money, fifteen or twenty days would be good time, but economy must be considered, and I am not prepared to suggest increased expense. As little time as possible should be spent in useless parade. Nothing distresses and annoys men so much as useless march outs and review days. Some days are frequently wasted in preparing for a parade before an inspecting officer. A great deal of that kind of work might be dispensed with. I do not know any feature of the camp of instruction which does so much harm as the canteen. I have come to the conclusion, although I do not hold extreme views in regard to prohibition, that if there is one place where intoxicating liquors should be prohibited it is in brigade camp. Nothing does so much injury to the men at drill, and nothing has roused such a feeling of indignation among the people of the country. In my capacity as surgeon, parents have come to me and asked me to report that their sons were unfit for duty: not that they did not wish them to learn drill, but they did not want them to go to camp, because they knew they were more likely to contract the habit of drinking strong liquors there than anywhere else. I know that young men who never take liquor elsewhere drink it in brigade camps. They think beer must be taken; and if they are not used to drinking, it unfits them for drill, and the hospital tent is filled with sick young men in the morning, not from overwork, but from carousals at night with bottles of beer. Canteens should be abolished. We may safely leave it to grocers to supply the necessaries for the men. Nothing would so conduce to the welfare of brigade camps as the total abolition of all intoxicants, and we should not allow beer or large beer to come in, because, where one kind of liquor is admitted other kinds are almost sure to be used. No surgeon who has any humanity about him will send a young man upon drill in the morning when he is suffering from a severe headache. A great many drills are lost and a great deal of time is wasted on account of the canteens in the camps. Just another word, with regard to the target practice at the camps. I think, in the interest of the force, it might almost be done away with, so far as camp instruction is concerned. Too much is attempted and

Mr. PLATT.

little or nothing is done. Recruits are not fit to take out before a target until they have had a chance of firing blank cartridges. I have seen young men brought out to target practice who never fired a rifle in their lives; the first time they fire they are hurt by the recoil, and many of them would not fire a rifle again. The rule, then, is for some officer to take the ground and fire the rounds for that man. I see in the Minister's report a suggestion that only half the number of rounds should be issued, so that the instructor could give more attention to the men and teach them how to hold the rifle. Some of the rifles give a rebound, and it is not very pleasant to a person who is unaccustomed to their use. I think I am correct in saying that a good deal of the money that goes for the purchase of ammunition, to be spent in target practice in brigade camps, is as good as thrown away. Just another point. There is nothing that a battalion is so proud of as of its band; and, from long experience in the volunteer force, I have invariably noticed that in every camp of instruction where several battalions have been grouped together for the purposes of drill, the battalion that has the best band was the best battalion there. I believe the Government should encourage, by every means, the formation of first-class bands, and give the bands every encouragement after they are formed.

Mr. CARON. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the manner in which he has submitted his views on these several points. I quite agree with him in reference to the canteens. The hon. gentleman will see that in 1883, when we framed the new regulations, we inserted a provision whereby those canteens were prohibited. But if the commanding officer does not do his duty, of course my hon. friend will understand how difficult it is for us to control from headquarters a matter of detail like this. With regard to the question of rifle practice, I have always believed that giving a lot of ammunition to rural troops during the camp for rifle practice is practically throwing much of it away. My idea is, that we should work a scheme whereby the ammunition, instead of being given during camp, would be handed over to the different battalions, so that they might form associations within their organizations, and have a certain number of days for practice. I believe that scheme would result very satisfactorily. I think Gen. Middleton, whose attention I have called to this matter, views it very much in the same light. I also agreed with the hon. gentleman as to the importance of the band in keeping up the efficiency of the battalion, but the hon. gentleman knows that we have given as much encouragement to that branch of the service as possible, with the means at the disposal of the Department.

Mr. SCRIVER. I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that he has not said anything in reply to the suggestions which have been made by several members of the House, with reference to an increase of pay to the volunteers.

Mr. CARON. I thought I had answered it, by stating that this year we have a very heavy expenditure to meet, and I think it would be better to select some year of profound peace, when we can give all our attention to that important matter. I do not believe that this year it will be possible for us to increase the pay.

Mr. SCRIVER. Then I trust that another year, if the hon. gentleman should be at the head of the Department, something will be done in this direction. Judging from what I have seen in my somewhat limited experience, it is absolutely necessary, if we would obtain the class of men that it is desirable to obtain to go into camp instruction, to pay an increased compensation. The hon. Minister must be aware that the wages of laboring men are very much higher than they were a few years ago, when this grade of pay was fixed. He cannot expect efficient men to go to

the camps of instruction unless they receive something equal to the pay that they get at home as farm laborers or as mechanics.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. Minister will remember that the pay has been reduced instead of advanced within recent years. The late Government increased it to 60 cents a day, and those who were acquainted with the force at that time are aware that the increase tended to raise the efficiency of the force. We know very well that long range rifles, like the Martini-Henry, are pretty severe on untrained shoulders, and that shows the greater necessity for training. Without being able efficiently to handle the rifle they are very incomplete soldiers indeed; and while it might be quite improper to confine practice to a single day during the drill, or to enter upon practice without having been thoroughly trained into the manner of placing the rifle to the shoulder, still it does not follow that the amount of practice should be reduced, but, on the contrary, it should be largely increased.

Contingencies..... \$38,000

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Are grants for drill in connection with public schools included in this amount? The attention of the Minister was drawn, some time ago, to the advantages that might result from furnishing our high schools with facilities for drill instruction. With the recent development of our high schools, particularly in Ontario, very material results might be produced at very light expense. There are 105 high schools and collegiate institutes in our Province, and the expense of training the pupils would not be large. Efficient officers are turned out of our military schools, and their services could be obtained at comparatively little expense. My connection with the collegiate institute in my own town has taught me that at a very slight cost we are able to secure the services of a thoroughly efficient drill instructor, and he has produced surprising results in one or two seasons.

Mr. CARON. This question is a very large one. It has already been brought before my notice by the Minister of Education of Ontario. In that Province alone there are 110,000 boys in the different schools, who would require to be drilled if the system were adopted. In the other Provinces there is also an army of scholars. The adoption of the proposed system would, therefore, involve a very large expenditure for instruction and procuring arms. It is a system which has been followed with great success in Germany, France and Switzerland. We cannot undertake that expenditure, however, this year, especially in view of the heavy outlay caused by the North-West troubles. I hope, possibly, at a future period, that we may discuss it, and I should like to see the schools, the high schools especially, placed in the position of receiving drill instruction, which would prove very useful in developing the *physique* of the boys, and in converting those boys, in later life, into first-class soldiers.

Grant to Dominion Rifle Association..... \$10,000

Mr. CARON. This is the same amount as last year. It is to provide for a Canadian team to go to Wimbledon. Our men have brought back from Wimbledon valuable prizes, including the Kolapore cup four times. The team this year is a very good one, and is under the command of Col. Ross, who is a very good officer, the second in command being Capt. Clarke, who was wounded at Fish Creek. I hope our Canadians at Wimbledon will be as successful as they have been in previous years.

Dominion Artillery Association..... \$2,000

Mr. CARON. I must ask the committee to drop this item. It will appear in the Supplementary Estimates for

last year. An English team came from Shoeburyness, and Her Majesty sent a prize for competition, the first prize ever granted by the Queen, to be competed for in any of the colonies. The English team, under the command of Lieut. Col. Rae, came to Canada and competed with our Canadian artillery team at the Island of Orleans. The prize which we should have so much liked to have kept, was carried back to England, after close competition. I believe these competitions have the best possible result. For this vote of \$2,000 we really get more drill out of the artillerymen and other branches of the service, who go in for extra drill, for which they are not paid, in order to be fit for competition, and this expenditure does good service in this way. This year, many of the men selected to shoot on the team in England against English artillerymen, are at the front, and I thought it better to drop the amount. Next year it will be put in again, and afford us an opportunity of sending our men to compete at Shoeburyness.

Royal Military College at Kingston..... \$50,000

Mr. CARON. This item is the same as last year. The reports of the Department gives the particulars as regards the number of cadets at the college, and other matters in that connection. I may say that those who have come up for examination to be admitted this year amount to 29, the largest number we ever had. We have had to limit the number to 65, owing to insufficiency of accommodation.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex.) As regards the employment of the graduates of this college, a return was recently submitted, showing that there was a comparatively small number employed in our service, although it was understood, as a reason for the institution of the college, that we would educate a class of young men who would be at our service when required, either in the civil service of the State or our military service. It is stated that many of the graduates are on active service in the North-West. If so, the committee will be glad to have that statement confirmed by the Minister of Militia. I have been looking over the return brought down to indicate the number of graduates of the military college who were holding positions in the different schools of instruction, and I find they are but a small fraction. If the instruction they received is of the value we expect it is, these young men should be well qualified to fill positions in the different schools of instruction, but we found only a small number of them in those schools. Of course, it may be that they have refused such positions, and, of course, we know a number of them hold commissions in the British service. It may be contended it is not to the advantage of this country that we should educate young men for the English service, but it is a fair reply to say that they are available for our service when required; and we know that one or two of them who hold commissions in the English service are at present on active duty in the North-West. I think the services of these young men should be taken advantage of to a greater extent than appears by the returns. Would the hon. gentleman inform us how many military school graduates are now in active service in the North-West?

Mr. CARON. As far as I can remember, there are 26 in the force at the front, and that is really a very large percentage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is nearly all who have graduated and are in the country.

Mr. CARON. Yes, and that includes the men who are in the infantry schools and also the General's aide-de-camp, and 3 in the Mounted Police.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very glad to hear that statement; it shows conclusively these young men have all done their duty. Deducting those who have received commissions in the English service, and who are

now serving Her Majesty in another capacity, that 26 must be by far the largest moiety of those who remain. I take the opportunity of asking the First Minister, in this connection, whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a reasonable percentage of the new officers who will be required for the service of the Mounted Police from the ranks of the military graduates. It would be a fair recognition of the services of those who have gone to the front, that from the twenty-six who have gone to the front, should be selected for appointments in the Mounted Police, those who have shown themselves most capable and most qualified for military life.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, it is only right that a fair percentage of those who have distinguished themselves at the front, cadets of the military college as well as officers of the various corps, should be given preference in any new commissions issued. Then, the hon. gentleman knows there are a great many men of education serving in the ranks of the Mounted Police, who enlisted in the hopes of rising, and their claims will have to be recognised.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quite aware that in the ranks of the Mounted Police, in our time, and I suppose the same thing has continued to occur, there was a considerable number of men of education. I do not know that they were all educated on exceptionally good subjects, but no doubt among them there can be found a fair percentage of men who deserve promotion, and I believe it would be very well indeed, in our service, that men should be promoted from the ranks if they show reasonable capacity. I am glad to hear the Minister say that those cadets who have shown themselves specially qualified will receive promotion. I suppose about 20 officers will be required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 15.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they were divided among the three grades the hon. gentleman referred to that would allow four or five to each. I have never myself contended that every man who passes through the Royal Military College should be held qualified, of course, for a commission under the Government; but what I have held is this, that the Government ought to provide a number of places in the civil or military service of the Dominion, or in the engineering service, as my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) suggests, for at least as many as the British Government takes off our hands. If it were known that the British Government gave four commissions a year, distributed among the most promising cadets, and that three or four positions in the civil service were given to those who deserved them most, and who were recommended by the commandant of the school, it would add very much to the utility and efficiency of that college; and, as I understand the Government limit the number to 65, that would provide for one-half of the graduating class each year. If the Government saw their way to make that announcement, I would suggest that, as the closing exercises of the military college are going to take place next Tuesday, it might be well to cause the announcement to be officially made, because I was informed by the commandant that the British Government had tendered a number of unusually high positions among the engineers to be granted to officers of the proper age; so that the Government would incur very little risk in offering to those who graduate with reasonable honor a chance for a place in the civil service. The British Government, I think, has given as many as a dozen commissions in the engineers and a dozen in the artillery, 24 in all. I shall ask the hon. gentleman to consider that matter, and I shall ask, on concurrence, what the decision of the Government is upon it. I would suggest that they offer, say, four appointments, which they will not have much difficulty, I fancy, in providing for, seeing that we are increasing our military force at a considerable rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Pay and maintenance of A, B and C Batteries,  
Royal Schools of Artillery, at Quebec, Kingston  
and Victoria, B.C. .... \$172,700

Mr. VAIL. What is the reason for the \$20,000 additional?

Mr. CARON. That is for the purpose of organising C battery in British Columbia. Last year we took a very much smaller vote, because I could not see my way to organise that battery last year. This year, however, the military advisers of the Department have called my attention to its importance, and we consider that we shall be able to organise C battery exactly like A and B batteries, except that we shall limit it to 100 men. My hon. friend will remember that A and B batteries are composed of 150 men each. They are always up to the full strength—in fact, very often above the strength. C battery we have reduced to 100 men, because we believe that we can compensate the increased cost of living in British Columbia by reducing the number.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is proposed to increase the strength of the permanent force to 350 men?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). And a portion of that force it is contemplated to station at London, and a portion at Winnipeg?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. HOLTON. I wish to enquire if it is the intention of the Minister to organise this battery (C) at once?

Mr. CARON. Yes; as soon as it is possible to do so. The plan contemplated is to have some men of the Royal Naval reserve. The difficulty we had to contend with was the fact that the labor market in British Columbia took most of the available men, and it was difficult to recruit in that Province. But we have the advantage of getting a class of men who are receiving pensions from the Imperial Government, and they are a very good class of men.

Mr. HOLTON. I notice in the Public Accounts that Lieut. Col. Holmes received pay as commandant of C battery from the 10th of August, 1883, to the 30th June, 1884, amounting to \$1,975, besides his travelling expenses from Quebec, amounting to \$731.25. I presume it is a fair question to ask how it is that this officer received pay for services which he could not have rendered, inasmuch as his command existed only on paper?

Mr. CARON. Lieut. Col. Holmes is Deputy Adjutant of the district. Previous to his being sent up there General Laurie was Deputy Adjutant General, but he resigned, and we sent Col. Holmes up to replace him as Deputy Adjutant General. He will command the C school when organised, and, in like manner, we made Col. Maunsell the commandant of the school of infantry at Fredericton, the Deputy Adjutant General for the district. I sent Col. Holmes up and made Col. Maunsell the commandant of A school of infantry at Fredericton and the Deputy Adjutant General of the district; consequently it is a mere misnomer, in so far as commanding the C battery is concerned, because C battery is not yet organised. It is a reduction in the expenditure, because, besides being the commandant of that school, he will still remain Deputy Adjutant General.

Mr. HOLTON. Does he not receive pay as Deputy Adjutant General?

Mr. CARON. No; he gets pay equivalent to the allowance made to Col. Maunsell, about \$360 extra. Of course, as there were no barracks, he had to be given an allowance to pay his hotel bill. It is merely an ordinary allowance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total strength of A, B and C batteries?

Mr. CARON. A and B 150 each; C will only be 100 men. The expense of living being greater in British

Columbia, I thought I would make it 100, instead of 150 men.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Government to have these men who are to be stationed at Victoria instructed in the use of torpedoes?

Mr. CARON. Yes; that is a part of our programme.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman in communication with the Imperial authorities on that point?

Mr. CARON. Yes; we have been, for some time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then he and they propose to co-operate together, so as to protect the harbor of Victoria. If I recollect aright, the harbor is particularly defensible by the use of torpedoes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; and especially Esquimalt Harbor.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Is it the intention of the Government to utilise the services of any of those gentlemen who have undergone a three months' course of instruction under Col. Holmes, in the formation of C Battery? How many officers will be attached to the battery, and will the selection be made from those who have taken out certificates in British Columbia?

Mr. CARON. We have not yet been able to decide who the officers will be. I do not know the qualifications of the gentlemen to whom my hon. friend refers, and the organisation has not reached that point when I could tell the hon. gentlemen who will be the officers. The officer commanding will be Col. Holmes, now Deputy Adjutant General. No doubt, when the force comes to be organised, all those elements will have to be properly considered.

Mr. BAKER. There are about 15 or 16 gentlemen in British Columbia who have been under severe training for 3 or 4 months, at considerable disadvantage to themselves, and have taken out certificates. I have letters from them, in which they say they do not wish to be overlooked in the formation of the battery. If there are to be 3 or 5 officers attached to it, as I believe there will be—3 officers, paymaster-sergeant, and so on—they should be selected from those who have borne the heat and burden of the day in British Columbia. I would also like to know whether the Minister of Militia is in a position to know that 100 men can be got out there for the pay.

Mr. CARON. That is one of the difficulties we have to contend against, but I think we can safely get the 100 men out of the Royal Naval Reserve, because the deficiencies in pay will be supplemented by the pension they will be receiving from the Imperial Government.

Mr. BAKER. Could the hon. gentleman state how many officers will be attached to C Battery, other than the commander.

Mr. CARON. We have generally 5 in a battery of 150 men. There will probably be 3 or 4.

Mr. WELDON. In connection with the volunteer artillery in St. John, I would inform the Minister that the late appointment of Col. Armstrong has given great dissatisfaction, and a number of the officers have resigned. Col. Armstrong was in the cavalry in King's county, was taken from that and put at the head of the artillery. It is hardly fair towards the officers who have been long in the artillery to pass over them and to appoint Col. Armstrong to the command of that force. I have no objection as regards Col. Armstrong, personally, because he is a friend of mine, but his appointment has been the cause of a great deal of complaint. You can scarcely take up a newspaper in which you would not find that the officers are sending in their resigna-

tions. I believe that now about 10 officers have retired from the battery on this account.

Mr. CARON. I know little about the appointment. It came through the regular channel. It is a matter the General has more to do with than I. I know very little about it, except that the recommendation was made through the official channel. I knew no reason why it should not be accepted. It was submitted to me in the ordinary course, and I sanctioned it, and I am very sorry to see it has caused any dissatisfaction. My hon. friend knows, perhaps, whether Col. Armstrong has taken out a certificate as an artillery officer. I will look into the matter. The mere fact of his being a cavalry officer would not prevent him from taking command of the battery.

Pay and maintenance of Cavalry and Infantry  
School corps at Quebec, Fredericton and  
Toronto ..... \$171,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to a matter in connection with the infantry school at Fredericton, that is, with reference to the canteen. Very strong representations have been made to me, over and over again, as to the sale and use of intoxicating liquors in the school itself, that civilians living in the city are sold to, and others are invited in and are treated to intoxicating liquors in the school. I think this ought to receive the attention of the Minister. A good step was taken in abolishing the canteens in the summer camps, and I am quite sure that it would meet with the approval of the people of Fredericton, and I think of the school itself, if the canteen were abolished there. Whatever may be said as to the necessity of liquors as medicine, it cannot be said that they are useful for the good order of a school, composed, for the most part, of young men.

Improved rifle ordnance ..... \$3,000

Mr. CARON. I am asking \$3,000 to complete the purchase of the guns required to replace the old smooth-bore guns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was done with the \$15,000 voted last year?

Mr. CARON. This amount was voted for the purpose of importing eight 9-pounder guns to arm the different field batteries which we have in Canada, and which, up to that time, were armed with the old, obsolete smooth-bore guns. By negotiation, we were able to get twelve guns for the amount voted, the Imperial Government, as usual, showing itself very well disposed and ready to help us in every way. Four of these guns have been sent to the Miramichi battery, and four are going to the Richmond battery, and the balance will be distributed among the other batteries, according to seniority.

Drill sheds and rifle ranges..... \$10,000

Mr. WATSON. Are all the rifle ranges to receive aid out of this?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Very strong petitions have been presented from the Stony Mountain range in Manitoba. The rifle association in Manitoba has spent a great deal of money in keeping up that range, and it has sent a number of good shots here, and has contributed its full share to the Wimbledon team. I would ask that the Government take this matter into serious consideration, as we have only one range in the Province, and will aid it to the greatest possible extent. The range costs the association a great deal of money to keep up, and the members have to go to a great deal of expense in order to get to it. About three years ago they were compelled to remove from Point Douglas, which they petitioned the Government to grant

them. I hope the Minister will see that they are entitled to receive additional aid.

Care and maintenance of military properties... \$12,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To my own knowledge the properties in Kingston want some looking after, particularly the front wall of Fort Henry. I do not know that it is a very valuable defence now-a-days, but it has a very unsightly effect, and as every tourist down the St. Lawrence sees it crumbling into the river, I think, for the credit of Canada, something might be done in regard to it, and a few hundred dollars would probably be enough to put it in a proper condition.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to know from the Minister with regard to certain properties belonging to the Department, which it was stated were no longer required for military purposes. There is a small property at Digby and another at Annapolis. Have they been transferred?

Mr. CARON. When any property is declared to be no longer of use for military purpose, it is transferred over to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. VAIL. It seems to me that when that transfer is made it should be made public.

Mr. CARON. Yes; it will be made public. It will be published in the *Official Gazette*.

Public Buildings—Ottawa—Additional public buildings, Wellington street..... \$175,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor for these buildings is Mr. A. Charlebois, and the contract is dated the 20th September, 1883, for the sum of \$295,000. That does not include the iron girders nor the iron roof. The total cost is estimated at \$503,000. But in the specifications on which the contract was based there was a certain kind of stone mentioned as standard, but the contractor was to furnish stone of equal quality to that stone, which was to be satisfactory to the chief architect. The contractor has submitted to the chief architect a number of stones as samples, and finally the chief architect declared one of them of equal quality to that demanded by the specifications. That one came from St. Simon, near to Trois Pistoles; but after working that quarry for a little time, it was found it would take too much time to open the quarry, and have the stone in large quantities and in proper blocks. The contractor saw, himself, that he would be obliged to provide some other stone, and finally that stone was selected which is now on the ground. It comes from a quarry in New Brunswick, and is brought up by the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems a long way to go for stone for Ottawa. I suppose it is 800 or 1,000 miles away. Is that all carried by railway up here?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it comes by the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk and the Atlantic road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the Minister has considered the question; but, ordinarily speaking, I should imagine that the conveyance of stone for the building here must add enormously and unnecessarily to the cost of the construction. Has the Minister any idea of what the charges are per cubic foot, or per ton, or whatever the measurement may be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say; but whether the distance is long or short, the contract was a lump sum of \$295,000; and therefore, if the distance is shorter, so much the better for the contractor; but the contractor found that the stone he was obtaining at that quarry was a good sandstone, which satisfied the chief engineer, and that he could obtain it at a lower rate than he could have obtained many other stones of good quality; and though the distance was

Mr. WATSON.

greater, still the price was so much lower that he was enabled to give us a stone equal in quality to the sample, and he may even save 5 cents or 10 cents on it.

Esquimalt Graving Dock—To complete..... \$400,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a contract for this. The contractors are Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. The approximate amount of the contract, at schedule prices, is about \$375,000, though we cannot tell exactly what it will be. Besides that, we are calling for tenders for the caisson, and the contract has just been awarded to the Montreal Bridge Company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did not the British Government contribute to this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, they will give \$265,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the work, when completed, be large enough to accommodate a first-class man-of-war, or as large a man-of-war as comes to that station?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I believe it will, but I do not say that it will be able to accommodate the largest ships of the navy. I do not think it will, but the size of this dock has been determined, with the assent of the British Government, and approved of by the Admiralty, and that is the reason why they give \$265,000. Besides that, we have changed one end of the dock. It was designed to have an entrance at one end and an exit at the other, to go into another dock, if we built one. As it was not likely that we would build another dock for many years, it was thought better not to lose the space at the other end, but to round it, as we have the Quebec dock, and in that way we got 50 feet more space, without a very large addition to the contract price. That has been approved of by the Admiralty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the dimension now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The inside length will be 380 feet clear. That length was estimated before the extension of 50 feet. Now it will be 430 feet.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). The dock is large enough to accommodate the largest class of vessel that has ever been out there. It is not expected that a vessel more than 400 feet long will ever go in there. The largest man-of-war that has ever been there was 386 feet in length.

Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River.. \$70,000

Mr. TROW. What proportion will be given for the harbor at Port Arthur, and what proportion for the Kaministiquia River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The proportion is \$28,000 for the deepening of the Kaministiquia, and the balance for the breakwater at Port Arthur. The local authorities at Port Arthur have contributed \$25,000, besides this amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I recollect aright, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have decided to place their main elevators on the Kaministiquia River, and at Fort William.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They have placed one at Port Arthur and the other at Fort William.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the largest is at Fort William?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. Many people thought the bottom of the river would be sand. It has been found that it is clay, and the clay is very hard. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves have been digging lately. Most likely, at the end of the season, we will find there is a large channel going up as far as the works done by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. TROW. Is the dredging at the mouth of the river in the bay, or does it extend up the river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The deepening is at the bar, and that has been cut. Now, there are certain spots where we wish to have the same depth of water as at the bar, so that large vessels may go up the river. The depth, I think, is, on the average, 16 feet, and the width 100 feet. There is a channel 3,700 feet long, 100 feet wide, average depth 18 feet through the centre and 14½ feet at the side.

Mr. TROW. That work properly constructed and of sufficient width and depth, would be permanent, for it is a natural bed of clay which has to be removed, and once removed there will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. MILLS. It is gratifying to discover that the Minister finds the late member for West York was quite right with regard to the place for the establishment of a harbor at Port Arthur. We remember the fierce attacks made on the Ministry then by the hon. member for Niagara, Mr. Plumb, and other hon. gentlemen. We remember the enquiries made in the Senate Chamber with regard to the establishment of this harbor and the great mistake made of placing the harbor in the Kaministiquia River instead of at Port Arthur. Now, the action of the Government completely vindicates the wisdom of the course adopted by the hon. member for East York when he was Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not know that opening the mouth of the Kaministiquia is adopting the policy of the Minister of Public Works in the late Government. The place he selected was 4 miles up the river. I think it is good policy to open both places, both Port Arthur and the mouth of the river. The harbor accommodation that will be afforded is very great.

Mr. TROW. The expenditure of a large sum of money at Port Arthur is quite out of place, for the simple reason that Port Arthur has no harbor, except at the lake itself, where there is a sweep of 24 miles, and which is subject to frequent storms and squalls.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman says there is a sweep of 24 miles. Its extreme width to the east is 12 miles, and on the south and north-west it is completely sheltered. As to waves breaking over the wharves, there is, on a wharf, just in front of the town, a little board shed, which has stood there for nearly two years, and which a single big wave would have swept away. This proves that the harbor is well sheltered.

Mr. TROW. I have seen vessels that could not get into the harbor for an entire day.

Cape Tormentine Harbor..... \$150,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This has not been expended. It is a large sum, and we do not want to make any mistake about the site. The chief engineer caused a certain examination to be made. I decided, after consulting with the chief engineer of the Department, to postpone the matter until he could visit the place himself, in order to obtain certain information he required about the locality. He will then be in a position to make his report, and be prepared to begin the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will this be any use, except in the winter, as a protection against the ice?

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia..... \$91,525

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Amherst public buildings—the whole amount required to complete is \$29,798; so that the vote of 1884-85, \$19,000, will complete the work. The next item, Baddeck post office and Custom house, \$4,000. That is in the county of Victoria, N. S., and is the county

town. I think the population is small. The exports amounted to \$89,926, I suppose for last year. The next item, Halifax Dominion buildings, is required for some repairs to the floors, \$1,500. Halifax examining warehouse—this, with the vote of last year, will complete the work. It will cost altogether about \$39,000. North Sydney post office—that has not gone on yet. We have had difficulty in obtaining a proper piece of land. Sydney marine hospital—I think that is for some repairs.

Mr. VAIL. Sydney is faring pretty well. It is getting three public buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It looks big, but these items have been there for two years; \$800 for the Sydney marine hospital is for the erection of a small detached building for the reception of dead bodies. Then the Truro Custom house, post office and savings bank—this is to complete. It will cost about \$35,000. Then the Windsor post office—\$3,000 more will be required next year. The cost will be about \$32,000. Yarmouth post office and Custom house, \$10,000. This work is proceeding; it will cost about \$37,000.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the Minister if he has fully considered the application that has been made from Guysboro' for a building there. I see there is no sum in this Estimate for that purpose. Perhaps he is to place an item in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid I will not be able to answer the hon. gentleman to-day. I think he will have to mention this question when the Supplementary Estimates come down. I will be able then to give the answer. I could not expect him to put that question among these matters, because this work was not mentioned among these items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we are to indulge in such luxuries as revising barristers, and all that sort of thing, you cannot expect to have post offices and Custom houses.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. the Minister of Customs says only \$700 was collected in Guysboro', last year, for Customs. Looking over the estimates of imports and exports in the districts in which Custom houses and post offices have been built, I find that Guysboro' stands at the head of a number of them. In Amherst the exports are \$179,710, and imports \$90,814; in Baddeck the exports are \$50,643, and imports \$36,321; in North Sidney, exports, \$142,694; imports \$93,116. In Sydney, exports, \$205,725; imports, \$45,577; in Arichat, exports, \$33,623; imports, \$25,265. In Guysboro', exports, \$196,689; imports, \$32,530; yet the hon. gentleman says that in consequence of the business being so small in Guysboro' it is not necessary to erect a building there.

Mr. BOWELL. Where do the imports come from?

Mr. KIRK. Never mind where they come from, they have come. I have already called attention to the fact that the Minister has reduced the imports and exports of the port of Guysboro' by eliminating from that port one of the largest outports in the country, Port Mulgrave, which has been attached to the adjoining county. In consequence of that, the showing for Guysboro' is much smaller than it would be otherwise. It would be quite easy for the hon. Minister, if he were to take away all the sub-ports in Guysboro', to show that its business is very small.

Mr. BOWELL. I only spoke of the collection of Customs duties at that port. At Amherst \$25,000 was collected—I am not speaking of the outports—while only \$700 has been collected in Guysboro'. At Mulgrave only \$900 was collected; so that even if that were added to Guysboro' it would not make much difference.

Mr. KIRK. What rent are you paying yearly?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know.

Mr. KIRK. You are paying treble rent for a building which is used also as a caucus room for the Conservative party when elections are being held. With regard to the amount collected in Guysboro', I dare say that if the hon. gentleman would analyse the amounts collected in the ports I have mentioned the same result as in the case of Guysboro' would be ascertained.

Public Buildings, Prince Edward Island.....\$91,525.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Charlottetown new Dominion building is in course of construction now. Montague post office—a lot has been secured for the erection of the building, but as we could not have a clear title immediately, the matter is being investigated by the Department of Justice, in order to obtain a title. Summerside public building, \$10,000; this amount will not cover the balance of expenditure, and \$3,000 more will be required next year. The total cost will be about \$33,000 or \$34,000, including fencing, etc.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the Charlottetown new Dominion building, an alteration was made in the stone required. It was got from Cumberland, and afterwards it was taken from the River John.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the specification of that building the same conditions were put as were put in all the others; that is to say, we give a certain standard or sample, and the stone must be as good as that. In this case, the stone that was furnished came from the River John. The other day, it was said the stone was not good stone, and I sent an officer down and he ascertained a portion was not up to the standard. That portion was set aside. Then he went to the quarry, and ascertained that on exactly the opposite side of the River John there was plenty of stone for the work, equal to the sample.

Mr. WELDON. What part of the country was the sample sent from?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the specification here, and I cannot tell what part of the country it came from.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman said the sample was obtained from Cumberland county, and I should like to know from what part of the county.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say.

Mr. McINTYRE. Has any contract been entered into for the building at Montague? The amount was voted three years ago, and now I see it is revoked. The hon. gentleman said the Government were taking steps to take land there, but they are taking a long time about it. It is useless to place amounts in the Estimates if they are not to be used.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have secured a lot, and we desired to have the title clear, but it has to be investigated by a barrister from the Department of Justice, as it appears that it was not a good one.

Mr. McINTYRE. From whom are you getting the land?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Lambert estate. The lot was secured for \$800, and the money has been deposited in the Bank of Montreal; but I would not, no matter what the pressure might be, erect a building on a lot unless I was sure the title was good, and therefore I have done what I have in many other cases—delayed the building until the title is proved good.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). The building was going to be proceeded with, but it was found that the title was a little defective. The matter was considerably complicated, but it is now about completed, and the title is found to be all right. No doubt the Minister will proceed with the building as soon as possible.

Public Buildings, New Brunswick ..... \$76,400

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Bathurst post office and Custom house, \$12,000. The amount of the contract is \$18,325. The whole building will cost a little less than \$30,000. The vote this year is \$12,000. Nearly the same amount, \$11,600, will be required next year to complete. Carleton post office, \$1,500. This will complete the building. The whole cost will be about \$13,600. Dorchester penitentiary, \$22,000. The hon. gentleman knows that constructions are going on there. This is required to carry on the contract, and provide for the most urgent wants to which attention has been called by the Minister of Justice. Next year we will have to provide a little over \$3,000 to complete. Moncton post office and Custom house, \$12,000. This sum is to complete, and will be sufficient, according to the statement which I have.

Mr. WELDON. The cost will be about \$32,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. You have to add to that the furniture and fittings, and heating apparatus and the incidentals. It will cost about \$40,000 altogether. New-castle post office and Custom house, \$20,000. The balance of the contract is \$26,000, and the incidentals, the heating apparatus, and so on, required to complete, \$33,000. It is only on the way, and therefore we will require next year about \$12,000 or \$15,000 more.

Mr. WELDON. What does the Government propose to do with the building now used as a Custom house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose we will have to dispose of it. St. John Custom house, \$1,400. These are small repairs to the building. St. Stephen's post office and Custom house, \$7,500. The tenders are being called for now.

Public Buildings, Quebec..... \$120,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hull post office and Inland Revenue offices, \$2,000; Grosse Isle quarantine station, \$10,000. All this is required to make some repairs in the buildings. As happily that station has not been much used for a number of years, it has been allowed to get out of repair, and last year we thought, in view of the danger of cholera, that we ought to put the place in proper order, and therefore we incurred expenses for which we are asking a vote in the Supplementary Estimates. We also established telegraph communication with Quebec, in order thus to be able to communicate freely with the city. Montreal drill hall, \$90,000. I am under the impression that, in the Supplementary Estimates, we will have to ask a vote for the armories. The building is nearly complete. The Montreal examining warehouse—to complete. That building was in a very bad state, and we thought at a time we might have to rebuild it altogether. All the girders and floors were gone, and we had to renew them. Sorel public building, \$19,000. This will not complete the work; we shall require nearly \$11,000 next year. St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, \$19,500. This is for materials and tools for the use of convicts, described in the estimates of the superintending architect who gives the items.

Public Buildings, Ontario..... \$227,610

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Amherstburg, \$8,000. There is a public building being erected there, and this is

towards the completion of the work. I think, however, we will require \$2,000 more to complete. Brockville post office and Custom house, \$11,500; this completes the building. Berlin post office and Custom house, \$12,500. About \$4,500 will be required next year to complete. Barrie post office—the sum of \$14,000 is required to complete. A vote will be required next year of a little less than \$5,000. Brantford post office—repairs and improvements. That building is in bad order. Cornwall post office and Custom house, \$8,500. That will complete the expense on this building. Clifton post office and Custom house, \$5,500. This will complete the work. Galt post office and Custom house, \$3,000. This is towards the contract on that building, but we will require next year a little more than \$14,000 to complete the work. Hamilton post office and Custom house, \$92,000. I think this will complete the work. The contractors have pushed that work with great vigor and to the great satisfaction of the Department. Kingston penitentiary, \$8,000. This is for works embraced in the estimate of the superintending architect for the purchase of machinery to complete the permanent gas works, which have been placed under contract, and for loads of sand and brick, and so on. Orangeville post office, \$7,000. This building is proceeding well, but we will require \$4,500 next year to complete. Port Hope post office and Custom house, \$4,500. That is most likely to complete the work. Peterborough post office and Custom house, \$10,000. This has not been proceeded with yet. We are in treaty about lands for the buildings there. Prescott post office and Custom house, \$8,000. That is in the same position. Sarnia immigrant sheds. We require \$350 more for that. St. Thomas post office and Custom house, \$13,600. That is to complete the work. Toronto Inland Revenue building—we require some repairs there, to the amount of \$1,660. Toronto examining warehouse, \$12,600. Hon. gentlemen may recollect that we have been building an extension to the examining warehouse, and this is only about one-third of what was supposed to be required, but we could not afford to build more last year and this year, and we have been limited to the amount of money which has been given to us.

Mr. SMALL. This is not for any new work, is it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; we have taken \$25,000 last year and \$12,000 this year.

Mr. SMALL. That is under the old contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I think so. The building we have erected there is in continuation of the main building, and at the west end of the building the intention is to erect another building, in order to put the engine and the hoist, so that the building may be more useful than it can be as it is. I think it will be built with the money given us, leaving the question of the machinery for next year.

Public Buildings, Manitoba..... \$90,612

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Manitoba penitentiary, to pay account for furniture supplied in 1880, \$112. That is an old account, which was left over because we could not find the proper officer to certify it, but when the officer went to Winnipeg we gave him a commission to report on it, and the account, which was \$134, was reduced to \$112 Manitoba penitentiary, \$37,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the building at Stony Mountain?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. We would like to ask more than this, but we could not afford to ask for more this year. We intend to erect a residence outside for the warden,

and all that portion now occupied by him will be turned into new cells, and we think that by that means we may avoid going to the cost of a new wing for perhaps two years more, and so may delay the expenditure therefor. Winnipeg drill shed, \$3,500. That is a contract, and this is to meet the balance of the contract, and provide for the fitting up of the armories and the cost of the superintendence. During the summer a portion of that shed was blown down, but it was at the cost of the contractor. I was sorry for him, but it could not be avoided. Winnipeg post office, \$50,000. We have a contract for that. This building is proceeding well, but we will have a large sum of money to provide for the works before completing the building, which will cost us about \$90,000.

Public Buildings, North-West Territories..... \$37,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Indian industrial schools at Qu'Appelle and High River, \$11,000. This is to complete.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it there was no entry last year if this is to complete?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This was a vote given to the Department of the Interior, and by Order in Council it was transferred to my Department, to erect the buildings, as the Department of the Interior had not the proper officer to look after it. I saw the building at Qu'Appelle, a few acres from the mission. It is a very good building, and I think will meet the wants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman has no particular information to give about the industrial schools? It is not strictly in his Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I suppose it will come when we take up the Indian Department. Regina new Indian offices, \$6,000. The Indian office is near the North-West council room, and this was found too small. There was not sufficient accommodation for offices and committee rooms, and, therefore, as this building, the Indian office, was next the council building, we thought we would make communication between the two, and build a new Indian office in a more central place. For that purpose we asked a vote of \$6,000. Regina jail and lunatic asylum. This building has been put under contract; the amount of the contract is about \$16,000.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, etc..... \$360,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you to add to the electric light here?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we have the electric light in this Chamber as well as in the Senate and lobbies, we will require to have engines erected below the cliff, because it would not be safe to put them in the building here. I have had an estimate made, and the whole thing will cost between \$25,000 and \$27,000 as the first expense. After that, I am told by my officers that the annual expense will be about two-thirds or one-half the cost of gas now. If the money is put at my disposal this year I will try, before next Session, to have better light in this Chamber. Then, allowance for fuel and light at Rideau Hall—this is the only amount given to the Governor General.

Harbors and Rivers, Prince Edward Island—balance of reimbursement to the Government of Prince Edward Island in settlement of their claims for the construction and maintenance of harbor and river works of federal importance, 1st July, 1873, to January, 1883..... \$24,210

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the sum total which is being paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A little over \$77,000. The mode adopted in determining this amount is as follows:—

There was a claim made by the Island Government about the harbors, and, with the consent of my colleagues, I appointed a commission of engineers to go and examine them. They were accompanied by one of the engineers of the Local Government, and they brought a report to the chief engineer of the Department, who classified the returns made by that board, and stated which of these were of federal importance and which were of local importance. That was laid before Parliament, and we selected those that we considered of federal importance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the Prince Edward Island Government accept this sum in full satisfaction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick..... \$31,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. St. John Harbor—Negro Point Breakwater—\$25,000. This is a very important work for the harbor of St. John. Storms have carried away a portion of the work, and large repairs are being made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know if this is ever coming to an end. This breakwater has been a source of expense to this Dominion for about fifteen years. I should like to know, approximately, how many hundred thousands of dollars it has cost us altogether.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The history of the expenditure is this: In the four years ending June, 1877, we expended on it \$145,000; in 1878 we spent on it \$80,000; in 1879, \$16,000; in 1880, \$5,900; in 1881, \$2,200; in 1882, \$5,200; in 1883, \$30,000; in 1884, \$41,000; in 1885, \$15,000; and now we are asking \$25,000. The total cost \$344,000. The hon. gentleman wishes to know when we will see the end of it. Well, I went to St. John, and it was so long I could not see the end of it. It is a very important work. The fact is, that it is a protection of the harbor. It is a necessity, and Parliament has always found it so, because for the last twelve years we have voted these large sums.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is for extending the breakwater?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; I think that in the end of 1882 the storm came and we had to expend \$30,000 on it.

Harbors and Rivers, Maritime Provinces—Repairs and improvements generally..... \$10,000

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Inasmuch as British Columbia is one of the Maritime Provinces, I would ask the hon. gentleman whether any of that money is to be expended there?

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec..... \$70,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. British Columbia may not be included in this, but she will not be forgotten. With reference to the item, Chateau Richer, we have been dredging this harbor, and this expenditure of \$2,000 will remove the boulders and widen the channel. Quebec marine hospital wharves, \$4,000. I think it was the member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) who said that some people, afflicted with small-pox, had been carried through the city of Quebec to the hospital. When these wharves are completed boats will be able to go direct to the hospital from the ships' side, without touching at the city at all. Rivière St. Louis. This is to complete a work undertaken three years ago; \$5,000 will complete it. Percé, \$3,000. This is for completing the purchase of stone and timber, and for the labor necessary to complete the work on that place.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... \$55,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With reference to Collingwood, Lake Huron, \$24,000, this is required for the con-  
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

struction of the remaining length of breakwater, 600 feet. Wilson's Channel, Lake Huron, \$4,500; that is on the course of vessels going west. There is a light-house on a rock which has been discovered there and which is about 10 feet below the water. By making that rock disappear, a great danger would cease to the vessels going westward. Little Current, Lake Huron, \$5,000. This work has been going on for some years past, and I understand from the chief engineer that this will complete the work. Port Hope Harbor, \$1,500. This is to complete the repairs commenced on the western pier and towards adding a further length to the breakwater. We had \$7,000 voted last year. Thornbury, Lake Huron, \$1,000. This is to be applied towards opening a passage of 12 feet in depth at low water. Kingston Harbor, Lake Ontario, \$4,000. That is a continuation of the works which have been going on there for years past.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I observe that there was a vote last year of \$4,000 for Bayfield Harbor. I would ask whether that sum has been expended, or if any portion of it remains unexpended? I would also ask whether the hon. gentleman has let the works there by tender, or how they were carried out?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As this harbor is not one of those for which money is to be voted this year, I have not the information with me, but if the hon. gentleman wishes to have the information, I will give it to him at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand that the \$4,000 has been expended, or very nearly. I also understand that the hon. gentleman did not let this work by tender, but did it by employing a superintendent and by day's labor. I am satisfied, from the information I have received from the locality, that \$100 worth of work has not been done for the \$4,000 expended, that the work was grossly mismanaged, that during the whole of last fall the superintendent did practically nothing. If the hon. gentleman will enquire as to the condition of that harbor and the value of the public money expended there, he will find that, practically, no good has been done by this large expenditure of public money. It is just another indication of the absurd notion of letting public works of that kind be done by day's labor and appointing some favorite of the Government to superintend them, as in this case. I believe the village council have petitioned the Department on this subject, and I know that the people of the locality have complained bitterly that the liberal grant which was made has been squandered and wasted in this work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to contradict what the hon. gentleman says, but I am sorry that he did not call my attention to this or notify me that he would call my attention to it, so that I might be ready to answer him. I could not expect that this would come up this evening, but I may say that I am not aware of any complaints having been made to the Department, though there may be some that I do not know of. After the statement of the hon. gentleman, I will take care to ascertain how things are, and I will state them as they are. If there has been mismanagement there, the officer who has mismanaged will have to answer for his conduct.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman explain why the works were not let by tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give any more information about that, because I cannot keep these things in my memory. The hon. gentleman may keep that one matter in his memory, because his attention is specially called to that work; but if his attention had been called to 350 different works, he would not be able to remember them all, or would probably mix a few of them with the others. I

will give him ample information the next time I come to the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is it not the rule of the Department that these works are let by tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The rule is to give contracts for all large works, but when there are small works, and it is considered that the public interest does not require it, and that the work will be done better by days' work, it is done by days' work. That has been the course under all Governments, and the Public Works Act does not require that works under \$10,000 should be put under contract. I do not, however, follow that. As a rule, I call for tenders. I find it is less trouble to the Department, that it is more satisfactory, and that there is less responsibility; but sometimes we have to do it by days' work; sometimes it is a pressing work, and in this case I cannot remember what this money was for. The hon. gentleman may go on with his statement, if he pleases, but I am unable to give him the information, and I think he had better reserve his other remarks until I am in a position to answer him, and until he is well informed about it. I can thank him for calling my attention to the matter, because I would not allow an officer of my Department to do what he should not have done. If he has not followed his instructions, if he has squandered money, he must be punished, but until I have the proof of it, and have seen the chief engineer, I cannot accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, except that I thank him for calling my attention to it. I will enquire into it, and will be able to meet him when next we come to Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I happened myself to visit that locality at the end of last autumn, and at that time I was informed by some of the people on the spot—in fact, by some of the parties the Public Works Department were employing—that they had been at work upon it since July. This was in October or November. The whole of the entrance to this small harbor was choked up with sand to a depth of 10 or 12 feet, I should say, and it was quite apparent, even to non-professional parties, that from whatever cause, no earthly good had been done by any expenditure which had taken place up to that time. How much of the \$4,000 had been expended up to the date of my visit I do not know, but I believe a good deal had been expended, and I suspect more than one-half. I think some attempt has been made to remove the sand, but, at any rate, at the present time not even a skiff could get in or out of the harbor, it was so completely choked up. This harbor of Bayfield has cost us a good deal of money in times gone by, and that coast is so exposed that it is a matter of importance, wherever a little harbor can be made, to give a chance for the smaller craft which navigate the lake to run in.

Mr. MILLS. I observe the whole vote that the hon. gentleman has taken in the Province of Ontario is less than one-fifth of what it was last year. This does not indicate a great deal of confidence on the part of the hon. gentleman in the prosperous condition of the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With regard to the harbor at Bayfield, an attempt was made to open the bar, and two or three days afterwards a storm came and filled it up again about as badly as it was at first. I am sure that the people must have felt sorry to see all the work and money lost that we had expended there. But I will give the whole facts to the hon. gentleman at the next sitting of the House, and if the officer has misbehaved, he will have to suffer for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In any case, I would say that, unless it be the intention of the Government to entirely abandon that harbor, it is really necessary to take some vote for the purpose of removing this obstruction. The character of that coast is such that if this sand forma-

tion is left alone it will go on and accumulate to such an extent that, in the course of a few years, it would be an exceedingly expensive business to remove it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is the only harbor between Goderich and Sarnia. A large sum of money has been expended for that harbor and a large portion of it was from private sources. When this work was first attempted by the Dominion Government something like \$20,000 had been expended by the local authorities, and it was thought in the public interest that a like sum should be voted by Parliament, which was done. If the work is allowed to remain as it is the harbor will be wholly useless in a short time. There is a considerable trade there, especially by fishing vessels and small craft.

Harbors and Rivers, Manitoba ..... \$1,000

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister if this is the only vote that is to be given to Manitoba this year? Last year \$10,000 were voted for making surveys in the Water Hen River, and the most of that money was expended in preparing plant for dredging the river and improving the lake. Nothing has been done with that plant, and yet it is all on hand, lying at Westbourne. Is it the intention of the Minister to bring down something in the Supplementary Estimates whereby that plant may be utilised that is now lying idle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These items are the ordinary estimates to continue works already undertaken; for any new work, the items will be found in the Supplementary Estimates that are yet to come down, and I cannot now tell the hon. gentleman what the new items will be.

Dredging—To meet expenses..... \$117,400

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Are these the dredges purchased last year from the Yankees for \$50,000?

Mr. KIRK. Has the Minister settled where the dredging is to be done in Nova Scotia this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These works are done in accordance with the report of the chief engineer, where they are most needed. I am not in a position to say the exact place, because the reports of the engineer come after the Session.

Mr. KIRK. Why is the vote so much less this year than last? Is it because there is less work to do?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is not because we have less work to do, but because we have less money to expend.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask, where is it intended to expend the \$10,000 in Manitoba?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The dredge has been employed in clearing the entrance from Lake Winnipeg to the Red River, but it had only commenced the work at the close of the fiscal year, and I suppose the chief engineer will recommend the continuance of that work.

Mr. WATSON. Will this money be all expended on Lake Winnipeg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not say that. It will be spent where it is most needed.

Mr. WATSON. I believe the dredge *Sir Hector* was found to draw too much water to get over the bar from outside, so that it had to commence to do the work from the river, and instead of conveying the mud and sand out into the lake, it conveyed it up into the river. I think there was some mistake in getting a dredge drawing 8 feet of water to go over a 6-foot bar, and I am afraid that a good deal of the work done will result in the sand being again deposited in the channel. If this work has to be done over again I think it had better be done from outside

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was some difficulty in consequence of the shallowness of the water, but afterwards the dredge did good service. I saw her there myself, and I know she was doing good service. Some time may have been lost in trying to work from one side or the other, but the chief engineer tells me he is convinced that this dredge will do the work. Of course, if we find that the statement of the hon. gentleman is correct, that it would be useless to work her, we would have to stop and not expend the money; that is all. The hon. gentleman may be sure that if we find that by using the dredge, as he has stated, it would produce that effect, we would not expend the money, and I thank the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to it.

Mr. WATSON. I did not call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the money could not be well spent in cleaning out this channel. I think it can be spent in that way there as well as anywhere in Canada, but it seems to me to be working back side foremost to carry the earth up the stream when it ought to be carried down. Usually, the refuse is carried out into the lake and not up the river. It is not with the intention of having the Minister withdraw this expenditure that I have called attention to it, but I think he should enquire into it before he expends more money there, because this will not improve the channel as it should. Lake Manitoba is a lake on which there is a great deal of traffic, and it appears that the troops and supplies from the North-West are to be brought that way, and it is very necessary that that channel should be expanded.

Telegraphs..... \$15,250

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Reconstruction of line between Battleford and Edmonton *via* Fort Pitt, \$12,000. The line, when it was built in the first instance, years ago, was not located where it should be; there are swamps and difficulties in the way, and the wood for the poles is very bad. We think that by building the line in a north west direction we might succeed better. I am not in a position to say whether we will be able to extend it this year. This amount may purely and simply repair the line as it stands now, and we will wait until next spring to see if another line will be built. The loop line between Fort Carlton and Stobart, on the Prince Albert branch, \$2,500. Hon. gentlemen must have seen that during the troubles in the North-West this little line was much required. It is a short line of 14 or 15 miles. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan to Clarke's Crossing. \$750. This is to help the Saskatchewan people to have communication with the main line.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock, a.m., Saturday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 30th June, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CULLING AND MEASURING OF TIMBER.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the resolution relating to the culling and measuring of timber in Ontario and Quebec be concurred in.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask what articles are to be culled by these cullers—lumber, spars, masts, and what other articles?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Deals are included.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the standard of deals—how many superficial feet?

Mr. COSTIGAN. About 1,980 feet.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 154) further to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Royal Military College of Canada..... \$59,000

Mr. CARON. I promised to bring down the names of the cadets on active service; they number twenty-six in all. Their names are as follows: Doucet, Wise, Weller, Tomlinson, C. E. Cartwright, Wood, Casgrain, Drayner, Sanders, Nanton, Coryell, Leonard, Groig, Freer, Sears, Laidlaw, R. Cartwright, Ogilvie, Chalmers, Nuthell, Rivers, Perry, Laurie, R., Strange, Woodman, Dixon and Hesketh.

Indian Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River—To complete..... \$11,000

Mr. MILLS. I think it would be well if the Minister in charge of Indian Affairs would give us some information with regard to these industrial schools, what number of Indian children are attending them, who is in charge, and how the expenditure has been incurred. We have not yet had a particle of information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The plan adopted was to utilise the public buildings at Battleford as a Protestant industrial school, and, instead of having one large industrial school for Catholics, it was thought better, after consultation with the archbishop and bishop in the North-West, to have two smaller schools, one in the vicinity of Fort Qu'Appelle and the other near the Rocky Mountains, under the charge of Father Lacombe. These schools are just in their infancy. I am not able just now, without notice for papers, to say what progress has been made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The buildings are up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have only been completed, I fancy, but they are still in an inchoate state. When the Indian estimates come up I shall be glad to obtain the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood that the school at Qu'Appelle was for half-breeds.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. The school at Fort Qu'Appelle is under Father Hugonnard. It is in the diocese of Archbishop Taché. The other school, farther west, is for the Blackfeet and Blood Indians of the Red Deer River, and is under Bishop Grandin, Bishop of St. Albert. Both schools are for Indian children, not half-breeds.

Harbors and Rivers—General repairs and improvements, Maritime Provinces..... \$10,000

Mr. VAIL. A very large proportion of this sum is, to my mind, diverted from its proper purpose. I notice by the Public Accounts of last year that over \$2,000 from the year before is added to the \$10,000, making a sum of \$12,426, of which no less than \$4,300 was paid for salaries and travel-

ling expenses of engineers. It seems to me it is hardly fair to charge this large amount out of so small a grant, which is intended for the repair of works. I merely call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this fact, so that he may make a little enquiry, and see if these expenses cannot be charged against public works generally, so as to leave the full appropriation for repairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had not a special vote for these engineers, who are only temporarily employed, and we must charge the expenditure for them in some vote connected with the region where they are employed. If they are employed in the Maritime Provinces we charge the expenditure in one of the votes for that Province instead of distributing it over the different votes. This has always been the case, and I do not think it makes any difference. With respect to the vote of \$4,000 last year, for the improvement of Bayfield Harbor, I am sorry the hon. members for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) and West Huron (Mr. Cameron) are not here, as the latter of those two gentlemen made a statement the other day about the harbor and was supported in a mild way by the other hon. member, who evidently did not attach so much importance to the matter; and I then said that if the hon. gentlemen had given me notice that they intended to bring up the matter, which was not one connected with the Estimates then before the House, I would have been prepared to have met them. If the statement made by the hon. gentleman was correct, if he was properly informed—because I do not suppose any hon. member would make a statement knowing it to be incorrect—the officer who had misbehaved should have been punished. I have obtained information from the Department since that time, and I will read the statement I have obtained, which meets the accusation of the hon. gentleman:

“At the last Session of Parliament the sum of \$4,000 was voted for repairing the harbor works at Bayfield, Ont. It having been brought to the notice of the Department that, owing to the breach through the northern pier, the sand had accumulated at the mouth of the harbor to such an extent as to completely block it and to prevent the ingress and egress of fishing boats, the sum of \$200 was spent in opening a sufficient channel to permit them to pass. Arrangements were at once made to procure the necessary timber for repairing the breach through the pier and extending the pile work a distance of 500 feet eastwardly into the harbor, in order to protect the north side of the basin. This work was commenced in July last and fair progress was made up to October, when it was found necessary, owing to stormy weather, to suspend work. This spring the work was resumed and completed, the length of work done being slightly over 600 feet. In confirmation of this I send two photographs, taken by the engineer in charge in May last, showing the position and nature of the work constructed and completed by the Department at Bayfield. The dredge *Challenge* is under order—as soon as it has completed its work at Kincardine—to proceed to Bayfield and remove the shoal which has accumulated. The material removed will be placed over the pile work to make a solid beach, as it were, to the northward, thus strengthening and protecting the same. The work above referred to was done by day labor, under the supervision of Mr. Gray, assistant engineer of the Department, and the foremanship of Mr. James Addison, of Goderich, and it was thus done because, owing to the extent of damaged work in the north pier, it was impossible to prepare a specification of the work to be done in the way of repairs, and it was considered to be advisable to do it by day labor, as then every exigency could be met and overcome at once and without delay.”

The dredge was there only a short time, doing work to the extent of \$200, in order to obtain a channel for fishing boats while the work of closing the gap in the north pier was being performed. The work proceeded during the season and was completed in the spring. Thus, we have closed the gap and the harbor is again as it formerly was, with this exception: there is a sand bar which was formed by the fact that another outlet had been formed by the gap in the pier. The dredge will go there and open it out. I have no doubt this statement will be satisfactory; but I think it will be more satisfactory for hon. gentlemen opposite to see for themselves how the work is done; and so far from having squandered the \$4,000 that Parliament gave my Department

for this purpose, the money has been put to very good account, as these two photographs show.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Huron, I think, complained that the work was undertaken by day work instead of being given out by contract; that the nature of the work required to be performed was not advertised and tenders were not asked; and he said, what the statement of the Minister seems to confirm, that the harbor is still obstructed by the sand bar at its entrance. That work is still to be done. The hon. gentleman has not stated what the cost has been for the repairs to the pier, whether it has come within the \$3,000 estimated or not, and what will be the expense of removing the sand bar.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Huron, with respect to the work being done by day labor, I gave the good and strong reason, which the chief engineer stated, that it was so done because the Department did not know the exact damage that had been done to the pier. But hon. gentlemen will see that the new work, which is on the west side of the harbor, is a very good work, and now that the silt which has accumulated at the mouth of the harbor will be removed and thrown behind the pile work, a solid work will be obtained. The hon. gentleman wants to know what the cost was. It has cost the amount of money which Parliament placed at my disposal, and a little more money will be required, which will be taken from the general works account, to clear the bar, which expenditure is a necessity in order to put the work in proper order. I have made this statement, because I thought it was due to my Department and to myself that Parliament should know that this work was properly performed, and that the money expended last year in opening the bar was only the small sum of \$200, and it was necessary in order to facilitate the ingress and egress of boats while the other work was being executed.

Dredging..... \$117,400

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to ask where the new dredging plant will be procured?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This item is for making large repairs to three of the present dredges, one of which wants a new boiler and the others different repairs. It is not an amount to be expended for new plant.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it for repairs on dredges procured at Lockport?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. Those dredges are very good dredges and are in perfect order. As the hon. gentleman will remember, those were obtained, and properly obtained, at that place at that time, because we could not produce them in this country.

Mr. WATSON. Where is the amount of \$10,000 for dredging in Manitoba to be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have already stated that part of the amount will have to be paid for dredging at the mouth of Red River. I was afraid the hon. gentleman was placing obstruction in the way of this work being done, and I hinted that to the hon. gentleman. I think it will be a good work and in the proper direction. We may have experienced difficulty in the beginning, but those will be overcome; and if the hon. gentleman has a little spare time, he might visit the work and see how it is progressing.

Mr. WATSON. I thought probably some of the amount would be expended at Lake Manitoba.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman as to that point.

## MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain further proposed resolutions (p. 2889) for the settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I thought it was to continue at \$150,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The *per capita* allowance is based on \$150,000. The debt is based upon \$125,000.

Mr. MILLS. What is the amount of the expenditure in the Province of Manitoba which may be charged against the Province under these two heads?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to say. I made special enquiry to ascertain if I could obtain the information for the House, but I found I could not. There has been a large amount of expenditure, covering a number of years, and it will require full investigation before the amount to be charged against this increased capital account can be obtained, and will have to be a matter of investigation in the future and agreement between the Province and the Dominion.

On resolution 2,

Mr. WATSON. Has the Minister any idea of the quantity of lands which will be transferred to Manitoba.

Mr. BOWELL. I have made enquiry, and one or two clerks were set to work to ascertain the quantity of swamp lands that would be included in that portion of the Province which has already been surveyed, but I have been unable to obtain it, as I expected. As the hon. gentleman knows, in regard to that portion of the Province not yet surveyed, it is impossible even to form an approximate idea as to the amount of lands that will be covered by this resolution. I can only repeat that the desire and the intention of the Government is to be as liberal in the settlement of this question as they possibly can be under the terms of the resolution.

Mr. MILLS. I understood from the hon. gentleman before that the Government did not assume or hold that they were transferring to Manitoba as swamp lands those lands that were rendered unfit for settlement by the overflow of Lake Manitoba. I understand that these lands that are overflowed—and they amount to a very large extent of territory during the season of high water—are lands that may be rendered fit for cultivation and settlement by some improvement in the drainage of the country by dredging the Waterhen River, and that, for a few thousand dollars' expenditure, over 100,000 acres would be brought within the range of land fit for settlement. It is as well that the House should know what they are doing in the matter because it would be very important if the Government of Manitoba knew that they would obtain 100,000 acres of land near Winnipeg or near the settled part of the Province for the expenditure of a few thousand dollars.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has put altogether too wide an interpretation on the language I used. What I said was that lands which were overflowed in the spring or fall by a rise of water could not be termed swamp lands; and I think the interpretation placed upon that term by the United States Government in transferring lands to the different States will be put on the language by the Government of the Dominion. Whether the lands which are overflowed by the rise of water in Lake Manitoba will come under the designation of swamp lands or not, I repeat, what I said the other night, is a question I am not prepared to answer distinctly. There are large areas of land in Manitoba which are occasionally overflowed in the spring, but which during the summer become dry, and not

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

only fit for pasture but for growing the best crops. I know that the question of the overflowed lands about Lake Manitoba has been before the Dominion Government for a number of years. The lands have been surveyed and estimates have been made as to the expense that would be incurred in lowering that lake. The question is one which I have no doubt the Manitoba Government will bring before the Dominion. If the Dominion Government has to go to the expense of lowering Lake Manitoba and thereby reclaiming those lands, which a few years ago were dry, and on which settlers had taken up homesteads, I presume the lands would belong to the Dominion Government, being the result of its expenditure. If, however, arrangements should be made between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Manitoba for the transfer of these lands to Manitoba on condition of their being drained and reclaimed, that will be a question in the future to decide. But lands which are occasionally overflowed by the rise of water, cannot be termed swamp lands. All lands decided to be swamp lands will go to the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that these lands would not be regarded as swamp lands, and would not be transferred. I think it is desirable that we should understand clearly what is actually transferred. Whether the Government would, outside of this contract, propose to transfer other lands to Manitoba on condition of something being done, as a matter of public policy, is a wholly different question. But what Manitoba is entitled to claim under this contract ought, I think, to be clearly stated, so that the people here as well as in Manitoba would see precisely how one party to this contract, at all events, interprets and understands it, and so that the House, in giving its sanction to the procedure, may know precisely what it is doing. I am not saying that we should not deal fairly and even liberally with the Province of Manitoba; but I think we should know precisely the meaning of the contract, so that if any discussion arises—and I think it is quite possible that instead of laying the foundation of a settlement we may be laying the foundation of a controversy—we should know how one party to this so-called settlement interprets it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. This is about as loose a kind of legislation as was ever before this House. This term swamp lands may apply to anything; one-half of the territory of Manitoba was swamp land at one time, and I can see that the Province of Manitoba might, at some future time, claim what we never intended to give. It seems to me that before this legislation is passed the lands should be surveyed and should be definitely located in the Bill. If that is not done, I can see that we are likely to have a great deal of correspondence and unpleasant complications in the future unless we concede to Manitoba all that it will claim.

Mr. BOWELL. I must dissent from the remarks of the hon. gentleman. It is not loose legislation, and I go farther and say that it is scarcely possible in any Bill to define what swamp lands are. I do not see how there could be any misunderstanding of the resolution; or how, from its wording, any difficulties can arise in the future more than necessarily arise in transferring any portion of the territory from one authority to another. The resolution says distinctly:—

"That all lands in Manitoba which can be shown to the satisfaction of the Dominion Government to be swamp lands be transferred to the Province and enure wholly to its benefit and uses."

The hon. gentleman must see, and I think the committee will agree with me, that this question must be one of future investigation and negotiation. It is impossible to define

swamp lands in the resolution, or to say whether a piece of land that is under water in the spring is swamp land, as the hon. gentleman knows, from his own experience in travelling from Emerson to Winnipeg, where the land and the railway were under water for days and weeks at the time when the Red River overflowed. Certainly those lands could not be designated, or accepted as swamp lands. But swamps land, as we understand them, are lands which are under water, and which cannot be cultivated or used in any way, without being cleared of the fallen wood and the debris which prevents the escape of water, or without being reclaimed by ditching. I take for granted that lands which are continuously under water, and which are not capable of being utilised but by means of a drain to let off the water so as to make them not only pasture or meadow lands, but also fit for the raising of grain, are the lands that would be interpreted to mean swamp lands, and that would be conveyed under the terms of this resolution. I confess I do not see the difficulty my hon. friend from Northumberland does, in interpreting the clause.

Mr. WATSON. I think the Government ought to be able to come to some conclusion with regard to the lands around Lake Manitoba. Elaborate reports have been made upon these lands, and they cannot expect to obtain much more information regarding them than they have at present. For that reason I think the Government ought to be able to form an opinion and tell the House whether those lands are to be regarded as swamp lands or not. The hon. Minister of Customs has referred to the lands which have been overflowed by the Red River. There was a flood there one year, but that is not a frequent occurrence; but the lands around Lake Manitoba have been overflowed for years. The lake has receded, but it is liable to rise again at any time. I think those lands should be considered swamp lands. The Minister stated that swamp lands would be held to be lands covered with water all the year round. There are very few such lands in Manitoba, as they generally dry off in the fall. Under such an interpretation, a very small quantity of land would fall to Manitoba. The House should understand something more in regard to what sort of a "deal" it was making with that Province; it would be more satisfactory to Manitoba and to the Dominion to know what class of lands are to be transferred to the Province under this arrangement. The Government should be able to say whether the lands round Lake Manitoba will be classed as swamp lands and be transferred to the Province. They possess sufficient information, for the facts have been obtained during different years, and are very elaborately set forth in the reports of engineers who have surveyed those lands. This matter should be settled before the final stage is taken.

Mr. ORTON. The Minister has very clearly defined what are to be considered swamp lands in Manitoba. I regret, however, some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland, in respect to the character of the lands in that Province. It is very wrong to give the impression that at certain seasons of the year half of the Province of Manitoba is under water. It is not the case.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. Minister of Customs said so.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not.

Mr. ORTON. The Minister of Customs said that the railway between Emerson and Winnipeg is frequently under water. I have never seen that railway under water, not even the greater part of the land alongside the railway. Certain portions of the land are under water in the spring of the year; but by the drainage already made in the Province of Manitoba many of the lands have been reclaimed and many of those which were formerly under water are now dry. No doubt, as the Minister stated, the class of lands which will be considered swamp is such as cannot be

reclaimed for the purpose of growing cereals. Any land considered mere pasture and hay land will be included in the lands to be handed over to the Province. That is a clear and well-defined description of the kind of swamp lands to be handed over to Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. I differ from the hon. gentleman, who thinks that is a clear definition as to what lands will be handed over to Parliament. The definition is not plain even to the Minister himself. There is nothing defined in the resolutions as to what are to be considered swamp lands. The lands around Lake Manitoba to which I have referred have been reported on repeatedly by engineers of the Public Works Department, and if the Minister will look over those reports he will be in a position to say whether those lands will be handed over to Manitoba or not. There are elaborate reports on them, and as good reports as can be obtained. It is desirable that the people of Manitoba and this House should understand whether those lands are to be handed over or not. In those reports there are particulars as to the height of water, and the quantity of land that can be reclaimed by lowering the level of the lake.

Mr. McLELAN. It is not known to the Government whether the Manitoba Government would desire to have those lands. The arrangement was made and the question was, whether the Legislature of Manitoba would accept the proposition made as a settlement of the claims. Until they knew whether the Legislature of Manitoba would accept the proposition, it was unnecessary to go into details. At present we do not know whether the Manitoba Government desire to have the particular lands to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If the representatives of the two Governments meet, and a proposition were made by the Legislature of Manitoba for the Dominion Government to hand over the lands to which the hon. gentleman has referred, then the matter would be considered by this Government, and acting on the information they possess it would be for this Government to say whether they would give those lands as coming under the denomination of swamp lands or not. Until that time arrives, it is premature to discuss what lands may be included.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think it is a matter between the two Governments alone, but the representatives have a right to know what lands will be transferred to the Province of Manitoba when those resolutions are passed, granting aid to the Province. It does not rest entirely between the Local Legislature of Manitoba and this Government. We have all a right to know what will be transferred by these resolutions. So far as regards the Lake Manitoba lands, I say, as representing that particular portion of the Province, that they are looked upon as among the best lands that can be reclaimed, and as forming about the largest tract that can be obtained for the least expenditure. I know that the Province expects those lands to be transferred, and it is not out of place to make these enquiries.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it is out of place, but it is premature to say whether those particular lands will be handed over or not.

Mr. WATSON. This House should be aware, in confirming this arrangement, as to what lands will be transferred. If the Minister will see fit to look over the information possessed by the Government, he will be able to tell whether the Government would be willing to hand those lands over to the Province or not. Manitoba will be willing to take all she can get, and look for more. If the hon. gentleman will state, at some future stage, that the lands referred to round Lake Manitoba will be transferred to the Province, if the Province will accept them, the matter will be satisfactory.

Mr. ORTON. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has read the report with respect to the cost of reclaiming those lands.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. ORTON. He will recollect that the estimated cost is something enormous, such a one as this Government should not impose on the Manitoba Government for the reclamation of lands round Lake Manitoba. It involves also questions concerning the navigation of Lakes Winnipegosis and Manitoba, which comes more particularly under the Dominion Parliament. The hon. gentleman has not shown that justice I should have expected him to show with respect to the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. I might inform the House that I am thoroughly posted in the matter. I know the lands and the lake, and I know the estimated cost of draining these lands is 50 cents per acre. I can assure the hon. gentleman that those lands are well worth reclaiming, and that if reclaimed some of the finest lands in the Province will be around Lake Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS. We have had an extraordinary statement from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He says it would be premature to enquire into the exact nature of this contract. It is true that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada had entered into arrangements with reference to the amount of subsidy and other benefits that Manitoba is to receive from the Dominion; that this settlement between the two Governments is subject to the ratification of the Parliament of Canada on the one hand and the Legislature of Manitoba on the other; but the hon. gentleman says it is premature to enquire into the exact nature of this settlement before either party has ratified it. Now, one would suppose that the proper course for Parliament to adopt would be to make itself acquainted with the nature of this understanding—to ascertain what sort of a bargain it is, whether it is one to the advantage of Manitoba, whether justice has been done that Province, or whether the Government of Canada has been prudent in the arrangements which it has made with the Government of Manitoba. It certainly does seem to me that the statement of the hon. gentleman is a reversal of the natural order of proceedings. Most parties entering into a contract or arrangement with each other undertake to ascertain the nature of the contract before it is finally ratified; and I think that is the course which prudence requires us to take. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to have as little knowledge of this subject as he had of the important subject of the Indian trousers a few evenings ago.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155) to increase the yearly subsidy to the Province of Manitoba, and for other purposes therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### COUNCIL OF THE NORTH-WEST.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 2531) for the appointment of an additional member of the Council for the North-West Territory, and an additional stipendiary magistrate, etc.

(In the Committee).

On resolution 1,

Mr. CARON. This resolution is to enable the Government to appoint another stipendiary magistrate in the  
Mr. WATSON.

North-West. The people of Calgary and other sections of the territory have urged that another magistrate be appointed. Having seen the difficulties which now exist in the North-West, we consider it would be reasonable to make provision for the appointment of another magistrate, because we have no doubt the work must be very largely increased there from what it has been heretofore. These gentlemen have, as hon. gentlemen know from the geography of the country, enormous distances to travel. It is almost impossible for them at times to be in the locality when their services are most needed. One resides at Battleford, another at Regina, and the third at Fort McLeod, and the resolution proposes to appoint a fourth.

Mr. MILLS. It may be that an additional magistrate is required for the purpose of administering justice in the North-West Territory, but that is a wholly different thing from appointing another member of the North-West council. At the time the Bill was introduced by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) for the establishment of a government for the North-West Territory, it was provided that a certain number of members should be appointed to that council to assist the Governor in framing ordinances and administering justice in that widely-extended territory. But it was also promised in that same Bill that certain members of the council should be elected by the people, one for every thousand of the inhabitants, and that when the council consisted of a certain number of elected members the members appointed by the Crown should then cease to be members of the council. In fact, as fast as circumstances would warrant the policy, they are to give to the council a representative character. It was recognised that it was not expedient to put in the hands of a nominated body the power of legislators for the people of that district. We know that our people are all trained to representative institutions; and no class of the population are so little likely to submit to the restraints of government by a body over whom they have no control as the population residing upon a border settlement. We know that in this country, as well as in the United States, the people residing upon the borders acquire habits of self-reliance to a larger extent than those living in towns and long-settled districts, and if they are not satisfied with the parties in whose hands the government is placed, they are not likely to respect very much the ordinances and laws made by those parties. It was therefore felt to be highly expedient that the administration of the affairs of our distant Territories should be as early as possible in the hands of those who enjoyed the confidence and respect of the people. Now, the provision for the election of members of the council still continues in force. The hon. gentleman has not informed us of the number of elected members now in the North-West council, but I apprehend that it must be very considerable; in my opinion, the number is sufficiently large to exclude the nominated members of the Crown altogether. There is no reason why, with the large population now living in the North-West Territories, there should be a council nominated by this Government at all. The council should be a body enjoying the confidence of the people of that Territory. They should be chosen to advise the Governor from those whom the people themselves have elected. There is no reason why the principle of responsible government should not be fully adopted, in so far as we have entrusted the people of the North-West Territories with the affairs of government at all. Now, it is impossible to suppose that the people of those distant regions can be satisfied with having a council to advise the Lieutenant Governor appointed by the Government at Ottawa. Why, Sir, we might just as well say that the people of Canada would be content to have the Administration of this country chosen by the Colonial Minister in Downing street. There would be as much propriety

in that proposition as there is in this. If, as the Minister of Agriculture states, there are now more than 50,000 people who are settled in that country, it is monstrous to withhold from them the right to elect those who are to advise the Lieutenant Governor as the executive officers in that country. There is no doubt that the course pursued by the Government in this matter has been a highly negligent course. The intention was, from the first, when my hon. friend from East York introduced that Bill, that the Lieutenant Governor should estimate the amount of subsidy that was required for carrying on the government of that country, and that a vote should be placed at his disposal the moment that there was a sufficient number of elected members of the council to justify such a proceeding, and that this money should be placed at the disposal of the council, precisely for the same purposes as subsidies are given to the various Provinces to carry on the affairs of the Provincial Governments. Now, what is the hon. gentleman doing? It may be that another stipendiary magistrate is required in that country. I do not pretend to say that he is not; I do not say the Government are not doing what is right and proper in proposing to appoint another; but I do say that they are doing what is highly inexpedient and highly improper, when they propose to make that stipendiary magistrate a member of the council, which, if the law was respected, would long ago have been superseded by a properly constituted council, enjoying the confidence of the people and chosen from amongst them. Why, Sir, the Government here have no more right to appoint a member of that council now—I mean a constitutional and moral right—than they would have to appoint the executive council of Quebec or Ontario. Are not the people who reside in that country, people who have enjoyed the elective franchise and assisted in carrying on the government in their respective Provinces, before they removed to the North-West? Are they not just as competent to determine who shall be councillors to advise the Lieutenant Governor as are the people in any one of the Eastern Provinces? Sir, I say that this proposition is a monstrous one. It is one that we ought not to entertain for a moment, and it is impossible that the Government could have seriously considered it before making this proposition. I say this in all sincerity. The hon. gentleman has but to look at the North-West Territories Act and he will find that whenever the population has reached a certain number in a particular district they have a right to elect a representative, and when there are a sufficient number of elected representatives the members of the council appointed by the Crown shall cease to be members altogether. What right has this Government to name a member of the council to advise the Lieutenant Governor? I say the time has gone by when the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories should carry on the Government as he may see fit, acting under instructions from the Government here, which is the same thing as acting under the advice of men appointed by the Government here. Why, Sir, it was an attempt of this kind, in 1870, that led to the rebellion in Manitoba. When Governor Macdougall was sent up there, the Government proposed to send along with him a number of councillors as advisors, ignoring the people of the Territory altogether, and now the Government propose to continue the same policy. They propose to name a member of the council in that Territory when, if the Minister of Agriculture is to be relied upon, there are already a large population possessing habits of self-reliance, intelligent men, men accustomed to representative institutions in the Provinces from which they emigrated, and they ought to have the councillors of the Lieutenant Governor chosen from amongst the men they have elected to be members of their Assembly.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman does not object, as I understand him, to the appointment of a new stipendiary

magistrate. The circumstances of the country, I believe, establish beyond the possibility of discussion, that there is a necessity of increasing the number of magistrates now in the North-West. As I have already stated, the work is increasing so fast that the present incumbents of the office are not sufficiently numerous to meet the requirements of the situation. The only objection is, as I understand from the hon. gentleman, that the new stipendiary magistrate should be appointed a member of the council, as is provided by this resolution. I really cannot see in what way this provision is so obnoxious. It is impossible for me to see, admitting that we have, as is well known, in the council of the North-West, these magistrates who are acting as stipendiary magistrates, why, when increasing the number of magistrates, we should leave out the new man who is to be appointed. The hon. gentleman says that it is quite a different thing appointing a new member of the council and appointing a stipendiary magistrate. That, of course, I admit, but I consider it is an advantage in these territories that men like the stipendiary magistrates should have seats in the council. The territory was a new one in which it became necessary to introduce a constitution that would apply to the requirements and necessities of the people, and, as I have said, it was an advantage, in framing the regulations, in framing the laws in that territory, to appoint men who possessed legal knowledge and had legal experience as have these stipendiary magistrates, members of the council. I do not see in what way we are trenching on the rights and liberties of the people of those territories. If the present resolutions are before Parliament, it is at the request of the people of Alberta; very large petitions have been presented to this House by the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Small) asking that the changes provided in the resolutions should take place. I believe the people of Alberta are sufficiently intelligent to see danger if there is any danger threatening their liberties in this matter, and would not send petitions here for the purpose of making the changes which hon. gentlemen opposite say will deprive them of their liberties.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are there any petitions praying for additional members of the council?

Mr. CARON. So I understand.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman read me one petition to that effect, I understood it was for the appointment of a magistrate. At a public meeting in Calgary, it was pointed out there was no necessity for Government members at all.

Mr. CARON. The petitions, I understood, ask for the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate, and also that he should be a member of the council. If not correct, I am perfectly willing to stand corrected, but I was under that impression. In any case, the petitions asked for the appointment of a new stipendiary magistrate. I should like to know the reason why one more stipendiary magistrate in a council, eight members of which are elected by the people, and in which there will be a larger number of elected members under the Bill to be introduced based on these resolutions, as the population increases, should be left out when his three colleagues have seats in the council. As far as I can see, there is no danger whatever, so far as the liberties of the people are concerned, and I believe when the necessity exists for the nomination of a stipendiary magistrate, he should be treated as the others are and have his seat in the council.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says he sees no good reason for leaving out this one when the other magistrates are embraced. If the law is respected, and there is anything like the population, if there is half the population which the Minister of Agriculture says there is in that country, it is contrary to the law that any appointed mem-

ber of the council should any longer be a member of the council. Let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 15 :

"When and so soon as the Lieutenant Governor is satisfied by such proof as he may require, that any district or portion of the North-West Territories, not exceeding an area of one thousand square miles, contains a population of not less than one thousand inhabitants of adult age, exclusive of aliens or unfranchised Indians, the Lieutenant Governor shall, by proclamation, erect such district or portion into an electoral district, by a name and with boundaries to be respectively declared in the proclamation, and such electoral district shall thenceforth be entitled to elect a member of the council or of the Legislative Assembly, as the case may be."

Section 21 provides :

"When the number of elected members amount to 21, the council hereinbefore appointed shall cease and be determined; and the members so elected shall be constituted and designated as the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories."

That Act is the constitution of the North-West Territories, the Government exists under it. If the Lieutenant Governor has been acting in a fraudulent manner, if he has failed in his duty, if he has failed to secure to the people in the various districts a fair representation, that may be reason for calling him to account; but if there is anything like the population the hon. gentleman claims there is in that territory, then the members appointed by the Crown should no longer continue to sit in that council. Instead of going further, the Government should withdraw from the position and respect the rights of the people therein, so far as they have been entrusted with the power to govern the country and to elect that legislature. These men called councillors are not ordinary advisors, they are legislators, they sit in the body that legislates for the people, and assist in making the ordinances by which the people are governed. Unless you distrust the population altogether and propose to govern them by military force—the mounted police and volunteers—you should leave the Government, in so far as local affairs are concerned, in their hands just as it is left in the hands of the people of the different Provinces. They best know their own wants and they constantly complain that the Government do not understand their wants and their circumstances. That being the case, it is a serious usurpation to foist upon their local legislative body an appointee of the Government here. The condition which justified the appointment of a council has gone by, and we should recognise the fact instead of forcing an appointee of the Crown upon the people there as a legislator. The time has come when they will seek representation in this House in order that they may be heard here. I think that a more imprudent course could not have been adopted, looking at the circumstances and at what has transpired there. You have had men whom you knew were loyal, men who were devoted to the Government, partisans of the Government, aiding and abetting the rebellion against the Government. Why? Because you have failed to allow them that fair expression of their views, because you have failed to give them an opportunity of administering their own affairs in their own way, and, instead of profiting by events, you are now marking out a course of a different character. It would be infinitely wiser and better, that you should retrace your steps and leave the people in the North-West Territory to govern themselves in their own way, in so far as you have entrusted the Government to a legislative body there.

Mr. LANGELIER. This measure is one of great importance to the North-West Territory. It is nothing more nor less than a serious invasion of the rights of the people of the North-West.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANGELIER. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, because probably they have not read the resolution on which they are going to vote. It is proposed to allow the Governor  
Mr. MILLS.

General to appoint an additional stipendiary magistrate of the North-West Territories, according to section 5.

Mr. CARON. Of what Act?

Mr. LANGELIER. Of the North-West Territories Act, the statute of 1880, chap. 25.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Consolidated Act.

Mr. LANGELIER. These resolutions provide :

"That it is expedient to authorize the Governor General to appoint in the manner provided by the 5th section of the North-West Territories Act, 1880, an additional member of the council for the said Territories, and an additional stipendiary magistrate in the manner provided by the 74th section of the said Act, and for the purposes mentioned in the said Act."

If we turn to section 5 of the Act, we find that it gives power to the Governor in Council to appoint a stipendiary magistrate who is to be, *ex-officio*, a member of the council of the North-West. The result is that two additional members of the council may be appointed under these resolutions to vote in the council of the North-West against those who are elected by the people. The same statute says that the council of the North-West shall be composed of six members appointed by the Governor in Council, with an unlimited number of members elected by the people. There is to be one elected by the people for each electoral district constituted by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, and when it is ascertained that there is a population of 1,000 souls on a territory of not more than 1,000 square miles. We have no information before us to show how many electoral districts there are. Suppose there are only six.

Mr. CARON. There are eight elected members.

Mr. LANGELIER. The smaller the number the worse the measure is. The representatives of the people in the North-West have all the power possessed by this House or by the Legislatures of Quebec or Ontario, and if this measure passes, the hon. gentleman says there will be eight elected members of the council, and, instead of six now appointed by the Crown, there will be eight; so they will be equally divided.

Mr. CARON. We are providing for only one.

Mr. LANGELIER. You are providing for two, because it is proposed to have an additional stipendiary magistrate who shall be a member of the council, and then another member of the council. The resolutions provide in this way for the appointment of two members of the council. If the resolutions were amended, it would remove one serious objection, but as they stand, they constitute a very serious invasion of the rights of the people of the North-West. No information has been given us on that subject, but, if there should be a division of opinion between the members of the council appointed by the Crown and the members of the council elected by the people, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, the representatives of the people would now be in a majority, but, after these appointments are made, they will no more have a majority, but they will be over-ruled by the members appointed by the Crown. The reasons which have been given are self-evident against such a principle as has been proposed, even if there were no other objections. According to clause 6, whenever any territory in the North-West has a population of 1,000 on a territory of 1,000 square miles, the Lieutenant Governor may constitute that an electoral district, and clause 21 says that, as soon as there are 21 elected members of the council, the members appointed by the Crown shall cease to act, and the name of the council shall be changed to the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territory. If we are to believe the information given us by the Minister of Agriculture the other night, there should be materials in the North West for electing more than twenty-one mem-

bers, if the Lieutenant Governor did his duty and constituted electoral districts according to the Act. There is no reason whatever for appointing an additional member of the council for a few months or a few weeks, until the Lieutenant Governor constitutes sufficient electoral districts to make the elected members twenty-one, when there would be no more a North-West Council. This is a very serious proposal, one which constitutes a serious invasion of the rights of the people of the North-West, and for which there is no justification. Under these circumstances, I think this should be postponed until we get some further information. It is stated by the Minister of Militia that there have been petitions, we have not seen those petitions; we do not know what they ask; the hon. Minister himself does not know whether they ask for the appointment of an additional stipendiary magistrate or an additional member of the council; and it is quite possible that those who have asked for the appointment of an additional stipendiary magistrate do not know that by doing so they are asking for an additional member of the council. They may not know that they are asking for something to curtail their rights. I think it is important to have more information as to the grounds on which a demand is made on the House for an additional stipendiary magistrate and two new members of the council.

Mr. WELDON. How many members are now appointed?

Mr. CARON. Six.

Mr. WELDON. And eight elected—fourteen in all?

Mr. CARON. Yes, and the present stipendiary magistrate will make another. I do not know how the hon. gentleman comes to understand that we are going to appoint two new members of the council. The clause, as I understand it, provides solely for the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate. Under the Act as it now exists, the stipendiary magistrates are members of the council. The intention is that the one we are going to appoint under this resolution should be placed exactly in the same position as the other stipendiary magistrates, and that he should become *ex officio* a member of the council, thus increasing the council by one simply. If there be eight elected councillors, the majority still remains in the hands of those elected by the people.

Mr. LANGELIER. The resolution says most plainly that the authority asked is for the appointment of an additional stipendiary magistrate and an additional member of the council.

Mr. CARON. That additional stipendiary magistrate becomes the additional member of the Council.

Mr. LANGELIER. If that is what is intended, it would be quite enough to say that the Governor in Council shall have power to appoint an additional stipendiary magistrate under clause 5, which says:

"The Governor General, with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, by warrant under his privy seal, may constitute and appoint such and so many persons, from time to time, not exceeding in the whole 6 persons, of which number the stipendiary magistrate hereinafter mentioned shall *ex officio* form part, to be a council to aid the Lieutenant Governor in the administration of the North-West Territories."

The resolution refers to this section, and provides for the appointment of an additional member of the council and an additional stipendiary magistrate, which shows clearly that it does not refer to the same officer. I do not say such is not the intention of the Government, but it is impossible to express it in a worse manner than it is done in the resolution.

Mr. CARON. If it is so, it can be remedied in the Bill; but the resolution is for the purpose of providing for one

stipendiary magistrate who, under clause 5, shall be *ex officio* a member of the council like the other three magistrates. The resolution, to my mind, is perfectly clear; it provides merely for the appointment of one stipendiary magistrate, and I think it necessary to state that that stipendiary magistrate should also be a member of the council. It is for that purpose that these words have been introduced.

Mr. WELDON. The 5th clause of the Act provides that the stipendiary magistrates shall be members of the council. That Act provided for an appointed council, but with the view that as fast as the country developed, it should be superseded by an elective council; and it is an infraction of the constitution of the North-West Territory, as laid down in this Act, to appoint another member, because I think the intention of the Act was that the council of six appointed members should gradually melt away and be merged in the elective council. At present the council consists of fourteen members, eight of whom have been elected by the people and six appointed by the Government. The hon. Minister now proposes to appoint a seventh; but he says the majority will remain with the elected members. If he looks at the Act he will see that the 12th section provides:

"The Lieutenant Governor shall preside at all sittings of the council; he shall on all subjects have the same right to vote as councillors have, with a casting vote in case of a tie."

So that, by voting with the seven members, and then having the casting vote, the control is taken from the elective members of the council and thrown into the hands of the members appointed by the Government. It seems to me that that is contrary to the principle of the Act, and it is not at all necessary, in the present juncture of affairs, that this stipendiary magistrate should be a member of the council. What might have been a matter of policy in 1880 is not necessarily proper in 1885, and the petitions the hon. gentleman referred to only pray for a stipendiary magistrate in the District of Alberta, and it seems to me, in order to carry out the constitutional principle set forth in this Act, which is in accordance with our own institutions, that even if a stipendiary magistrate is appointed he should not be a member of the council. It will be subversive of the principle of this Bill, and will be practically throwing the control of the council into the hands of the appointees of the Government.

Mr. ORTON. The hon. gentlemen opposite have been very successful in the past in their attempts to manufacture grievances, and the object of the present discussion is to manufacture a new grievance for the people of the North-West. The hon. member for Bothwell stated, and it has been repeated by the hon. member for Megantic, that there was a grievance, and that it was the duty of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territory to now have an election of members to represent the people in the Territory. The hon. gentleman must be perfectly well aware that it is utterly impossible for the Lieutenant Governor of the Territory to be in a position to hold such an election, from the fact that the Territory is entitled to more representation. A Bill has been passed during the present Session empowering the Government to take a census of the population of the Territory with the object of giving it just and fair representation. If the hon. gentleman had been just and candid in his remarks he would have stated that fact to the House, instead of trying to create the impression abroad that there was a grievance existing which the Government were not trying to remedy.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in his statement. He does not know much of what he is talking about. The North-West Territories Act which provides for the appointment of a council, also provides that the Lieutenant Governor may, upon representations made

to him at any time that there exists within a limited area a number of souls entitled to a representative, authorise a census to be taken. Such censuses have been taken repeatedly in the North-West Territories by the local authority, and upon proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor the members of the council have been added to. The Census Bill of this Session has no such purpose. The member for East York, who brought in the provision with respect to the North-West Territories, did not pass legislation so imperfect as the hon. member for Wellington supposes. He did not leave that part of local legislation to be done here in 1885, when the law was that the council might be increased when the population was sufficient to give it a representative. The hon. gentleman says we are manufacturing grievances. The hon. gentleman thinks he knows all about the North-West, having been there a few weeks at different times. I know the grievance exists, that the representative system has not been applied in the North-West. I know it not from private but from public information, and it is to be found in the newspapers and in the mouths of those who come from the North-West.

Mr. ORTON. The hon. gentleman has it from his agents.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman thinks the people of the North-West are such fools, idiots and babies that they will believe they are aggrieved, though they are not aggrieved, because some agents go and tell them so. They are just as intelligent as the hon. gentleman's constituents in Wellington.

Mr. ORTON. I never referred to them in any sense whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. They are as little likely to be gulled by designing politicians as are the people of Ontario. I say, this question of the rapid creation of a really representative territorial government, is one of the last consequence. If the Government had not been so completely in the hands of the Executive as it has been for some time past, it would have been better for the North-West to-day. The power of that Government has been largely impaired by the fact that so large a proportion of the council was composed of members who sat there as representatives, but were never elected. It was difficult to arrange it otherwise at the start. I admit there was a difficulty. I remember at that time the First Minister was opposed to the proposal, because he thought it was a bad thing to give representative institutions to the Territory. He would have the council all nominated. But to propose at this time of the day, after we have had experience of the consequences of the lack of representative institutions in that country, to impair the existing power and balance as between popular and nominative representatives, is something most extraordinary. I say it ought not to be done. I know of no public reason why the number of nominated members of the council should be increased; but, if the number of nominated members is to be increased, the number of elected members should also be increased, and increased in still larger proportion. That is what is wanted. We must recognise the dissatisfaction and discontent existing, because we do not choose to apply there the principles of popular representative government which we here would decline to live without, but which hon. gentlemen opposite think are too good for the people of the North-West.

Mr. ORTON. I think the hon. gentleman has made remarks that are not justified. He has referred to my temporary visits to the North-West. I am a resident of the North-West; I have been there several years and have travelled a good deal over the country. What I have said in regard to the feeling existing there is likely to be more accurate than the reports to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I know for a fact that agitators have been sent there; that letters have been received from gentlemen in that country

Mr. BLAKE.

representing the party opposite, in which they tried to make the people of the North-West believe that they are oppressed and ill-used; and I maintain that there has been no attempt to ill-use the people, but that, on the contrary, the Government are ready at any time to give them their rights, and to give them the right of electing members to represent them, and that during the Session the Government have taken power to have a census taken in the North-West, with a view to giving them representatives. With respect to the power given the Lieutenant Governor to cause an election to be held, I do not see anything in the Act empowering him to call for such an election to take place. At all events the means of obtaining the census must come from Ottawa, because it is from this Government the sinews of war have to be obtained. The remarks I made were, therefore, not out of place, and were not of such an ignorant character as the hon. gentleman would lead the House to believe.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman evidently thinks he is the only one who has been in the North-West. I stated in his absence that I was present at a public meeting at Calgary at which this subject was brought up, and at that meeting complaints were made that the Government were taking away from the people the right of self-government. I warn the Ministers that if this course is proceeded in, evil results will inevitably follow. The people are determined that no attempt to keep the power out of their hands shall succeed, and efforts will only be repelled by improper means.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Does the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) expect the House to believe that the people of the North-West are willing that the Government here should send nominated persons to represent them in their local affairs? He knows nothing of the class of people who have settled that country if he imagines that they are asking this Government to send up men there to regulate their affairs. You might as well suppose that petitions would come in from any county in Ontario asking the Government to appoint members of their councils so as to overbalance their own local representations. If the Minister wishes to accomplish this object I can tell him that he is taking the very course which will enable him to do it. The local members are in a majority in the council, but if this Bill passes, that majority will be at the end, and if it continues in the same way, you will go on for all time appointing more stipendiary magistrates, who will have seats in the council and will overbalance the local members. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) has stated what has occurred at a public meeting. I had the honor of being present at that meeting, and I can tell the House that that was not all that I heard on that subject. I know the people of that section of the country are not satisfied that their local affairs should be managed by men who are appointed by this Government. In fact it would be impossible that men who have had their training should be content with that sort of thing. The great majority of the people are from the older Provinces—largely, indeed, from the Province of Ontario, and I have no hesitation in saying that in no portion of the Dominion of Canada to-day, so far as intelligence is concerned, in proportion to the population, are the people better qualified to take care of their own affairs than they are in that portion of the Dominion. There is a higher average of intelligence in proportion to the population in that section of the country than in any other. It is not the lame, the halt, and the blind that go to the front: it is the very cream of the old Provinces who have gone there—the men who have most energy, the young men, those who have touched the highest grade of intelligence; and to expect to make this House believe that those men want the Government to appoint representatives to take care of their own local matters, is certainly undertaking a serious contract.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) said we were trying to manufacture a grievance for the people of the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman altogether under-estimates the general intelligence of the people of the North-West. They are perfectly competent to exercise their own judgment as to their own condition and circumstances, and so much is this the case that they are not willing to take their grievances or their lessons from this side of the House or from the other. They are fully competent to decide what is best in their own interest and they claim the right to exercise the powers of self-government, so far as their own local affairs are concerned, precisely the same as the population in other parts of the Dominion. A meeting was called nearly two years ago at Prince Albert, which was largely attended by the people in that district, and they declared that they were not satisfied with the retention of the nominated side of the North-West council. They said the time had come when it should come to an end, and they insisted on the council being entirely in their own hands. If the hon. gentleman will look back through the *Saskatchewan Herald* he will find a report of that meeting some time in 1883, and he will find that one of the grievances was the nominated members of this North-West council. Now, the hon. gentleman, when the people are feeling sore, when the country is agitated, when they still feel that they have grievances against the Administration, proposes to aggravate the condition of things existing there, by the nomination of another member to the council. I think that ought to come to an end, and I am satisfied that the population is sufficiently numerous to bring this council to an end, if proper provisions were made for the election of members to represent the people of that Territory. If the Minister will look at Section 15, of the Consolidated Act relating to the Government established in the North-West Territories, he will find that the Lieutenant Governor is limited in his power to erect representative district to districts of 1,000 square miles in extent. Now, that provision was inserted in the Act at an early period, when there were but a few isolated settlements in the North-West, and when the population were scattered round some little villages, as in the case of Prince Albert and Battleford, and the provision was made with reference to those settlements. Now facilities are given for the population extending over the entire territory; the people are scattered far and wide; the building of the railway has furnished those facilities. That provision of the law ought to be amended so as to permit the whole country to be divided into electoral districts, each of which will be entitled to send a representative to the North-West council. The hon. gentleman will see that under the provisions of the Bill there were many scattered settlements where you might not be able to find an outlying population of 1,000 on 1,000 square miles of territory, and in that respect the Government should amend the law rather than to undertake to provide for further appointments to the council.

Mr. CARON. The Bill provides for that.

Mr. MILLS. If so, so far the Bill will be an improvement on the present law. But it is anything but an improvement. It is wholly contrary to the spirit of the law for the hon. gentleman to undertake to create other members of council by nomination here. The time has gone by for that, and I am satisfied the population of the North-West will not tolerate the interference of the Government in their domestic legislation by appointments of this sort; and I think they will be unworthy of the rights of freemen if they did tolerate such a thing. It is impossible that the government of that country can be satisfactorily carried on, when you have interferences of this sort.

Mr. ORTON. The hon. gentleman, by implication, charged me with having advocated that the Government

in Ottawa, should control the affairs of the people of the North West. I advocated nothing of the kind. What I stated was that I believed the people of the North-West, who had petitioned the Government to appoint a new stipendiary magistrate, knew what they were doing. They knew that every stipendiary magistrate was *ex officio* a member of the council, and they knew that if they petitioned for an additional stipendiary magistrate, he would be *ex officio* a member of that council. They have sufficient intelligence to know what they were doing, and I do not think they require to be told by hon. gentlemen opposite what their desires and intentions are, when they petition Parliament to that effect. I desire to impress the fact that the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Government have neglected the rights of the people there, is wrong; that instead of that, they have taken the necessary steps to give the people of the North-West Territories, at an early date, representation according to their population in an intelligent manner, by having a census taken, so that electoral districts may be set aside, and the people may fairly have an opportunity of electing members to represent them.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with the hon. member for Central Wellington (Mr. Orton), that the people of the North-West do not want to be dictated to as to what are their rights or their wrongs, or, as to whether they have grievances or not. He says, the people petitioned Parliament to appoint another stipendiary magistrate at Calgary. Now, I feel satisfied, that if the people of the North-West had had the power to petition to have a stipendiary magistrate appointed, who should be a member of the council, they would have done so; and I think the Government ought to take an early opportunity of providing that stipendiary magistrates should not be members of the council *ex officio*. The Government should take lessons from the past, and should avoid appointing more officials in this North-West than they can possibly help. I do not know whether these stipendiary magistrates receive anything additional for being members of the council, but I do not think that any stipendiary magistrate appointed by the Government should be a member of the council. It is a thing which is detestable to the people of the North-West, to have officials appointed by this Government instead of being elected by the people. The sooner the Government realise that they should have men ruling over the country who are elected by the people, the better it will be for the Government and for the country as a whole. It may be necessary to appoint a stipendiary magistrate for that section, or it may be done for the purpose of making a position for some individual. We know that such has been the case in the past. In 1879, Judge Ryan, who was a stipendiary magistrate in the North-West Territories, was deposed because the portion of the territory within his jurisdiction was added to the Province of Manitoba, and it was only a few months afterwards that Judge Rouleau was appointed in his place. We have yet to learn whether there were any reasons for removing Judge Ryan and appointing Judge Rouleau unless they were political reasons; Judge Ryan filled that position satisfactorily, and no reasons have been given by the Government why he was dismissed, except that a portion of the territory he had control of was added to Manitoba. I might inform the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) that if he looks at clauses 15 and 16 in the Act of 1880, he will find that the Lieutenant Governor has power, at any time, to hold an election for a member of the North-West council in any district which has sufficient population; it is not at all necessary for him to wait until the census is taken under the Act passed by this House this Session. During the time I have had a seat in this House I have heard members year after year urging the Government to give the North-West

Territories representation, and the people of that country have been clamoring for representation, both in this House and in the North-West Council. It is now proposed to make the appointed members and the elected members of that council equal, so that, the Lieutenant Governor having the casting vote, the majority will be the appointees of this Government. That is wrong. If it is necessary to appoint a new stipendiary magistrate for the North-West, I think the Government ought at once to provide that the stipendiary magistrates, if members of the council, should be elected by the people. Do not make it compulsory upon them to be members of the council, but do not let their appointment disqualify them. If the people choose them, well and good; but there are men in that country just as able to make laws for the government of the people as men appointed by this Government.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentlemen opposite who regard it as so very objectionable that the stipendiary magistrate should be appointed with seats in the council, have only to refer to the statutes to find that that was the policy of the ex-leader of the Government. The Act of 1877 contains the same objectionable clause which is now complained of. I have not heard any complaints from the North-West with regard to these magistrates. I understood that the petitions which have been presented required that the stipendiary magistrates should be treated just as the other stipendiary magistrates have been heretofore, and I take for granted that the people of the North-West, knowing that every stipendiary magistrate had a seat in the North-West Council, had they considered that objectionable, would certainly have requested that the stipendiary magistrate should not have a seat in the council. Clause 3, in the Act of 1877, states:

"The Governor General with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, by warrant under his privy seal, may constitute and appoint such and so many persons, from time to time, not exceeding in the whole six persons of which number the stipendiary magistrates hereinafter mentioned shall *ex-officio* form part, to be a council to aid the Lieutenant Governor in the administration of the North-West Territories."

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to refer him to clause 74 of the same Act which provides for the appointment of barristers of five years' standing, not exceeding three, as stipendiary magistrates. So that the provision the hon. gentleman has read only applies to three; you have three now, and you are appointing another, giving him the same power as the others, which the Act does not give. It would require a specific power to make a new stipendiary magistrate a member of the council, and you are not taking that.

Mr. CARON. I have explained to the hon. gentleman that, in consequence of the increased work in the North-West Territories, it has become necessary to increase the number of stipendiary magistrates, and I need not refer to the petitions which have been presented, asking that this appointment should be made, to show that the people themselves consider that the three stipendiary magistrates appointed by my hon. friend the ex-leader of the Government by that Act, are not now sufficient to do the work of the Territories. If it be true that under the Act which I have quoted the hon. gentleman gave to his stipendiary magistrates the power of advising the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to-day, when it becomes necessary to appoint another stipendiary magistrate, why treat him differently from the others who have been appointed heretofore?

Mr. MILLS. The change of circumstances.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Because the Act distinctly provides that the elective element should prevail in the course of time, and that the nominative element should cease when the number of elective members shall reach 21; and if the council does not consist of 21 elected members, it is simply

Mr. WATSON.

because the Lieutenant Governor has neglected his duty. There have been complaints in the Territory already. I have given the hon. gentleman an instance in which the present state of things was publicly discussed and complained of, and the hon. gentlemen is making it worse instead of better. The popular element should be strengthened, but the hon. gentleman is weakening it and introducing an element of discontent which will produce disastrous consequences.

Mr. CARON. The only difference between the hon. gentleman and myself is that he established the principle of giving the stipendiary magistrates a seat in the council.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Because there was nobody else to sit in the council.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman says the time has come to change that policy and to deprive the stipendiary magistrates of their seats in the North-West council. Well, we do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the time has come to make that change, and we will hold to his policy of giving stipendiary magistrates seats in the council. The hon. gentleman says the Lieutenant Governor might have been derelict in his duty if the number of elected members of the council is not larger than it is. The hon. gentleman knows that by section 15 of the North-West Territory Act, the Lieutenant Governor is given power to erect into an electoral district any portion of the North-West Territory not exceeding an area of 1,000 square miles, which contains a population of not less than 1,000 inhabitants. By the 19th section, it is also provided that when any electoral district contains a population of 2,000 inhabitants of adult age, exclusive of aliens or of unenfranchised Indians, the Lieutenant Governor shall issue his writ for the election of a second member for the electoral district. However, notwithstanding these two clauses, the Lieutenant Governor considered, and there has been a long correspondence in reference to that point, that having once constituted an electoral district, it was not within his power to change it. Well, the Bill which will follow these resolutions will provide for this. Now, I see really no objection to this resolution as presented. There still will remain a majority in the hands of the elected members of the council.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. CARON. There are eight elected members of that council and if you appoint one more magistrate and make him a member, you still remain with seven, instead of six to eight.

Mr. MILLS. The Governor is a member, and he has two votes.

Mr. BLAKE. The Governor has a vote and then he has another vote. You will have seven nominated members who, with the Governor's two votes, will make nine votes against eight of elected members. The hon. gentleman seems to think that because at the very commencement of the business, when there was hardly any population in the Territories at all, my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) proposed that three stipendiary magistrates, and no more, should be members of the council. That was intended to be a permanent policy under which, not only these three magistrates, but also any future stipendiary magistrates should be for all times members of the Local Government of the North-West. That is practically what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. CARON. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. That is practically what the hon. gentleman says, because he says that we, on this side, are objecting to the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie). But the policy of my hon. friend, when there was hardly any population in the Territories, and when he was proposing to appoint not exceeding three, and for some time there were only two, stipendiary magistrates, members of the council,

was that these three—and that was the maximum number of stipendiary magistrates who could be members of the council—should not be permanent, because he looked forward to the time when there would be sufficient population in the Territories to elect members to the number of 21; and when the council was to cease, and the members, 21 in number, were to constitute a Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territory. Therefore, the provision of my hon. friend, under which the number of nominated councillors was not to exceed three in the earliest stages, was not to be a permanent, but a temporary provision, to continue in force until the population reached the required figure to enable it to elect 21 members. Now the population of the Territories is sufficient in number and sufficiently compressed into different areas, I have no doubt, to accomplish that result. I have no doubt there are now 21 areas of one thousand inhabitants each, or, at any rate, if not that many areas, there are sufficient as of two thousand each which can return and who are entitled to two members, to make up the deficiency. But if not, that day is fast approaching, and under these circumstances why should the hon. gentleman propose, just at this time, to add to the representation of the nominative against the elective system? He says, because the people of Calgary sent a petition declaring there was a deficiency in the administration of justice, and that, since they required a stipendiary magistrate, they evidently wished to have an additional member of the council. In the first place, what the people of Calgary wanted was justice, and the only way they could get it was by the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate, and, perhaps, the people of that area might be content, if they could get justice on no other terms, to accept the condition of having an additional stipendiary magistrate added to the council.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend says not. He says they were complaining of the power of the nominative members, as they stand at present. But, in any case, the people of Calgary are not the people of all the Territories. They are entitled to justice, and, if the necessity of the case require it, to another magistrate, but are not entitled to impose upon the Territories an additional nominated member. The people of the North-West Territory are in a different position now to that in which they were when the Act was passed. Their circumstances are different. The exigencies of the country then required as many nominated members as we proposed should be appointed; the exigencies of the country do not now require them. On the contrary, they require that, as rapidly as possible, the nominated members should disappear instead of being increased by Parliament. There is no reason why this magistrate, whose duties are to be judicial, should remain a member of the council, simply that he may be put on as high a pedestal as the other magistrates. The question is what are the rights of the people and what will satisfy the people. When my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, introduced this measure, the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, objected to the elective element being introduced, because, from his point of view, it was too soon to talk of such a thing; and when he came to power in 1878, the rumor spread abroad, and some of his organs announced, that a change was going to be made and that the territorial government which the hon. gentleman rather condemned, was going to be abolished or modified. The moment the rumor spread abroad, which it did in 1879, that an attempt would be made to abolish the territorial government, the people of the Territories were aroused, even the people who had not at that time the benefits of the representative element, but who were in hopes of obtaining it in course of time, and whose hopes would thus be checked, were alarmed exceedingly. Repeated applications were made to have a census taken in the District of Lorne, amongst others, and two

censuses were taken before a sufficient number of persons were found to entitle them to a member of the council. They were taken on the petitions of the people, anxious to obtain that portion of self-government which the Act had guaranteed to them as soon as their population would admit it. The Act did not immediately take effect. It was some time in the year 1880, I think, before these people were entitled to a representative in the council. In February of that year a meeting was held at Duck Lake to protest against the intention of the Government, as stated in the ministerial organs, to abolish even this rudimentary system of government. The meeting was called by Father André, and was addressed by him, and his speech will show how the people felt, so long ago as 1880, on this subject:

"He said before long this together with several other settlements will be entitled to representation in the council at Battleford. Then the council would be in a better position to speak in the name of the people, to press their wants and remedy their grievances at Ottawa."

He proposed that they should send a petition to Ottawa against the idea of abolishing the territorial government, a share in which these people had not, but expected to get in a short time, and a protest and petition, signed by numerous persons, on the 23rd of February, 1880, was sent to the Government. This protest and petition was couched in the following terms:

"That your petitioners would further press upon your hon. House the consideration, that as the inhabitants of the North-West Territories are now nearly equal to the population of the Province of British Columbia or of Manitoba, with a near prospect of a large majority in favor of the Territories, it will be manifestly unfair to deprive them of a local council in which several settlements, even though the basis of representation under the present be not extended, are not now or will shortly be entitled to direct representation. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your hon. House will sanction no legislation which would have the effect of depriving the people of the North-West Territories of a resident local government.

Public meetings were held at Prince Albert, St. Laurent and other places, in the spring of 1880, to give expression to the views of the people on the subject of the suggested abolition of the territorial government. The feeling was all but universal in condemnation of any change, and petitions against such a retrograde step were almost unanimously signed. At Prince Albert, a couple of gentlemen spoke against taking any action, one of them being reported as having said that it would be much the better course to let Sir John Macdonald have his own way without opposition or remonstrance, as he knew much better than the people of the country could possibly do, what was for their real good. But this extreme view of party fidelity did not find an echo in the mind of the meeting, people preferring to trust their own judgment to that of a gentleman who has never seen the country, and who could, therefore, know nothing personally of its requirements. I mention these things as occurring upon a rumor that it was intended to deprive the people of that territorial system, to show you how satisfied they were with it, and how important it is not to increase the absolute as well as the relative weight of representation by our resolution of to-day. If, at a period some time ago, these people thought that it was important to have representation here, if they thought it was important to have that territory divided into provinces, how much more now ought we not to add to the weight of the nominative as against the representative element. In the fall of 1882 the people of Prince Albert petitioned the Government, and one clause of the petition runs thus:

"And whereas the North-West Territories is increasing in population at an unprecedented rate, and doubtless next year a larger immigration will flow in from all parts of the world, and certain sections of the country are already thickly populated, such as the district of Saskatchewan, this has now a population almost as large as the Province of British Columbia, and as it is impossible that the inhabitants of such a large tract of country could be understood by the representatives sent to Parliament by the older Provinces, and as there are settlements such as Prince Albert desirous of becoming incorporated as towns, and as it is absolutely necessary that roads should be improved, bridges, schools, and other public buildings should be erected, to keep pace with the

immigration flowing in, your petitioners believe the time is ripe for forming the North-West Territories into Provinces with the powers and privileges of the other Provinces of the Dominion."

I read that to you as bearing directly upon a proposition made in the year 1885, to have more of the Crown colony and departmental system of Government than that which now exists. If, four or five years ago, they thought they ought to have provincial rights, you propose to say now: No, we will send you up another ruler from Ottawa. Then, the North-West Council, on the 9th October, 1883, made another representation—a council which was certainly at that time composed of a preponderating element of nominated members.

"Your memorialists believe that the success of the North-West Territories is of such importance to the whole Dominion that the time has arrived when representation for the Territories should be had in Parliament. At the present time, the people of the North-West are without representation of any kind, and have to depend solely on petitions and memorials to make their wants known."

There was a meeting at Prince Albert in October, 1883, and amongst the resolutions passed at that large meeting was one endorsing the view that the Territories should have representation in the Dominion Parliament. Then, there was a meeting in February, 1884, at Colleston school house, in this section, and, of the resolutions that were passed, these were two:

"6. That the North-West Territory are entitled to representation in the Dominion Parliament, and that it is unjust to compel the settlers here to pay taxes until such representation is granted.

"7. That the North-West Council should be composed purely of representative members, and that it should exercise the same powers and enjoy the same privileges as the Provincial Legislatures in the established Provinces."

That shows what the feeling of the people was, and that is more than a year and a half ago. They were then complaining of the existing nominated element, and now you say: We will add another nominated member to the council. Then we had a debate here in the year 1884, in which some of these questions were raised and suggested to the consideration of the House. Then, we had on the 15th November, 1884, a very largely signed petition passed through the Territories which prayed for responsible government for the Territories. This was not confined to one section. My hon. friend has spoken of what he saw at Calgary himself and at Moosomin in the winter of this year. A large meeting was held, and a resolution was passed as to the representation of the people in the Government of the North-West Territories. I might give many more citations. I give these to show that the people of this country are yearning, as we ought to know they would, for their full share in the rights of citizenship in the Federal Parliament, and for a fuller meed of self-government in the country in which they live, and to that I think they are entitled. I think, therefore, that it is very objectionable to commence to increase the weight of the nominated as against the elected body. You say the elected body will have a preponderance, but there may be unfaithful members. I have known members of Parliament who have been unfaithful to their trust. There may be an unfaithful elected councillor who may combine with the powers that be, who may combine with the Lieutenant Governor appointed here and with the people who are nominated here, and, if a question is on the balance, you will find that, although the weight originally preponderated a little one way, the nominated element will get the sway. I have read with attention the reports of the proceedings of the North-West Council and the comments of the newspapers upon those reports, and I have seen expressions, I may go so far as to say of disgust, but certainly of regret, as to the inefficiency of those proceedings, due, as was stated, to the preponderance of the nominated as distinguished from the elected members. If that is so, we ought not to-day to propose to increase the weight of the nominated as contrasted with the elected members.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think it would be advisable to change the words of this resolution. If the construction given to it by the Minister of Militia is correct, the wording should be altered, otherwise it would be taken that hereafter eight members of the council were to be appointed by the Government. There is no difficulty, because it is understood that the intention of the Government is to add only one member of the council.

Mr. CARON. Yes, it is.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that language is entirely inapt to express the intention of the Government in the sense which they profess to desire. They ask to appoint a member to the North-West Council, but they also ask to appoint a stipendiary magistrate who *per curiam officii* will be a member of the North-West Council. You might appoint a member who was not a stipendiary magistrate at all.

Mr. CARON. Not under clause 74.

Mr. BLAKE. I am speaking of the appointment of a member of the council.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would remind the Premier that according to the 74th clause the limitation is to authority. You have the authority already.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The additional man is to be appointed in the manner provided by the 74th section.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the stipendiary magistrate. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor General to appoint in the manner provided by the 5th section, an additional member of council, and an additional stipendiary magistrate in the manner provided by the 74th section—that is what you say. You say you are going to appoint an additional member of council by one section and an additional member of council by another section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move in amendment:

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor General to appoint an additional stipendiary magistrate in the manner provided by the 74th section of the North-West Territories Act, 1880, and for the purposes mentioned in the said Act, who shall be an additional member of the council of the said Territories in the manner provided by the 5th section of the Act.

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment to the amendment to strike out the words: "Who shall be an additional member of the council of the said Territories."

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

On resolution 2,

Mr. CARON. This resolution is to make provision for recapturing insane persons who have escaped from the asylum. At the present time these unfortunate people are sent to Manitoba, and the Dominion Government has to pay the Government of Manitoba so much per head for the maintenance of the insane. It is providing the means of maintaining inmates when the transfer to another asylum, which is in course of construction, takes place.

Resolution to be reported.

## SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Administration of Justice and other matters in the North-West Territories.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

## HARBOR OF THREE RIVERS.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 150) to authorise the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of the harbor of Three Rivers.

Mr. MILLS. Explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I have already explained this proposal upon two occasions. It is simply to enable the Government to loan the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers a sum of money upon debentures issued by the Board of Commissioners, in order to relieve them from paying 6 per cent., which rate they now pay, upon the bonds issued by them; and also in addition to the sum already borrowed of \$63,600, to loan an additional sum of about \$18,400 to enable them to complete. That will be a loan to them upon the security of the debentures of the harbor.

Mr. MILLS. What sum do they now pay, and what will they pay under the new arrangement?

Mr. BOWELL. They at present pay 6 per cent.; under the present arrangement they will pay 4 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. What is the amount annually under each heading?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount already expended is \$63,600, upon which they are paying 6 per cent. It is proposed to loan an additional sum of \$18,400, to enable them to complete, making a total sum of \$82,000 at 4 per cent. The revenue of the harbor will more than cover, with the proceeds of the leases into which they have already entered with certain parties, 4 per cent. on the full amount of the loan.

Mr. MILLS. What is the annual amount of revenue?

Mr. BOWELL. The revenue from harbor dues is \$3,900, and from rents of wharves assured \$2,000, making a total of \$5,900.

Mr. MILLS. Does any portion of that form a sinking fund, or is it a perpetual charge.

Mr. BOWELL. No; it is for 25 years.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS. I do not see any arrangements by which the principal is to be paid off. The Harbor Commissioners might expend the surplus, over the sum required for the payment of interest, and there would be nothing to meet the principal.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no provision for sinking fund as it is expected that the increase of the business of the port, after the improvements have taken place, will be such as will enable them to pay the debentures when they fall due.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that there ought to be some provision for sinking fund, as it is certainly legislating in a rather extraordinary way not to provide for the payment of the principal.

Mr. BOWELL. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is a good one, and perhaps it would be as well to provide for some sinking fund, even though it should be a very small one. I, therefore, suggest that at the end of the clause, after the word "whatever" the following words be added:

And the said commissioners shall also pay to the said Finance Minister every half year as aforesaid, one-half of 1 per cent. as sinking fund, towards the redemption of said debentures.

Mr. MILLS. Is there a provision for the imposition of harbor dues or tolls?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, under the Act which incorporates them.

Mr. MILLS. Have they power to fix the amount of the tolls?

Mr. BOWELL. No, that is in the hands of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MILLS. They could not increase them without the consent of the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, nor could they go on with new work without the previous sanction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that the sinking fund rate is a very low one—not sufficient to pay it up in the time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It would not be enough, but the hon. gentleman must have such confidence in the growth of the place, and in the effect of these works, that with no other encumbrance upon the board, this will be quite enough.

Mr. MILLS. One-half per cent. every six months means one per cent. per annum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. That makes one-fourth in every 25 years. I do not think the hon. gentleman can be accused of dealing niggardly with the city of Three Rivers—a place so largely dependent on the lumbering business, which is every year becoming less.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman does not accuse my hon. friend of dealing niggardly with the city of Three Rivers.

On section 4,

Mr. WELDON. Are these debentures overdue?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. WELDON. How can you call them in?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These people wish it so, because they know they could not pay their interest, and therefore they would be only too glad to give up their debentures and have them redeemed. In fact, that is the reason the Bill was introduced.

Mr. WELDON. How can this Parliament declare that the interest shall not be paid after a certain date? That interferes with civil rights.

Mr. BLAKE. The debenture holders are entitled to certain rights under their contract, and I do not think we ought to provide absolutely that those rights shall be changed or modified. The hon. gentleman says he is quite sure they will bring in their debentures for redemption. Very well, let him trust them for that; but do not provide that if they refuse to bring them in you will not give them any interest, because the law is such that they are entitled to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In compliance with what the hon. gentleman has said, I would suggest that all the words after the words "Harbor Commissioners," in the 8th line, be struck out. That leaves the bondholders free.

Amendment agreed to; Bill reported with amendments which read the first and the second times and concurred in.

#### CONSOLIDATED INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second the reading of Bill (No. 146) to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883. He said: One part of the Bill is intended to provide for the better carrying out of the regulations of the Act. Owing to the deficiencies in the Act as it now stands, our officers in many cases have not been able to secure convictions. Another change is consequent on the increased duty placed on cigars

this Session. A very important question is that of a drawback to distillers on whiskey which must be kept on the distillers premises for a certain time. This drawback is allowed in the old country and in the United States, and there is no reason why it should not be allowed here. No allowance is to be made unless the spirits have been kept in wood or in such ventilating tanks as are approved of by departmental regulations during the whole period for which abatement is claimed. The allowance to be made will not exceed six per cent. for the first year, four per cent. for the second year, and three per cent. for the third year and two per cent. for each succeeding year up to seven years in all. Some of our officers have visited the distilleries in the United States and consulted the excise officers in that country, and the opinion of the American excise officers is that these allowances are about fair for shrinkage by evaporation; but this is not absolute, because after all the spirits will be regauged. It has been remarked in the newspapers that the principle adopted here of prohibiting the sale of any but mature whiskey was a scheme concocted by the distillers to create a monopoly. It is only fair to state that while the distillers asked for the first clause and the drawback for shrinkage, no suggestion was received from any one of them with regard to this other clause. This was a suggestion made by the committee, after giving the matter a good deal of attention, and which I thought worthy of consideration. The object is to have the purest spirits put in the market, and prevent the sale of adulterated liquors.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any process by which it has been ascertained that although not stored in woods, but in properly ventilated tanks this process of improvement will go on as well as in wood? If stored in metal tanks, the spirits might as well be bottled as the process of adulteration must go on in order to have improvement. I have seen it stated that a process has been discovered, which is now in use, by which this improvement can be obtained almost as soon as the liquor is distilled.

Mr. COSTIGAN. From what I can learn, the maturing of whiskey takes place in wooden vessels. I have seen the reference the hon. gentleman alludes to, but the Department has no idea of that process having been successfully carried out. There are certain preparations or drugs that may be put into the liquor that will apparently remove the objectionable elements sought to be removed by adulteration, but in reality they only conceal them. Being put in wooden vessels and kept there, the evaporation proceeding through the wood, is the only means of purifying the spirits.

Mr. BLAKE. What are these ventilating tanks?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know what is meant by ventilating tanks; they must be wooden vessels. In a large distillery they have copper tanks.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the proposed amendment?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In committee, I shall either have to amend that section limiting the period when liquor may be entered for consumption, or strike it out.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the hon. gentleman will either eliminate the section altogether or will make provision for the sale at any time of spirits which are to be used for methylated spirits or vinegar or anything of that kind; not that he has any proposition for continuing it in a modified form.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I shall either strike it out altogether, or, if amendments can be made to meet the objection of manufacturers, and also in the direction of new distilleries which may be established, I shall propose the amendment.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

#### ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MILLS. In the return brought down relating to the boundary of Ontario, the only papers were letters from the Secretary of State, Earl Derby, enclosing copy of the order for the decision of the Judicial Committee and a letter from the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario with the proposed draft Bill. There was no letter from the Government here acknowledging either of those communications, and there was no intimation as to the views of the Government with reference to any proposition, either the one made by the Imperial Government or the one made by the Government of Ontario. Has there been any further correspondence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, those communications have been acknowledged. There has been a good deal of semi official and verbal communication between the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Ontario on that subject. The Minister of Justice is in Toronto and will be back to-morrow, and I fancy there will be some more information about it then.

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman state when he will bring down the correspondence in reference to the fisheries?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I expected to have received the assent to-day, but, I am sorry to say, I have not.

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

#### After Recess.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Steam mail service between the United States and  
Victoria, British Columbia..... \$17,640

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I desire to ask the Minister if it is contemplated to increase that subsidy, owing to the increased number of trips. At the present time they are making five trips every month during the summer, between April and, I think, the end of October.

Mr. CARLING. I would say to the hon. gentleman that it is not the intention to increase the subsidy at present.

For subsidy to line of steamers to run fortnightly  
between France and Quebec..... \$50,000

Mr. VAIL. How many trips are they required to make in a year? Who is the contractor?

Mr. BOWELL. The agreement has been made with the Halifax Steam Navigation Company through their representative and manager, Mr. Wood, for \$2,000 per trip. Payment has been made for one trip. I am not able to inform the hon. gentleman of whom the company is composed.

Mr. MILLS. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the service is that is performed, how the contract is let, and what is there to warrant this expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. The contract was entered into with this company for a service between France and Quebec during certain seasons of the year, the vessels to land at Halifax or some of the maritime ports.

Mr. VAIL. Has the French Government granted an equal sum?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I think not; and that is the reason why the stipulation that is in the former vote has been left out on this occasion.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will see that the authority given by Parliament was to pay this sum provided the Government of France gave an equal subsidy, and he says the Government of France did not give any subsidy. The question is, then, under what authority was the \$2,000 paid.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have only paid for one trip, \$2,000, so that if we had used the \$50,000 it would have been \$4,000 a month for the whole year. In paying only \$2,000 we have really remained within the vote of Parliament, and within the intention of Parliament, because we have expended only one-half the amount that we would have expended each month if the French Government had given an equal amount; and now we ask that this course be followed for the next year instead of the vote of the year before, otherwise France would not give the necessary amount. Therefore, we thought it better to try to open commercial communication with France, even with half of the subsidy, in order to obtain an outlet for our commerce.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but Parliament was asked to agree to a scheme of steam communication between France and Quebec upon a basis that \$100,000 was to be contributed as a national encouragement, one-half by France and one-half by Canada. What the hon. gentleman has done has been to expend \$2,000 of the \$50,000 granted on that condition, without the performance of that condition, not in pursuance of the intention of Parliament at all but in contravention of the vote and of the intention of Parliament, because the intention of Parliament was, that this amount should be given only on these conditions, and it was the hon. gentlemen themselves who proposed these conditions. They said themselves that \$100,000 was the least public encouragement that would enable us to have an efficient line and, having done so, they decided that each country ought to pay half. Then, not having been able to carry out that arrangement, they seem to have made an arrangement unwarranted and unauthorised, and of a different character. Under these circumstances, I think the committee is entitled to know what style of steamers and of what power were employed and how it comes about that an efficient arrangement has been made for \$50,000 when the Government thought it would require a public encouragement from both countries of \$100,000 a year. Then one wants to know what is the meaning of this arrangement the hon. gentleman has spoken about as between France and Halifax. The vote of Parliament was between France and Quebec, but the hon. gentleman says that a certain number of trips are to be made between France and Halifax. That may be a very proper thing; but if we are going to arrange for a line of communication all the year round, between France and Quebec during the shipping season and between France and Halifax during the winter, a vote should be taken accordingly. Now we are told that a contract or arrangement has been made, and the particulars should be brought down. Hon. gentlemen have been asking for steamship subsidies in various quarters for a number of years. They have been projected by speculators. Now it is said this service is arranged for. If so, we should know particulars of the arrangement; how many trips are to be made between France and Quebec, how many between Halifax and France; what is the result of the trip that has taken place, and what are the prospects as to the future.

Mr. PAINT. Some of the facts are these. I happened to see the agent here last week. There are two ships running; they are something under 2,000 tons, and are first-class ships. The service is from Quebec and Halifax to Havre, touching at Swansea, in Wales.

Mr. BLAKE. Now that the Deputy Assistant Minister has explained the matter, perhaps the Minister will throw some light upon it.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not the full terms of the contract here, but I will bring them down before I ask concurrence, in order that full information may be given, and I will present any further information I obtain.

Mr. PAINT. The French Government would not vote a subsidy. They required that two of the ships should be officered by French officers and should fly the French flag.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose that some one on the Treasury benches is acquainted with these interesting matters as to the negotiations with France, and the great difficulty which prevented the success of the scheme of the Canadian Government. Or is all the wisdom on this subject to be found in the rank and file of the ministerial party?

Mr. PAINT. I may say, also—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not believe it is as black as it is painted.

Mr. MILLS. I think we are entitled to further information on this subject. It is pretty evident from what the Minister said, and from what the Deputy Ministers also stated, that the French Government did not think trade between Canada and France of sufficient consequence to justify any expenditure for this purpose. Before the Government undertakes to commit the country to this expenditure we are entitled to know what they expect to accomplish. In what way do they expect to promote the interests of the country by subsidising a mail steam line between Canada and France? There are trade relations between Canada and the United Kingdom to offer some justification for a subsidy to a line of steamers between those points. But what is the trade between Canada and France to justify an expenditure of that kind? Surely mail communication required with France could be had through the United Kingdom. France does not take our raw products, and the present trade policy of the country is such as not to encourage the importation of manufactured goods from France. Besides, the Government have never succeeded in securing more than two or three immigrants a year from that country. Looking at the present state of the public revenue and the large expenditure of the Government, Parliament is entitled to further information on this subject before the vote is passed, and it is not sufficient that the Minister promises to bring down a statement as to the form of the contract, for what is required is to know what justification there is for entering into such a contract. In pursuing the present course the Government have treated the committee with indignity.

Mr. PAINT. One of the ships sailed from Halifax, not more than two weeks ago, for Havre, with a cargo and 24 first-class passengers. The capital for building the ships has been furnished by France, Scotland and Halifax.

Mr. LANGEVIER. I know that one of the steamers came to Quebec some time ago, but positively refused to take any cargo from that port. It seemed to me most extraordinary that a line receiving a subsidy should decline to take any cargo from Quebec. I know a firm who had prepared a lot of deals to send.

Mr. PAINT. What was the description of the cargo?

Mr. LANGEVIER. Deals.

Mr. PAINT. A first-class steamer cannot carry deals, and pay.

Mr. LANGEVIER. The steamer declined to take any cargo whatever from Quebec. The facts of the matter were

published in the newspapers. There was a good deal of correspondence in the papers about it, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that the name of the firm was Plamondon & Auger; and it appears from these statements that this so-called line which is subsidised for travel between France and Quebec, does not touch at Quebec at all. This same steamer, it was stated, went down to Montreal with about one-third of a cargo, taking nothing from Quebec at all. Now, I say, if that is the case, that cannot be construed as performing the contract.

**Mr. BOWELL.** After the statement made by the hon. gentleman for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), I would ask the committee to allow this item to stand, until full enquiry can be made into the statement which the hon. gentleman has made. If a vessel which is subsidised in order to create a trade—for I think I may use that expression—between France and this Dominion—refuses to carry freight when offered from a Canadian port, it strikes me it would be a very good reason for annulling the contract. I may say, however, to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that if the Parliament of Canada at its last Session voted \$50,000 per annum, in order to subsidise steamers to ply between some port in France and some ports in Canada, in order to build up a trade which has not in the past existed between those countries, conditional upon the French Government giving an equal sum or more to subsidise them, and if the Government of Canada could secure such a service as was contemplated when the first vote was made, without being aided or subsidised by the French Government, the object for which the money was appropriated has been accomplished; and there could be very little difference to this country, whether the French Government really subsidised the line or not, unless that subsidy was absolutely necessary to secure the services of such a class of vessels as was contemplated when the vote was given, although the contract may not have been, as intimated by the leader of the Opposition, strictly in accord with the reading of the resolution.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** I do not know what the terms of the contract may be, but having some knowledge of ship-owning for a number of years, and knowing something about the trade of carrying lumber, I may say that I can quite understand why the owner or master of a first-class steamer would decline to carry lumber. The truth is that the freights on lumber for some years back have been so low that no first-class steamers will carry it, unless they carry enough to ballast the vessel. It is true that even the Allan vessels and other steam vessels frequently take a portion of their cargo in deals, not because it pays them to do so, but because sometimes it is necessary, when they cannot get a full return cargo, to take part of a cargo in timber, which is a non-paying freight for a steamship, at a merely nominal price. Now, I can quite understand a vessel coming to Quebec and refusing to be chartered at the current rates to carry deals to either British or French ports, and if the rates are not sufficient to pay the vessel it would naturally go to Montreal and try to get another freight there. That is quite consistent, and is in itself no reason to suppose that the contract should be open to be cancelled. It was not because the lumber was offered at Quebec any more than if it had been offered at Bathurst, Miramichi or any other place, but simply because the freight was not of a character to pay the ship for the expense of carrying it. I can quite understand that it might be desirable and very probable that a trade should be opened up with France, but it is open to the Government to enter into a contract or not, and they can put in such conditions as will best promote trade and best suit the interests of the country. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) is perfectly accurate in his statement, but that is no reason, in my opinion, for cancelling

**Mr. LANGELIER.**

the contract, without looking into the fact of whether the freight was at such a rate as would warrant the vessel in carrying it.

**Mr. McLELAN.** I may say that I met the agent of the vessel in question during the last trip, and he mentioned to me that he had offered deals as part of his cargo at Quebec, and he gave the price and it appeared to me to be so low that it could not have been carried even on a sailing vessel. He declined it because it was even below the ordinary sailing ship rates, and those would be a loss for any steamship to carry. He mentioned to me that he had about one hundred tons at Quebec, and that he was going to Charlottetown and then to Halifax to complete his cargo, not with lumber, but with other goods which would tend more to develop the trade between the two countries than the carrying of deals.

**Mr. DESJARDINS.** The explanation of the Minister of Marine is quite different from the statement of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier). We understood from the statement of the hon. member for Megantic that the cargo had been refused positively, but now we see that the company did not carry it, simply because the rates were not satisfactory—an explanation which puts the matter on a different footing altogether.

**Mr. LANGELIER.** I gave the information as I saw it, for it was published in all the newspapers in Quebec and a great deal of indignation was expressed about it. No answer was given to the communication of Messrs. Plamondon & Auger, which was not that they did not agree upon terms but that there had been a positive refusal to take any goods from Quebec. I do not myself know whether the information was correct or not, but that was what was stated in the newspapers of the city.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Are we to understand that the arrangement is such that the vessel is to touch at different ports, or that it is to make stated trips from Quebec, calling at Halifax, Swansea and Havre; for we hear now the steamer was to call at Charlottetown. Of course, one of the elements for which I suppose we pay a subsidy is the loss in departing at stated periods from certain ports, thus giving merchants the certainty of obtaining pretty rapid despatch. but if the vessel is to go on a sort of coasting through the Dominion, picking up a cargo here and there, that may be a very good service, but it is a different kind of service from that which I understood from the hon. gentleman who undertakes to paint the lily.

**Mr. WELDON.** In regard to the remark of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint), that the French Government would not give the subsidy because they wanted a French vessel, it was put forward as one reason for this grant last year that it was given to two French vessels in order to obtain from the French Government \$75,000 instead of \$50,000.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I wish it distinctly understood that the language used by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) induced me to ask the committee to let the item stand, that is, that the owners or managers of the boat refused to accept not only deals but any other kind of goods from Quebec. One can scarcely conceive that possible, but when it is stated on the authority of a member of this House the actual facts should be ascertained. I must take exception altogether to the view of this question taken by the leader of the Opposition. No one ever supposed that a small subsidy of this kind was granted for the purpose of establishing a line of steamers running direct from Quebec to Havre or any other port in France. It was always understood that if a cargo could not be obtained in Montreal or Quebec the vessel plying between the Dominion and France should be allowed to call at any other port to make up her cargo. It

would scarcely be fair to ask any steamer, particularly one of that size and value, to sail from only one port of the Dominion to a port in France, whether it had any cargo or not. The object in making the grant was to build up a trade that has not existed in the past, and in order that every part of the Dominion might benefit by it, the vessel was to be permitted to go to any port in the Dominion to complete her cargo. Nothing could be of greater advantage to the Island of Prince Edward than for a vessel of that character to call at Charlottetown or Georgetown or any other port of that Island in order to obtain canned fish—

Mr. MITCHELL. Or cattle.

Mr. BOWELL—or horses for shipment to Europe, and if the cargo could not be completed there, the vessel ought to be allowed to go to Halifax or to some other Dominion ports and then proceed on her voyage. It was never intended to have a weekly or a fortnightly line. The object was to give so much a trip between this Dominion and some port in France, and so increase the trade of the country and build up a direct communication between France and Canada, so that immigrants might take advantage of a line of that kind. It was also hoped that Canadian merchants might receive their goods as cheaply as possible, and that, after ascertaining what we could furnish to the markets in France, we could send goods direct to that country, and thereby enable our exporters to secure the full benefit of their own trade.

Mr. BLAKE. The grant as proposed was to promote steam communication between France and Quebec, not between France and Canada, and the proposal this year is the same. It may not be a wise proposal; the suggestion the hon. gentleman makes now may be much wiser—that it should be between any port in Canada and France; but that is not the proposal in the vote. The original intention as stated by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon)—I very well remember the discussion—was that the subsidy should be no less than \$125,000 a year, we to pay \$50,000; and we were so cunning that we were going to have French steamers, which would get the advantage of the tonnage or mileage bounty given by the French Government, and thus practically make the French pay \$75,000 of \$125,000. This is a considerable subsidy from the public to promote this trade, and it ought to secure a very good line, and frequent and tolerably direct communications. Even \$50,000 a year is a very considerable subsidy. I do not know what these 2,000 ton vessels consume of coal per trip; but I fancy that subsidy goes a pretty long way towards paying their coal bill.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says there is no trade to be promoted at present by the subsidy given to this line of steamers, but it is for the purpose of securing trade.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say it was for that exclusively.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman said it was a trade to be created, and a trade to be created is certainly a trade that does not exist; and the hon. gentlemen neither last year nor this have given the House the slightest information as to how the trade was to spring up. We know that the commercial policy of France is not one favorable to the establishment of an extensive trade with this country, and I am at a loss to understand in what this extraordinary trade that is to be built up is to consist. In the debate that took place last year on the subject, not the slightest information was given as to what the nature of this trade was to be. The hon. gentleman proposed to subsidise a line of steamers, and seemed to assume as conclusively established that if the subsidy were given, a trade would actually spring up. I take the following from the debate of last year:—

“Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to any term so long as ten years. The contracts given to the Allan Line have never exceeded five years. Is not the bounty referred to confined to French bottoms?”

“Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

“Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the bounty could only be obtained by the vessels being built in France.

“Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If they were built here and sold to France a sum would be obtained, but a smaller one.

“Mr. MACKENZIE. About one-third.

“Mr. DESJARDINS. Besides the bounty given on ships built in France, there is another bounty granted to ships running under the French flag. For instance: If there were four steamers of 2,500 tons each, the bounty of construction would be \$128,000, while the bounty for navigation would, supposing there was a fortnightly service, reach \$101,000 or 505,000 francs besides.”

That is they would obtain \$229,000 from France and \$50,000 from this country. This would be a very excellent and profitable arrangement, no doubt, for the company, but in what way will it profit this country? What particular trade or business do the Government expect to benefit by subsidising these lines? Because it is well known that a Canadian line of steamers would not obtain these profits which the hon. Minister and his supporters said it was one of the objects of the Government to secure. We are bound to assume the Government are dealing in this matter as a private corporation would deal with their own money; we are bound to assume that the Government are acting in the interests of the people, but we have the right to know what particular interest or interests are to be benefited. Surely the Minister must have some idea upon this question. We cannot assume that there are certain supporters of the Government interested in a particular line of steamers who are expected to be benefited by contributions taken from the public treasury; we cannot suppose the Government are seeking to help their friends and protect them against losses by putting their hands into the public treasury and distributing public money amongst them. What is the interest of this country the Government hope to promote by subsidising this line? Surely they have information on this subject. They must have formed their opinions upon intelligent data, and where is the data upon which those conclusions were reached. That information we are entitled to have and the committee should have it before passing this vote.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised that the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) has taken, upon that question which interests peculiarly the city of Quebec, the position he has just taken. The hon. member must know that there is not only the lumber trade we can do with France. There are, in our country, large mines of phosphate and other mines; there is the cattle trade; there are thousands of articles we can exchange with our old mother country, and I do not understand why the hon. member comes, in this occurrence, and speaks against the interests of the Province of Quebec, and especially against the interests of the city, of which he is proud of being mayor. If he wished to be useful to the city of Quebec, I think that, under the circumstances, he had better remain silent. When he said here that the French company refused to take any freight from Quebec, he has done that city the worst service he could do. He told us that we, from the city of Quebec, did not require the opening of commercial relations with France, and, under a disguised form, he asks the Parliament not to vote the \$50,000 the Government are willing to give to the city of Quebec. It is under such circumstances that the people of Quebec could say: O God, deliver us from our friends, and especially from our mayor! The hon. member mentioned the names of Mr. Auger and Mr. Plamondon as those of whom freight was refused. I do not know whether Mr. Auger and Mr. Plamondon form the whole of the city

of Quebec; I know that it is not very long ago since, if they were not proprietors of the whole city of Quebec, they were, at any rate, proprietors of *L'Electeur*, a paper edited by the brother of the member for Megantic. Since that time, I believe that those familiar and intimate relations have disappeared, and more extensive relations with France are also likely to vanish. I do not know whether it is for the same reason, but, at any rate, I think that the refusal met with by MM. Auger and Plamondon, should not be a reason why we should refuse to the city of Quebec the advantages that the Parliament and the Government particularly are willing to give them. If one bird is not the spring, the proposition not accepted of MM. Auger and Plamondon should not have any influence on the decision of this Parliament, and, notwithstanding the desire shown by the hon. member for Megantic of vindicating the private interests of MM. Auger and Plamondon, I believe that the interests of the city of Quebec ought to be the first. I hope, considering those interests more general, that the House will be disposed to take a note of the words of the hon. member for Megantic, so that they will not forget that, apart from the lumber trade, there are also in the city of Quebec other things with which it is possible to freight a vessel. As I have said before, we have the cattle trade; we have the phosphates; we have also the products of various mines, and in all those things, there is enough not only to freight one vessel, but a great number of vessels, for France. For those reasons, I hope that the Minister of Customs will be disposed to defer the *quasi*-threat, so to speak, he made to us of not giving that subvention, and that he will give to the Province and the city of Quebec the advantages the Government are willing to give them, advantages that the hon. member for Megantic would deny them.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have in my hands a paper published in the city of Quebec, *L'Evénement*, a ministerial paper, and in it I find the following leading article. It is headed "Why?"

"We desire to call the attention of the Government to a fact which seems to be most singular. It is known that the Government have granted a considerable subsidy to the new line of steamers plying between Havre and Montreal. Our despatches from the latter city inform us that the *Ulunda*, the first steamer that has gone up the St. Lawrence, has left that city with scarcely 100 tons of freight. The despatch adds that the agents of the company, Carbray & Routh, were in hopes that the cargo of the *Ulunda* could be completed at Halifax. One thing that surprises us enormously is this: We are just informed that Auger & Plamondon, lumber merchants of this city, who have made considerable sales in France, and who were relying on that line to send their lumber goods to France, have been informed that the steamers of that company would not stop at Quebec to take any portion of their cargo. We do not understand why Quebec should be deprived of the advantage which that line is calculated to afford to our merchants who have any business transactions with France."

That line if subsidised by the Government, one of its steamers leaves Montreal without obtaining a complete cargo, a firm at Quebec offered to complete the cargo, and the company refused to stop at Quebec.

Mr. MITCHELL. What was the price of freight named? For the whole thing turns on the price.

Mr. BOWELL. What is the date of that article.

Mr. LANGELIER. The 3rd of June. Whether the facts are correct or not, I do not know. I take my information from the newspaper article and the correspondence which appeared in the paper, and the statements have never been contradicted. The hon. member for Montmagany (Mr. Landry) said I was complaining that the French line did not stop at Quebec. There is no French line. The two steamers have been built on the Clyde, and they are owned by English shareholders. I do not complain of that, but there is no use calling it a French line. It is a line running between Havre and Montreal, which does not stop at M. LANDRY (Montmagany).

Quebec. I remember, when the *Ulunda* visited Quebec for the first time, that the Captain invited a certain number of newspaper men and prominent citizens to visit her. She was found to be a very fine steamer, quite new, about 2,000 tons burden, and was much praised, and it was expected after the reception she had that she would come back, but she only stopped to change pilots. There is another line to which I have called the attention of the House, the Beaver line, whose steamers do not stop at Quebec, but we have nothing to say against the Beaver line because it is not subsidised, by the Government. When we have a line, however, subsidised to the extent of \$50,000 a year to do service between the port of Quebec and France, and which will not stop to receive cargo at Quebec, we have a right to ask the reason why. The hon. member said the cargo was not suitable. Had the steamer been able to obtain a full cargo or nearly so in Montreal, I could understand that objection; but as she had only 100 tons of cargo and her capacity was 2,000 tons, I am at a loss to understand why she refused to take cargo at Quebec. Other steamers which cannot complete cargo at Montreal, complete with deals at Quebec, and why this subsidised line should not follow a similar course requires explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have only a word to add in explanation to the statement I made. The hon. gentleman has read the correspondence in the newspaper.

Mr. LANGELIER. The editorial.

Mr. MITCHELL. The editorial, in which it is charged that a vessel subsidised by the Dominion of Canada, between Canada and France, refused to take a cargo from Quebec. I suppose the vessel was going from Montreal?

Mr. LANGELIER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. He says they had only 100 tons at Montreal, and they refused to stop and take deals at Quebec. I can quite understand why that is so. My hon. friend says that steamships are at this moment taking deals from Quebec. I know, and I have stated before, that even the Allan steamships—first-class vessels—take a portion of deals when they cannot fill up otherwise, or when they have a heavy cargo of wheat, and as they do not desire to sink their vessels, take a lighter cargo of wood to make up for it. It is very evident to me why this vessel did not take the deals at Quebec. It is probable that the freight was insufficient, probably £2 a standard for carrying deal, and, when you take into account the enormous duties which are imposed at Quebec, owing to the action of the ship-laborers' society, and other extravagant expenses there which they impose upon vessels, I can understand that that would create reluctance to take a cargo at Quebec. No one can make me believe that a business agent, controlling steamships in Liverpool or in Montreal, would allow the ships to go without a cargo or refuse to take paying freight at either Quebec or Montreal or anywhere else. Everyone knows that deals are not freight to make a paying cargo for steamships; everyone knows that a steamship will not take them if she can possibly take anything else. If she has enough to ballast her, it would pay her better to run down a few hundred miles to some other port in order to get a paying freight. I believe the true reason was that the freight offered was not as much as would be remunerative in view of the heavy charges in the port of Quebec. The hon. gentleman says this editorial has never been answered. Is that a reason why this vote should be refused? Because an editorial was written making statements as to the management of the line which have not been answered? There are hundreds of thousands of editorials written which are never answered. I have written several myself which have not been answered. I know that the reason was that most of them could not be answered, but I have written some that could have

been answered. As a business man I say that, considering the offer which was made, I would rather let the ship go empty than go into Quebec and pay the additional insurance, the cost of loading, and the enormous charges which the Union in Quebec has imposed upon ships, which is something iniquitous. I can understand why the owner or the agent of a steamship, who would not refuse to stop and take a cargo which would be remunerative, would refuse to take a portion of his cargo when he did not know that it would pay.

Mr. PAINT. Apart from all this, the cargo was not ready, neither would it have been for several weeks.

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) Will the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) tell me what these gentlemen wished to ship? If I understand aright what has just been said, it was lumber, deals, which it was intended to ship. But I do not understand how Mr. Auger could ship lumber, because he is a notary. Did he have any documents to ship, I wonder? Then, Mr. Plamondon is a tanner. He might ship leather, hides or anything of that kind, but besides that, I do not think that he can be considered as an authority in the lumber trade. I never knew him to buy a board or a deal. For my part, I will tell the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) that if we wish to ship anything to France we can do so. I myself have shipped to France large cargoes, not only of lumber, staves and deals, but I have shipped grain; large quantities of grain may be sent there. But as to notaries or tanners, steamers cannot be sent for them, if they only wish to send a few boards as samples, as they are called in the trade. I do not see why the Government should base their opinion on the report of these gentlemen, one of whom is a notary and the other is in the leather trade. They are probably respectable people in their professions; but we do not know them as merchants at Quebec, and they have never shipped, in the sense of the editorial which the hon. gentleman is trying to use, in order to induce a steamer to call at Quebec. Every day we can stop steamers at Quebec to ship lumber. So that this is no reason why the Government should take notice of that the hon. member for Megantic has just said; and I hope that the Government will not take any heed of it.

Mr. LANGELIER. If the hon. gentleman did not understand the translation that I gave of the article I have just read, I will give it to him in French. It reads as follows:

"We do not understand why Quebec should be deprived of the advantage which that line is calculated to afford to our merchants who have any business transactions with France. That line is subsidised by the Government. One of their steamers leaves Montreal without having been able to obtain a cargo. A Quebec firm offers to contribute towards its cargo, and the Quebec agent refuses. Why is that?"

And the article further states—and I can say that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Valin) is as badly informed on the profession of Messrs. Auger & Plamondon as he is on the facts—the article says:

"We are just informed that Auger & Plamondon, lumber merchants of this city, who have made considerable sales in France, and who were relying on that line to send their lumber goods to France, have been informed that the steamers of that company would not stop at Quebec to take any portion of their cargo."

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) Is it a fact that Messrs. Auger & Plamondon are lumber merchants? How long have they been in that business?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) This shows that the hon. member does not know what is taking place in Quebec. These gentlemen have been in the lumber business in Quebec for seven or eight years. As I said awhile ago, there may be more than one Auger in the world. The hon. member knows a Mr. Auger who is a notary, but there is more than one Mr. Auger in Quebec. There is also a Mr. Auger, who has been in the lumber trade for over twenty years.

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) I can tell the hon. member that there is not one Mr. Auger, nor one Mr. Plamondon, known at Quebec as lumber merchants.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) It is quite possible that the hon. member does not know that; no doubt there are a great many other things that he does not know. But it is a perfectly positive fact that there is a Mr. Auger who is a lumber merchant in Quebec, and has been for several years. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Valin) says that a lumber cargo should not be taken from a party because that party happens to be a notary. Well, has a ship-owner the right to require from those who wish to use his vessel that they should pass an examination? And if he is offered cattle for a cargo, has he a right to say: Hold on a bit; are you a lawyer or a notary or a cattle dealer? The hon. member has not always exercised the same profession; he has been a ship-builder, he has done something else before that, and will probably do something else after.

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) The hon. member will understand that when one abandons a trade, one must be known in a second trade or in a third. But here these gentlemen have never changed their profession, and they will probably exercise it for a long time without carrying on a trade of any kind.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) I shall ask the hon. member for Megantic if he really believes this editorial of *L'Événement*, of which he has just quoted an extract, as evidence, and whether he believes in that evidence? Evidently he cannot.

Mr. STAIRS. Some time ago I had an interview with the agent of the steamship company. I did not pay particular attention to what he said, but, as far as I can remember, I will explain it to the House. He told me that there was no real offer at Quebec at all; the whole thing being contingent upon a sale being made in France. The agents in Quebec were to cable to Havre to see if they could sell these deals so that they could make a fair cargo for the vessel, and I think, as my hon. friend from Northumberland has stated, that the price was to be only 40s. a standard, a very low price. I believe the agent would have taken that if it was a firm offer, but if they kept the steamer there waiting it would not be enough to pay, as there was a very slight probability of getting anything.

Mr. LANGELIER. It would be as good an answer to say that, because it was not paying to get a cargo in Quebec or any other port in Canada, these steamships could go to New York, although they have a subsidy. The subsidy is voted to them as an encouragement, and, if they go to a port simply because they get paying freight, they should not come to our ports at all unless they get a paying freight. Whether the information given is correct or not, it is not in accordance with the information given by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). The information given in the paper is that the agent said he would not take any cargo in Quebec. These are the words of the editorial.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Do you believe that?

Mr. LANGELIER. I have been informed that the steamers of that company would not stop at Quebec to take any portion of their cargo.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman drew inaccurate deductions altogether from the utterance made by my hon. friend from Halifax. What he stated was that there was no *bond fide* offer made to this steamer of any freight, but that they desired the steamer to remain in Quebec until they could ascertain from France whether they could obtain a market for their deals. That was the statement. I do not vouch for the accuracy of it, because I know nothing about it. The hon. gentleman says that, unless

they would do that, they might go to New York with equal propriety, or to any other American port, to get their cargo. There was nothing to warrant that deduction from the language of my hon. friend. On the contrary, if the statement made by the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) be correct, the steamship company had a good reason for not remaining. I asked the committee to allow the vote to stand, in order that I might ascertain what were the facts of the case. Before we go into committee again I will endeavor to ascertain whether the statement made in the paper which has been read is borne out by the facts.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The editorial, as read and translated by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), does not at all convey the meaning given to it by that hon. gentleman. The paper does not say that the ship has refused any cargo at all. They have refused that kind of cargo, and that is all, and that is the meaning of the article.

Mr. LANGELIER. They have refused that particular cargo, and stated in their refusal that they would take none at all. That is the statement in the paper.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the hon. gentleman will also give us the correspondence that took place with France on the subject.

Mr. BOWELL. As far as I can. But I can only reiterate what I have said: If we have accomplished the object which Parliament had in view in granting the subsidy, I cannot see what difference it makes to Canada whether France gave a subsidy or not; but I will, as far as possible, ascertain what the facts are.

Mr. MILLS. We want to know what the trade is to be also.

Item postponed.

For subsidy to line of steamers to run between Liverpool, or London, or both, and St. John, N.B., Halifax, N.S., a port in the Dominion to be the terminal port..... \$25,000

Mr. WELDON. What has been done under that grant?

Mr. BOWELL. This subsidy is paid to the Furniss line of steamers at the rate of \$1,500 a trip. Up to the 1st June eleven trips have been made, and \$16,500 have been paid under the contract. The contract is still continued. I suppose they run either to Liverpool or London, wherever they can get freight.

Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé, and intermediate ports ..... \$12,500

Mr. WELDON. What steamer performs this service?

Mr. BOWELL. The *Admiral*.

Mr. WELDON. I have understood that this steamer does not make connection with the railway from St. John, with the night train that brings western passengers, and that she leaves Dalhousie before the morning train arrives.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed by the Minister of Railways that connection is made at Dalhousie. There may be times when the train is behind, or the vessel may be delayed by stress of weather.

Mr. WELDON. I am informed that she leaves in the morning before the night train from the west arrives, and, consequently the passengers have to remain over.

For steam communication from Port Mulgrave, at the terminus of the Eastern Extension Railway, to East Bay, Cape Breton..... \$6,000

Mr. KIRK. I would like to enquire whether the Government intend to put an additional sum in the Supplementary Estimates to enable this service to be performed during the winter season. It seems that this subsidy, together with an amount nearly equal to that granted by the Local Government of Nova Scotia, enables the steamer to do the work in

Mr. BOWELL.

the summer season only. The steamer that was under contract for the performance of this service in summer ran nearly all the winter between Port Mulgrave and Cape Canso and Arichat. Application has been made for an additional subsidy to enable the steamer to continue the service for another year, and a strong petition has been sent up by the people of those ports for that purpose. I think \$3,000 more would support a boat all the year round, and the traffic that is accumulating on this route would prove very profitable to the vessel.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position now to say whether the Government will add anything to this amount in the Supplementary Estimates. I have made a note of it, however.

To provide for subsidy of \$1,500 a voyage, for five voyages, of steamers from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain, or a continental port..... \$7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that taken advantage of during the past year?

Mr. BOWELL. No; not for the past two years.

Mr. WELDON. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the service being performed there now. A gentleman has started a vessel running from Miramichi to Liverpool and calling at Charlottetown. He has performed one satisfactory trip both ways, affording great accommodation both to Miramichi and Charlottetown. She is now on her second trip. I hope some arrangement will be made, not only to give an additional subsidy to that vessel, but to furnish a first-class vessel that will perform the service that is needed. I hope, under the circumstances, that not only \$1,500 but an additional subsidy will be granted as they deserve it.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been an application before the Government for two months for the service of which the hon. member for St. John speaks. In expectation of getting this subsidy a vessel has been purchased called the *Clifton*, 2,665 tons, and she is now running between Miramichi, Prince Edward Island and Great Britain, London I believe. She is put on to carry produce, potatoes, oats, cattle, horses and sheep, and fill up with lumber when she cannot get a more remunerative cargo. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the application made, and to endorse the statement of the member for St. John. I hope in the Supplementary Estimates an amount will appear for a service between Charlottetown and Miramichi.

Steam service between Canada and Antwerp..... \$24,000

Mr. VAIL. How many trips have been made?

Mr. BOWELL. The White Cross line received \$2,000 a trip up to 1st June last. Six trips have been made, and \$12,000 paid in accordance to the contract.

Mr. VAIL. At whose instance was the grant made?

Mr. BOWELL. I really cannot say just now.

Mr. VAIL. The fact of the matter is, that this line, as well as the line to Germany, brings out beet-root sugar at 14 shillings a ton, which sugar comes into competition with the West India sugar, and is killing out the West India trade. The vessels carry nothing back from this country. They go to American ports. They call at Halifax on the return trip, and some one runs up to the post office for the letters. Sometimes there is only one letter, and then they sail. They leave nothing in the port. There is nothing to ship by them. I consider the grant is wholly thrown away, and it is merely to encourage beet-root sugar importation, which has the result of driving away the West India trade. I do not think this sum should be voted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any contract been made, and, if so, what are its terms?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a contract, but I am not able to say what its terms are. I will make enquiries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt there is much to be said as to the policy under certain conditions of assisting in developing trade between this country and other countries, where there exists material for carrying on considerable trade. I have very great doubt as to whether many of these grants have not been made without looking very far ahead to see what we could exchange with those countries. The facts which the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) mentioned are rather significant and suggestive. In coming down after certain sums have been paid by the country on these accounts, the Minister should be able to give considerable details as to what trade is going on. The hon. member for Digby has stated that there is practically no export trade from Canada either to Antwerp or Germany. The Minister of Customs will be able to inform us on that head, whether considerable quantities of our goods have been shipped by those lines. To merely bring over at very low rates a considerable quantity of beet-root sugar is a service which can be performed at less cost than the amount of this vote.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be possible—I am not prepared to say that the hon. member for Digby has not made a correct statement—that the vessels bring out beet-root sugar. The committee will remember that the principal object the Government and the House had in view when they placed that item in the Estimates, and also the item respecting communication with Germany, was in order to secure German immigration to this country, knowing, as they did, that the vessels coming from Antwerp and German ports to the United States carried immigrants to that country. It was believed that by giving a subsidy to these steamship lines and compelling them to land at a Canadian port the result would be that a large portion of the German immigration would be induced to come to Canada.

Mr. VAIL. Has that hope been realised?

Mr. BOWELL. To a considerable extent.

Mr. VAIL. Will the Minister of Agriculture tell us how many immigrants were brought out by this line?

Mr. POPE. Not a very large number. The steamers have been very unfortunate. The company have lost two or three steamers.

Mr. VAIL. Not this line.

Mr. POPE. Yes; if it is the line I think it is, from Montreal to Antwerp, of which Mr. Munderloch is agent. Several immigrants have come out. Most of them have settled in this section of the country, and many have gone west to the Pacific. Quite a large number of Belgians have settled in Quebec.

Mr. VAIL. Very few immigrants have settled in Nova Scotia during last year, probably a dozen, but I do not think any considerable number came by that line, and really the only object there can be in subsidising this line would seem to be to bring in sugar into this country to compete with the West India sugar.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the importation of beet-root sugar would injure the West India sugar trade. If it had that effect I do not think it would be wise to encourage its importation, but the hon. gentleman must recollect that it is absolutely necessary for our refiners to have the same class of sugar that is used in the Scotch refineries, and if we shut out a certain proportion

of this beet-root sugar it would do the West India trade very much harm. There would be less sugar refined in the Dominion altogether, because the low grade Scotch sugars, which are made to a large extent out of this beet-root sugar, would compete so closely with our own refiners that they would not be able to compete with it. It is quite certain that our refineries in the Dominion are using a far larger proportion of cane sugar than is used in Scotland, and they want a certain proportion of the beet-root sugar, which is a hard, crystallised sugar, to mix with the cane sugar. I do not think it would be to the interest of our refiners, or to the interest of the West India trade, which we all wish to see prosper, and especially the Maritime Provinces, that this small proportion of beet-root sugar should be shut out.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not a question of shutting out beet-root sugar, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, but whether we shall provide free freights for beet-root sugar, as against the regular freights which are paid on the West India sugar.

Mr. STAIRS. I was not speaking of the question of subsidies at all, which is another question, but I was answering the argument of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail). He argued that it would be to the disadvantage of the West India trade to allow a certain proportion of this beet-root sugar to come in. I was trying to point out that was not the case.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think the hon. gentleman has looked at the statistics of the West India trade, otherwise he would have seen that the encouragement of the importation of this beet-root sugar has had the effect, within the last six months of the last year, of bringing in seven times as much from foreign countries as we imported before, while that imported from the West Indies has been about 28 per cent. of that which was imported for the previous six months. If subsidising vessels to bring in beet-root sugar will have that effect on the West India trade, which is the most important trade that Halifax has, or can have, the hon. gentleman must see that although it might benefit one or two refiners it must ultimately injure our trade with the West Indies.

Mr. STAIRS. I will admit, for the sake of argument, that seven times as much beet-root sugar came in during those six months as came in for the corresponding period of the previous year, but that does not prove that it injured the West India trade; because he will find that if he shut out that sugar the sugar would not be refined in the Dominion. I say, if you shut it out it will be impossible for our refiners to compete with the Greenock sugar, and instead of the sugar coming in from the West Indies it would come in as refined or cheap yellow sugar.

Mr. BLAKE. There is where the hon. gentleman begs the question, as he did in answer to my interjection. He seems to think that the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) is proposing that beet-root sugar should be shut out in some way or other. My hon. friend does not propose that, but he says if you subsidise a steamer trading from a port which enables it to import beet-root sugar free, if you practically give free freight for beet-root sugar, while West India sugar has to be imported in vessels which have to find paying freights, you are producing unfair competition between the two. Put them both on the same footing, and if it is necessary to import beet-root sugar, import it at a proper freight, as you do with the other. But you are giving an undue advantage to the one, because you are practically importing beet-root sugar free while the other has to pay a freight.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not think I was begging the question. I was replying fairly, I think, to the argument of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), whose line of argument was

not the same as that of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. As to the advisability of these subsidies, that is one question, and I am prepared to defend them from another standpoint altogether. But I was not speaking of that question at all.

Mr. VAIL. It is plain, as the leader of the Opposition has stated, that if you subsidise steamers to bring beet-root sugar here, and you do not do the same for West India sugar, you are certainly giving a great advantage to the one over the other, in the matter of competition. Under the present system I understand you can import beet-root sugar, which has 96 per cent. of saccharine matter in it, and land it at Halifax at \$3.90 per 100 pounds, whereas it costs \$4.25 to import it from Demerara, which is at a little less distance away than Germany. And when you consider that Demerara sugar has only 85 or 86 per cent. of saccharine matter, and beet-root sugar has 96, it makes a difference in that respect alone of something like \$1 per hundred. The hon. gentleman will see that this is bringing beet-root sugar into very close competition with the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we want to see is, whether we are getting value for our money in these subsidies. Now this subsidy to Antwerp and the subsidy to Germany must be taken together, and we ought to have from one Minister or another some details of the trade which has been developed. In the first instance, when you create a trade, as the Minister of Customs recently said, a good deal must be taken on trust, but after the steamers have been employed a certain number of months or years we ought to receive full details of what has been done, what sort of trade is in process of being developed; and as to that we have not received any information as yet, except from the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail).

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman disputed the point I made, that one or two of these steamers have been lost. The steamers which were put on were understood not to make more than six or seven trips the first year. I think it was the second year or the last of the first year that two of these steamers were lost, which has had the effect of disarranging things. The object, of course, was to encourage the trade, and a better man or a more painstaking man than this gentleman could not have been found in the country. He has been of great assistance in bringing immigrants from Antwerp, from which a great deal of the German immigration comes.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has been asking to what extent German immigrants have availed themselves of this line of steamers, and the Minister was not able to give the House any information on this subject. The hon. gentleman comes down again and asks us to vote \$24,000 to subsidise this line. We ask what the steamers are doing for the money, how far they have succeeded in securing immigration to this country, and the hon. gentleman has not given any information at all. On the contrary, he said it was a line of steamers that had been singularly unfortunate—that had lost two of its steamers. Several hon. gentlemen said the steamers lost did not belong to this line at all.

Mr. POPE. They did.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. Minister of Customs was asked what the terms of the contract with this line of steamers were, and he said he was unable to give the House that information. So that we have the Ministers coming down and asking for this subsidy without stating what the terms of the contract are or what advantages the country has secured from this contract during the past 12 months.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has a very happy faculty of putting words in people's mouths which they

Mr. STAIRS.

never uttered. He said I was unable to state to the committee what the terms of the contract were. I read the terms of the contract, and I informed the committee how many trips had been made and how much money had been paid.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman said he had not them.

Mr. BOWELL. I said I had not the conditions of the contract, but I gave the terms of the contract, so far as the money subsidy is concerned, and stated that the reason for subsidising both of these lines was for the purpose of encouraging German immigration.

Mr. VAIL. I find, on looking at the returns of the Minister of Agriculture, that the total number of immigrants who arrived at Halifax during the past year was 5,604.

Mr. POPE. They come to Montreal.

Mr. VAIL. These steamers are to run from Halifax, and they go to United States ports and load there, and call back at Halifax.

Mr. POPE. That is in winter; they come to Montreal in summer.

Mr. VAIL. The nationalities of the immigrants I find to be: English, 4,097; Scotch, 197; Irish, 697; and other countries, 608.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Customs, of course, told us how much money was paid and how many trips were made, but the question is much wider than that: we want to know what advantage is derived from this subsidy. When we are told that the object is to encourage immigration—

Mr. POPE. And trade.

Mr. BLAKE. But the main object was to encourage immigration. A little while ago, when we were at the trade, it was immigrants; now, when we get to the immigrants it is trade. What I have to say is, that we ought to know what has been done in the way of encouraging trade, so far as that was the object, and what has been done in the way of obtaining immigration, so far as that was the object; and when the Government, after having asked for these votes, as speculative votes, and having got the money, come down and ask us to renew them, we are entitled to know in detail what the result of the experiment has been. That is information we ought to have; but here we are, in the sixth month of the Session, in Supply, and hon. Ministers are not yet in a position to give information on which these Estimates can be intelligently disposed of by the committee. My hon. friend asks me to read these remarks of the Minister of Finance last year:

"This is an arrangement made with a line of steamers to sail between Antwerp and Canada, once a month, \$2,000 for the round trip. The company made five or six trips last summer."

That was in the summer of 1883; they have been doing business, I presume, during the summer of 1884, and now we have come to the third year:

"The object of granting the money is to encourage, if possible, German immigration."

The Minister of Finance did not say trade. If it had been the Minister of Immigration, I suppose he would have said trade.

Mr. POPE. I say both.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman does not take care, he will fall between the two stools, and get lost, like those steamers:

"We provide that the vessels shall be of certain size and speed and have accommodation for steerage passengers. The arrangement made with respect to the Hamburg service is that they shall perform not less than ten trips during the year. One of the steamers was lost on the way, having some passengers on board."

If the hon. gentleman would only arrange that the rest of the steamers should be lost, perhaps we should get rid of the subsidy.

Mr. VAIL. The German immigration to Montreal and Quebec does not seem to be very great. I see that during the past year none at all arrived at the port of Quebec from Germany or Norway, and in the arrivals and departures at Montreal the number of Germans is put down at 53.

Mr. MILLS. So that the result of this expenditure of \$48,000 for these two lines is, at most, to secure less than 700 people from Germany, although we know that the larger number of Germans and Norwegians who come to this country come by way of Liverpool, and not by these lines of steamers.

For steam communication between Canada and Germany ..... \$24,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What port of Germany does this line sail to?

Mr. POPE. I have nothing to do with it.

Mr. MILLS. This was to promote immigration, and surely the Minister ought to know what port the vessels sail to.

Mr. POPE. I explained the other, which I happened to know by chance.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the Minister will tell us what Minister we are to apply to.

Mr. POPE. The Minister of Finance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will cable to ascertain.

Mr. POPE. I will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the item had better stand until you get your reply.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman had better consult the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) on this subject. He is the only man in the House who knows anything about those questions.

Maintenance of Government steamers..... \$130,000

Mr. McLELAN. The steamers *Sir James Douglas*, British Columbia \$15,000 estimated for her repairs. Not expected to be anything more than the ordinary wear and tear. No special repairs, except a new screw and probably a shaft. The *Napoleon*, \$26,000; the *Druid*, \$20,000; the *Newfield*, extensive repairs and new boiler, \$26,000, maintenance and repairs. A portion of the repairs have been paid out of 18-4-85. This year the *Newfield* has earned nearly enough to pay for her repairs by salvage in assisting other steamers. The *Northern Light*, estimated \$20,000, not very large repairs, but the ordinary expenses of running, from \$18,000 to \$20,000 last year. The repairs amounted to something like \$20,000 last year; she will not require any special repairs. *Lansdowne*, \$22,000, estimated for the running expenses. Total, \$130,000.

Mr. WELDON. What is the total cost of the *Lansdowne*?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the figures, but it borders on \$55,000 to \$65,000.

Mr. MILLS. Where are those different steamers engaged?

Mr. McLELAN. The *Sir James Douglas* on the Pacific coast; the *Napoleon* and *Druid* in the Gulf; the *Newfield* about the northern part of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; the *Lansdowne* intended to be employed in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. WELDON. Has any attempt been made to increase the speed of the *Lansdowne*?

Mr. McLELAN. The engineer recommended a new screw, but it has been found, on later trial, that when submerged more at the stern she does better.

Mr. BLAKE. That does not include any of the original cost of the *Lansdowne*?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this amount for the *Northern Light* include what is necessary to make her fit for service during the approaching winter?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it embrace any portion of the ice boat service?

Mr. McLELAN. No; nothing further for the ice service, but only for the running of the *Northern Light*. She was specially repaired last year out of the expenses 1884-85, and this year she does not require heavy repairs.

Mr. BLAKE. What expected repairs belong to the vote of this year?

Mr. McLELAN. \$20,000 was put down for maintenance. We keep the engineer on all the year round. We have to take the engine apart and make the ordinary repairs. Almost every season some considerable part of the machinery has to go to the foundry and workshops to be put in order. From \$2,000 to \$6,000 is the ordinary repairs during the year.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any intention to propose another vote for another steamer for that communication?

Mr. McLELAN. We have had enquiries made as to the best means of crossing at the cape. We have had a man engaged in examining the service there. He spent some weeks while the boats were crossing, and took observations, and he will visit the place shortly, so as to have observations in summer and winter. On receiving the results of his observations we will decide what action to take.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this some one who is familiar with the locality?

Mr. McLELAN. He was with the *Northern Light* one winter, and he crossed a number of times on the ice at the cape.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope, after the experience of this year, better arrangements will be made in connection with the winter crossing. I think it has been made very plain that the arrangements are not such as they ought to be, as to the shelter and the accommodation and the supplies. I think that ought to demand the attention of the Minister.

Mr. McLELAN. It is intended to improve the system of crossing. The matter has been placed under the charge of my Department. Before it was managed by a contract from the Post Office Department, and private individuals had the matter under their control. The system was much in want of some controlling head, and it was decided to place it under my Department, in connection with the *Northern Light*, as the officials in that Department were more likely to be familiar with that service. We hope that, by next season, we will have the service better attended to.

Mr. VAIL. I am told that the *Lansdowne* is even slower than the *Glendon*. I did not think it was possible that any steamer could be slower than the *Glendon*. I hope it is not the case, for she has cost a great deal of money. If the engines are too small for the hull, a great mistake has been made.

Mr. McLELAN. When they learned the trim of the vessel, the screw had a better hold of the water, and I think she averaged from 7½ to 8½ knots an hour. That is not a very great speed for a steamer, but the *Lansdowne* was not

intended for a fast boat. After the plans were made, it was thought better that she should be built for ice service, and before she was launched she was sheathed with a covering, which decreases her speed about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  knots an hour. I am told by engineers that, by changing the screw, that will be to a great extent, remedied.

Mr. BLAKE. Was there anything in the contract as to speed?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I understood from the Minister that \$26,000 was to be expended on the steamer *Sir James Douglas*

Mr. McLELAN. No; we estimate \$15,000 for this year for the *Douglas*.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). For repairs?

Mr. McLELAN. No; for the maintenance of the vessel and for any repairs that may be needed. She will require a new screw and a new shaft.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). The speed of the vessel is very much under what it ought to be at that cost.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this include the *Canadienne*?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. What is her armament?

Mr. McLELAN. Two or four, I am not sure which.

Mr. WELDON. She was used as a ram last fall; she ran down a vessel in Gaspé Bay.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. We should like to have some information as to the expenditure of the money voted last year, and some intimation that this was not an issue whereby some advantage to the commercial and mercantile interests of the country were united.

Mr. McLELAN. Since 1883 we have had the examination of masters and mates on our coasting and inland service. A number of men have been examined and certificates issued in the last two years, and I think the service has been greatly improved in this way.

Mr. PLATT. Is the Minister aware that the law has been disregarded in many cases, as to the production of certificates at the different ports?

Mr. McLELAN. That must be the fault of the collectors of Customs, in not asking for the certificates. I know that many vessels have been held by the collectors because the master or mate had not got his certificate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This vote is \$500 more than it appears to be, because, on the next page I find that \$500 is entered for John Taylor, with a note, "previously paid out of vote, examination of masters and mates, as he also acts as clerk to the chairman of the board."

Mr. LANGELIER. Is any portion of that sum used for the schools of navigation that used to exist at Quebec, Halifax and St. John?

Mr. McLELAN. In the city of Quebec we have been paying a man there who taught the school, and we have appointed him examiner of masters and mates. In that way he has been enabled to maintain the school, and has given a good deal of assistance to those who are desirous of obtaining certificates of masters and mates. But at St. John and Halifax there is no sum given to any of the teachers of the schools of navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about that \$500?  
Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. McLELAN. We cannot exactly fix the amount, because it depends something on the travelling fees of the examiners of masters and mates, and we did not reduce that \$500, not knowing what their travelling expenses might be this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was spent last year?

Mr. McLELAN. \$5,580, and the fees were \$2,000.

Mr. BOWELL. My recollection of the duties of collectors of Customs is that, as a rule, when the captains and mates upon vessels land at their ports, perhaps once a year, and they have ascertained that they are duly licensed to perform their duties, they are not in the habit of troubling them afterwards. However, as the hon. gentleman has called attention to it, I will make enquiries, and see whether that duty has been neglected to the extent the hon. gentleman mentioned. It must always be borne in mind that the inspectors of these boats, before they are permitted to run in the spring, satisfy themselves that the captains and mates who are to manage the boats are properly certificated. If they are not, they will not grant them the permit or allow the vessel to run at all. It may be that the collectors, knowing that to be the duty of the inspectors, may not have been as rigid as they were formerly in asking for this certificate.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria.) It has not unfrequently happened in Victoria that the mate of a vessel may possess a master's certificate for an inland coasting vessel, and the captain of the boat is an American citizen, having no certificate at all. The mate goes to the Custom house and clears the vessel; then, even before the hawser is let go, up jumps the Yankee skipper and takes charge of the vessel right in our own waters. I would like to see that put a stop to. I have seen that myself several times from the docks of the Hudson Bay Company's wharves.

Mr. McLELAN. We will have that attended to.

For purchase of life-boats, stations and life-preservers, maintenance of crews and rewards for saving life.....	\$8,000
---	---------

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just remark to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that on the coast of Lake Huron, which he knows is extremely exposed, there have been of late some demands, I believe, submitted to him for the establishment of one or more additional life boat stations. The trade of Lake Huron is very considerable and increasing, and it is hard to imagine a coast upon which there is more danger than that, when there is a severe gale from the south or south-west, or even from the north-west. Several points have been named—has the hon. gentleman come to any decision as to the desirability of establishing an additional life-boat station on Lake Huron?

Mr. McLELAN. From information that I have received, applications that have been made to the Department, I have felt that one might be established at Collingwood. It is contracted for and is being built. I propose to station one at Collingwood, one at Pelee Island, one at Cobourg, one at Goderich, one at Fort Stanley and one at Toronto. Toronto has been a station for life-boats before, but the the boat was not very good, and it was proposed to put one of the more modern boats at Toronto. I have adopted the plan of appointing a captain and paying him something for taking charge of the boat, and he selects the crew. These men are to practice once a fortnight, and at the end of the season we pay them for the number of times they have practised.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Minister any life-saving station at Long Point, upon Lake Erie, which is the most

exposed portion of the whole coast? More wrecks occur there than at any other point upon Lake Erie, or, in fact, upon any of the upper lakes.

Mr. DAWSON. There are several points on Lake Huron a little farther west where it was contemplated to have life-saving boats. The shipping is increasing very largely on the western lakes, and I think there are other points farther west than Collingwood where it is very desirable to have something of the kind.

Mr. McLELAN. I know there are a number of other applications. I am having them considered, and we will probably have a few more boats constructed when this contract is terminated, and it has proved satisfactory.

Mr. McNEILL. There is a great need for life-saving appliances farther west than the points mentioned by the hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not with me a list of the points that have been named, but only those that we are considering now.

Mr. CHARLTON. If any station is to be placed on the north shore of Lake Erie, certainly there should be one at Long Point, Port Stanley, which the Minister mentioned, is by no means as exposed as the coast along Long Point.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I would impress upon the Minister the necessity of establishing a life-boat service at Burlington Beach, near the Burlington Bay Canal. There have been several wrecks there and a number of lives lost within a few years. Certainly it is most desirable that there should be some service of that kind established.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I desire to enquire of the Minister whether the Government have decided to give a fitting reward to Mr. Joseph Vincent, a brave man, in recognition of saving numerous lives from drowning.

Mr. McLELAN. The matter has been under the consideration of the Department, it having been brought to our notice that this man has saved between thirty and forty people from drowning in and about the harbor of Montreal. It certainly is a case deserving of some testimonial from the Government, and a testimonial is in course of preparation.

Mr. PLATT. As regards the location of the life-saving stations, the Minister has told us that it is a very difficult matter to decide on the exact location on a long line of coast with many dangerous points. But there are stations at points within fifteen miles of which there has not been a wreck for ten or fifteen years. Hon. members who point out dangerous places will not be likely to get life-boats placed at them. I cannot understand why the very simple method is not adopted of asking master mariners to give their opinion. The Minister has the names of all certificated masters and mates for our inland waters, and he might easily issue circulars, asking them to state what points were most in need of life-saving stations, and it should be understood that their answers will rule the Department. It is true that in one case they were asked as to the location for a life-saving station. But their recommendation was not followed, and it was placed where the mariners said it would be no use. It is all very well to send a marine engineer to report. But neither the Department nor Parliament know anything about such matters, compared with the knowledge possessed by the mariners. Their advice and direction should be satisfactory in every case. Unless our life-boats or life-saving stations are more efficiently maintained in the future than in the past, it is not worth while for the Government to spend much money in increasing the number. It would be better to increase the efficiency of those already in existence. I see by a return which was brought down at the close of last Session, asking for the location of all the life-boats in Canada and a descrip-

tion of the boats and other particulars, that a very meagre statement is furnished. A single page contains the whole report of the life-saving service of this country, which costs \$8,000 a year. There were only 8 life-boats last year on our extended and dangerous coast. The crews amount to very little; there are no articles of enlistment; there is a captain, who is paid a small salary for taking care of the boat. He has to select a crew and practice twice a month. He gets a crew together—anybody he can. If the Minister will look at the accounts he will find he has not paid the same crew twice, but that there was a different set of men every time. There is no instruction given to the crew, for there are no teachers. They draw their pay; but, as I have said, there is no instructor and no prescribed system of drill for them to pursue while on the water. In Prince Edward county we have two excellent boats; but we have the captains and boats, and they are all. The locations are not the best, and sometimes the boats are not available. In case of a disaster occurring near the station volunteer crews have to be depended on, and I believe they are not able to get out the boat in anything like a respectable length of time. One of the boats is no less than one or two miles from the shore. When it was necessary to get it out last fall a man's team was taken from the field, against his earnest protests, and after several hours the boat was dragged to the shore on sleds. The captain was not so much to blame, for he had no crew to call upon. No man need join him unless he chooses. On that occasion only four of the crew selected by the captain got into the boat, after all. If there were a few stations really efficient, where crews were stationed, and had efficient instruction and obtained some idea of what drill or practice should be, that would be of some use. To expend the present amount, without speaking of a larger sum, will be throwing money away, if the service continues of the present character. If there were one good station, entirely efficient, which would form the model for other stations and give spirit to the service, other crews would take pride in becoming efficient. We have, however, no regular crews. The character of the boats is perhaps all that can be desired in boats costing the sum expended. I should like the Minister to state where the boats ordered are being constructed.

Mr. McLELAN. It is true we have not had many stations at which captains and crews were appointed and were kept in practice. I think the hon. gentleman in his own county has the first and only ones, with the exception of one appointed a few weeks ago. The life-boats referred to in the list by the hon. gentleman are old metallic life-boats.

Mr. PLAIT. It included the surf-boats.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; and yours too. The places of the station where certain boats should be found were stated. In case they were called for, crews could be gathered together and go out. In consequence of this system, and of the boats not being in charge of anyone, they were neglected, and when called for were very often unfit to use. I have been trying this other plan. I purchased from Buffalo two of the most improved boats of the present day. They were placed in the hon. gentleman's own county. I had the captain of the life-boat service of the lakes of the United States, Captain Dobbin, come and examine the location and points at which the boats were to be placed. Captain Dobbin decided that the point referred to by the hon. gentleman was the best point for the boat, because the roads led to different places; and the boats are on carriages, and can be dragged by teams. Sometimes you have to go to the windward of where the wreck is, in order to be carried within reach of the wreck. Captain Dobbin, who has had very long experience in the life-saving services on the lakes in the United States, has said that that was a proper place to locate the boat, and he also

approved of the location of one at Wellington. At Wellington the boat-house is built, and at Poplar Point the boat-house was rented for a time, but the matter came up this spring, and I have directed that a boat-house should be provided there.

Mr. PLATT. On the lake shore side or the bay side ?

Mr. McLELAN. I think on the same point where Capt. Dobbin had it located. I have twelve of these boats building, six for the Maritime Provinces and six for the lakes. These others are being built on the same patterns, but they are not so costly as those we imported. I propose to put them in charge of a captain, making him responsible for the care of the boat and the training of the crew, and we will see that he performs those duties.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) that this \$8,000 is practically wasted. I think it is a small sum to put against the value of even one life saved, if it were saved in one year or five years ; and I think it is to be regretted that the sum is not larger, and that more life-saving stations are not to be established. I am glad the hon. Minister has decided to place one at Owen Sound, and I think that with the increasing trade which is going on on Georgian Bay there should be more. When the *Jane Ward* was lost at Collingwood, some thirteen lives were in imminent danger, close to the shore, but as there was no life-saving station there the people who were looking on from the shore were helpless ; whereas, if they had had a boat and a captain they could have had a voluntary crew, who would have gone to the wreck and perhaps have saved these lives, but they were lost because there were no appliances to save them. I think the Minister, instead of asking for \$8,000, should have asked for a much larger sum, for the establishment of more of these stations. I think one should have been established between Meaford and Owen Sound, and also one or two on Manitoulin Island, where there have been some disastrous wrecks the last few years, and almost every one of them within a short distance of the shore. The sailing there is peculiarly dangerous, and in many cases had there been life-saving appliances there is no doubt a number of lives could have been saved. I think there is no difficulty in ascertaining at what points it is most desirable to place these stations, for it is only necessary to look at the records of where these wrecks have taken place in order to ascertain the most important points to place them. I agree with the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), with reference to having trained men to man these boats ; but even if that were not done, and a boat and a captain were supplied at the proper places, I have no doubt they would be very serviceable in saving many lives, which otherwise would be lost.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. gentleman must have failed to comprehend my remarks if he thinks I complain that the amount is too large. It is not the amount, but the character of the expenditure, that I complain of.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the money was practically wasted.

Mr. PLATT. That might be the case if \$100,000 instead of \$8,000 were spent, if the service was inefficient. I believe that the money has been too much scattered, and that we should have had a life-saving station which would serve as a school of training for the crews of other stations. We have eight or ten stations, and we are about to establish some ten or twelve more by this same expenditure, and for that number of stations \$8,000 is not sufficient to carry them on successfully or efficiently. With reference to the location of life-boat stations in my own county, I cannot possibly see, nor can any of the sailors in that part of the country see, why the life boat should be placed on the bay

Mr. McLELAN.

side, where by no possibility can wrecks occur, and from which the boat could not be taken to the lake shore, except by carrying it on a wagon. I could not see why it should have been placed where it is, unless for the convenience of the captain. The station at Wellington is looked upon by the mariners on that coast as being an out-of-the-way place, but as the life-boat house has been built there, I suppose the station will remain. I would strongly urge the sending one man from each crew in connection with the life-boat service, to the United States for instruction, in order to qualify them as the instructors of the others. These captains are desirous of receiving instruction, but they have received no list of instructions. I have taken the pains, so far as my own county is concerned, to procure books of instructions from the other side, and they have been endeavoring to learn something of the system. But what they complain of most is, that they have no enlisted crew. They may have volunteers to act under them during a season, but they may dislike the first drill, and they cannot be got back. I think the service, as on the other side, should be regulated by law, that the crews should be enlisted, and should be as much under the command of the captain as if they were in military service. At present the captain has no command of them, and when they go out in the boat one is as much a captain as the other. Then there are complaints of the absence of the appliances which should accompany each boat. I believe that there are only three or four life-belts, or life-preservers, as they are commonly called. There is not one for each of the crew, to say nothing of those whom they seek to rescue. There should be at least twelve preservers or belts for each boat. I am glad the Minister is securing the building of these boats on this side of the line, instead of getting them built at Buffalo, and I suppose the boat wagons will likewise be built here. The two wagons which came to my own county were built in Buffalo, the freight was paid by rail to the town of Picton, 12 miles beyond Wellington, although it was known that they were to be stationed there, and they remained for some time drying in the sun, and then it cost \$3 or \$10 to take them back to Wellington. In various ways the service has been so managed that the people now look upon it as of no account. There is no county on the inland lakes where a better crew can be got than in the county of Prince Edward, if they have sufficient encouragement. I have no doubt the suggestions I have given to the Minister, if acted upon, will do something towards infusing some spirit into the life-saving service, and I hope that the Minister will establish one station which will be looked upon as a school, or centre, for the training of other crews. That can never be done until we have an enlisted crew, and some drill instructions sent out to them. They have not even any instruction as to the resuscitation of the apparently drowned ; they know nothing about it. That is one of the first things taught to the enlisted surfmen on the other side ; but here, when a man is rescued, who has been a few minutes in the water, no attempt would be made to resuscitate him. The men feel themselves so helpless that they do not care to remain in the service. With regard to the rewards for saving life, I would like the hon. Minister to state on what principle they are given ; how does he obtain his information as to whether they are deserved or not ?

Mr. McLELAN. Generally, a report is made by the ship that rescues ; then we send an enquiry to the captain of the rescued crew, and taking the two together, we see what has been the nature of the service—whether it has been especially hazardous or not—and regulate our reward according to the risk run, and according to the detention of the ship for the purpose. Sometimes the ship has to lay alongside

of the wreck for 24 hours before it is able to rescue the crew, and in that case, although the captain has not risked his life, he is considered entitled to some reward as well as the person who mans the force to rescue the crew.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to enquire of the Minister if it is a fact that there are no life-belts supplied to the crew of the life-boat service?

Mr. McLELAN. We do provide life-belts. I was surprised to hear that some of the crews were without them, and I will make enquiry in reference to that. The boats are made self-righting and self-baling.

Mr. PLATT. There are life-belts sent to the stations, but there are not sufficient for the crew.

Mr. McLELAN. There should be one for each member of the crew, and some extra for rescued people.

Mr. PLATT. To show the necessity of having persons in command of these boats who understand them, I will mention an instance in which the life-boat at Poplar Point was called upon to capture a vessel that had parted its cable and got out to sea. When the crew returned and got near the shore the boat was half full of water, and they did not know the reason; so they left the boat in the water, and got out themselves, and let it remain in the water all night, and it was hauled out of the water in the morning by a team of horses. This happened simply because they did not know how to regulate the valves at the bottom of the boat. That could not occur if there had been a man there who understood the management of the boat. I think these boats are admirable if they are manned by crews who understand them; but the sailors and fishermen of that coast prefer their own boats, because they understand them, and could do better service in them than with these boats. If these boats were managed by competent men, who understood their business, they could stand any sea on that coast; but the men have not yet learned how to manage them. My question with regard to the rewards for saving life had especial reference to the granting of medals and watches, and the character of the evidence which comes before the Minister as to the men entitled to recognition. No doubt the Department has been played upon, to a certain extent, for the distribution of the rewards has not been conducted, in my opinion, as it should have been. I need only refer to the awarding of watches in two instances which occurred in my own county during the past year, to convince the hon. gentleman that some other system of securing evidence should be adopted than that which now exists. The two instances I refer to, the hon. gentleman will call to mind. I am sure the evidence was purely of an interested character. There was nothing those men had done in the past 20 years to entitle them to recognition above their fellow sailors and fishermen on that coast. The secret was, that those two men were disaffected politicians; they had both been promised light-house positions, and failed to get them, and being supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, they felt themselves entitled to recompense, and in order to keep them to their first love they were rewarded. I do not say these men are not deserving, but I say there are scores who have done as much and perhaps more in saving life, and they will feel that those two men were selected for some particular purpose. If that is the manner in which the public money devoted to rewards for saving life is expended throughout the country, it is worse than thrown away, and might better be applied in some other way. I would be willing to vote almost any amount of money to make our life-saving service what it should be.

Mr. McLELAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that those men, a number of years ago, did save life.

Mr. PLATT. I did not say that.

Mr. McLELAN. Suppose it was several years ago that this occurred, and those men were never rewarded, I do not think the Government were to blame, or I was to blame, in recognising the rescue of life that they effected, because a number of years passed since it occurred. I met one of those men in my visit to his county; I saw his wife, who detailed the circumstances of one case to me, which I think was certainly deserving of recognition by the Government. I had some enquiries made as to another case that was mentioned to me at the time; reports were made to me upon it, and I thought those men were entitled to some recognition for the rescue of life they accomplished some years ago, in order that it might have an influence on the men along the coast generally. They will see that their efforts to rescue lives are not to be passed unheeded and unrecognised by the Government. If nothing else were chargeable against me at the end of my political career, but having rewarded a couple of men who risked their lives to save the lives of others, I will get off very well.

Mr. PLATT. With regard to one case that occurred twenty-five years ago, I think the old man was deserving of recognition and should have been recognised at the time, but in the other instance one man was selected and the rest of the crew overlooked. The rest of the crew regarded it as an insult that they should have been overlooked, because they did not happen to have a grievance against the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. I knew nothing of their politics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many years ago was this instance of gallantry performed?

Mr. McLELAN. I think it was a continuation of instances, dating back twenty-five years and coming down to a few years ago. Some hon. members from Quebec have referred to a case in Montreal, which has been brought to my notice, of a man in the harbor of Montreal who has rescued some thirty or forty lives at various times. The habit has grown upon him of saving lives, and it ought to have some recognition, and the case in the hon. gentleman's county was something similar.

Mr. PLATT. There is just one instance in the whole of his long career where a life was saved, by individual effort. In most instances, 8 or 10 men share the danger and should share the reward. Though the hon. gentleman says he knew nothing about their politics, the impression exists in the neighborhood where these people reside that politics had a great deal to do with it. A few summers ago, at the time the agitation was raised in favor of these two individuals, a young lady at the Bay of Quinté rescued her comrade at the risk of her own life. Her mother applied to the same party who obtained the recognition for these individuals, and the reply, in the first place, was, that her case should be considered with the others. On repeating the request, she was told that he had since learned she was not a very good friend of his at the elections and could not expect any favors. I would suggest to the Minister that that money could be well spent in encouraging the fishermen on the long line of dangerous coast of my county. The life-boat at Poplar Point could be removed if the hon. gentleman would give a bounty of from \$10 to \$15 to whoever would keep a boat of a certain standard always in readiness on the coast, with an additional bounty for every life saved. The coast is not a dangerous one; only one life has been imperilled since the life-boat was stationed there, and in that case the rescue was not effected by life-boat, but by brave fishermen in their own boat.

Mr. BOWELL. I wish to set the hon. gentleman right with reference to the bringing of the life-boats and taking the one to Picton instead of leaving it at Trenton. My hon. friend was not in the country then, and I was acting head of the

Department. Positive orders were given to have the boat left at Trenton, and carried over the railway to its destination; but from some blunder, it was carried to Picton instead. To carry it from Picton to its destination cost nothing from Toronto, as, owing to the generosity of the Grand Trunk Railway, these boats were carried over the whole of this line free.

Mr. WELDON. Where are the boats to be put?

Mr. McLELAN. They have not been finally located yet.

Mr. PLATT. Has any change been made at Sambro Island since a year ago?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not located the boats in the Maritime Provinces yet.

Mr. WELDON. In the case of the loss of the *Amsterdam* on Sable Island, there were serious charges made in American papers against the people on the Island.

Mr. McLELAN. I am placing two improved lights there. I have put a new superintendent, a young, energetic man, who has had a great deal of experience; and I am about putting a telephone wire across the island, about 20 miles, connecting the three stations, so that information may be conveyed from one station to another and all be able to concentrate at one point in case of necessity.

Mr. WELDON. There were letters written complaining of the conduct of the people on the island. Were any complaints made to the Department?

Mr. McLELAN. Two or three men got liquor on board ship.

Investigation into wrecks and collection of information relating to disasters of shipping..... \$1,500

Mr. PLATT. Will the Minister state if his officers were at all to blame for the disaster on the Sambro Island?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not got it here, but I can bring it down to-morrow. I know of no irregularity brought before me, of any officer who was neglecting the working of the Department.

Canadian registration of shipping ..... \$500

Mr. McLELAN. This is for the registration of shipping. The surveyors are paid by fees from the owners of vessels, but the registrars have to keep a set of books.

Mr. WELDON. Did not the Imperial Government furnish the books and forms?

Mr. McLELAN. No; we are called upon now to do that.

Montreal and Quebec water and river police..... \$40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a vote which has gone on increasing steadily for half a dozen years, until it has assumed very respectable proportions. It does not appear to me that there has been any increase in the trade which has caused this large increase, or even this increase of this year. What is proposed to be done with the \$2,000 additional, and, in fact, what is proposed to be done with the whole \$40,000?

Mr. McLELAN. In Montreal there will be some increase by the extension of the service, by which the ground they have to go over and watch is increased; and the offices that we keep at Montreal have been found to be unfit for the health of the occupants, so that we have been obliged to take new premises, and some considerable expense will be incurred in fitting up the new premises; and, with two additional men, the extra sum has to be asked for.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters..... \$2,000

Mr. VAIL. How much of this vote was spent last year?

Mr. McLELAN. \$350.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. VAIL. It seems to me that the vote might be made more useful. I am sure that a good deal more than that could have been spent with advantage to the people. I am afraid that this service does not receive the attention from the Department which it should.

Mr. McLELAN. When there has been a wreck in a harbor or a channel my Department attends to its removal. When it is a natural obstruction, rocks or boulders or anything of that kind, the Department of Public Works attends to it.

Mr. VAIL. I thought the Department of Marine attended to the removal of boulders.

Mr. McLELAN. No; the Minister of Public Works is the boulder man.

Salaries and allowances of lighthouse keepers ..... \$172,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of the increase?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a very considerable increase in the number of lights. We established more than 20 last year; and quite a number of these were not in operation until late in the season; and the full year's salary was not paid last year, but they will be in operation this year, and the amount will be required. Before the close of 1886 a large number will be added to the lights.

Mr. KIRK. Has the Minister a list of those erected last year?

Mr. McLELAN. They are all mentioned in the report. There were about 23 or 24 from the year 1883 to 1884.

Mr. VAIL. Were they mostly in the Maritime Provinces or in the Upper Provinces?

Mr. McLELAN. We are building more westward now. There have been some built in the Lower Provinces.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman promised last year that a light should be put on Goose Island, in Guysboro' county, but I do not think that has been done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the Minister aware that the practice prevails, I do not know how extensively, among the lighthouse keepers, of regularly farming out the work assigned to them? Not a few of the hon. gentleman's employes are in the habit of sub-leasing the work they are bound to do to other parties, and getting the work done at half or two-thirds the salary, as the case may be.

Mr. McLELAN. This matter has been brought to my attention, and the parties have been notified that they must attend to the business themselves or resign, and in all cases the man who receives the appointment must understand that he must perform the duty and not farm it out. It sometimes happens that a man, from illness, asks leave of absence for a few months, and names a party to replace him, and if we ascertain that he is capable of attending to the duties, we give the leave of absence and put that party in charge. But where it comes to our notice that the party has not attended to the duty, we remove him at once.

Mr. KIRK. Is it not customary, where a father is appointed, for instance, as lighthouse keeper, that the son may do the work, and the father not attend to it at all himself? The Minister is aware that that is the custom.

Mr. McLELAN. In many cases the man who is appointed is assisted by his family, but he is supposed to be there as the overseer of the light. Sometimes a man's sons, sometimes his daughters, and sometimes his wife do a great deal of the work connected with the lighthouse; but our inspectors, in making their rounds, always enquire into these matters, and if there is any neglect of duty it is always brought to our notice.

Mr. KIRK. Has it ever been brought to the notice of the Minister that in one case, at any rate, in the county of Guysboro', where the light is on an island, the person who is appointed lives on the mainland, while his son lives on the island and keeps the light?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware of that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have known instances where daughters keep them, and they are much better and cleaner kept.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say the hon. gentleman is right enough, but in cases where it is in the family one does not want to be too critical. But the point I mentioned is totally distinct—that is, the cases of farming out lighthouses, because I have heard of cases in which the work has been seriously neglected. The temptation in those cases is always to take the man who will do it for the smallest sum, and he is very apt to be very indifferent about performing the work.

Mr. PLATT. Sometimes the substitute to whom the keeping of the lighthouse is farmed out may be of service in detecting the appropriation of the Government's supplies. I would like to ask what has become of the complaints that have been made to the Department from the substitute of the lighthouse keeper at Knapp's lighthouse, near Kingston. I have it on good authority that complaints were made by the substitute that the lighthouse keeper was in the habit of appropriating Government supplies to his own use.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not recollect the case to which the hon. gentleman refers. I know we have one or two investigations going on now into charges against lighthouse keepers for misconduct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a matter of notoriety in some parts of the country that the barns and houses of men who are lucky enough to be lighthouse keepers are always painted in the identical colors that the Government supplies for the use of the lighthouses. I suppose their eyes become familiarised with these colors and they find them suitable for their own barns and houses. There is no doubt a good deal of speculation is going on in a small way by some of these lighthouse keepers. My hon. friend was alluding to Knapp's lighthouse. I think I heard something about that, and formal complaints were made to the Department here. The Minister might bring us some information as to what was done. My recollection is, that the report was made to the Department, I think, a couple of years ago, and an investigation was promised, but none took place.

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiries into the case.

Agencies, rents and contingencies in lighthouse and coast service.....	\$20,290
--	----------

Mr. McLELAN. There is an increase of \$2,290. Our building at Charlottetown was burned last year, and we are compelled to rent one. Then there were \$1,721 previously charged to maintenance of lights. These two items make up the difference.

Maintenance and repairs to lights, fog-whistles, buoys and beacons, humane establishments and provision depots.....	\$308,900
---	-----------

Mr. McLELAN. There is an increase in this service. During the last year 22 or 23 new lights have been added. I wish to place automatic fog-horns at points where there are now steam whistles. The expense of the former is much less than the latter, and the change is therefore desirable, as an economical one. The old-fashioned steam whistles take from 200 to 300 tons of coal a year, while the fog-horn can be ran for about 70 tons. I am having twelve or thirteen constructed. It is intended to place them where steam whistles now exist, and to retain the latter. The Americans have duplicates of whistles or horns at their

stations. The cost of an automatic fog horn is \$1,000, exclusive of patentee's fee, cost of transporting and raising them. I have tried gas buoys in the lower St. Lawrence. During my visit to England I made particular enquiries as to them, both at London and Glasgow, and I felt they were desirable on our waters. I imported two and placed them on the St. Lawrence. They are charged with condensed gas, are anchored at certain points, and burn night and day for about three months. Ship owners and mariners are delighted with them, for they enable vessels to be brought up instead of being compelled to anchor all night. If it is found that the rough weather in the fall does not extinguish them, it will be desirable to procure a larger supply.

Mr. KIRK. What is the expense?

Mr. McLELAN. They cost about £700 each. They burn ninety days. They contain gas condensed, and they are supplied at intervals with gas in a condensed form.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will a fog-alarm be placed at the south side of Grand Manan this season?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. In regard to the lightship *Miramichi* and the *Lady Gordon*, I desire to say a word about this particular case. The vessel was going up harbor in charge of a pilot, and damage was done to the lightship. The pilot commissioners entirely exonerated the pilot from blame; but, notwithstanding that, the Department commenced a very expensive suit in the Admiralty Court against the owners of the vessel. The suit has been dismissed. There is a most extraordinary provision in our law, entirely contrary to the English law, making owners responsible when pilots are in charge of vessels. The owner of the vessel is a very active opponent of this Government. He opposed the Minister of Finance at the last election—and that gentleman has been put to heavy expense, although the court not only decided the case in his favor, but said that the Government should pay the costs. And after putting the party to this expense, they should meet the expenses he would be put to. Communication was made to the Minister, but the matter was persisted in, with the result I have stated.

Mr. McLELAN. The pilot commissioners may have, on the trial, given different evidence than what was given to the Department. It was reported to the Department that the ship was in fault entirely, and the owner of the vessel, when applied to, having made no answer, there was no alternative but to call on him as usual to make good the damages.

Mr. WELDON. He stated that he replied both to the legal gentlemen in the case and to the Department, repudiating all liability, but it shows that the Department must not have investigated the subject, because the result is a large amount of costs, when on investigation the decision of the pilot commissioners is sustained by the Vice Admiralty Court.

Mr. PLATT. I wish again to call the attention of the Minister, as I did last year, to a petition received from the mariners of Lake Ontario, as to the necessity for changing the deranged lights at Weller's Bay. The hon. gentleman promised to send engineers there to report, but nothing has been done. They represent that these lights are not in due range with the best channel, that they are too low to be of any real service, and that the buoys are not placed in the proper position. The channel has shifted considerably since these representations were made, and the matter is consequently of greater importance. In consequence of the position of these lights, one or two vessels have been stranded there in the past year. I hope another year will not elapse before the Minister sees that his engineer visits this place.

Mr. BOWELL. Were the lights, as originally placed, correct?

Mr. PLATT. The sailors say not.

Mr. BOWELL. That cannot be, surely. They were placed there by the late Government.

Mr. WELDON. By a change in our Act Canadian vessels are under a liability from which British vessels are free under the Merchants Shipping Act. I understood that our Act was an exact copy of the British Act, but there has been a most radical change, and one which seriously affects Canadian vessels.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman mentioned that matter to me a short time ago, and it is now under consideration.

Cape Race Light .....\$1,300

Mr. McLELAN. I may say, with reference to this item, that a proposition has been made to us by the British Government. There is a tax imposed on all vessels coming to Canada by the British Government, for the light at Cape Race, and from those dues there has been a large accumulation, amounting to something like £13,000 or £14,000 sterling, and they have proposed to us to hand over the maintenance of this light and pay us over a certain sum, which would probably enable us to abolish this tax on our shipping.

Mr. WELDON. What is the cost of keeping it up?

Mr. McLELAN. According to my estimate, it costs the British Government more than we would be able to do it for. I think that \$1,300 and the interest on the sum they offer to give us will maintain the light and allow our shipping to go through free.

Mr. WELDON. Does not foreign shipping pay?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; all north of a certain point.

Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-alarms..... \$40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has not furnished us with the details of this. Generally speaking, a sort of memorandum was placed in our hands, giving us these details.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not had it printed, but I have a memorandum here. I propose to place a light at the entrance of Lake Nipissing, a fog-alarm at Caribou Island, Lake Superior, and another fog-alarm at Thunder Cape. The Americans have placed a fog-alarm on their point, and mariners say that when they pick that up and hold it, if they have another on our point, they can get to Port Arthur, even in foggy weather. There are lights and fog-horns to be put up at various other places, and the balance of the vote is to be applied to lights which have been undertaken. The estimates we have made have been low, and it is necessary to complete the lights which are under way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total number of lighthouses now in operation?

Mr. McLELAN. About 590.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to the Quaco Head lighthouse, which was burned down in 1881, as showing the importance of not changing the site of lighthouses. The effect of changing in this case has been very disastrous. The lighthouse was on a reef opposite the bay, and when it was burned a new one was constructed on the head, where four or five acres of land were purchased at a cost of \$40 an acre. Since then there have been four or five vessels lost. In one case, that of the *A. J. Baxter*, Mr. R. Brown and Heber Brown made two trips to the vessel and rescued a lady passenger and the

Mr. PLATT.

crew, and they are certainly deserving of reward. One is the assistant keeper of the lighthouse, although I do not know but that since then he has been dismissed. The old lighthouse keeper, who was there 28 years, has been dismissed or superannuated, and a man named Charles Brown has been appointed in his place. Last year a large three-masted American schooner struck on the reef. One man escaped and the rest of the crew were lost; and a most unfortunate circumstance was, that the mate and several other men got on the foundation of the old lighthouse, where they remained all night and perished, and where their bodies were found in the morning. There was a great deal of feeling throughout the community about the lighthouse keeper hearing the cries of those men and making no efforts to save them. I think it my duty to call the attention of the Minister to this matter, to show that the change of the site of the lighthouse, instead of being a benefit, has been an injury, causing, not only a great loss of property, but a loss of life.

Mr. McLELAN. I think the hon. gentleman is going a little too far in saying that all that loss of life was in consequence of the change of site, which was made by the the advice of nautical men who visited the place and reported in favor of the change. I think the wreck he refers to took place in a thick snow storm and fog, when it was impossible that any light could be seen.

Mr. DAWSON. There were appropriations made for certain lights upon the great lakes in former years. I suppose these lights will be gone on with by-and-bye. For the Victoria light, the Spanish River light, and some beacons on Lake Superior, appropriations were made two years ago.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not remember the particular ones the hon. gentleman refers to, but all for which appropriations were made are under way.

Mr. DAWSON. Every lighthouse in that part of the country has been placed in the position where it would do the most good. All the lighthouses are admirably placed and admirably managed, and all we want is a good many more of them. I simply call attention to the matter, so that it may not be overlooked.

Mr. WELDON. Since the spring of 1883 there have been no less than four vessels lost at Quaco, and there was never a wreck on that reef before. I do not recollect, from the correspondence that was brought down, that any nautical man examined that site. But there are the facts, that when the light was on the old place there were no wrecks, and probably, if the light had been on the reef when that vessel was wrecked, it might have been seen in time, and 13 or 14 lives might have been saved.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to enquire again about the preparation made some years ago to erect a lighthouse on Goose Island. Last year I was informed the reason why the building was not erected was that there was difficulty experienced in procuring the land on which the officer reported the house would be built. The Minister stated, last year, he intended to expropriate the land and proceed with the building of the house.

Mr. McLELAN. I will get the information and bring it down.

Mr. GILLMOR. Has attention been called to the lighthouse at Culbar? I have some friends there, who told me it was the general impression the lighthouse was not in the proper place. When the house was on the reef the vessels had better warning than now, when it is inside the reef. I have a great deal of confidence in the judgment of Mr. Harding, but really this is a very serious matter, and I would like to know whether it is on his report the house was built inside the reef.

Mr. McLELAN. My recollection is that it was on Mr. Harding's report that the change was made.

Mr. WELDON. With reference to telephonic and telegraphic communication on Sable Island, the hon. gentleman said it would cost about \$100,000. Has he had communication with the American or English Governments, as this is a matter in which these Governments should bear a share? Sable Island is right in the track of vessels bound for the United States and England.

Mr. KIRK. Where is it intended to erect those signal stations?

Mr. McLELAN. To the greatest extent, along the Gulf of St. Lawrence, part of which is along the coast of Nova Scotia.

Mr. PAINT. I would bring to the Minister's attention the pressing necessity there is for a signal station at the Strait of Canso, in connection with the Point Tupper lighthouse. It is only half a mile from where the large steamers pass daily, and it would be a great advantage to report them to their owners or agents.

Mr. KIRK. I corroborate the statement of the hon. gentleman for Richmond (Mr. Paint). In 1882, when we were running our elections, my opponent stated there were \$7,000 in the Estimates for the purpose of erecting signals in Guysboro'. Not one single dollar has been expended. I would ask if these \$7,000 are to be expended in that county?

Fish-breeding, building fishways and clearing rivers..... \$35,000

Mr. WELDON. Can the hon. gentleman tell us anything about the success of the fish-breeding establishments?

Mr. McLELAN. They are treated at length in the reports submitted to the House, and we hear reports every year that they are of much benefit. In reference to the Nepisiquit, a gentleman was here, with whom I had a conversation, and I asked him if he would not put in the form of a letter to me the evidence which he had. I received from him a letter, dated the 8th June, in which he says:

"As evidence of the practical results following the planting of salmon fry, from the Restigouche and Miramichi hatcheries, in the river Nepisiquit, I have the honor to report some facts that have come within my own observation. In the year 1881, after the planting of fry from the Restigouche hatchery, in 1878, in the Nepisiquit there was a larger than usual return of grilse to that river, the majority of which, being larger and very different in form from true Nepisiquit grilse, left no doubt as to their parentage. They were the product of the Restigouche fry planted in 1878. So, in like manner, in 1883, after the planting of fry from the Miramichi hatchery, there was an unusual supply of grilse in the Nepisiquit. Now, except to a close observer, the Miramichi grilse are not very unlike those of the Nepisiquit; the excess in number were due to the planting of fry from the Miramichi, and, as removing any question on this point during the following year, 1884, the fly-fishers upon the river and the net-fishers upon the coast observed a marked distinction in most of the salmon taken, unlike the Nepisiquit salmon, and concur in the opinion that they were Miramichi salmon, and thus the most natural conclusion that these were the products of the planting of the fry from the Miramichi hatchery in the waters of the Nepisiquit, in 1880."

That is sufficient on the point the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. EDGAR. I would ask the Minister whether he has made any attempt to stock the rivers that run into Lake Ontario with salmon. That was done for a time, at any rate, and every year I believe salmon have been running up the stream as far as Newcastle, just as they did up to the streams in former years, the Humber, the Don, and the Credit: they have abandoned those streams on account of the mill dams which have been erected upon them, but they have always been running up to Newcastle, where the hatchery is. I understood that the salmon were to be deposited in a number of streams running into Lake Ontario, but I have not heard or seen whether the result was successful or not. There was another interesting experiment tried, by putting young salmon fry into some of the rivers that run into Lake Huron, to test the question whether it was possible for salmon to exist without

getting to salt water. Certainly, they do exist in Lake Ontario, and some say they go to the salt water, and some say they only go to the deep waters in Lake Ontario. But, at any rate, if they had succeeded in getting the young salmon to return to the rivers where they were spawned, in Lake Huron they would not have had an opportunity of climbing up Niagara Falls on the way back from the sea. Perhaps the Minister will tell us as to the result of the experiment.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information he requires. I was under the impression that there had been no salmon in the Newcastle stream of late years. I understood from Mr. Wilmot, the manager of the Newcastle hatchery, that those salmon, a number of years ago, were very abundant in that stream, but they had now disappeared entirely. He attributed that to the water having become warmer as the country became denuded of its forests.

Mr. TAYLOR. Two years ago I made application to the Department for a supply of salmon fry, and I got ten cans, of which I placed four in an inland lake in which there was no salmon. There is a creek leading out of this lake into another lake, and between the two there is a mill race. At the setting in of cold weather the miller discovered that a large number of them, in passing through the mill race, had been killed by the wheels. They were 4 to 6 inches long. They had been put in in the spring, and this was in the fall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe that the diminution in the number of our fish is due to the habits of the fishermen in destroying the fish during the breeding season. In portions of Lake Ontario I have observed constantly that in spite of the orders of the Department immense quantities of fish about spawning time are seized and taken.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the fisheries in the Georgian Bay and about Cockburn Island are concerned, some complaints were made that the inspectors there were negligent. The close season is not at all observed by the fishermen. I have been told by persons of the highest respectability that they have seen fish taken off the boats of these fishermen by the shovel full. It is notorious that such is the case. If that system of fishing is to go on for any length of time, it will result in the depletion of Lake Huron of its fish, and it will be a great misfortune to the people engaged in that industry.

Mr. McLELAN. I have given a good deal of attention to the close season for fish in the Georgian Bay and the north-western lakes, and this year I have extended the time for about twenty days, as I am satisfied the close season was not long enough, and I hope by that means to avoid the great destruction of fish at the spawning season. It is difficult to regulate or control this matter and to prevent the catch of fish during that season, but with the extension of time and with increased diligence I hope to protect the fish largely during the spawning season.

Mr. DAWSON. The fisheries in Lake Huron are largely within the district which I have the honor to represent, as is also Cockburn Island. I believe the cause of the destruction of fish is, to a considerable degree, due to over fishing. The natives and half-breeds and Indians depend a great deal upon the fish they catch, and suffer a good deal from over fishing by people who come from a distance. There is one system which I think ought to be abolished, and that is the system granting boat licenses. A band of men get a boat license for \$5; they go out at all prohibited seasons and into all places, and they have no interest in preserving the fish, but to catch as many as they can. I think the best system is to grant licenses for certain places for certain areas in which they can fish, because the holder of a license

has an interest in protecting the ground and prevent it from being over fished.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the wish of the fishermen in the Georgian Bay to have their licenses localised; they wish to have boat licenses. Then they had very good fishing grounds, and were fishing among other fishermen. When stormy weather came they got under the shelter of the island, and they fished with much greater advantage than their competitors. At Meaford, Owen Sound, Collingwood, and as far as Penetanguishene, the system of licensing localities has been abolished, and they have licensed only boats. My experience as to the abuse of the fisheries is not that of the member who last spoke. I think the fishermen of the Georgian Bay observe fairly well the regulations, and do not fish in the close season. Many of the abuses, I am told, come from Americans fishing in Georgian Bay and Lake Huron.

Mr. DAWSON. The fishermen have exhausted all the fisheries of the Georgian Bay, and are now going west and depleting the waters of Algoma and depriving people of the means of living. In a few years there will be no fish to dispute about. In Algoma fish is the staff of life with the Indians and half-breeds, and it is to the Indians there the same as buffalo was to the Indians of the plains. Some of the Indians are half starving on account of the lack of fish. The fishermen of Georgian Bay should remain nearer home, and there should be some plan adopted for restraining them.

Mr. SPROULE. That object can be obtained by compelling the fishermen to use a larger mesh for their nets. The present net is too small, and large quantities of small fish are taken. Under the net regulations this evil will be avoided in future.

Mr. LISTER. The information I have with respect to the fishermen having a right to fish in the Georgian Bay and at Cockburn Island is of such a reliable character that I can prove the statements I have made, that those fishermen have thrown from their boats shovels full of the ova of the fish they have caught during the close season. The company to which I refer is a very extensive one, and carries on fishing on a large scale. It has a very large number of men employed, large numbers of boats and steam tugs. They catch thousands of dollars worth of fish every month and carry it to Detroit and other ports, where it finds a ready sale. It is of very little consequence to consumers whether it is caught in the close season or not; but it is of vital consequence to the Indians that the close season should be observed, as otherwise their full supply is destroyed. If one inspector is not sufficient, more inspectors should be appointed; and, at all events, the close season should be rigidly kept and offenders punished. What I have said I am fully prepared to prove.

Mr. DAWSON. The close season was formerly only ten or twelve days. The Department have, very properly, extended it to one month.

Mr. KIRK. The question of protecting river fisheries is one of considerable difficulty. The regulations in Nova Scotia are sufficiently stringent, but it is difficult to have them carried out. It would be cheaper to protect the rivers than to supply them with fry from the hatcheries. Another cause of the decline in the supply of fish is the condition of the streams in some localities. A petition was presented to the Department, asking that a sum of money should be placed in the Estimates to clear the debris from Country Harbor. As regards Indian Harbor, the stream sometimes fills up with sand, and a small amount should be expended annually to keep it free from obstruction. Then, again, there are several streams upon which there are dams, which obstruct the streams and which require fish-

Mr. DAWSON.

ways. There is one to which the Minister's attention has been called several times, and it has been reported upon by the overseer this year as well as last. It is called Fisher's mill dam, and there should be one of the best fish-ways placed in it. I have recommended, on several occasions, that a warden should be appointed at this place. There has been a fish-way there for some time, but it is one of the old kind, and does not suit very well. It is on the east branch of the East River of St. Mary's. I believe salmon do not go through there now, but gaspereaux and trout do, and if a proper fish-way were put in, I have no doubt salmon would also get through.

Mr. EDGAR. With regard to the Newcastle fishery, I have taken a little trouble in looking into the results as regards speckled trout. I find that since 1877 they have been laying down a large number of eggs and hatching out a great quantity of fry—from 50,000 to 200,000 eggs a year, and nearly as many fry are reported as hatched. Now, I cannot find in the reports any statement of the places where these fry or eggs have been distributed, nor can I find anything of the practical results which have been arrived at through all this expenditure. It is a matter which is of great personal interest to many people in this country, and it has also some commercial importance. There appear to be about one million of eggs produced for distribution to about one-half as many fry hatched out, and if any intelligence or care had been exercised in spreading those through the streams of Ontario, instead of having the fish a great deal scarcer every year, we would have found them increasing in quantity. We know that in France and Germany, if a man has a stream or creek on his place, he makes it a source of revenue as well as pleasure, by cultivating and producing trout. They learn how to extract the ova and place them where a little running water will hatch them at a proper time of the year. There is nothing to prevent that being done in Ontario. I believe, as a matter of fact, that the Government do not peddle out eggs or fry, or sell them to individuals. I suppose they distribute them in the streams, free; and, at any rate, I see no returns of money from the sale of them.

Mr. McLELAN. None are sold.

Mr. SPROULE. You could not have searched very far back, or you would have found how they are distributed.

Mr. EDGAR. If they are not sold, I am afraid there is something very much like it going on in Newcastle. I suppose the Department does not allow them to hatch out eggs to be bought by the manager there to hatch and sell. That would be the same thing, and I have some correspondence on that point from two different sources. I have a letter to a friend of mine from Mr. Wilmot, in which, when enquiries are made about getting young fry, he says that he cannot supply them; that the eggs are short, but he will try to get them from other people, at so much a thousand; he will hatch them free, and then they can go and get them. Now, it is an extraordinary thing that in two different years and to two different persons there should be a complaint of such a short supply, because in everyone of those years, from 1877 to 1884, I find that nearly double the quantity of eggs were laid down as the quantity of fry reported. The first letter was in November 1881, in which Mr. Wilmot replies to a gentleman who is establishing a pond which he is anxious to have stocked. It is a very fine one; I have seen it myself.

Mr. BOWELL. Was it brook trout?

Mr. EDGAR. Yes; he writes, in November, 1881:

"If you will let me know at Christmas what numbers you will want, I will be able to tell you what they will cost, as the only amount you will require to pay will be the first cost of the eggs."

Then he says he will hatch them for nothing; but he does not say how much they will cost. Then, in November, 1882, he says:

"I sent off my orders for all eggs asked for some time ago, and I am almost afraid it is too late now. But if you telegraph me what number you want, I will wire the breeders, and know if they can send them out to me yet. Do not delay in this, as one or two days will make a great difference. They will cost you \$5 a thousand, and we will hatch them gratis."

So, at any rate, he is there hatching, at Government expense, eggs for breeders. My correspondent gives me the following account of what subsequently took place:—

"With regard to Wilnot and the fish, his price was \$5 per 1,000, for eggs and hatched fry. I gave an order for 15,000, and after detaining me for six months, he disappointed me, which, in reality, meant a year's loss, when I determined to go to the United States to see Seth Green at Rochester, and while there he offered to furnish me with anything he had free of cost. He says if Wilnot had sent an order for any number, they would have been sent free of cost, too."

That is very extraordinary, when Mr. Wilnot says he had to send \$5 a thousand. The other gentleman received a letter from Mr. Wilnot, dated September, 1884, and he says, in reply to enquiries on the same subject:

"With regard to young fry produced from the ova, we sometimes obtain eggs for private individuals by their supplying us with the funds to purchase the eggs, and then we hatch them out here gratis. The eggs are usually sold by American dealers for from \$1 to \$5 a thousand. If we secure a lot of eggs, as we sometimes do, from the Lower Provinces, the mode of the disposal of the fry from them is through the Minister of Marine at Ottawa. Formal application is necessary."

I think it is extraordinary that the establishment there cannot stock streams free if the Government are maintaining it in that way, and it is still more unfortunate if the means supplied are used only to enable some one else to sell trout ova in the country, when it is certain that an enormous number of ova are produced in the year.

Mr. McLELAN. Not very many of speckled trout; there were only 50,000 last year.

Mr. EDGAR. This year, 1882, there were 200,000.

Mr. McLELAN. I hope the hon. gentleman will give me the names of the parties, because he makes a charge against Mr. Wilnot, and it is necessary that it should be investigated.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes; I will let you have the names at once.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not believe Mr. Wilnot does that for the purpose of making a profit. I know that many of the United States hatcheries charge for their fry and ova. I dare say that if an individual applied to Mr. Seth Green or to some of the State hatcheries, he would get the fry for nothing, but they would not give it as a matter of business. If Mr. Wilnot is able to purchase across the border from parties who are making a business of hatching and selling the fry, for an individual in our own country, who wants to supply a stream or a lake, and if Mr. Wilnot hatched them in the Government hatchery, I do not think he would be doing anything very wrong. All the fish hatched out there are distributed more or less in every county of the Province of Ontario where there are streams which he considers suitable for the fish, and to which there are means of transporting the young fry without injury.

Mr. SPROULE. I have had communication with Americans on the same subject, and I know they are in the habit of selling the ova. A gentleman in Rochester to whom I have written several times has informed me that they could be purchased at the same price the hon. gentleman states, \$5 a thousand. I think he is entirely wrong when he says there is no knowledge of where fish fry are distributed. To my own knowledge, for some years past, they have been distributed in the Georgian Bay.

Mr. EDGAR. I am talking of speckled trout only.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought he had reference to all the fish hatched out at that hatchery. The speckled trout have been very limited. When they have been applied for to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, an order has always been given for them, when they are there, and as far as I

know, in my part of the country, where they have been put into the streams, they have done very well.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it would be a very good thing if the Department, in order to promote the increase of speckled trout throughout the country, would direct the preparation of a little pamphlet of some kind, instructing the people as to their protection, such as allowing shrubs and bushes to grow along the streams. It is well known that many streams become unfit for trout because the temperature of the water, owing to exposure to the sun, becomes too high, and if trees are allowed to grow along the banks they keep the temperature of the water low in summer. If a few instructions of that kind were given, and it were announced that the people could obtain fry, and even if township municipalities were notified that they could have streams stocked, it would be a good thing for the country.

Mr. LISTER. I see that one P. McCarrum and one J. B. Moody are appointed overseers for the north branch of the Sydenham River. I would ask the Minister what licenses have been taken out to fish in that river?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to answer that question; but even in cases where no licenses are taken out, if there be fish in the river it is very necessary to appoint wardens and overseers to protect it.

Mr. LISTER. As a matter of fact, there are no fish in that river of any commercial value. It was only the other day that I received a letter from a friend in my own county, pointing out that to keep Mr. Moody in the position of overseer is perfectly ridiculous. Mr. Moody has drawn, for a number of years, \$50 a year, and has done absolutely nothing. There is not a fish that can be got between the two points where he is overseer.

Mr. SPROULE. These overseers are distributed all over the country, but were appointed by the late Government. There are a number in my county drawing \$50 a year, who have not done a day's work all the time they have been appointed. If they were discharged now it would be said they were discharged because they were political opponents.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Moody was appointed by this Government. It is a matter of no consequence to me whether an officer is a Conservative or Reformer. But it is not reasonable that so many men should be paid for doing nothing.

Mr. KIRK. Strike off all the wardens in the Dominion for doing nothing and you would have nothing left.

Mr. McLELAN. Let the hon. gentleman name some in his county?

Mr. KIRK. I could name dozens of them, who do not leave their houses, so little work have they.

Mr. McLELAN. Will the hon. gentleman send me their names?

Mr. KIRK. No; I am not going to give any names. It is not to be expected that for the small pay they get these men are going to watch the streams day and night to find out who are violating the law. They will wait until someone comes and tells them. I believe it would be better for the Minister to have fewer men and pay them more salary.

Fishery, protection steamers and vessels—Maintenance and repairs ..... \$50,000

Mr. McLELAN. With reference to this item. I explained that the Canadian fisheries would be placed under charge of the Fisheries Department, and it is necessary that money should be voted for the fishery service. We hope it will not be necessary to spend a large amount, but it is possible no result may be reached with the United States, and it may be necessary for us to provide for the protection of our fisheries. I purpose to take the *Druid* and devote her to that purpose, and I propose to call tenders shortly to make the proper repairs and fit her for the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is necessary we should have some idea how the Government propose to use the vote. Are we going to have a lot of small boats or powerful steamers to cruise about, or what do the Government propose to do to protect the fisheries with this vote?

Mr. McLELAN. I have explained that the *Canadienne* is to be maintained, and will be employed on that service, and that the steamer *Druid* is to be fitted with new engines and boilers and will be devoted to that service. We have a number of other steamers that may be occasionally employed for that service; and then comes a question, whether it may not be advisable to employ some sailing vessels, which may have the appearance of fishing vessels. I think it is true, as the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) says, that this vote is rather insufficient, but if the arrangements we have made had not been arrived at, we would have asked for an additional sum. In the meantime, this may suffice, before the fishing season of next year arrives the House will assemble again, and we shall be in the hands of Parliament.

Mr. WELDON. I understood that the *Druid* was included in the vote for Government steamers.

Mr. McLELAN. There is something in that vote for her, but I now propose to have new engines and boilers made, and she, perhaps, may not be taken away from the service until later in the season, in the fall or winter.

Mr. KIRK. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to a paragraph in Overseer Rogers' report, in reference to the county of Guysboro':

"The fishermen of Chedabucto Bay complain of the damage done their fishing gear by the American seiners, and with justice, as from forty to fifty sail could be seen at one time sailing to and fro through the nets, etc., for several weeks, and the fishermen say that whenever and wherever their gear came in the way of the Americans, who were casting their seines, it was 'out knife and cut away.' Mr. Tory fears fatal results will follow a continuation of such acts, as the fishermen will not endure it. It calls for protection on the part of the Government."

It appears to me that this is a matter which requires the attention of the Government. I can myself corroborate the statement of Mr. Tory in regard to this matter. Last year I counted 37 sail, and I am quite sure there were more than that, who were seining at the time, and they paid no respect to the nets. Some of the fishermen lost all their nets. It was done sometimes in the night and sometimes in the day, and they always denied it, and said it was some other vessel. The people were very much incensed about it last year, and this year the feeling will be intensified, because I know they feel very strongly in regard to the Americans being allowed to fish in their waters without any compensation.

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit ..... \$1,500

Mr. McLELAN. There are two or three unsettled accounts in connection with the fisheries exhibition, and there are some expenses in connection with the exhibition in the hall here in Ottawa, which is open to the public. It is also desirable that, if any valuable specimens are offered, they should be secured, so that, if ever we have to make another exhibition, we should have the material at hand.

Services by persons in Customs and Fishery Departments and other expenses in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty and collection of Statistics..... \$4,000

Mr. VAIL. Last year the Minister suggested that the whole of this work might be done through the Customs. Has that been acted upon?

Mr. McLELAN. In a great many cases it has. The Customs officers have been used and paid for that service.

Mr. KIRK. In looking over the reports of the fishery overseers of the different Provinces, I notice that they com-

Mr. McLELAN.

plain of the falling off of the lobster fishery, and of the fact that lobsters are smaller now than they were formerly. They attribute this to over-fishing, but I am informed by the fishermen that that is not the only reason, but that another reason is, the time at which the fish are caught. They say that the close season is not a suitable one. You will destroy more fish by fishing for lobsters when they are spawning and the shell is soft, in one week, than you will destroy in a month at any other season. Besides that, at that season they are not fit for food, and should not be caught. The question is, what is the proper time during which to protect those fish. The fishermen say no lobster should be caught after the middle of July. The regulations allow them to be caught up to the 1st August, and the Government have allowed them to be caught up to the 15th August, and then allow no fishing in the fall of the year. The regulations, our people think, would be much better if the fishing were stopped on the 15th July and thence to the end of August. They destroy more fish during those six weeks than they do in all the rest of the year; and it would be much better for the fishermen themselves, if they were stopped from fishing on the 15th of July and allowed to commence again on the 1st September. I know the packers object to it. They want as long a time as possible; they object to being obliged to open up their factories in the fall of the year, and would prefer fishing a little longer in the spring of the year. That is the reason they press upon the Government to be allowed to fish when they ought not to be allowed to fish at all. I think it would be better to make the seasons vary in different parts of the Province. So far as Guysboro' is concerned, at any rate, the fishermen agree that fish ought not to be caught later than the middle of July.

Scientific Institutions—Grant for meteorological observatories, including instruments and cost of telegraphing weather warning..... \$50,000

Mr. McLELAN. There was a very large increase in the vote of last year, in order to provide for additional stations in Manitoba and the North-West, and several storm signals have been put up at Port Arthur and other points, and in order to complete them \$500 more is required.

Mr. WELDON. What is the object of changing the vote in New Brunswick?

Mr. McLELAN. It was formerly a special sum, and was placed under the supervision of the meteorological service.

Mr. PAINT. In connection with this vote, it has been brought to my notice by leading parties in the county of Richmond and by the lockmaster at St. Peter's Canal, where over a thousand vessels pass every year, that there is a necessity for a storm signal station there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What stations has the gentleman opened in the North-West Territory?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not ready to name them. I think most of the stations along the Canadian Pacific Railway have been made signal stations, and about fifty in Manitoba, and forty-five along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WELDON. Why should \$1,500 be taken out of a special vote granted to New Brunswick last year, and put into the general vote this year? A year or two ago Mr. Murdoch was relieved from his position after thirty years' service, and, apparently, it was for the purpose of reducing expense, but now it appears that the expense will be increased.

Mr. McLELAN. There were two gentlemen employed, and one was dispensed with, and the other does the whole service.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Murdoch was in charge of the meteorological service altogether. Mr. Hutchinson dropped

the time ball at noon, that was all he had to do. Mr. Murdoch, a most efficient and invaluable officer, was dismissed, and Mr. Hutchinson was put in charge of both employments. Whether he is capable of performing the work or not I am not able to say.

Marine hospitals for sick and distressed seamen..... \$62,000

Mr. McLELAN. At St. John we have a hospital that is maintained out of this fund. At Halifax we have an arrangement with the general hospitals, which we pay so much for every patient. At various other points we have the same arrangement. We employ a physician at a salary ranging from \$100 to \$400 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The amount required for each Province should be stated, instead of six Provinces being lumped together in one sum of \$35,000.

Mr. McLELAN. The amounts are as follows: The large hospital at Quebec, \$20,000; various other hospitals, Quebec, \$5,000; Nova Scotia, \$13,000; New Brunswick, \$11,000; Prince Edward Island, \$1,400; British Columbia, \$4,000.

Mr. VAIL. A very large amount, collected by the sick mariners' fund, is paid in by Nova Scotia; and the amount received is comparatively small, remembering that its ports are open all the year round. The Department should be very liberal with respect to small bills sent in for parties when there is no marine hospital at the place.

Superintendence of Insurance ..... \$6,250

Mr. VAIL. Is this item necessary? I thought the superintendent had retired.

Mr. BOWELL. He is to be superannuated on 1st August, but he is still actively engaged in the performance of his duties. It is, of course, intended to fill his place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not many years since the superintendent was appointed; I appointed him myself 10 years ago. Professor Cherryman is not such an old man as to require to be superannuated after 10 years service, and it will undoubtedly involve a very considerable addition to our superannuation allowances. It is a matter that requires to be seriously considered. The professor is a man of very considerable mathematical ability, and I believe he has done his work well, and is quite capable, for years to come, of doing his work well. He is far too young a man to be superannuated, at a heavy charge to the public service, without grave reason.

Mr. BOWELL. The reason is, that he made application himself, and he insists upon its being carried out, on account of his health, he not being able to continue the performance of his duties; that is established beyond a doubt, although apparently he is a healthy man. The hon. member for South Huron is quite correct; it will add quite an addition to the superannuation fund, from the fact that when he was appointed it was with a distinct understanding that when he retired, having been appointed at an advanced age, he should have ten years added to his term of service. That was part of the condition on which he agreed to accept the appointment. I was not aware under what Government he was appointed until the hon. gentleman from South Huron informed the House that he was appointed by himself; but when the question came before the Treasury Board I was very much surprised to find that ten years were to be added to his length of service; but on investigating the documents in the Finance Department, it appeared that one of the conditions on which he accepted the position was, that that number of years was to be added to his term of service whenever he should be superannuated. The resignation of Prof. Cherriman was not done with any desire on the part

of the Government, because he was not only a clever man, but he had proved himself to be a very valuable officer, and there may be some difficulty in getting a man to perform the duties as satisfactorily to the Government and in the interests of the service as Mr. Cherriman has done, and it was a matter of very great regret, on the part of Sir Leonard Tilley, that he was obliged to make the recommendation he did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very sorry to hear the cause. If it had been any cause other than ill health, I should have hesitated to agree to the superannuation, especially for the reason that when we were obliged to bring in an officer from outside we were compelled to make a bargain such as has been referred to. If the superintendent's health is such that it will not allow him to continue in his position, it is another matter.

Mr. VAIL. He has always received a large salary, \$4,000.

Mr. BOWELL. You cannot secure a man of his ability and of the position he held in educational institutions without paying a large salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We get enough out of the insurance companies to pay it.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:45 a.m., Wednesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 1st, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 150) to authorise the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of the Harbor of Three Rivers.—(Mr. Bowell.)

### ADDITIONAL STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE, NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. CARON moved concurrence in the report of Committee of Whole on certain resolutions for the appointment of an additional stipendiary magistrate under the North-West Territories Act, 1880, who shall be an additional member of the council of the said Territories.

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment that the said resolutions be not now concurred in, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to strike out the provision for the new stipendiary magistrate being a member of the council.

House divided on the amendment.

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Bernier,	Guay,	Platt,
Blake,	Holton,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Kirk,	Scriven,
Cameron (Huron),	Langelier,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Lister,	Springer,
Casgrain,	McCraney,	Trow,
Catudal,	McIntyre,	Vail,
Charlton,	McIsaac,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Mulock,	Weldon,
Edgar,	Paterson (Brant),	Wells.—37.
Fisher,		

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Grandbois,	McLelan,
Bain (Soulanges),	Guilbault,	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Guillet,	Massue,
Bell,	Haggart,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Hall,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Orton,
Bergin,	Homer,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Ives,	Pope,
Bossé,	Jamieson,	Pruyn,
Bowell,	Jenkins,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Inverness),	Kilvert,	Royal,
Carling,	Labrosse,	Shakespeare,
Caron,	Landry (Kent),	Small,
Cochrane,	Landry (Montmagny),	Smyth,
Colby,	Langevin,	Stairs,
Costigan,	Macdonald (King's),	Taschereau,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Townshend,
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Tupper,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McDougall (G. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Farrow,	McGreevy,	Wood (Brockville).—67.
Girouard,		

Amendment negatived.

Resolutions concurred in and referred to committee on Bill (No. 141) respecting the administration of justice, and other matters, in the North-West Territories.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Steam communication between the United States and Victoria, B. C.....\$17,840 00

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to have the words "San Francisco" substituted for "United States" in this vote. We have mail communication between Puget Sound and Victoria. This appears to be a clerical error, and it should be "San Francisco" in accordance with the terms of union.

Steam communication between Canada and Antwerp..... \$24,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want the information which was promised to us on this item and the following one, and which should have been given in committee.

Mr. BOWELL. I have just sent for the papers, and the item may perhaps be allowed to stand in the meantime. I believe the only information asked for last night, that we were unable to give, was the points at which those steamers were to touch in Germany.

Mr. BLAKE. There was more than that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was some information about the exports.

Mr. VAIL. It was stated that the object of this subsidy was to increase the immigration from Germany, and I think we showed plainly from the returns that there was no increase in immigration in that way. That was one of the things the Minister promised to look into, and there was also the question of the extension of the trade. I think he should give us a reason why these subsidies are granted at all. My own opinion is that the money is worse than thrown away.

Fishery Protection Steamers and Vessels—Maintenance and repairs..... \$50,000 00

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask whether any of this vote will be used to provide vessels for the protection of the fisheries in case nothing should come out of the expected negotiations with the American Government.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, for the protection of the sea fisheries.

Grant for meteorological observatories ..... \$50,000 00

Mr. WELDON. I would like to know how the amount for New Brunswick is divided, and in what places.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. McLELAN. In Sackville, St. John and Fredericton.  
Mr. WELDON. What will be the amount for St. John?  
Mr. McLELAN. I think \$700, speaking from memory.

Superintendence of Insurance ..... \$6,250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Customs stated the other night that Professor Cherriman's resignation was accepted, to take effect on the 1st of August, and that the superannuation allowance was agreed upon. What is the amount of that superannuation allowance?

Mr. BOWELL. I speak under correction, but I think it is based upon 20 years' service—that is, 10 years of actual service and the 10 years which is added under the agreement made at the time he was brought into the service.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Amendments made in Committee of the Whole to Bill (No. 134) respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883, were read the second time and concurred in.

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

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to move :

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by adding thereto the following clause :

Section 16 of the said Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor :

"The applicant shall with his application deposit a fee of \$10, which shall be repaid to him in case his application is refused."

I presume the Government have no objection to this clause being added to the Bill. Under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 provision was made for druggists to obtain licenses from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the respective Provinces. By the Act of 1884, that provision was repealed, and thereafter it became necessary for druggists to apply, under the Liquor Act of 1883, for licenses, those applications having to be made, under the Act of 1884, to the commissioners appointed under the Act of 1833. Therefore, under the law as it stands at present, the applications for licenses, whether by liquor sellers or druggists, are required to be made to the commissioners appointed under the Act of 1883; and the section of the Act of 1883 requires that every applicant for a license shall make a deposit of \$10 with the commissioners, as a fee to defray the expenses of the examination of the premises and advertising the nature of the application. That provision can hardly apply to the case of the druggists, because the examination that is necessary in the case of hotel keepers is not at all necessary in the case of druggists. As a case in point, I might mention that I received a communication during the present Session from a druggist in my constituency, in which he stated he had made his deposit of \$10 with his application, but that his premises had never been examined and no Governmental expenditure of any kind contracted, and the only outcome at all, as far as he was concerned, was that it cost him \$10. His experience no doubt is that of all others whose applications have been refused. The same remarks, though not to the same extent, apply to the applications of hotel keepers. It appears to me that those who applied for permission to carry on a trade, which permission was ultimately refused, should be refunded the money they deposited. Under the Act of Ontario, no fee is exacted from the unsuccessful applicant. There are precedents in favor of refunding the money under such circumstances. For example, when parties apply to this House for private Bill legislation, the invariable rule is, I believe, when the application is unsuccessful, to return the fee, and in this particular case the same rule should be followed. Not only in the future should that be the policy it should be retroactive, though,

I regret that, as a private member, I am unable, under the rules of the House, to move that this provision be retroactive. It seems to me to be a special hardship in regard to the past, that all the fees which have been paid to the commissioners have been practically valueless, as the Act under which they made the payments has been declared *ultra vires*, so that every applicant, whether successful or unsuccessful, has simply, under the Act, been compelled to pay a fee of \$10, for which he gets no value, and for which, under the law as it at present stands, he is not going to get value. I will not press the matter further now. I have no doubt the fairness of the position I take is such that it will recommend itself to the favorable consideration of the Government and the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that this section ought to be introduced in committee in the first place, but I do not take that point. The point I take is that this is an amendment to the McCarthy Act, and I do not think we ought to take up one clause of the Act more than another until we have the Bill before us. We cannot well be supposed to have the Act before us when this Bill is merely to suspend those portions of the McCarthy Act which have been declared by the Supreme Court *ultra vires*. A decision will be obtained this autumn, I have no doubt, before Parliament meets again in January, and then we can deal with this question more properly, as with many others that very likely will arise. I ask the House not to accept the amendment on that ground, but to keep the Bill as it is, leaving the rest of the Act intact. At this late stage we cannot well go into the discussion of the McCarthy Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much the position the hon. gentleman has taken. Although I have advocated, both by voice and vote, a strict enforcement of the Temperance Act, I do not see any reason why Parliament should inflict an injustice upon those who have been honestly engaged in the liquor trade. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that, under the provisions of his Act of 1883, the liquor dealers of this country are being subjected to great annoyance and trouble in their business and put to very considerable expense. The hon. gentleman assured them that he would secure the passing of an Act by the Dominion Parliament, restoring to the municipalities the power of dealing with the liquor question, taken from them by the Local Legislatures. He succeeded in getting an Act passed through Parliament, not restoring it to the Local authorities, but taking it into his own hands, by appointing a Board of License Commissioners to deal with the whole question. These commissioners have issued a large number of licenses. I find, in reply to a return called for, that 6,054 applications have been made for Dominion licenses, and each applicant had to deposit \$10, making a total deposit of \$60,500. True, a number of the applicants did not take out licenses. Their eyes were opened by the decision of the Privy Council and the decision of the Supreme Court, and they found the hon. gentleman's Bill was valueless; but the applications and deposits were made, and such as obtained licenses had to pay \$5.00 more, the total paid to the Board of License Commissioners being \$77,336. The hon. gentleman says this is a Bill for a specific purpose, that of suspending the clauses of the McCarthy Act which the court has declared *ultra vires*, and that it would not be right to engraft on the Bill any other provision; but he forgets that the board are still proceeding in the discharge of their duties, that they are still granting licenses and will continue to grant licenses unless we obtain a decision of the court before next license year comes around. It is a hardship to people engaged in a trade legalised by Parliament that they should be harassed and put to expenses and costs by reason of the Act passed by this Parliament, and the only redress that they can expect at the hands of the Government, a redress which they have a right to expect, is that

the moneys illegally and improperly taken from them under color of this Act, which turns out to be no Act of Parliament, should be refunded them. They have paid to the Government the sum of \$77,336, and the hon. gentleman knows the Supplementary Estimates ask for \$60,000 for the past financial year, for the purpose of meeting the expense of carrying out this Act. Besides the hon. gentleman knows that this Bill now passing through Parliament will not suspend the operation of the Act entirely. It only suspends the portions which the Superior Court has declared to be beyond our competency. The Supreme Court appears to have decided that this Parliament has the right to grant licenses for wholesale purposes and for the sale of liquor upon vessels. The hon. gentleman's board throughout the whole Dominion have still the power under this Act, with which the Bill now before Parliament does not interfere, of granting licenses for the sale of liquor wholesale and for the sale of liquor on board vessels. Therefore it is only right that the motion of my hon. friend should pass, and that those who see fit to make an application to the board of license commissioners appointed by the Government, but, who do not take out licenses from such board, should have restored to them the money they had paid on their application. I go further; I think every dollar that has been taken from the licensed victuallers in the Dominion of Canada, under color of this statute, should be restored to them by the Government, and the Government ought to stay the hands of the licensing board entirely until the question has been finally decided by the Privy Council as to the right of this Parliament to deal, not only with the retail trade, but with the wholesale trade and with licensing vessels for the sale of liquor. However, as my hon. friend says that a private member of the House cannot by the rules of Parliament ask to restore to the licensed dealers the money improperly taken from them, we ask, at all events, that in future, in making application for licenses which are not taken out, the money shall be restored to the applicants. There is another great difficulty in the enforcement of this Act, to which I call the attention of the First Minister. In almost every county in Ontario, the license inspector is not in sympathy with the Scott Act movement, but is in sympathy with the liquor vendors. In the majority of cases, the boards are composed of men who are not in sympathy with the Scott Act, and in almost every case the inspector is opposed to it. In Milton, in the county of Halton, a meeting was held and the difficulties of enforcing the Act, an Act of the Parliament of Canada, were clearly pointed out by the friends of the temperance cause. On the 22nd June, 1885, a meeting was held in Milton and the following resolution was passed:—

"Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to at once call the attention of the Dominion Government to the situation and ask if it is the intention of the Government to furnish funds to put the enforcing machinery at present in existence into operation."

And a person by the name of Brothers, who is an advocate of the temperance cause and takes a lively interest in the movement, writes, enclosing the resolution, in the following terms:—

"I was instructed to communicate with the Government regarding the Scott Act here. They appointed officials here who refused to take a hold of any cases of liquor selling unless the costs were secured by a guarantee or deposit, and we would like to find out whether the Dominion intends to furnish funds to carry out the law or not. Will you please give the copy of the resolution enclosed to the Department and ask them to let us know or find out yourself and do so, though it would perhaps be better to get the Department to communicate with us. We would then have something from the Government direct.

"Yours truly,  
"W. D. BROTHERS."

This letter is addressed not to me, but to an hon. member who handed it to me, and I call attention to it because I know, from other information in my possession, as well as from this, that in many cases where the Scott Act is in force the Dominion board are not in sympathy with it and peremptorily refuse to take the first step to enforce it. The

Scott Act is the law of the Dominion, and the Dominion authorities ought to see that the provisions of the law are properly and strictly enforced.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman is riding two horses. First he is with the licensed victuallers, and then he is with the Scott Act. What he has said is not strictly correct. He states that all the inspectors are in sympathy with the licensed victuallers and opposed to the Scott Act people. That may be the case in Huron, but it is not the case in Hastings, and the hon. gentleman has no right to stand up and accuse men who are not here to take their own part, when he has no evidence to prove it. I believe the officers selected by the Government as inspectors are good men, and are anxious to discharge their duty in the public interest, not to injure the Scott Act people or to injure those who are engaged in the sale of liquor. The hon. gentleman says the money should be refunded, but the next moment he admits that this matter is to be appealed to the Privy Council in order to decide whether we have the right to legislate upon it or not. I think it will be time enough to refund this money when we find out whether we have the right to give these licenses or not. It is not decided yet. I am satisfied the Government will do what is right. We do not intend to take money from the liquor dealers unjustly, or to treat them wrongfully. The hon. gentleman speaks of a wrong being done by this Parliament, but he forgets that it was the Provincial Parliament of Ontario that did the wrong, and that many hundreds of the parties engaged in the sale of liquor begged for a Dominion Act, in order to get out from the tyrannical Acts of the Local Government, to get out from the tyranny of the commissioners.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You cannot deny it, and to get out from the tyranny of the inspectors, who said: You must do as we say or you will not have a license. They, the dealers in liquor, wanted to get out from the tyranny and the dishonesty and want of justice on the part of the inspectors and the license commissioners, and they are only too anxious and glad that they should come under the Dominion Act, because there is at all events, under that Act, one officer whom the people elect, and that is the warden. There was a time when they could control the council, and when, I contend, the law was better administered and the licensed people kept better houses and gave better accommodation, and when they had not to pay so much for their licenses; they had only to pay \$30, and now they have to pay \$60 or \$70; and I say they are unfairly treated by the Local Government. When it is decided whether this Parliament has the right to grant licenses or not, the Government will do what is right by the licensed victuallers of the Dominion of Canada, and why should they not? They ought to be fairly dealt with. The hon. gentleman knows, he is satisfied in his own mind, that they will be fairly dealt with, but, in order to make a point against the Government, he is riding that horse. He has rode the temperance horse a long time, and now he wants to ride the other horse.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I could not manage to ride the Indian.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I know the Indians in my part of the country, and they are all right—a great many of them better and whiter than you are. Thank God we have none of your breed on the reserve.

Mr. McCRAVEY. I came into the House as the second reading of this Bill was announced, and, having received this letter and not having looked at it, I handed it

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

over to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). It comes from the Secretary of the Scott Act Alliance in the county of Halton, and shows how the Act is working there under the machinery we have at present. When the Act was first passed in the county of Halton, the friends of the Scott Act not having the machinery to enforce it, went to the Local Government and asked them to give them the machinery. The Local Government agreed to appoint a stipendiary magistrate, an inspector and three commissioners, and to receive the fees and pay the stipendiary magistrate as well as the inspector, which they did, and the Act worked well until such time as the new machinery under the McCarthy Act came in. Commissioners were appointed under the McCarthy Act, but some of them are not in sympathy with the Act. I have nothing to say against those gentlemen, I believe they are all honorable men; and, as has been stated by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) a large number of the commissioners appointed under that McCarthy Act are not in sympathy with the Scott Act in Scott Act counties. I can name a number of counties in which the whole three of the commissioners are pronounced opponents of the Scott Act, where the inspectors are pronounced opponents of the Scott Act, and where the county attorneys are pronounced opponents of the Scott Act. I have been told such is the case in the county of Dufferin, and that such is the case in the county represented by the hon. member who has just spoken—so much so that these commissioners, instead of licensing the regularly licensed druggists in the county of Huron, have granted to nearly 30 hotel keepers licenses to sell under the druggist clause, and have charged them no fees, so that it is utterly impossible under the present machinery to enforce the Scott Act. The people are now complaining, and they want to know whether it is the intention of the Government to provide proper machinery for enforcing the Act. On this point I will read a few words from a letter written by a gentleman who has had large experience in enforcing the Act in the county of Halton. Speaking of the McCarthy Act he says:

"You know how this was forced upon us against our will, and you can truthfully say that it has done much harm, and done more to retard the progress of the successful working of the Scott Act in Halton than any other cause, and the whole blame lies at the door of the Dominion Government"

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Give us the name.

Mr. McCRAVEY. The name is W. H. Young, stipendiary magistrate for Halton. I do not think he will object to my giving his name. Now, Sir, I do say that the Parliament of Canada, having given us this law, the Government are in duty bound to provide the machinery for enforcing that law, and I think they ought now to let us know what they intend to do in reference to this matter.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman speaks about giving machinery to the Scott Act people. We went so far as to take an order from the bottom of the paper and move it to the top, and proceed with it, and pass through this House a Bill framed and drafted by the Dominion Alliance. We were told that was the machinery they wanted, and before that Bill has been finally assented to by the Governor General, the hon. gentleman says that the Parliament of Canada ought to give them machinery. If the hon. gentleman means that one-half the revenues of this country are to be devoted to the detection of infractions of this law, and to pay costs where people see fit to go around and make complaints that they cannot prove, I doubt very much whether the Parliament of Canada will be disposed to appropriate money for that purpose. I think that many of the members of this House would prefer to see the Government using a little more care with reference to paying the expenses of efforts to pass the Scott Act in counties where the sentiment of the people is not ripe for it.

Mr. McCRAANEY. If the House will allow me to make an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. A personal explanation of course, but no reply.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I just wish to say that the machinery I referred to was the appointment of men who would see that the Act was fairly carried out.

Amendment negatived.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. MULOCK. I believe under the rules I am not entitled to any reply, having simply moved an amendment, but I suppose on the motion for the third reading I am at liberty to refer to the subject again. I wish to refer to the reasons assigned by the First Minister for not granting this amendment at this date. He says this is a Bill simply to suspend the McCarthy Act. I would remind him that when this Bill goes through, the McCarthy Act for the whole of the year 1885 is suspended, and no matter what is the result of the decision of the Privy Council, you are rendering valueless all the applications and all the licenses granted by the commissioners for this year. Therefore, practically, when this Act is suspended, no matter what may be the decision of the Privy Council, the effect will be that during the year 1885 this Act has no validity, and yet during the whole of this year the commissioners have exacted these fees. The applicants, out of respect for the legislation on the Statute Book, put in their applications. I think under these circumstances the Government is bound as a matter of honor to return the amount of money they have paid, no matter what may be the decision of the Privy Council respecting this Bill in the future. The hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. White), who accuses hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, more particularly the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), with desiring to ride two horses, has himself attempted that feat.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Three horses.

Mr. MULOCK. He deplores the hardships to which the licensed victuallers have been subjected, and he proposes to add to those hardships by refusing to grant them relief under the present circumstances. If they have had to pay such high fees, if they have been so harassed, why does he help to increase their burdens, as he now proposes to do in refusing his sanction to the little portion of relief that was here suggested? I hope that before Parliament rises the Government will see that it is their duty towards these men who, out of respect to the law, have made their applications in the year 1885, and which applications have been practically rendered useless now, to return this fee.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I do not want to add to the burdens of the licensed victuallers; the hon. gentleman was mistaken in saying so. I said that when it shall be finally decided that this Government had no right to pass the McCarthy Act and to grant licenses, the Government ought to take into consideration whether they should refund the money. I am in favor of the money all being refunded in case it is decided that we had no right to pass the Act. When the hon. gentleman says that the licenses have been increased, he knows it was the Local Government and not this Government who increased them, that it was the Local Government who increased the burdens on the people, and put them in the position they are in now.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NORTH WEST TERRITORIES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 141) respecting the administration of Justice and other matters in the North-West Territories.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CARON. This amendment is to remove the limitation of the power of the North-West Council to impose a fine not exceeding \$100. By the Act as it now stands the power of the council is thus limited. Stipendiary Magistrate Richardson and some others thought that by this limitation there was some doubt cast upon the right of the council to impose imprisonment as a penalty. It was pointed out to them that this was given by an Order in Council; but still as the limitation is considered to be an unnecessary one in view of the very large powers which the North-West Council now possess, it is deemed advisable to strike it out.

Mr. EDGAR. Then it strikes out the limitation altogether?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

On section 2,

Mr. CARON. The object of this amendment is to make it clear that the North-West Council had power to pass the school ordinances which were passed at the last session of the council. In order to remove doubt about this power the clause provides that this amendment shall date back to the date when the North-West Territory Act came into force. From the information given to me it appears that some correspondence took place between the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territory and between some of the stipendiary magistrates and the Department of Justice. The doubt was raised in consequence of the fact that at some places in the Territories there is not as yet a system of taxation. This amendment has been introduced for the purpose of removing any doubt and relieving the old Act of any disability.

Mr. WELDON. The school system was a voluntary one and could be adopted by the people of the district if they pleased. The effect of this amendment will be that the Governor in Council could pass a school ordinance without the consent of the district.

Mr. MILLS. When the Act relating to the North-West Territories was first adopted, in 1875, there was some discussion on representation and taxation, and I think the conclusion generally reached was that it was not desirable to violate the fundamental principle recognised in the English constitution, that where there is no representation there should be no power of taxation. That was recognised, and, although the North-West Council was intended to be given power to establish school districts and provide a school system, it was left optional with the people to decide how far they would agree to a system of taxation for school purposes. The hon. gentleman proposes to depart from that principle, and to provide that the council of the North-West, in which a majority of votes would be cast by those who are nominated by the Crown and not by those elected by the people, should have the power to provide for the imposition of taxation upon the people of the North-West. That would be a very wide departure from a well recognised rule. What is the fundamental rule recognised in regard to taxation? It is not that taxation is voted by Parliament simply as a representative body, but it is provided by the House of Commons as a delegated body. The taxation imposed on the people and the subsidies given to the Crown are given by those to whom they properly belong, and Parliament decides for what purposes the Crown may use the money offered it. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce a wholly new doctrine, and that is that property may be taken from the holders thereof without their consent. The hon. gentleman also proposes to make that law which has not been law up to this moment. He proposes to introduce a principle which he says has been recognised by the Government of Ontario

in the Streams Bill. He proposes that that which was not law shall be made law by this Parliament, and it shall not only be made law, but it shall be dated back, so as to come into effect from the passing of the North-West Territories Act. No matter how contrary to law that may be, the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill to make it law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not advised as to how any doubt should have arisen as to the part of the section which is intended to be amended; but some doubt has arisen in the North-West, and on the representations made, it is proposed to strike out that portion of the section. The hon. gentleman will see if he reads the section in the Act of 1880 that it will not have the effect of subjecting the people to taxation without representation. We will suppose that the words which are to be left out, are left out, and I will read the clause as it stands:

"The Lieutenant Governor by and with the consent of the Council or Assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided that the majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the North-West Territories, or any lesser portion or sub-division thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and, further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

In both cases the Lieutenant Governor, with the consent of the council or the assembly, may pass all the necessary ordinances for the purposes of education, but such ordinances must provide that a majority of the ratepayers in any district or portion of the North-West, must do so and so in the way of making the necessary assessment and collection for the purposes of these schools. It seems to me that as the establishment of the schools themselves and the levying of the rate is left to a majority of the ratepayers, the question of representation without taxation cannot well come in.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is unfortunate that we should be asked to pass this clause, amending the law as it now stands, when the Minister who is responsible for putting the measure through the committee, cannot give us any explanation of the necessity for the amendment, and the First Minister cannot tell us the nature of the doubt which is supposed to render that amendment necessary. We are informed that there has been a great deal of correspondence on the subject, but we have not seen or read that correspondence; they do not communicate the correspondence to us, or give us any opportunity of forming an intelligible opinion as to the necessity of passing such an amendment, or making the amendment retroactive. All sides admit that retroactive legislation is only to be justified by special circumstances; and when such legislation is proposed, the special reason or emergency should be stated to us in order to justify the passing of such a law. I think, therefore, both as to the general amendment and as to the circumstances of its being retroactive in its effect that some explanation is required. I would understand this clause as it stands in the Bill, to intend that the people in any district, before any general or special ordinances are passed in effect creating municipal institutions in that district, shall organise themselves into municipalities, which they cannot do without taxation; and the first step for them to take if they want schools, is to secure the local municipal institution, of which the necessary and the wholesome ingredient is a local system of taxation, to sustain those institutions. There was a practical test of their wanting schools, or of their being able to establish schools in a particular district. When any portion of the Territories had been put in a position that there was a local system of taxation established, thereupon the Lieutenant Governor, with the con-

Mr. MILLS.

sent of the council, could establish school ordinances, and the local system, the local machinery or ordinances, are carried out under that. Now, what is the doubt, what is the difficulty? What is the intention hereafter? Is it intended, for example, that general ordinances, establishing schools all over the North-West Territories, or in any portion of them in which the nominated council is to have preponderance, may be passed as they think it expedient, and is there to be some compulsion on the people to raise the funds or to be a dead letter until they do establish a local system of taxation and raise the necessary funds?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that, although the amendment may be open to the remarks the hon. gentleman has made, on reading the clause again, the object is clear. It is a case of the cart before the horse. According to the Act the system of taxation must be established first. I take it that the moment this Act was passed, which was in 1880, the Lieutenant Governor in Council passed a law establishing a system, and in the same Act they provided that the schools should be established, and that Act contained all the clauses of this Act. It is done at the same time *pari passu*. It is quite clear that a doubt has been raised whether there must not be a special system of taxation adopted first by a separate Act, before the second portion of the Act can come into force.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is purely hypothetical, and it is based on an error, because this clause was introduced in the original Act of 1875, and has been the law ever since, while the Minister who is in charge of the Bill vouchsafed the information that it was only last Session that this difficulty arose. So it will not do for an ingenious and a subtle mind to conjecture an explanation without the facts to sustain it.

Mr. EDGAR. If this amendment is only to correct an error in one clause, why do we require to change the general law which is a good one? We do not think that this clause can possibly mean what the First Minister suggests, because it does not say a general system of taxation for the whole North-West, but only applies to separate districts or portions. It means that when in any separate district, or portion, a system of taxation is adopted, they may make provision for separate and other schools.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is not an isolated case at all. It applies to scores of cases in the North-West Territories. To my mind it is quite clear they cannot have a school or a school section in any portion of the North-West Territories, they cannot impose taxes on themselves for the purpose of establishing a school unless there has been first adopted in the district of which the school section forms a part, a system of taxation. This is only another instance of how thoroughly ignorant hon. gentlemen are of the condition of affairs in the North-West. This difficulty arose two years ago in the village of Moose Jaw, which was not then incorporated, and I do not know that it is yet. The people there undertook to establish a school and to assess themselves to pay a teacher, but when they came to levy the taxes they found they could not do it, because the township in which Moose Jaw is situated had never adopted a system of taxation; and Moose Jaw itself, not having been incorporated as a village or town, had no system of taxation. The difficulty is not limited to Moose Jaw; it has existed in several places in the North-West, and I think the Government must have heard of it. I know that the authorities of Moose Jaw had correspondence with the Government on this subject so far back as 1883. I was consulted by parties in November, 1883, and I recommended communication with the Lieutenant Governor and with the Government at Ottawa. This is not an isolated case, but there are similar cases in many places in the North-West Territories; and the hon. gentleman knows that in very

few districts in the North-West has any system of taxation been yet adopted.

Mr. CARON. It seems to me that this amendment exactly meets the point the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has just stated. He says he sees no objection at all to our confirming the ordinance. That is really what this amendment is doing. Doubt having existed as to the North-West Council having the power to pass a school ordinance, this clause removes that doubt, and really confirms the ordinance which has been passed. I think it is very desirable that in the future there should be no doubt as to the powers of the council, and this amendment provides that in the future there can be no doubt. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down said, that the establishment of a school section must be preceded by a system of taxation. That law is left as it has existed, but I think it is right that the doubt I have referred to should be removed by this amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is desirable that we should understand what the result of this amendment is going to be. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), from a cursory perusal of the Act of 1880, has been unable to find a clause which immediately preceded the school clause in the original Act. I call the attention of the First Minister to the cast of the original Act. The first portion of the 10th clause is as follows:—

"Whenever any electoral district shall be found to contain not less than 1,000 inhabitants, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, may pass ordinances erecting the same into a municipal corporation or corporations as they may think fit: and thenceforth the power of the Lieutenant Governor and council or assembly as herein conferred in respect of taxation for municipal purposes shall cease."

That, I believe, is in the new Act; but my hon. friend has been unable to find in it this portion of the 10th clause:

"And every such municipal corporation shall thenceforth have the right to pass by-laws for raising within such municipality by taxation a revenue for municipal purposes in such district, and for the collection and appropriation of the same in the promotion thereof; and the Lieutenant Governor and council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass any ordinance or ordinances prescribing the powers and authorities which may be exercised by any such municipal corporation and the mode and extent of such taxation; provided that the power herein given to the Lieutenant Governor and council or assembly, as the case may be, of taxation for local purposes of such district shall not be prejudiced by the erection of the same into a municipality or municipalities, but such power shall continue vested in them in respect of local purposes not comprised within such municipal purposes as to which powers may be conferred by any ordinance or ordinances as aforesaid."

So that there was a power to erect districts into municipal corporations; there was a power given to the municipalities so erected to tax for the purposes for which they were allowed to tax, and the power of the Lieutenant Governor and Council to impose local taxation for that class of purposes ceased; but there remained the other power to the Lieutenant Governor to pass ordinances in respect to other purposes, such as education, and the ratepayers of the district were to make the necessary assessments and collection. So that it seems to me the original cast of the legislation intended that unless and until the municipal corporations had power to levy rates for school purposes, it was intended that the Lieutenant Governor should have powers to assess for schools; but that when the local corporation was clothed with power to tax for school purposes, it should go on and create schools, and then the latter portion of the 10th section should apply. If the latter part be left out, that may have created a doubt, but we should know what is the exact nature of the doubt and what the result of the legislation is going to be. If we have no power to pass this local legislation we may be left in a worse position than before. We want to have the power, either indirectly through the medium of the Council of the North-West Territories to levy rates for the purpose of a sustaining schools, or power directly by ourselves; but the nature of the doubt not being now explained to us, I am not satisfied

that we shall make a satisfactory piece of legislation even now. If your intention is that there shall be local taxation for school purposes, though there is no municipal organisation for any other purpose, you might very well have put in more words than there are here. If your intention is they shall have a school only when there is a municipal institution of wider range established, that is a different thing, but it may be necessary for the purpose to say what provisions in the present law are substituted for those which appear to have been stricken out of the 10th section of the original Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy that the difficulty of establishing these municipalities was found to be a bar to the introduction of the school system. Under the old Act, the establishment of a municipality must precede any school whatever. Well, the settlers are even now scattered, and in 1880 they were still more so, in small groups all over the North-West. There were not a sufficient number to establish a municipality, but quite sufficient to establish a school system, and therefore, I presume, in order to enable any group of parents or settlers to establish a school system without establishing a municipality in the first place, this law was adopted:

"It shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the North-West Territories, or any lesser portion or sub-division thereof by whatever name the same may be known may establish such schools therein as they may see fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor."

They form themselves into a school district and tax themselves for the purpose of establishing a school. That is evidently the intention of the clause, and this is merely to confirm it and remove doubt.

Mr. MILLS. The Act of 1877 provides:

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council or the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly, as the case may be, shall have such powers to make ordinances for the government of the North-West Territory, as the Governor in Council may, from time to time, confer upon him, provided always such powers shall not at any time be in excess of those conferred by the 92nd and 93rd sections of the British North America Act, in 1867, upon the Legislature of the several Provinces of the Dominion."

I remember well there was an Order in Council prepared under this provision of the Act, defining what the powers of the Lieutenant Governor in Council in the North-West Territory should be, and among the powers conferred upon him, under this section, was one providing for legislation on the subject of schools, and the power to pass ordinances in relation to public schools, and I have no doubt whatever that ample power was given under that section. That law is continued, and, in all probability, if the Local Legislature there has legislated upon the subject, they will have as ample power to deal with it as the hon. gentleman now proposes to give them.

On section 3,

Mr. CARON. This is to remove a doubt as to dealing with electoral districts when created.

Mr. EDGAR. As the clause stands now, it is not stated that when an electoral district is divided into two electoral districts, whether the member for the old electoral district will continue to sit and the people wait until his term expires before they can get another member. Words of this kind might be added: They shall be entitled to elect a member after the expiration of the term of the sitting member, or on a vacancy occurring, for any cause, in the representation of the electoral district. Otherwise, you would postpone the additional representation until the next general elections.

Mr. MILLS. I have called the attention of the Minister to section 15: "When, and so soon as the Lieutenant Governor is satisfied by such proof as he may require, that any districts or portion of the North-West Territories, not

exceeding an area of 1,000 square miles." At the time the Act was framed there were three settlements, Prince Albert settlement, Battleford settlement, and the one in the vicinity of Fort Macleod, and the object no doubt of this provision was to prevent migratory people, who resided perhaps amongst the Indians, being counted among the electors and to discourage the scattering of electors over a wide extent of territory. But the hon. gentleman will see that this is a very limited territory in a sparsely settled country to erect into an electoral district, and that a very much larger territory ought to be embraced. 50 miles square makes 2,500 square miles, and no doubt the small representation in the North-West Council is in part due to the fact that a large population, scattered over a large extent of territory, is so sparse that you cannot find 1,000 adults on 1,000 square miles. That ought to be remedied, and the Act ought to be so amended, that the North-West Council should be authorised to make such boundaries as they see proper for their electoral districts. Otherwise you may have more than half the population of the territory, for many years to come, wholly unrepresented. You cannot erect into an electoral district any territory that does not contain 1,000 adult persons on these narrow limits. If you were to say that it should be 100 miles square, in a sparsely settled district, it would not be very large in that country, and it would contain 10,000 square miles. The hon. gentleman will see that it is highly expedient that the restriction should be removed, and that provision should be made as to the term for which the council are to be elected.

Mr. CARON. By the 15th clause, to which the hon. gentleman has just been referring, the Lieutenant Governor may erect into an electoral district any portion of the North-West Territories not exceeding an area of 1,000 square miles which contains a population of not less than 1,000 inhabitants of adult age, exclusive of aliens or unfranchised Indians. By the 19th clause it is provided that, when such electoral district contains 2,000 such inhabitants, the Lieutenant Governor shall issue his writ for the election of a second member for such electoral district. The Lieutenant Governor is of opinion, as far as the information I have goes, that, having once constituted an electoral district, he is not able to change it, and it is to remove that doubt that, concurring in the view entertained by the Lieutenant Governor, the Bill has been prepared to meet the difficulty. I believe also that one of the members of the council, Mr. Jackson, when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was in the North-West, had a conversation with him in reference to this very important matter from their standpoint, and he asked to have the law so amended that the boundaries of an electoral district could be altered. The two things upon which this Act appears to lay stress are that the area of the electoral district shall not be more than 1,000 square miles, and that the population shall not be less than 1,000 inhabitants of adult age. The amendment, as now proposed by the Bill to section 19, has been framed for the purpose of meeting this difficulty, and I think it does. It meets exactly what was suggested, enabling the Lieutenant Governor to divide any electoral district which has more than 2,000 inhabitants into two electoral districts, issuing his writ for the purpose of allowing another member to be elected to represent that district.

Mr. BLAKE. I think what we ought to endeavor to attain is the early and speedy representation of the various localities which have a substantial number of inhabitants. I do not think we can place too much stress upon that safety valve which is given by the system of representation. I think we ought to regard the mode of settlement as it has happened in the North-West. The Act, when passed by my hon. friend, was wholly speculative and

Mr. MILLS.

experimental, and at that time there were just three settlements, although at least two settlements were not then, or for some years afterwards, large enough to get the benefit of it. What I would like to see is this: I would, in the first place, adopt the principle of dividing the districts, instead of agreeing that there should be a second member for the same district. It would be more satisfactory, in dealing with local affairs, that the different localities should elect their own members than that a large number should elect two members by a single vote. It would be more just and reasonable. Suppose you have a district in which there are 1,000 square miles, in which there are 1,900 adult souls. You cannot provide either that that district should be divided, under the amendment, or that a second member should be given to it; but, immediately outside of that district, there may be 500 adults settled; so that you could cut that district, with the adjacent districts, into two districts each with more than 1,000 square miles, and each with more than 1,000 souls. What is wanted is that, when you come round to the last session before the election, the council should reconsider the divisions. Take the case of the Lorne district. If you find that, in that 1,000 square miles, there are, with an adjacent part not exceeding another 1,000 square miles, 2,000 people, you might get in the Prince Albert and St. Laurent districts, and you might thus have it declared that there should be proper representation at the earliest practicable opportunity. I do not think we can hope that, in so short a time as two years, you can effectually make provision, except with regard to the so-called general election, but you must wait for the termination of the existing man's term. But, in the rapid changes of population and condition which we hope for in that country, if there shall have supervened a change in the affairs of that country, an arrangement of the bounds would be a thing which it would be very desirable to bring about, and we should have facility to do that. I think the hon. gentleman would find it very important to have it arranged in that way rather than that there should be a larger area with two members. I believe it would be better, for example, to emphasise it by a locality, but there might be a member for the easterly portion or the southerly portion of the Lorne district, and another member for the upper portion, and that would be better than to have two members for the whole district. No doubt, in order to get the two members, you will have to take larger bounds but you will get the men in faster and you will get them to represent smaller areas in fact, and smaller area of population, and you will have a better result than by this plan.

Mr. MILLS. A district of 50 miles square would contain 2,500 square miles, and you might find a population of over 1,000 adults entitled to elect a member for such a district, whereas, if you confine it to about 33 miles square, which would make 1,000 square miles, you would not have that population, and you might have a number of such districts succeeding each other, which, under this law, could not have any representation at all. I think it is desirable that even a sparse population should have representation given to it, and I think the time has gone by when a distinction of this kind should obtain. We have had many constituencies in Ontario which contained more than 1,000 square miles before the population was as large as it now is. There was the western district for instance, which included Essex, Kent and Lambton, and which at one time returned a member to the Legislature of Canada; and those three counties contained a much larger area than the one I have mentioned. Then there was the district comprising Huron, Grey and Bruce, which was very much larger than even the western district, and that returned a member. I think the restriction here is no longer appropriate, looking at the circumstances of the country and the conditions of settle-

ment. We know, too, that distance is even less regarded in a prairie country than it is in the older portions of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the whole system is but experimental in the Act of 1880, and the previous Act, and I have no doubt that it must be fully considered hereafter, with the view of bringing the legislative bodies more in accordance with the system in the Provinces. I do not think, however, at present that it would be well to alter the area, but in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member for the West Riding, I would suggest to my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill, that to the amendment which says: "The 19th section of the Act is hereby amended by adding thereto the words: 'Or he may, in the manner aforesaid, erect such electoral district into two electoral districts, each of which shall be entitled to elect a member;'" these words to be added: "with the advice of the council or assembly, as the case may be, rearrange the electoral districts or any of them from time to time." That is to say, he may, with the advice of his council, gerymander the different districts so as to meet the case mentioned by the hon. member for the West Riding, that there may be in one electoral district 1,900 people and there may be a few outside. In order to meet such a case he may, with the advice of the assembly, rearrange them so as to bring these people in.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that some indication be made in order to secure, as far as possible, a representation for each district of 1,000 square miles with 1,000 souls in the territory, or something of that kind. You will find the phrase just now used, "rearrange the electoral districts," is an extremely vague one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. EDGAR. The number of one adult to the square mile, come to think of it, is a considerable population in a new country, because it involves a population of at least two and a half to the square mile, including children, and requires a much more dense population than I think ought to be required in that country. Now, I have just been looking at the density of population in some of the United States. Our population, according to this scale, must be about 2.5 to the square mile. In Colorado the population is 1.9 to the square mile; in Idaho there is not 1 to the square mile; in Montana nothing like 1 to the mile; Nevada, less than 1 to the mile; New Mexico, just 1; the State of Oregon, 1.8; Utah, 1.7; Washington Territory, 1.1; so that the population to the mile that we require for representation in any portion of the North-West is much more dense than in any of the States I have mentioned.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I think the point in relation to distance in the North-West is well worth the attention of the Government. There is no doubt that in that prairie country distances appear less than half what they do in the older Provinces. People there think less of 50 miles than we do of 20. Even in Ontario, some counties are a 100 miles in length. When thrown into a square, a 1,000 square miles, come within a small fraction of a block 32 miles square. Now, an adherence to that principle that there must be 1,000 adult persons in that area, deprives all those portions where the population is more scattered, from representation. There are many practical reasons in the North-West why that rule should be varied. It is certain to be the case that farms will be much larger in area than they are here. There is a necessity that pastures should contain a greater area than they have in this country. Moreover, the season is closely limited at both ends, and it will be found necessary to do a certain amount of ploughing at a time when the crop is maturing. There are many reasons why this

rigid rule of 32 miles square should not be adhered to, because if it is there are many parts which are more thinly settled which will be without representation.

Mr. CARON. I beg to submit the following amendment to that clause which I think covers the points brought out in this discussion:—

Or he may, with the advice of his council or assembly, as the case may be, from time to time rearrange such electoral districts or any of them, so as to secure as far as possible the representation of each electoral district of not less than 1,000 square miles, and containing 1,000 inhabitants of adult age.

On section 4,

Mr. CARON. The object of this clause is to enable the Government to appoint another stipendiary magistrate. I explained yesterday that the people of the districts consider this necessary owing to the increased population and business.

On section 6,

Mr. CARON. The attention of the Government has been called to the fact that in cases of appeal to the Queen's Bench of Manitoba no provision has been made up to the present time to allow costs to successful parties. It was thought desirable to amend the law so as to make the necessary provisions.

On section 10,

Mr. EDGAR. What are the provisions of the North-West Territories Act as to declaring a person to be insane, because this seems to be a very serious clause? It gives the Lieutenant Governor power to shut up persons in asylums or other places for almost any time he chooses. There should be some provision as to how a person is to be declared insane. In the other Provinces a certificate signed by two doctors is required.

Mr. CARON. Sections 10, 11, 12, and 13 are intended to take the place of the Act 42 Vic., cap. 1, section 13. This Act makes provision for the keeping of lunatics in Manitoba penitentiary. At present those unfortunate people have been kept at a temporary lunatic asylum in Manitoba. The intention is ultimately to remove them to Selkirk lunatic asylum, pending the erection of a proper building at Regina. Section 10 corresponds with section 1 of 42 Vic., cap. 28. Some little departure was made from that section, and the present section has been drawn more in conformity with the section of the Procedure Act relating to insane prisoners, 33 and 34 Vic. The additions are principally upon two points. First, by the Act of 1879, the Lieutenant Governor only acted when authorised by the Governor General. It was found in the experience of those who were applying the law, that a great deal of time was lost and a great deal of useless correspondence had to be exchanged, for the purpose of obtaining the authority to which I have just been referring. It is considered better that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories should be allowed to Act on his own responsibility, the same as the Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces do. In the second place, by the Act of 1879, the Governor General could only authorise the Lieutenant Governor to act when he was satisfied that the person was afflicted with permanent insanity. This has been omitted, and I think it is a desirable omission to make. The Lieutenant Governor has been authorised to act in respect of any insane person who is under any law or ordinance kept in custody until the Lieutenant Governor's pleasure is known. Section 11 corresponds with section 3 of the Act of 1879, without any material change. Section 12 is new, and is necessary to legalise the transfer which was made from Manitoba penitentiary to the temporary lunatic asylum of Manitoba, and also the transfer which it will be necessary to make from that place of confinement to the asylum to be erected at Selkirk. Section 13 is the section

which provides to the maintenance of lunatics, and it was the subject of discussion upon one of the resolutions which I had the honor to bring down yesterday.

Mr. EDGAR. I daresay all the machinery which is provided for here, is quite necessary, but what I would like to know, is, how a person is declared or found insane, in the territories, under what law or ordinance, so that he can be dealt with under this clause? We are providing that all these stringent and arbitrary measures which override the ordinary rules of law, shall be put in operation with respect to any person who under any law or ordinance in force in the North-West Territories, is kept in custody as insane. It all depends on that. I do not dispute the wisdom of that provision, provided we are told what the ordinances of the North-West Territories are as to the insane, because they ought to be understood by the House.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that every possible precaution should be taken, and that this law should be guarded by every possible means, lest under such extensive powers abuses might occur. It struck me as much as it strikes the hon. gentleman at present, and I took particular trouble to ascertain what had been done, and if since the Act was put in operation, any abuses had taken place. In the North-West, so far as I can ascertain, every precaution is taken. No lunatic can be placed in an asylum without the order of a stipendiary magistrate. That is a very great source of protection to these unfortunate people. Knowing the high judicial position occupied by the stipendiary magistrates, it is plain that leaving it to them to issue an order without which no insane person can be placed in confinement, gives all possible protection against abuses of any kind. These orders are also sent down here for approval, and great care is taken with regard to them by the Department of Justice. That is another source of protection. They are gone over by the deputy, or the Minister of Justice himself, and every possible precaution is taken to see that they are perfectly right.

Mr. MILLS. It would be advantageous if these orders were published in the volume of the statutes, the same as the general orders, because in the majority of cases, the ordinances relating to government in the Territories, are not printed or very widely distributed. They embrace, I suppose, but a limited space, and I see no reason why they might not be published along with the statutes of Canada. I think this is specially desirable, so long as nominated members continue to be members of the council, and the Government and Parliament are largely responsible for their acts.

On section 14,

Mr. CARON. This clause refers to the sale of arms in the North-West. Referring to the speech delivered by the Minister of Justice when he introduced this Bill, I see he stated that it was prepared after consultation with Colonel Richardson, one of the stipendiary magistrates, and it was deemed advisable after that consultation, that the burden of proof should lie with the person who has arms in his possession, to show that he has a license to carry them. The smooth bore shot guns will be the only arms which will be left to the Indians under the provisions of this Act. All fixed ammunition and arms of precision are taken from them. It is considered that smooth bore shot guns will be sufficient to enable them to carry on the hunting and killing of the fur-bearing animals and the small game which abound in that district.

Mr. BLAKE. This section would deal with the case of a private individual selling or exchanging his own arm with another. Of course I quite agree as to the importance of some provision which will ensure no more of these dangerous weapons getting into the hands of the Indians; but we

Mr. CARON.

must see that the general convenience of the public is interfered with as little as possible. A settler may go up there and he may have a rifle or something of that kind; he may get hard up, and another settler may come along with whom he may want to exchange his rifle. This Bill prevents that. Would it not be better to confine the limitation to the class of persons you are providing for? I do not much object to licenses being required from persons making a trade of selling arms; that is one thing, but in a country like that, I can understand a very frequent commerce of the kind I have described in arms and ammunition between the settlers themselves; and it would seem to be a hard thing that that should be prevented, unless the hon. gentleman showed that there was a public danger which required a restriction of that kind to be imposed upon white men.

Mr. CARON. I think it would be very difficult, more especially under present circumstances, to prevent these arms getting into the hands of the Indians if the trading and bartering of them were allowed. I have no doubt the day will come when this restriction will be removed; but at present I think it is necessary, and I am confirmed in my opinion from having read the discussion which took place in another Chamber where a similar objection was urged. I think it would be better to allow the clause to remain as it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think under present circumstances the ordinary settler will be very glad to see this clause. It cannot be too stringent at this moment. The great object is to collect arms of precision, and not allow them to be in the hands of certain classes. If a white person went into the country having arms in his possession, and happened to sell them to Indians or a half-breed or a horse thief, it would be very difficult to trace them. The Bill requires that he shall have them in his possession. That is stringent but it is absolutely necessary that we should know where the arms are. The Lieutenant Governor will appoint commissioners—magistrates of the country who will be commissioners—and any respectable person going to a magistrate will get permission to carry a weapon. It is registered that he has that weapon, and if he cannot produce it at any time, he will be obliged to show to whom he has sold or traded it. Without that, you have no means of tracing the clandestine exchange of arms. This is only a temporary provision, which I daresay will disappear as the country grows older; but at present I can assure the committee it will give satisfaction and confidence to the settlers.

Mr. MILLS. What is the reason certain powers are given to the Lieutenant Governor and others to the Governor in Council?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Lieutenant Governor and council is a legislative body.

Mr. MILLS. It is an administrative body in a larger degree than a legislative body.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It only sits once a year for a few weeks.

Mr. MILLS. You trust them with the liquor business.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the hon. gentleman intend to include pistols and revolvers in this provision?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I may just say that I perceive the difficulties of the situation, but at the same time I feel there would be a very great danger of difficulty arising from this provision. You are dealing with a sparsely settled community at a very great distance, and you are practically taking the arms out of the hands of white men unless they get these permits. I have not read the debate which took place in

the other Chamber, and I have not the grounds of the satisfaction produced by its perusal in the mind of the hon. Minister; but I do entertain some apprehension lest, in our laudable desire to prevent dangerous characters having arms, we may interfere with the protection of peaceable subjects.

Mr. MILLS. I cannot help thinking this measure will be regarded with very great displeasure in the North-West Territory. There is good and sufficient cause for taking arms out of the hands of the Indian population. They no longer subsist by the chase, as there is none there, and we wish to confine them to their reservations and put it out of their power to be dangerous to the new settlers; but to provide for disarming the entire population and treat the white people as people not fit to be entrusted with arms, to deal with them as the Russian Government deals with the Poles, does seem a very extraordinary course to adopt, when our desire is to encourage immigration and the settlement of the country. I believe the people of the North-West Territory will regard this with great indignation, and I think with just reason. If you have a sparse population, which you cannot sufficiently defend against the murderous attacks of the Indians, to say to them: You shall not have arms in your possession without a license, is to say to them: you shall not go into the country and take up lands for the purpose of cultivation and settlement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has not read the whole clause or he would not say so. In the first place, there must be permission given by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or a commissioner appointed by him to have arms. Then the Governor in Council may, from time to time, issue general regulations for the granting of permission to sell, exchange, trade, barter, give or possess arms or ammunition. The 5th clause provides: "The provisions of this section respecting the possession of arms and ammunition shall not apply to any officer or men of Her Majesty's forces of the militia force or of the North-West Mounted Police force." Then "the Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare by proclamation that upon and after a day therein named, this section shall be in force in the North-West Territory"; so that until the issue of the proclamation this clause shall not be in force. "Or in any place or places therein in such proclamation designated, and upon and after such day but not before, the provisions hereof shall take effect and be in force accordingly." Then the 7th section provides: "The Governor in Council may, in like manner, from time to time, declare this section to be no longer in force in any such place or places, and may again, from time to time, declare it to be in force therein." This refers to districts where an insurrection or outbreak may take place, and this restriction will be taken away when the exigency is passed.

Mr. BLAKE. The spirit in which the Government proposes this section is that such proclamation will be issued only in case an emergency shall arise in particular districts, and that it will have force only for a limited period of time. From his original statement, I would have supposed he had intended to give the Act a wider application, and to act in a different spirit from that which he has indicated. We are certainly giving the power to the Governor in Council at once to put the whole North-West under this restriction.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I think it is but right that the Indians should not be allowed to have military rifles; the Indian is a very different person with a Winchester in his hands from what he is without it. No one can read the report of the Mounted Police without gathering from it that the tendency on his part is to become rather saucy, and nothing would please the settler more than to find that rifles are no longer to be in the possession of the Indians. There is no necessity that they should have

them, for with the exception of a few tribes who inhabit the mountain ranges and hunt the wild sheep, which are outside range of shot, there is no chase that requires the use of the rifle. But if there is to be any restriction placed on the white settler having the rifle, I fear we are stepping on to thin ice, treading upon dangerous ground.

Bill reported with amendments.

Mr. CARON moved that the Bill, as amended, be now taken into consideration.

Mr. MILLS moved that the Bill be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend the same so as to provide that electoral districts may be established embracing areas of 2,000 square miles.

Mr. CARON. As I have already stated, we consider that it is more advisable before making any such change that we should have an opportunity of consulting the local authorities on that point. I think for the present the Bill should remain as it is.

Mr. MILLS. The local authorities will have an opportunity of considering this proposition after we have adopted it; and if they do not choose to enlarge their districts, they will not be under obligation to do so. This takes away no power, but simply gives them the discretion they are best able to exercise in that territory. I may remind this House that the Minister of Agriculture has informed us there are more than 100,000 people in that territory, and there are only 8 representatives, which, at most, would not represent a population exceeding 25,000. There must be a very large population scattered over that territory that is not embraced in these electoral districts, and it is easy to understand why not. They are not sufficiently numerous to constitute the required number within the area of a 1,000 square miles.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am opposed to this amendment, because by it Parliament would be expressing an opinion it ought not to express before consulting the local authorities.

Mr. BLAKE. We are getting very particular about the local authorities, so particular that we will not allow them, should they think it wise, to give more representation to the people of the North-West. We are passing a law under which it is impossible for them, if they think it wise, to give representation to the people, unless they find in a 1,000 square miles 1,000 souls. And we are so particular about their interests and so afraid that they will be oppressed by the weight of our opinion that we refuse to give them the opportunity of having representation for a district extending for 2,000 square miles unless 1,000 souls are found in it. I am afraid we are running into extremes. There has been too much neglect in the past, and there is too nice a distinction in the present.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The addition of 1,000 square miles to 1,000 square miles would only make a difference from the centre to the outside of the square of about  $6\frac{1}{2}$  miles. A square containing 2,000 square miles would be 45 miles across, and a square containing 1,000 square miles would be 32 miles across, so that there is only a difference of  $6\frac{1}{2}$  miles from the centre in consequence of the addition of 1,000 square miles. In a country where the roads are good, and you have not to make the angles as you do here, the distance is immaterial.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Bernier,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,

Edgar,  
Fairbank,  
Forbes,  
Gillmor,  
Guay,

McCraney,  
Mills,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,

Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
Charlton,  
De St. Georges,

Holton,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Livingston,  
Mackenzie,

Rinfret,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Weldon.—37.

## NATS :

## Messieurs

Abbott,  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Blondeau,  
Bossé,  
Bowell,  
Cameron (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Desaulniers (Mask'gé),  
Desaulniers (St. Ma'ce),  
Desjardins,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Farrow,  
Foster,

Gagné,  
Gigault,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guilbault,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hickey,  
Homer,  
Hurteau,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Landry (Montmagny),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Mackintosh,  
Macmaster,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Picton),

McDougall (O. Breton),  
McGreedy,  
McLelan,  
Massue,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,  
Orton,  
Paint,  
Patterson (Essex),  
Pope,  
Pruyn,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Ross,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Smyth,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Townshend,  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westm'l'd).—79.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

## INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 146) to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1833.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is a new clause, is it not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; there is now a penalty in reference to spirits, and we are extending it to malt.

Mr. PATERSON. It seems to me that an innocent person might be made to suffer under this clause. A carter or a teamster who was engaged to move some of this stuff illegally manufactured, without any knowledge that it was illegal, might be compelled to forfeit his horses and all that he had.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Customs law, I think, provides for the same thing, and I suppose that, if the party proves his innocence, he would not have to pay any penalty. Some such provision is necessary, as we have had cases of this kind.

On section 4,

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is a change here from the old Act. The old Act attached the penalty to the selling of the package, the barrel or cask, while this attaches the penalty to the sale of the contents of the package.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The question is whether that is not a little too stringent. Suppose a person went into a cigar factory, for instance, and saw an empty cigar box and asked to have it to keep a plant in, or for some other innocent purpose. If the label remained on that box the manufacturer would be liable to a penalty.

Mr. FAIRBANK.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, but manufacturers will take means to make themselves acquainted with the provisions of this Act.

On section 8,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is entirely new. Distillers have for some time complained that they have a right to a refund for the shrinkage in spirits that are warehoused, and they claim that they are actually paying duty on a quantity of spirits that they do not put into the market. In England and in the United States the Government allows this drawback, and we propose to do the same. Having now a high class of excisemen, who have been thoroughly trained by practical examinations, this new system may be adopted with safety.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This clause means the introduction of the English law with respect to abatement. This means a loss of revenue, except the proposition which was in the resolution, which was somewhat changed before it passed through committee, is carried out in another form and an extra duty is imposed on spirits. Is it the intention of the Government to impose an extra 5 cents a gallon, which we were given to understand it was the intention of the Government to do, in order to make up the loss of revenue that will follow?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Finance Minister would answer the question if he were here.

Mr. BLAKE. This is part of the whole proposition. The scheme of the Government was said to be to impose an additional 5 cents a gallon, but in effect to give it back again, so that the revenue might not be diminished. The form of the proposition was objectionable. The Government had no right under constitutional rules to give the power of taxing the people to the Governor in Council. The Government yielded to this objection, and it was understood they would obtain in proper constitutional form this increase of duty. We have not seen any proposal to raise the duty, and therefore may suspect, in fact I have suspected it for some time, that looking at the period of the Session at which we have arrived, there has been some change in the policy of the Government, and it is not intended to protect the revenue against the change that will be effected by this Bill. We ought to know what the policy of the Government is upon this subject.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This year there will be no loss of revenue by the operation of this clause. I do not think it is necessary to make any changes now. Parliament will meet again before the revenue can be affected by this provision.

Mr. BLAKE. No. Whiskey will evaporate during the next 12 months, as it has done before.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I feel bound to say that some remarks have been made in this House and in the country which were rather unfair to the distillers. It has been said that they were taking advantage of this notice that was given to them of an increase of duty, and that this was a put up job between the Minister of Inland Revenue and the distillers to get \$1,000,000 into the treasury.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it was the other way.

Mr. BLAKE. We did not charge the distillers with being so anxious to assist the hon. gentleman by depleting their pockets of large sums.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The committee having struck that clause out of the Bill, I cannot ask the committee to put it in again; and I must go on with the Bill as it now is.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a wholly satisfactory answer. The committee struck the clause out at the Minister's request upon the objection being taken, to which no answer

could be given, that it was not in accordance with the constitution that the Governor in Council should be given power to impose burdens on the people; but those burdens were to be imposed by the Act of the Legislature. The statement was certainly implied, and I think it was stated, that the policy of the Government was unchanged, and that which made it important to make the proposal still remained, and the Government would endeavor to accomplish it in a proper and constitutional manner. Now the Minister has hinted that it is not his intention this Session to propose that increase of duty, because no difficulty will arise for 12 months. Being reminded that whiskey will evaporate during the next 12 months as it has during previous periods, and that there will be a diminution of revenue. He has no answer to that argument, and he falls back on the committee and says he has no alternative but to go on with the Bill. If so, it must be upon the understanding that the present proposal is to pass without making any effort to replenish the revenue. I think the revenue would have been diminished in any event, because I do not think the 5 cents additional would have been equivalent to the reduction. The first proposal was in form a permissive one, and the Governor in Council might have said that they would not raise the duty by 5 cents on the gallon. I do not remember that the statement was made that he had "put up a job."

Mr. COSTIGAN. That statement was made in the newspapers.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the newspapers may have said so, but of course the newspapers are not subject to those rules of politeness and elegance of speech which we so studiously observe in this chamber. Therefore, I would not say that hon. gentlemen had "put up a job" on them, but would say that they had combined together to extract a large amount from the pockets of the distillers, first of all by threatening them with 5 cents additional duty and threatening them with an indefinite restriction in the power of vending their goods, and in order to avoid which restriction and the increase of duty, they withdrew a very large quantity of spirits. In fact I heard of one firm who had paid in a cheque of \$450,000 in a single case, and I do not suppose that they would be very much gratified with this. But having done this, the hon. gentleman now proposes—perhaps to compensate them—to say to them: Well, gentlemen, it is true I played rather a sharp game on you; I did threaten, or frighten, or induce you to pay in these large amounts, but I will make it up. I will give you drawbacks; I will not charge you duty, so that you will be able to do very well, as it is well known that you are a close combination, that you combine to keep the prices up, and that as the Customs are so much in excess of the Excise, you can succeed in doing so; so do not think so badly of us; we were hard up; we wanted the money badly, but we have taken this plan of compensating you.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I understand, the point taken was that this clause was objectionable because it placed the power in the hands of the Governor in Council. I think perhaps I was in error in stating that there would be no loss of revenue during the balance of this year, but I am quite satisfied that it is not the intention that there should be any loss of revenue. However, that difficulty will have to be made up in some way, and some other steps will have to be taken to meet the deficiency.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course the committee will take it for granted, after what the hon. gentleman has said, that the 5 cents will be put in a proper constitutional way.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood that that was the arrangement the other night—that the objection was

that the Governor in Council should have the power. If that is the case, and if it will cover the shrinkage—though I think that is doubtful—the objection is to a large extent removed.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister will recollect that I asked for some information as to the ventilating tanks which are mentioned here.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only information I can give is that it is claimed by the distillers and all others with whom I have discussed this point, that spirits can only be matured by evaporation through wood.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a speculative suggestion. Up to this time, there has apparently been no method discovered of accomplishing this useful evaporation, which causes to depart some of the noxious qualities of the whiskey. I think we had better deal with it—what is ascertained up to this time; because if you have some of these tanks, there might perhaps be an evaporation or a going out of the whiskey by the ladle; it might be counted twice. If science has not yet discovered, in the prosecution of its laborious efforts to make whiskey, an innocuous, useful, and nourishing drink, any method except by keeping it in wood, had we not better in the meantime refer to what has been done up to this time, and if by next year the distillers can convince the hon. gentleman that there is some other method, he can then enlarge this provision of the Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps it would be as well to amend the clause in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and make it apply only to evaporation in wood.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 9,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister has perhaps had under his notice, as other members of the House have had, a circular in which very strong representations have been made with reference to this clause. It is a circular from Montreal. It points out that the effect of the clause is simply to create a monopoly of the liquor interest. Without committing myself wholly to it, I think, when the matter is brought before the House, the Minister should give some explanations. The circular also points out that, if it were necessary to retain the whiskey for two years before any of it should go into consumption, such an amount of capital will be required to carry on the business as to place a monopoly in the hands of the few engaged in it at the present time.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have seen the circular the hon. gentleman refers to. I am satisfied that the objections to this clause have come from persons who are interested in the manufacture of methylated spirits and vinegar, because there is no provision made in the Bill to allow them to get the spirits for such manufacturing purposes. With regard to the complaint of monopoly, I do not think there is much danger of that, but I intend to remove even that cause of complaint. I propose to add to the section:

"Provided always that spirits may be entered and removed for consumption at any date for chemical or manufacturing purposes only, when such entry and removal are made and effected in accordance with regulations in that behalf made by the Governor in Council; and provided also that, in the case of new distilleries established after the 1st day of July, 1887, by any person who is not the holder of a license as a distiller on the 1st day of July, 1885, the distiller licensed in respect thereof may enter and remove for consumption for any purpose one-third part of the product of such distillery at any time after it is manufactured during the two years next following the issuing of the license relating to such distillery, and that during the three years next following the expiry of the said two years such licensee may enter and remove for consumption for any purpose one-third part of the product of such distillery, which third part has been manufactured for at least 12 months."

The effect of this will be to bring any new distillery that may be started, under the operation of this Act by slow degrees.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister has fallen into another difficulty in trying to remedy this. When the resolutions were under discussion the other night, the strong reason urged for this change in the law was that it had been demonstrated that it was unhealthy to use spirits too soon after they had been distilled, and the Government having an eye to the public health, had instituted this change in the law. But the amendment the hon. Minister proposes is designed to let out on the community one-third of the quantity the new distiller may produce in this highly dangerous condition. I do not know whether he could devise any remedy for that difficulty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. gentleman should have allowed some one else to make that speech. In his first speech he represented a certain class of the community who issued circulars denouncing this clause as an attempt to place the distilling of liquor in this country in the hands of a few men. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman how I proposed to remove that objection. Then he rises and goes to the other side of the question and says, that having asked the House to adopt this principle on the ground that the matured whiskey was better for the consumers in point of health, I am now going to throw one-third of the product of the new distilleries on the community without being matured. There may be something in the argument, but we cannot always accomplish all we wish to accomplish. The hon. gentleman will admit that if this legislation is carried through, the bulk of the spirits distilled in the country will come under the operation of this Act. Still, in order not to appear unjust to the new distillers, we allow them to dispose of one-third of the quantity they may manufacture without being matured.

Mr. BLAKE. There are some people who get case-hardened. Could we make any arrangement by which they would sell only to case-hardened people who would not be hurt?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. Minister aware whether this restriction which he proposes has been introduced elsewhere, and if so, where it is?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know any other country where it prevails; but that is no reason why we should not introduce it here.

Mr. EDGAR. It is all very well to talk about this being a measure for the public health. I do not think anyone in the House is carried away by that story. I think everybody understands that it is a measure to give monopoly to a few large distillers. There are only a few in the country, and notwithstanding the concessions the hon. gentleman proposes to make, the Bill will prevent anyone else going into the business. It may or may not be a good thing for the country to give monopolies in whiskey; but that is going to be the result. Suppose a new distiller is allowed to take out a small portion of the new whiskey he manufactures; when he goes a little farther he will not be allowed to take out any portion, and it will require enormous capital to remain in the business. I do not suppose any existing distiller will be able to do business when this comes into force without putting millions of dollars into the particular portion of their business that will require them to keep all this stuff in stock. Some of them will have to put in \$2,000,000, or \$3,000,000, or \$4,000,000, for that purpose, and in that way they will be able to keep everybody else out of the trade as long as they like, and create an enormous monopoly. If the hon. gentleman can show that it is for the good of temperance or the health of the community that there should be this

Mr. COSTIGAN.

enormous monopoly, there will be some ground for voting this change in the law. Otherwise there will be no ground.

Mr. BLAKE. We ought to confine ourselves to persuasion and not go into prohibition or restriction. We ought to persuade the liquor dealers without money. The hon. gentleman offers them a handsome bonus for keeping whiskey in stock, and to prevent them selling for those years with the consequence referred to. It may be very serious; there may be a limited supply.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman said I should not have made the two speeches I did, but I did not commit myself to the circular. I took care to say that I had simply brought it under notice. I also alluded to the fact that the Minister (Mr. McLelan) who was in charge of the resolutions before, had pointed out that the object of this provision was to benefit public health, and I said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) could not reconcile both his amendments. The circular said it was not necessary for the public health that the liquor should be kept in store, because the quality of the spirits was not improved by it, and that the new process of manufacture overcame that difficulty as to age. If the hon. gentleman is able to say positively it is an absolute necessity, in order to have pure spirits, that age should be upon them, he will contradict one statement in the circular that age is not necessary to secure purity of spirits. If it be not necessary, it does look as if there was some force in the complaint that the tendency of this clause will be to create a monopoly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Having once come to the conclusion to ask Parliament to allow a drawback to the distillers of whiskey that is being purified in wood, the question came, not from the distillers but from the Department, whether, if the maturing of this whiskey makes it a better and a safer article to use, it would not be well to try and lead up to that point where nothing but mature whiskey would be used.

Mr. BLAKE. You do that by making it profitable to the men who keep it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do it still further by the 2nd clause. The hon. gentleman stated, in referring to that circular, that there was some other chemical means by which the same object can be obtained, that is, the maturing of the spirits. From all we can learn, every 9 out of 10 agree that the ageing of whiskey in wood is the only means of improving its quality or maturing it. With regard to the particular process alluded to in the circular, I have learned—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that by some chemical process you may introduce such elements or drugs into the whiskey as will cover up the objectionable elements that you require to eliminate by evaporation, but that when you come to use the whiskey you find these objectionable elements are still in it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman by any chemical or mechanical means has succeeded in covering up, much less removing, the objectionable parts of the clause. Every body knows that fresh bread is unwholesome and that it ought to be kept a little time before being used. Let us restrict the consumption of fresh bread.

On section 10.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under this clause, every person who exposes or offers for sale, or who removes from the place of manufacture any compounded article which is not designated by some label or brand, in accordance with the provisions hereinafter contained, shall incur a penalty of \$50. Any innocent person who does not know anything of the law, and it is not expected that people should know this law except those who come under its operation as manufacturers, and who happens to buy and sell a compounded article in good faith, contrary to the provi-

sions of this measure, will incur this penalty. The penalty should be upon the manufacturer and not the innocent person unless the Minister has some reason. I do not know why we should take this extra precaution which bears not upon the compounder but upon the innocent purchaser.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the section is open to that construction, although it is not intended.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then we had better alter the wording of it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The words "the person who removes for sale" would cover it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite agree with the Minister that there must be strong provisions made to prevent fraud, but a license is granted every year to compounders, and a druggist or grocer may have been in the habit of obtaining a compounded article from a certain compounder, and after the license has expired and has not been renewed, the merchant may go on buying from the man who is illegally compounding, without knowing that he has no license. The danger is that the innocent person may suffer for the guilty. In the case I have named, the druggist or grocer would be subject to the penalty, though he was perfectly innocent.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think, if we make the change which I have suggested, we will meet the difficulty. If a man has been doing business with a firm he will see that there is something wrong if the goods are not labelled.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the Minister trusts to the label as a warning to the merchant who purchases?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

On section 17,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In this clause the words, "having knowledge of the fact," which were in the old Act, have been dropped out. I should like to ask why, because it seems to me that the officer should have a knowledge of the fact before he seizes.

Bill reported, and amendments concurred in.

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

### After Recess.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 2531) to grant the further subsidies therein mentioned towards the construction of the railways therein described, said: The resolutions that I have to move for the consideration of this House refer to a very important subject connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This Parliament has voted large subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order that the system of railways in Ontario and Quebec might by that line be connected with the Pacific Ocean, and also, in order that we might open the Territories of the North-West, and form, including the Province of British Columbia, one great country extending from ocean to ocean. That policy has been followed from year to year, until now we are on the eve of seeing the Pacific Railway completed from the Pacific Ocean to the city of Montreal. The fact is, that in a very few months the realisation of our wishes in that direction will be a *fait accompli*, and that great work will have been completed in a little more than half the time that was stipulated at first. But that great road would not produce all the results that Parliament and the people anticipated from it if we were to stop half way, and to bring it from the shores of the Pacific only to the city

of Montreal. The policy of this Government has been to secure the connection of that railway, not only with the harbor of Montreal, but also to extend it to the port of Quebec, at all events, for the summer, and that during the winter months it should communicate with the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, by an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal. That policy was promulgated and supported by Acts of Parliament passed last Session, by which we voted, for a direct line from Montreal to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, a yearly sum of money during a number of years, in order to assist the construction of that extension from Montreal to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax. On the other hand, Parliament, at its last Session, expressed its desire that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended from Montreal to Quebec by the north shore of the St. Lawrence. An Act of Parliament was passed to that effect, and certain conditions were inserted, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway could extend its line from Montreal to Quebec, or failing that, certain other conditions were put in the law. Thus the policy of Parliament and this Government has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be extended on the south shore of the St. Lawrence down to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and on the north shore of the St. Lawrence by the North Shore Railway to Quebec and thence by the Intercolonial. To follow this policy the Government had the honor to submit to this House certain resolutions, the first of which relate to the extension of the Intercolonial, or a branch of the Intercolonial, if you may call it so, from River du Loup or River Ouelle, in Quebec, to Edmonston, in New Brunswick. During a previous Session, I think it was in 1882, Parliament passed the Act 45 Vic., cap. 14, by which certain subsidies were given to certain railways, and amongst them one for a railway from a point on the Intercolonial, at River du Loup or River Ouelle, in the Province of Quebec, to Edmonston, in New Brunswick, \$3,200 per mile, or a subsidy not exceeding \$240,000. This subsidy has been on the Statute Book since 1882, but it has been found to be insufficient for the purpose of accomplishing what Parliament had in view; and, moreover, the survey of the line has shown that while it was supposed to be a distance of 75 miles, it has proved to be 83 miles in length, and, therefore, the subsidy voted by Parliament at its Session of 1882 was found not to meet the exigency, because 8 miles were without a subsidy. The intention of the Government is to ask this House to sanction an increase of the subsidy by \$2,800 per mile, in order to make it altogether \$6,000 per mile, and for the 8 miles which the line is shown to be over and above the 75 miles, the proposal of the Government is to vote \$6,000 per mile, in order that the 83 miles may be covered by a subsidy of \$6,000 per mile. This road is an important road. It is an important link, because it will place the city of Quebec, the district of Quebec, and a large portion of the Province of Quebec, which cannot be put in communication with the lower Provinces by the proposed short route from Montreal on the south shore railway by the Eastern Townships, in communication with St. John and other seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and also will develop the northern portion of New Brunswick, which is now without communication by railway. This route will also facilitate, by the extension of the Canada Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec, the commercial intercourse of a large portion of the Province of Quebec with the Province of New Brunswick, and *vice versa*. And, therefore, we are of opinion that the proposition of the Government to aid this road and increase its subsidy, so as to secure its construction, is one that will be acceptable to this House as well as the country. I come now to speak of the proposed short line on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. In accordance with the promise made to this House last Ses-

sion, that the Government would see proper surveys made, in order to ascertain which line was the best and shortest between Montreal and the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, the Government, through the Department of Railways, gave directions to engineers to go and examine the country and certain routes, in order to see which was the most desirable and the shortest and best for the country and to secure the object Parliament had in view in voting a certain sum of money during a certain number of years for that purpose. Those lines have been surveyed: (1) from Montreal *via* Sherbrooke, Moorehead Lake and Mettawamkeag. (2) Montreal *via* Sherbrooke, north of Moorehead Lake and Canterbury. (3) Montreal *via* Quebec and Hartland. (4) Montreal by River Ouelle or St. Rochs and Edmonston. (5) Montreal *via* Quebec, River du Loup and Edmonston. These five lines were examined and surveyed, and the engineers, after their labors in the field had been performed, reported to headquarters, and during the winter they have prepared plans and specifications. The result has been, so far as the distance in miles and grades and curves are concerned, as follows:—I had better make the comparison between the different lines from the same point to the same point; thus hon. gentlemen will see more clearly the difference in length and in other respects to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, respectively. By the southern route *via* Mettawamkeag and Macadam to St. Andrews, 430 miles; by the southern route *via* Canterbury to St. Andrews, 444 miles; by the northern route *via* Quebec and St. Charles to St. Andrews, 491 miles; by the northern route *via* Quebec and St. Rochs to St. Andrews, 543 miles; by the northern route *via* Quebec and River du Loup to St. Andrews, 578 miles; so that these five routes, as to length in miles, stand thus: 430, 444, 491, 543, and 578. Now, to St. John, taking the routes in the same order, we have, first, the southern route by Mettawamkeag, 472 miles; by the Canterbury route, 472 miles; by the northern route *via* Quebec and St. Charles, 517 miles; by Quebec and St. Rochs, 569 miles; and by River du Loup, 604 miles; so that to St. John the distances stand thus: 472, 472, 517, 569 and 604. The distances in miles to Halifax are as follows:—B by the Mettawamkeag route, 720 miles; by Canterbury, 721 miles; by Quebec and St. Charles, 744 miles; by Quebec and St. Rochs, 796 miles; and by Quebec and River du Loup, 831 miles; and the distances to Halifax stand thus: 720, 721, 744, 796, 831. The grades to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, by the first route, are 74 feet a mile; on the southern route by Canterbury, 74 feet per mile; by Quebec and St. Charles, 85 feet; by Quebec and St. Rochs, 85; by Quebec and River du Loup, 85; so that the grades vary from 74 for the two first lines to 85, which is the maximum for the three others. The curves for the first route are 6, 6 and 10, respectively, to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, and they are the same for the Canterbury route. For the route by Quebec and St. Charles they are 6, 10 and 10. For the route by Quebec and St. Rochs they are 10, 10 and 10, to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, respectively, and they are the same for the River du Loup route. So that the distances to St. Andrews, to St. John and to Halifax are the shortest by the Mettawamkeag route, though the difference between it and the Canterbury route is not very great. As to St. Andrews, it is 14 miles more; to Halifax, 1 mile more, and the others are still larger. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the House will wish to know what are the railways that form these different lines—or, at least, the shortest line; and, of course, I will give the others, if hon. gentlemen desire to have them. I will take the Mettawamkeag first. That road from Montreal to St. Andrews will be composed of the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway, 20 miles, built; then section "A" of survey, 80 miles, to be built; then the International Railway, 89 miles built; then section "C" of survey, 136

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

miles to be built; then the European and North American Railway, 62 miles built; then the New Brunswick and Canada Railway, 43 miles built; so that the line to St. Andrews gives you 214 miles of railway built, and 216 miles to be built, making the 430 miles. To St. John the lines are the Montreal, Portland and Boston, 20 miles built; section "A" survey, 80 miles to be built; International Railway, 89 miles built; section "C" of survey, 136 miles to be built; European and North American Railway, 62 miles built. All these are the same as the first route and the following are different: the St. John and Maine Railway, instead of the New Brunswick and Canada, 85 miles built, making 256 miles built and 216 to be built. Then, from Montreal to Halifax by that same route, we have the Montreal, Portland and Boston, the same as in the first instance, 20 miles built; section "A" of survey, 80 miles to be built; the International Railway, 89 miles built, the same as before; section "C" of survey, 136 miles to be built; the European and North American Railway, 62 miles built; while the following are different: the St. John and Maine Railway, 19 miles built; unsurveyed, 113 miles; Intercolonial Railway, 201 miles built; making a total from Montreal to Halifax built 391, and to be built 329 miles. That is the same as the two others, plus 113 miles to build. That is the route *via* Mettawamkeag. I do not know whether the House wishes the same figures with regard to the others, but if they do I will give them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By the second route, which is the Canterbury route, Montreal to St. Andrews, we have the Montreal, Portland and Boston, 20 miles built; section "A" of survey, 80 miles to be built; the Intercolonial, 89 miles built; section "B" of survey, 191 miles to be built; New Brunswick and Canada Railway, 64 miles built; making 172 miles built and 271 miles to be built. Then, from Montreal to St. John, by the Canterbury route, we have the Montreal, Portland and Boston, 20 miles built; section "A" of survey, 80 miles to be built; International Railway, 89 miles built; section "B" of survey, 217 miles to be built; St. John and Maine Railway, 66 miles built; making, from Montreal to St. John, 175 miles built and 297 miles to be built. Montreal to Halifax—Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway, 20 miles built; section "A" of survey, 80 miles to be built; International Railway, 89 miles built; section "B" of survey, 212 miles to be built; not surveyed, 119 miles to be built; Intercolonial Railway, 210 miles built; making a total of 310 miles built and 411 miles to be built. By the third route, which is the northern route *via* Quebec and St. Charles:

	Built.	To be built.
Montreal to St Andrews—		
North Shore Railway .....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway .....	15	.....
Section "D" of survey .....		197
New Brunswick and Canada Railway....	107	.....
Total .....	294	197
Montreal to St. John—		
North Shore Railway .....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway .....	15	.....
Section "D" of survey .....		197
New Brunswick Railway .....	64	.....
Fredericton Branch Railway .....	23	.....
St. John and Maine Railway .....	46	.....
Total .....	320	197
Montreal to Halifax—		
North Shore Railway .....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway .....	15	.....
Section "D" of survey .....		197
New Brunswick Railway .....	64	.....
Not surveyed .....		95
Intercolonial Railway .....	201	.....
Total .....	452	292

By the fourth route, *via* Quebec and St. Rochs :

	Built.	To be built.
<b>Montreal to St. Andrews—</b>		
North Shore Railway.....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway.....	59	.....
Section " E " of survey.....	.....	105
New Brunswick Railway.....	113	.....
New Brunswick and Canada Railway...	94	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Montreal to St. John—</b>		
North Shore Railway.....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway.....	59	.....
Section " E " of survey.....	.....	105
New Brunswick Railway.....	164	.....
Fredericton Branch Railway.....	23	.....
St. John and Maine Railway.....	43	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Montreal to Halifax—</b>		
North Shore Railway.....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway.....	59	.....
Section " E " of survey.....	.....	105
New Brunswick Railway.....	164	.....
Not surveyed.....	.....	95
Intercolonial Railway.....	201	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>200</b>

The last route is the Northern route *via* Quebec and Rivière du Loup :

	Built.	To be built.
<b>Montreal to St. Andrews—</b>		
North Shore Railway.....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway.....	116	.....
Section " F " of survey.....	.....	83
New Brunswick Railway.....	113	.....
New Brunswick and Canada Railway.....	94	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Montreal to St. John—</b>		
North Shore Railway.....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway.....	116	.....
Section " F " of survey.....	.....	83
New Brunswick Railway.....	164	.....
Fredericton Branch Railway.....	23	.....
St. John and Maine Railway.....	46	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Montreal to Halifax—</b>		
North Shore Railway.....	172	.....
Intercolonial Railway.....	116	.....
Section " F " of survey.....	.....	83
New Brunswick Railway.....	164	.....
Not surveyed.....	.....	95
Intercolonial Railway.....	201	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>178</b>

Hon. gentlemen must see by these figures of distances that the Mettawamkeag and Macadam route, 430 miles, is the shortest; the next is the Canterbury route, 444 miles; and the others are, respectively 491 miles, 543 miles and 578 miles. By the Mettawamkeag route the distance to build to St. Andrews and St. John is 216 miles. This route has been found to be the shortest of the five lines that have been surveyed. The object was, if possible, to find a line on Canadian territory all through. The only line entirely on Canadian territory is the line by Rivière du Loup, which is 578 miles to St. Andrews, compared with 430 miles by the Mettawamkeag and Macadam route, or the shortest by 148 miles; to St. John the distance by the Mettawamkeag route is 472 miles, against 604 miles by the Rivière du Loup route, a difference of 132 miles; to Halifax the distance by the Mettawamkeag route is 720 miles, against 831 miles by the Rivière du Loup line, making a difference to Halifax of 111 miles. Hon. gentlemen will also observe that this short line—the shortest we can find—is a line which will compete, as far as we can, with the line from Montreal to Portland. If I am not misinformed, the distance from Montreal to Portland is 297 miles, and the shortest route we can find from Montreal to St. John, St. Andrews, Halifax or Louisbourg, is

much longer than that; the shortest to St. Andrews is 430 miles. Therefore, with all our desire to have a line, if possible, that could compete with some chance of success with the Portland line, that would pass through Canadian territory from the moment it leaves Montreal to the time it would reach a port in the Maritime Provinces, we have been unable to come to the conclusion that we could adopt that line around by Rivière du Loup as the shortest line. Nevertheless, we have thought it was due to that large section of the Province of Quebec and the Ottawa region, a large portion of which could not take advantage of the short line, the shortest we can find to these ports in the Lower Provinces, that we should give a chance to that region to get to St. John, Halifax, St. Andrews, and other sea-ports of the Lower Provinces, by increasing the subsidy on that short piece of road, 83 miles, from Rivière du Loup to Edmonston. But though we encouraged that line, we had to look elsewhere to find the shortest route practicable under the circumstances, and after examining the whole matter we found that this line, No. 1 line, going to St. Andrews and St. John and Halifax—the Mettawamkeag route, if we can distinguish it so—is the shortest of all the lines that have been surveyed. We have been told by Mr. Light, one of the engineers employed to survey certain lines in the Province of Quebec for this object, that another line might be considered, which they called the combination line; we have been told that it might be made the shortest line; we have been told that that line, which had been examined also by Mr. Wicksteed, through the Etchemin valley towards Hervey, might be found to be the shortest line. It would have been our duty to examine that line, and if found so much shorter, or at all shorter than the other line, to see whether, in every sense, in every aspect, it could be considered the best line. Under those circumstances I caused another map to be prepared for this purpose, showing the proposed Mettawamkeag route to St. Andrews and the other ports and to Louisbourg, which eventually, I hope, will be found the greatest sea-port of Canada, the point where steamers will come from Europe in a shorter time than they can reach any other point on this continent, and therefore show that after all the European pioneers of this country, the French, when they selected Louisbourg as a great boulevard against their enemies, selected really the harbor which will be the harbor of the future. At all events, I asked the chief engineer of railways to prepare this other map, and to show on it an air line from Montreal to Louisbourg, that is to say, the straight line from one point to the other. I have had that line drawn, and the Mettawamkeag route is contrasted here with the other lines passing through Quebec and the other portions of the territory; and the result is, that this Mettawamkeag route is, at its greatest distance from the air line, distant 20 miles from it; that is to say, that the distance to the air line, from the point which is the farthest on the Mettawamkeag route from the air line, is 20 miles, whilst the most distant point on the other lines through Quebec is 80 miles from the air line. It is impossible that any calculation can show that a line which is 80 miles at a number of points from the air line can be shorter than the other line, which is, at its most distant point, distant about 20 miles from the air line. It stands to reason, though there are curves, that if, instead of putting a curve, you draw a line from Montreal to the extreme point, and another line to the point where it reaches the air line on the Quebec route, and do the same thing for the Mettawamkeag route, you will find that that will make two triangles; and it is elementary that the longest side of a triangle is shorter than the two other sides. Therefore, if the distance from the base to the farthest point of the triangle is 20 miles, the route or distance of the two sides of that triangle must be shorter than that of the two sides of the other triangle, in which the distance from the base to

the highest point is 80 miles. Therefore, with all my goodwill to my native city of Quebec, with all the desire to do all I could for it, facts are facts, truth is truth, and I must go by the facts and the truth. I have only to see which of these lines is the shortest, which is the best, and which we should adopt, in order to carry out the policy of Parliament and this Government, of connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal with the harbors of the lower Provinces by the shortest route. The result of that examination is, that the Government have come to the conclusion to recommend that this line, the Mettawamkeag route, be adopted as the shortest and the best line. I think this will do, at all events, for the present, as the *exposé* of the reasons why the Government think they should adopt this line. Now, I come to the third portion of these resolutions, which relates to the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec by the North shore of the St. Lawrence and the North Shore Railway. The House will, no doubt, remember that last year an Act was passed authorising certain subsidies and grants for and in respect of certain lines of railway therein mentioned. Amongst these, there was an item to this effect :

"For the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's junction, near Montreal, or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the harbor of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$960,000."

Then it was provided by the Act that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, within six months after the passing of the Act, could come to an understanding with the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the authorities of the North Shore Railway, as it is stated here :

"To purchase the North Shore Railway from St. Martin's junction to Quebec, or may obtain control of the same, or may make, with the owners of the said railway, such arrangements as will allow the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend its railway to Quebec, failing which the provisions contained in the three following sections may take effect."

That was not done. The six months elapsed, and a few months more, and nothing done, and the result was that the other clauses of the Act mentioned there might have come into effect, but the provisions of the Act were that the Pacific Railway Company could make a bargain or a treaty, or come to an understanding with certain individuals or companies for the purpose of building for the Pacific Railway the extension of its line from Montreal, or some point on the Pacific Railway, to Quebec, by the north shore, and that, whenever that treaty was made and signed between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and these parties, then these parties would apply to the Government of Canada and obtain from them a charter, which the Act authorised, with the powers ordinarily given to such companies, and that the Government could then promise them the subsidy of \$960,000 voted by Parliament for the building of that line, of course, with the necessary conditions of building so many miles, and so on. That was not done. This Act has not had the effect which the Government and Parliament expected, and therefore it has remained what we call in French *lettre morte*—a dead letter. Under these circumstances, the Government, knowing its intention and the intention of Parliament to extend the Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec, thought that it should try to obtain that result by some additional legislation, and some additional aid, if possible. Therefore, these resolutions have been laid before the House, but they will have to be modified in one or two points, and I will state, in a few minutes, in what direction. On the other hand, I should state that the Government, being very anxious that the desire and the wish and the intention of Parliament, and their own intention, should be carried into effect, have opened negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as well as with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to ascertain how far those companies

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

would be disposed to meet the wishes of the Government and of Parliament; and it has come to this point, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, who control the North Shore Railway by the stock they possess, have declared to the Government that they are ready to transfer and sell the North Shore Railway from Montreal to Quebec under certain conditions of payment to reimburse them, and the Jacques Cartier Branch, or Junction Railway, under certain conditions of price, in order to recoup them the amount paid by them for the stock of the company, which will go, of course, with the railway to be transferred, and also the price of certain improvements made on the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are disposed and ready to take the North Shore Railway under these conditions, so that the North Shore Railway would pass to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with the amount of debt due to the Quebec Government on that road and also the bonds which are the first mortgage after the debt to the Quebec Government. Then the Grand Trunk Railway Company are ready to sell, and have promised that they will sell, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are ready to accept and have stated so on their side. Under those circumstances, when we come to the paragraph next before the last of these resolutions, I will move that all the words after "North Shore Railway" in the fourth line, should be expunged, down to the word "then," in the second line from the end of the clause. The Government will ask also to have power to purchase this railway, if it is found necessary for the purpose for which Parliament has voted the money, and that these words should be added to the 6th paragraph :—

And, if it should be expedient so to do, in order to facilitate obtaining such access—

That is access to the harbor of Quebec—

the Governor in Council may acquire the North Shore Railway, and may apply the said sum of \$1,500,000, or any part thereof, in aid of such acquisition, and, upon such acquisition, may transfer or lease such railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, subject to such obligations as the Government shall have assumed in acquiring it.

The hon. gentlemen will see that the money the House is now asked to vote is not a million and a-half, because we already voted last Session \$960,000, as I stated a few minutes ago, for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also \$200,000 for the the Jacques Cartier Junction Railway, so that \$340,000 is the additional vote now proposed, in case that amount is required, to attain the objects that this House and the Government have in view, and had in view in voting this sum last Session, and in passing two or three statutes since 1880. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have explained these resolutions so as to be understood; at all events, I have endeavored to do so, and I now move that you leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider these resolutions.

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

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. BLAKE. In 1882 the Government informed us, when inviting us to vote a subsidy of something under \$250,000 for this branch, that they were satisfied it would be adequate to accomplish the purpose in view, that they had made proper enquiries and were satisfied that the result which they proposed to Parliament to achieve could be achieved at that expense. The Minister has now informed us that the Government have been disappointed in that expectation, and they have now brought down to us a proposal which doubles the charge. I desire to know what enquiries have been made, what information has been received, and what pledges have been obtained on which the Government bases this renewed and enlarged estimate as adequate to accomplish the object in view?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The best answer I can give is, that though this statute was passed on the 17th of May, 1882, over three years ago, the road has not yet been built. One of the companies has just done enough to keep itself alive, like all other railway companies—just enough to save the charter; but the fact is, that the railway has not been undertaken. If I remember a right there are two companies; there is a company incorporated in the Province of Quebec, and the other in the Province of New Brunswick; but although there are two companies, they could not obtain the necessary funds to build this road. The \$3,200 per mile would not suffice. We have been informed by the parties connected with these companies that if the subsidy were increased to \$6,000 they have no doubt they could obtain the necessary funds to carry on that work. I suppose the hon. gentleman is not very well acquainted with that route, but I understand that though a good portion of the road is rather level, a part of it is far from being so, where the grades will be heavy, and therefore it will be a difficult road to build. Nevertheless, I think this road from Rivière du Loup will not be more difficult than the New Brunswick route.

Mr. BLAKE. I failed to make myself understood. What I stated was, that in 1882, when we were asked to grant this subsidy, we were informed by the Government that having made the necessary enquiries to enable them to speak upon the subject, they had satisfied themselves that that sum would be adequate to accomplish the object they proposed to us, by giving about a quarter of a million to achieve, that is, a connection between the Intercolonial Railway to Edmonston, on the New Brunswick Railway. They have failed in the accomplishment of that object. The expectations which they led Parliament to entertain have been disappointed, and the hon. gentleman tells us that the best answer to my question is that fact. Now, I want that fact explained. What I object to is, that we are told by the Government that certain sums will be adequate to achieve certain results, that we are asked to vote these sums on that assurance, and that a little while afterwards we are told: Oh, they are not adequate; you must double the amount, in order to accomplish the result. I want to understand how it was that the expectations of the Government, after having made proper enquiries and based their statement to Parliament upon the result of those enquiries, have been disappointed. Next, I want to understand what better assurance there is now, what further enquiry has taken place, what further investigation has been had, which enables Parliament now to say that even double the money will accomplish the result.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the answer I gave in the first place is a very good one, and certainly the best the hon. gentleman could expect under the circumstances, namely, the fact that although the money had been voted for three years the road has not yet been built, though that road is a very desirable one, though it would open direct communication between the Province of Quebec and the Province of New Brunswick, though it would open a very fine country, though it would open a large trade between the two Provinces: nevertheless the subsidy that Parliament authorised the Government to give, has not been sufficient to induce any company to undertake the work. The fact that it has not been asked for shows that it was not sufficient. The hon. gentleman wants more explanation than that. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that during the last few years railways in America have not been a very favorable investment for capitalists in England, and therefore those railways which it was considered could be built with the aid of a subsidy of \$3,200 have not been built, and no one has ventured to undertake the enterprise. I do not see that as regards the Provinces comprising the Confederation there was any good reason

why capitalists should lose confidence and not invest their money in building railways. But hon. gentlemen know that the line which divides us from the United States is a political line, a line which exists on paper and is indicated by meets and bounds; but it is a line which does not prevent capitalists believing that railways which fail on the American side, where a great deal of stock has been watered, are in some ways connected with our railways, and the result has been that those who invested money have lost it. Capitalists do not make a difference between the two countries; they call it all America, and determine, on the grounds I have indicated, that they will not invest their money there. I know this perfectly well. When I went to England for different purposes I found great ignorance prevailing about the position of Canada. The people were confounding Canada and the United States; it was America all the time; and therefore we had the misfortune to be placed with our cousins on the other side of the line and to suffer for the misdeeds of some of their people; and the result has been that these railway projects have not had the success that was expected. Very few of those railways to which Parliament voted a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile have as yet been successfully undertaken. A few of them have been commenced and they are being pushed forward quietly, perhaps too quietly for the expectations of those who have undertaken the work. In this case, though this road seems to be a very good one, yet we find that the promoters of this railway cannot raise the capital with a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile, but an additional amount would, in all probability, give them the success which they have not yet achieved. I hope this explanation will be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. If the explanation were accepted as satisfactory I would be very easily satisfied. I say that the statements made in 1882 have turned out to be unjustified by the facts. We were told at that time that the money voted would secure the object we had in view. I ventured to say, the other day, and I repeat it to-night, that it is a very serious thing for the Government to propose to Parliament to embark in various enterprises, upon the assurance that the grants of money will be adequate to execute the policy which they propose, and the Government, two or three years afterwards, or one year later, as is the case with some of the proposals before us, to come and say: We were all wrong; but you have agreed to the policy, and we must now furnish the means which we are told will be adequate to accomplish the result desired. The hon. gentleman knows, of course, the gauge of the New Brunswick Railway. Are the 75 or 83 miles from River du Loup to Edmonston to be of the gauge of the Intercolonial or new Brunswick Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand the gauge of the two railways is the same.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the gauge will be the same as the Intercolonial?

Mr. WILSON. The gauge is the same.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been widened. Then the hon. gentleman stated that the alignment would be equal to that of the New Brunswick Railway. He is, no doubt, aware that that is not regarded as a first-class line.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said the worst portion of the 83 miles to be built would be better than the New Brunswick Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. It is an easy road to build.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is an easy road to build for a long distance.

Mr. BLAKE. I am told that the New Brunswick Railway cost between \$8,000 to \$9,000 a mile. It was cheaply built. I am speaking of it as a narrow gauge road. Has

the hon. gentleman received from the promoters of this enterprise any estimate as to what the cost of the 83 miles will be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the Government have no information as to what the cost of the railway will be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No more than we have for other railways. We suppose that this road will cost about the same as other railways built recently in other portions of the country. Taking that into account, we think a subsidy of \$6,000 a mile is not too large.

Mr. BLAKE. I may remark that as a sort of offset, I cannot call it a compensation, for the misfortunes in which Canada has been involved by being confounded with the United States sometimes in the opinion of capitalists, and our greater financial strength and money power being thus obscured from the eyes of the world for a time, it is a well-known fact that the cost of railway construction on this continent has been at a very low ebb for the last two years, partly due to those difficulties which have resulted, perhaps, in a good many projected railways failing to proceed, and partly to the state of the iron trade, and in reducing the cost of rails. As a result, the cost of construction on a good many lines, more particularly in the north-western States, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and others—where it is not buried in the water to which the hon. gentleman alluded—is very low. That is to be considered when we determine the amount of public assistance required. The original proposal made to Parliament was based upon a principle, and it was this: the subsidy of \$3,200 per mile, including sidings, would iron the road, and it would be sufficient inducement to enable a contract to be made for building the road. The price of steel is very low, and there is a comparative low price for labor as well. When we are told now that the cost of building the road is to be about double that what it ought to have cost, I feel that it is due to us to furnish some more accurate information as to the estimated cost of the road and as to the financial scheme of the company. We have been disappointed before, and now when another scheme is laid before this House by the Government, no information is furnished, beyond that given by the promoters, that they could not build for \$3,200 per mile, but they now think they can get on with \$6,000. I do not think that is a proper preliminary enquiry upon which to base public grants, and I think it is the more important because this grant has been on the Statute Book for three years. There have been two companies incorporated: they have been doing something or other, the hon. gentleman says, and they ought, at any rate, to have been able to furnish him with fuller materials upon which to base the assurance that this sum if granted, will be adequate to the purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. Minister explain why it is that there is an alternative proposition—one line by Rivière du Loup, and the other by Rivière Ouelle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By the Act of 1882 the grant was for a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup, or at Rivière Ouelle; of course, we are increasing the grant by this resolution, and we want it to be for the same railway.

Mr. LAURIER. This was three years ago, and since that time the Government have had a survey made of the Rivière du Loup valley. They have had time to make up their minds which line should be subsidised. As I understand, no survey has been made by the Government of the Rivière Ouelle valley, and I would like to know if it is proposed to dispose of the subsidy without further survey.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The surveys have been made by the company.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; but the Government have thought proper to have a survey of one line made by their own engineers. Is it proposed to give the subsidy without further survey, or to dispose of it only after a survey has been made of the Rivière Ouelle valley?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a survey made by the Government for another purpose, and of course it answers this purpose as well. The survey of the Rivière Ouelle Company was made by themselves, and therefore the information is there. It is complete. The company will, of course, have to take the line which is best for the interests of the company, and also best in the interest of the public, and the Government will have to see which line is the best in the public interest.

Mr. LAURIER. I hardly think that is a good answer. The hon. Minister says the survey has been made with the object of ascertaining, I suppose, whether or not it was in the interest of the public that this line should be subsidised. It cannot have been for any other purpose. The subsidy was granted under the idea that it was in the public interest to subsidise one or other of these roads. If the Government propose to dispense with the survey in one case, what is to enable them to decide between the two?

Mr. COSTIGAN. With regard to the statement made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, as to the cost of the New Brunswick Railway, I think he is correct as to the cost per mile; but it must be remembered that that road was constructed as a narrow gauge road, and in the cheapest and most rapid way possible to reach a given point. The curves were very sharp, and the bridges were of a temporary character. It went through the valley of the St. John, and there were no heavy engineering difficulties met with, so that it was very cheaply constructed. As to the cost, the gauge has to be broadened to make it the same as the Intercolonial Railway, and then they have gone on for the last three or four years replacing the cheap temporary structures by those of a heavier and more permanent character; and besides having in view making it part of the through line, they intend to alter the road very materially, as to its curves, etc. Whether \$6,000 per mile is sufficient or not, I may say the New Brunswick Railway Company were very anxious to push the road through, as they repeatedly represented that if a subsidy of \$6,000 per mile were given they were prepared to push the road through vigorously, and I have no doubt they will do so.

Mr. BLAKE. Have there been any representations made by the New Brunswick Railway Company to the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief engineer says that there was an offer on the part of that company, through its president, to build a railway, if they had had a subsidy of this kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Because I moved, three or four months ago, for any correspondence which had taken place between the Government and any railway companies with regard to subsidies, in order to have this information with reference to the propositions which I suspected would come down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not suppose that it was considered that that motion covered this case, because there was no subsidy given to that company, or to a company which had been incorporated.

Mr. BLAKE. Which was the company that was to have it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were two companies.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and one of the two was to have it. I take it for granted that it was the company, but it was not named in the resolution, so it was not thought worth while to give Parliament the information.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that Mr. Burpee was vice-president or manager of the road, and that he was here; and he told me, in conversations I had with him, that the company would consider a subsidy of \$6,000 sufficient to put the road through, though he did not seem very anxious about it at the time. But if this subsidy was voted and given to them they would undertake to push the road through. There was no desire to get the subsidy, but they wanted to see the road built.

Mr. BLONDEAU. I would like to know the reason why the route has been changed. We are told that it is from St. Rochs to Edmonston; but I know a route has been surveyed from Rivière Ouëlle to Edmonston, and I hope the report of that survey will be brought down before this matter is decided.

Mr. LAURIER. I happen to know there has been no survey in the Rivière Ouëlle valley. I heard the Minister speak to-day of the line to St. Rochs. What line is it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It appears that the engineer who was sent to survey this line reported that he could not come out at Rivière Ouëlle, as there were difficulties in the way, and he came out at St. Rochs. I do not know how far that is from Rivière Ouëlle, but it is in the next or the second parish from there, and that is the reason the name of St. Rochs was inserted.

Mr. LAURIER. Who was the engineer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Crawford.

Mr. BLONDEAU. I am surprised that he did not come out there. He had to start from Rivière Ouëlle to make his survey, and he made that survey before he made the survey to Rivière du Loup, and then he made his report for this line. It was the same engineer, Mr. Crawford. We have been promised the report of this survey, and we have not got it yet.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems, from the statement of the hon. Minister, that the engineer made every effort to reach my hon. friend's point, and he could not get there. The Minister said the difficulties of the country were too great.

Mr. BLONDEAU. All I know is, that he started from Rivière Ouëlle to Edmonston; but we have no more information about it. We should have the report of the survey. I wish to know which is the best route; if the Rivière du Loup is the best, all right.

Mr. BLAKE. If the engineer did commence to survey from Rivière Ouëlle to Edmonston, perhaps he never was able to get to Edmonston. But probably, if the hon. gentleman would telegraph to the engineer, he might find him somewhere between Rivière Ouëlle and Edmonston.

Mr. BLONDEAU. He had to go to Ste. Anne instead of St. Rochs; but he did not go to either place, and he has not been to Edmonston; he went to Rivière du Loup, that is all.

Mr. BLAKE. And this is the way the public money is voted.

On resolution 2,

Mr. DODD. I would like to ask why it is that this resolution varies from that which was brought down last year, inasmuch as Sydney and Louisbourg are left out? I trust the Government do not intend to ignore that important part of this Dominion, and that something will be done for it, in some way or other. The claims of that island have often been represented to this House; and just now, when the Imperial Government are taking steps to establish one of their coaling stations there for the protection of the Canadian marine, I think we should have some information as to whether this Government are going to increase the subsidies already granted, if they are found insufficient to secure a

railway through the island. In case of war or invasion, I think it is necessary that we should have a line of railway to some Atlantic port on that island, so that the militia troops of Canada, who have shown themselves quite capable of defending this country, would be enabled to repel an enemy seeking to destroy the collieries of that important section of the country. I know of no part of the Dominion of Canada to which the Government are under so many obligations as to the Island of Cape Breton, because at the last election it sent five representatives to support them, the first time since Confederation, and it should not be ignored. I trust we shall receive from some member of the Government a statement that something is to be done, and that we are not entirely to be ignored, as this resolution, in its present form, would indicate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would point out to my hon. friend that provision has been made already for building a railway through Cape Breton, either to Sydney or Louisbourg, and there is a chartered company for that purpose. There has never, however, been any location survey made through Cape Breton, and it is the intention of the Government to come down to Parliament this Session, and ask Parliament for a grant for a location survey through the island, in the first place. Then, I do not know, but I hope that either the company which has now got the charter, or some other company, may build the road. My hon. friend, in moving the resolutions, has stated that we look forward to Louisbourg being the great Atlantic port for Canada some day or other, that it is the port nearest to Europe, shortening the distance to Europe, and there are great expectations by those who have considered the question—for instance, certain men, such as the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Stephen, who is very enthusiastic on that point—believe that will be a point of departure eventually for first-class steamers carrying passengers from the Atlantic States, as well as from Canada, to Europe. People who fear the long sea voyage will choose that line. Whether that will be realised I cannot say; but, no doubt, that road will be built. The Government have shown goodwill towards it, Parliament has shown goodwill towards it by the vote of last year, and there will be a grant asked for the survey.

Mr. VAIL. Another very important road overlooked this year is the important link connecting Annapolis and Digby.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The missing link.

Mr. VAIL. The missing link. The grant, last year, of \$3,000 a mile, is not quite enough to ensure the completion of the road, and I was in hopes of seeing another \$3,000 a mile added this year. There are two or three heavy bridges to be built, and I hope the Government will see their way to add another \$3,000 to the subsidy. Of course, the smaller Provinces are not in a condition to subsidise their roads at present.

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Dodd) on the admirable manner in which he wields the whip and the fortunate results he has obtained by the process. These results do not come upon us with the pleasant shock they would if we had not seen it stated in the newspapers that there was to be a survey in the island of Cape Breton. It is fortunate for my hon. friend that there has been a prolongation of the Session, for without it he would not have got the survey. Being here, fortunately, in July, he has had time to melt the Government into a survey; and while the other parts of the Dominion are getting railways, the hon. gentleman will have engineers. I know there will be a great deal of difficulty in deciding where the route shall be, as that is a delicate question in the island. However united the hon. members may be in their prime duty, as

members of the island, in supporting the Government, there may be a little discord among them as to the way the engineers should go through the island; but I do not want to disturb the harmony of the happy family by saying anything more on this point.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was pleased to see the Minister of Public Works make reference to St. Andrews so frequently, but I am sorry to see that it is not referred to in these resolutions. This third resolution is for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake and Mettawamkeag, but there is not a word about St. Andrews. I think it ought to be inserted, because it comes first in order. If it has been an oversight, I would like to have it inserted. I would move that St. Andrews be inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. There is one point I do not observe the hon. the Minister mentioned in his explanations before the Speaker left the Chair. Of course it is not of much consequence; it is only a little more than \$1,500,000. We were told last year the \$170,000 a year for fifteen years would be adequate to accomplish the result set before us by this resolution, and the subsidy is now to be made \$250,000 a year for twenty years. I desire to know how it turns out that the \$170,000 for fifteen years is inadequate, and on what calculation it is now proposed to vote \$250,000 a year for twenty years, making an addition of \$1,500,000 to the proposed vote of last year.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) Before this motion is adopted I have a few words to say on that subject. In the first place, I must express my regret that the Government should have comprised under one single resolution the three questions which they submit to the approval of this House. The resolution which they have just proposed and which is now under consideration involves three distinct votes: one in favor of the Rivière du Loup to Edmondston, one in favor of the short line through Sherbrooke, and one in favor of the terminus which it is intended to give to Quebec. This terminus was promised last year by the Government; it was promised to the country at large, and therefore the Government are bound to keep their promise. As regards the choice of the short line, that question was not decided last year by the Government, and if I remember what certain newspapers have said—for I am too discreet to state all that I have heard—the Government had decided to let Parliament choose for themselves whatever line was thought to be the shortest. Now, people have come down with surveys. It will be remembered that the Government had promised us surveys of the most extensive and complete kind. Have they given them to us? I do not think that we have obtained all that we have a right to expect. To quote only one instance, I may state among the returns brought down by the Government we do not see any mention of the survey made by the Government officers of the line known as the combination line. That line has been completely ignored. Not only that, but in the official remarks which we have before the House, we see that the report sent to the Railway Department by Mr. Light has been violently criticised by the chief engineer of the Government railways, and not only violently criticised, but I must say maliciously criticised, and I think I ought to use a still stronger expression while speaking of that criticism. Now, Mr. Chairman, in that report we find:

“Mr. Light gives, on page 7, the distance from Montreal to Hervey *via* Quebec as 248 miles. This should be 406 miles.”

Here is the answer. Mr. Light claims that he has said the following:—

“What I did say was: ‘The distance from Montreal to Hervey *via* Quebec, to build, is 248 miles.’ (See page 55, engineer’s report).”

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny).

omission of these two little words, to build, makes all the difference in the statement.”

And further on the engineer again attacks Mr. Light on account of another distance, which Mr. Schreiber tries to rectify in the same dishonest manner. He concludes as follows:—

“I have not looked into the matter of distances, etc., beyond the 7th page, but I fear they may be no more accurate than those I have remarked upon.”

The engineer, Mr. Chairman, makes this dishonest criticism—dishonest is the word—to arrive at the conclusion that the report of Mr. Light was not worth looking at. I think that before proceeding with these resolutions, before adopting them, before choosing, with the Government, the short line *via* Sherbrooke and Mettawamkeag, we ought to have the reports which were promised on several occasions by the Government last year. For my part, in spite of all the goodwill I may bear to the Government, I must say that I cannot accept these resolutions as long as we have not a correct report of the surveys which have been made, or more satisfactory explanations. The Mettawamkeag line has been compared to any other line, and we see by Mr. Schreiber’s report that 113 miles of that line are still unsurveyed; its grades and curves are unknown, and therefore we have none of the points of comparison which would be needed to compare that line with any other line. The hon. Minister of Public Works said, awhile ago, that he had compared that combination line with the other line, but the terms of comparison which he has taken appears to me to be somewhat extraordinary. He said: If we draw an air line, we find that the combination line lies at a distance of 80 miles from that air line, while the Mettawamkeag line is only at a distance of 20 miles from it. If the combination line was to be a railway built as theoretically as that air line, I could understand that the comparison might be somewhat correct; but when we are building a line of railway, we must keep account, not only of the length of the road, but also of the difficulties which are to be met by the locomotive. The curves and grades are as many factors, which we must not omit to keep account of when reckoning the distance, and if a locomotive can draw forty cars on a road whose gradients are more or less steep, and, perhaps, a little longer than another, it must not be inferred that that road is longer than a neighboring line, shorter in length, but on which a locomotive could only draw twenty cars by reason of the steepness of grades. Now, if we look at the profile of the road—I have it before me, and I will take the liberty of laying it on the Table of the House, so that any one may look at it—we find that the Intercolonial has a level of 1,873 feet, and that the highest level of the Intercolonial is 750 feet. Well, it will be readily understood that a locomotive going over that road, with 20 or 30 cars attached to it, will meet such difficulties that the road will be virtually longer; that it is only shorter in appearance on account of the summits being higher. There is one report of Mr. Light to the Government, which is now before the House. That report shows that what is called the combination line is 10 miles shorter than the Mettawamkeag line; consequently, if it is intended to choose the shortest line, instead of making a theoretical reckoning, as the hon. Minister of Public Works has done, we may and we ought to guide ourselves on the figures given by that engineer, and adopt that combination line. Let it be proved to me that these figures are false and I will be the first to reject them and to pronounce in favor of the Mettawamkeag line; but as long as there is no proof that Mr. Light’s report is false, and that the report concerning the other line is correct in all its details, I shall believe that I have not before me sufficient information to make a judicious choice, and in that case it is my duty to require from the Government that they should lay before us all the necessary papers. Here is another fact which corroborates my assertion, and which shows, besides, what is

the feeling of the Government engineer. Mr. Schreiber, in the 5th page of his report, says:

"The line between Quebec and Chesuncook has not been surveyed."

Here is what Mr. Light answers to that:

"I have always considered that a survey of this line was most important, and strongly recommended to Mr. Schreiber that it should be made by telegram dated 18th August, 1884. His reply was a peremptory refusal. Mr. Wicksteed's barometrical examination was subsequently ordered, having the result, already stated, of corroborating my figures."

So that here is an engineer who works not only in the interest of the Province of Quebec but also in the interest of the country at large, because if a shorter line is found, which will pass through Quebec, I believe it is the country at large which will be benefited by it; here is an engineer who asks the Government to allow him to make an instrumental survey on a certain line, and the Government engineer answers by a flat refusal. Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that justice has not been done to the country; justice has not been done to the Province of Quebec, and the promises of the Government have not been kept. It order that the Mettawamkeag line may be preferred to all others, we are told that it is a few miles shorter than the combination line or any other line. And what is the argument which is brought forward? They say: It is the shortest line, and therefore it must be chosen, because traffic will follow that route in preference to any other which would be longer. But, Mr. Chairman, if a bridge is built at Lachine—as it will be the necessary consequence of the choice of the Mettawamkeag line—the same argument ought to apply, and the moment trade finds a shorter route to go to Portland, by the Portland and Montreal route, the southern line will become completely useless, because traffic will never follow that route. The argument which may answer to choose between the different lines from Montreal to the seaboard, must hold good for traffic in its choice of the shortest line, and will undoubtedly bring on the choice of the direct line between Montreal and Portland. To do away with this inconvenience we must legislate so as to bring the Pacific extension by the northern route, which will place the bridge over the river more to the east; and the traffic being a great deal further than Montreal in its passage over the American lines, will have more chance to pass into the Maritime Provinces. From that point of view, the interests of the Maritime Provinces, of the Province of Quebec and of the country at large, requires that the line which is intended to direct the Montreal traffic towards the Maritime Provinces should cross the river at the most eastern point; the more so, since the eloquence of figures indicate in the most positive manner that it is that line which the Government ought to choose, since it will most certainly insure the flow of trade towards the Maritime Provinces. I am not speaking now about the Quebec terminus; the statement which has just been made by the Government shows that nothing is done; that, on the contrary, all remains to be done; offers have been made, or at least negotiations are going on with the Pacific Railway and the North Shore Railway for the sale of that road; but nothing has been absolutely settled, and from the very words of the hon. Minister of Public Works, we are told that he will move an amendment to the resolutions asking for the power, if it should be expedient. There is still that restriction—to acquire the North Shore Railway from the Grand Trunk Company, to give it to the Pacific Company. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I regret that these three resolutions, affecting three distinct questions, have been combined into one. There is one, perhaps two, which might suit us; but if one of them does not please us, then the Government will forgive us if the three resolutions have to suffer from the fact that we cannot approve of them as a whole in a clause

such as that to which I have just referred, as regards the shortest line. For these reasons, the Government, before asking us to vote on these resolutions, must fulfil the promise they have made to us, to make a complete survey of these different lines, a survey which will enable members who are not here to defend the interests of our constituents to tell them: Well, we have accepted the views of the Government, because it has been proved to us, by figures, that this route will be the shortest; but as long as that proof is not given, I believe we cannot accept this resolution.

Mr. HALI. In reply to the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), I may say that when the line by Quebec was first suggested, there was no pretension whatever that, a shorter line could be found between Montreal and the seaports of the lower Provinces than the one proposed *vid* Sherbrooke and Moosehead Lake. The only pretension urged was, that for patriotic reasons it was extremely desirable that the line should be built through on Canadian soil. The application for a survey was based entirely on that ground. Not a single hon. member who asked the Government at that time to consent to a survey, advanced any pretension that by this route could a shorter line be found than by way of Sherbrooke and Moosehead Lake. We must assume that those from Quebec who advocated so strongly the building of the line entirely through Canadian territory did so, in the first place, from patriotic motives, but we may also assume, without impropriety, that they were actuated to some extent by motives of self interest; because, if that route were adopted, it would secure the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the maritime ports *vid* Quebec. In order to secure that, a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec was necessary and Mr. Light, of Quebec, a civil engineer, had prepared a very elaborate plan for the construction of such a bridge, and was most pronounced in his advocacy of that line. The Government acceded to the very reasonable request, that if a line could be found on Canadian soil which would give an approximately short route to the maritime ports, that line should be chosen, and consented to the survey. The conduct of the survey was placed in the hands of Mr. Light. It required but little investigation after Parliament adjourned to determine that it was an impossibility that a short commercial line, which was a *desideratum*, and which had been promised to the lower Provinces, could be secured on Canadian soil. Mr. Light, however, with a laudable desire to have his name connected with the construction of the bridge for which he had prepared a plan, having come to the conclusion that the line which was advocated here by the representatives of Quebec, and for which a survey was promised, was not practicable, started the theory that it was possible a shorter line could be found by way of Quebec, even if it crossed the State of Maine. It was a startling theory, because it was asserting that the two sides of a triangle could be made shorter than the base line. His project was taken up by parties interested in the city of Quebec, and the survey, which was authorised by Government for the purpose of obtaining a line on Canadian soil, was diverted from that purpose, to give him the opportunity, by any method in his power, of securing a short line by way of Quebec through the State of Maine. He had entire charge of the survey, selected his own route and employed his own engineers, and the following are the distances he reported: From Quebec to St. Andrews by the line he surveyed, 482 miles; as against 430 miles by way of Sherbrooke and Moosehead Lake; to St. John, a distance of 508 miles against 472 by way of Sherbrooke, and to Halifax 735 miles against 720 by way of Sherbrooke.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Those figures are not proved.

Mr. HALL. They are taken from Mr. Light's own report, and they show distances in favor of Sherbrooke of 52 miles to St. Andrews, 36 miles to St. John, and 15 miles to Halifax, over the line by way of Quebec. Even with these distances, Mr. Light did not report that he had found a line which he could recommend. He stated in effect that it was hardly practicable, but he believed that a little distance further south or north of the line he had surveyed, a practicable line could be secured. This report was sent in on the 23rd March.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). The hon. member is speaking of the line surveyed by Hartland, and not the combination line at all.

Mr. HALL. I am coming to the combination line presently, but that is not the line which Mr. Light professed to have surveyed. The report of the other survey coming in about the same time, gave Mr. Light the opportunity to discover that the distances were considerably shorter by way of Sherbrooke; and three days later, on the 26th March, without having gone over the country and without having any additional information, Mr. Light sends in a supplementary report upon what he calls the "combination line." This has been designated a theoretical line, and such, I think, I can prove it to be. He shows the distance to St. Andrews by that route to be 453 miles, against 430 miles by way of Sherbrooke; the distance to St. John 481 miles, against 472 by way of Sherbrooke; and the distance to Halifax 710 miles, against 720 by way of Sherbrooke. The only point to which he found the line was shorter was Halifax, and that only by a distance of 10 miles. The Government, of course, had before them these two conclusions, the one the result of thorough surveys as far as Mettawamkeag, and the knowledge the engineers possessed of the 130 miles beyond that, over an almost level country, with no engineering difficulties; and on the other side, they had the assumption by Mr. Light that a line could be secured over the route he had designated. In order to come to a conclusion between these two lines, the first thing which would naturally occur to members of the Government, and which will occur to members of the House, would be: which is by nature or superficially the shortest line; and in determining that, the most natural and common sense method would be to determine which was the shortest by an air line. The Minister of Public Works has referred to a portion of this subject. I was not aware he had had any examination made of it, and I took care to have the air lines measured on a standard map by a competent engineer. I find that the air line distance by way of Sherbrooke to St. Andrews, is 316 miles and to St. John 330 miles. Of course, in reference to Halifax, my argument would be all the stronger if I took the air line; but that would be unfair, because it would involve the crossing of the Bay of Fundy; so I take Salisbury, which is a common point to both these lines, and I find it is by an air line from Montreal 412 miles. The shortest distance that can be reckoned from Montreal to Quebec is by the North Shore Railway, which is 172 miles in length. That is the line adopted by Mr. Light himself in all his calculations. Taking that, and adding it to the distance by air line by that route, the result is, that the distance from Montreal to St. Andrews is 408 miles; to St. John, 444 miles; and to Salisbury, 472 miles; being a difference in favor of the Sherbrooke line of 92 miles to St. Andrews, 114 miles to St. John, and 60 miles to Salisbury. I think it would strike anyone who applied the ordinary principles of common sense to it, that it would be very difficult to overcome those figures. They are confirmed by the measurements taken at the instance of the Minister of Public Works, determining that the surveyed line by way of Sherbrooke was only 20 miles from the air line, while that by the combination line was 80 miles. There is another matter to be taken into considera-

Mr. HALL.

tion in deciding between these two reports, and that is the character and professional standing of the parties who made these investigations. It is, of course, a matter of some delicacy to refer to any gentleman's professional standing, nor would I do so now had not Mr. Light made insinuations and charges against the Government engineer, and also made a reflection upon the staff which had been selected. I think he has done gross injustice to those who are interested in what I believe to be the shortest line, and therefore my comments upon Mr. Light and his professional position are simply made in refutation of such aspersions. In the first place, I refer to Mr. Light's assumption of title and position. His reports are signed by him as a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers for Great Britain. I have looked over all the catalogues of that institution, and I hold in my hands the last catalogue published, and I fail to find the name of Mr. Light there, although we find the names of gentlemen whom we know very well—Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Fleming and Mr. Petersen—appear in each addition of it. By some strange mishap Mr. Light's name appears to have been omitted from every catalogue published. Then, he styles himself Government engineer for the Province of Quebec. I have received a telegram from a provincial Minister, stating that Mr. Light is not and has not been, for two or three years, in the employ of the Government.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. Because they have nothing for an engineer to do. As long as they had, he was the engineer.

Mr. HALL. I am going to state the circumstances under which he ceased to be their engineer. It is the misfortune of the Province of Quebec that he was their engineer. He was their engineer when the north shore road was located and constructed. The portion of the road from Montreal to Ottawa had first been constructed and completed. The first line that was located from Quebec was what was called the shore line, giving an independent connection to the city of Montreal. The line had been located and the contract made for the construction of that line, but interests at Terrebonne were brought to bear, to make the Government think a line by Terrebonne would be more desirable, and Mr. Light, for some reason, seemed to concur in that view, when he was called upon by the Government to report upon it.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. As Mr. Schreiber is doing to-day.

Mr. HALL. I think the sequel will turn out differently from what it did in the case of Mr. Light. Mr. Light reported, in the first place, that by going by way of Terrebonne there would be a saving of over 1,000 feet of iron truss bridging, that there would be only two slight curves upon that route, as compared with 15 curves on the shore line, and that there would be a saving of \$289,312 in the construction of that line. The Government, it seems, were not quite satisfied. The report astonished them somewhat, and they obtained the reports of other engineers, which contradicted Mr. Light, to some extent. Mr. Light made a second examination some eleven months afterwards, and on the 17th December, 1877, reported that the saving by this line would be \$531,458, or \$200,000 more than he had first reported. Upon the strength of that report, which seemed to be very carefully prepared, and which he gave upon his authority as Government engineer, the Government of the Province of Quebec changed this shore line to the Terrebonne line, although it had the effect of depriving them of the independent connection with the city of Montreal, as they would have had by the other line, and left them with a terminus 8 miles distant from that city. What was the result? Instead of the iron bridging being 1,000 feet shorter upon the Terrebonne line, it proved to be 1,600 feet longer; the curvature, instead of being, as reported, proved to be in the ratio of 86 to 182, that is, about 1 to 2 instead of 2 to 15, a very material change. As to cost, the result was something very astonishing. Instead of saving

\$531,458, as Mr. Light had promised, the Government of the Province of Quebec not only paid, under Mr. Light's own certificates, the full amount of the old contract, but also, upon his certificates, half a million dollars in addition, and the claim is not yet settled; so that his calculations were over a million dollars wrong, even upon his own subsequent admission. The Government were so dissatisfied with the result that they resisted the claim, and the matter went to arbitration; and when Mr. Light, as a witness before the arbitrators, was confronted by the statements he had made himself, under which the Government had been induced to make these changes, the only explanation he could give of the discrepancy was, that he had acted upon insufficient data. At the time he had made these surveys, not hastily, but extending over a period of eleven months, he had been acting in this official capacity and made these reports upon the responsibility of his official position, and yet there resulted this disastrous and unaccountable discrepancy. The House has to consider, under these circumstances, with such a record as Mr. Light has, when, in the present case, he does not pretend even to have made any instrumental survey over the line he recommends, whether it is wise to accept his theory with reference to this combination line. Apart from the question of distance, however, which I think is satisfactorily settled by the reports before the House, there are some other advantages in favor of the Sherbrooke line which should be referred to. There is, in the first place, the question of bridging, for although, of course, connection with the lower Provinces cannot be secured except by a bridge across the St. Lawrence, it is to be remembered that a bridge already exists at Montreal which may be perhaps utilised in some form; and, under any circumstances, there is no claim or expectation that any company seeking to build a line by way of Sherbrooke, will obtain Government aid for the construction of a bridge across the river at that point. Now, all the reports of Mr. Light are based upon the construction of this bridge at Quebec at Government expense. It is true that, with his capacity for elasticity in figures to which I have referred, he has reduced the estimated cost to some \$3,000,000, but other competent engineers have estimated that the expense cannot be less than \$7,000,000, to be added to the cost of the railway, in order to secure connection by way of Quebec. Then, with reference to grades. Of course, Mr. Light has made a very serious point against the line by way of Sherbrooke, that there is a grade of 74 feet. He ignores, or at least omits to mention, the fact that the line by way of Quebec is governed continually by the grade of 85 feet from Hochelaga, upon the north shore road, as it is impossible to get out of Montreal and make the connection which he recommends by way of the north shore without overcoming that grade of 85 feet, which must govern the whole line for through freight. It is to be borne in mind that a grade upon a road which has only been laid out for local purposes may possibly be reduced. The International Railway has been built partly for local purposes—but it has demonstrated the important fact, that the height of land can be got over by a grade not exceeding 74 feet; that grade can be probably very much reduced, as well as the curvature, which is objectionable in its present form. But we know, at any rate, the worst, that 74 feet grade is the highest that we will be obliged to meet with in making connection by way of Sherbrooke; whereas, by way of Quebec we have to overcome a grade of 85 feet in getting out of Hochelaga, and we do not know what other grades we may have to meet in going over the height of land. The altitude on this theoretical line has only been barometrically ascertained, and even Mr. Wicksteed himself, who surveyed a portion of the line, reports that it was very unsatisfactory in that respect, and that he

found a great discrepancy between the barometrical indications at particular points in going and returning. When we bear in mind that a single inch in the variation of the barometer indicates over 800 feet difference in altitude, it is easy to perceive how very far astray Mr. Wicksteed may have been in depending upon the barometer for ascertaining the altitude over this line. Then there is another feature in relation to this line by way of Sherbrooke, in respect of which there is no authentic information before the House, but which I state because I have personal knowledge with reference to it, and that is, its extreme freedom from obstruction by snow. Last winter was one of the most trying for obstruction by snow that has ever been known. The Intercolonial Railway was blocked for nearly a week, with no trains passing over it. The Grand Trunk in that vicinity was also blocked for two or three days at a time, and the trains were cancelled. But the International Railway, during the whole of last winter, with four trains a day passing over it, was never delayed over half an hour. Now, I think that is a very important consideration in endeavoring to establish the best connection with the lower Provinces. Another feature is the fact that if the line by way of Sherbrooke be adopted, and the International line be consolidated with it, we have the advantage of a charter which has already been obtained for the construction of a line through the State of Maine. That charter was obtained with a good deal of difficulty. The Legislature has only biennial sessions, and two years must, at all events, elapse before another charter can be obtained; and therefore it is perfectly impossible for any other railway company to make any arrangement for constructing a line through Maine, before a delay of two years has elapsed. Then (in contradiction to Mr. Light's own statement in that respect), we have already railway communication with Quebec, by which the district of Quebec would get the advantage of the construction of this short line by Sherbrooke. As an illustration of Mr. Light's unfairness in his representations, I read, on page 5 of his report:

"This line, termed the 'International,' has been traced by way of Sherbrooke to Lake Megantic."

The line has been built and in operation for the last five years, with four trains passing upon it daily, yet Mr. Light has the fairness to speak of it in his report as a line that "has been traced." Again, he says:

"The disadvantage to Quebec of such a line may be briefly stated. No connection with the city of Quebec could be made with it, because its extra length would destroy its usefulness."

As a matter of fact, connection has been made. The Quebec Central Railway, running from Sherbrooke to Quebec, has been in operation for the last three or four years. At the last Session of this Parliament, in anticipation of the eventual adoption of the short line by Sherbrooke, the Government gave a bonus to encourage a line to connect the Quebec Central at Beauce Junction with the International Railway, in order to give Quebec better connection with that line. I may say, and it will please the leader of the Opposition, who took a good deal of interest in that line, last year—that, in addition to the railway of 139 miles in length, from Sherbrooke to Quebec, which has been running for a number of years, under the impetus of this bonus given last year, 17 miles of this extension, through the valley of the Chaudière, giving this better connection to Quebec, have been built during the last summer, and inspected and accepted by the Government engineer. Taking all these facts into consideration, on the one hand the certainty of a practicable route in close proximity to the air line, giving the best average connection with the three seaports of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, and acceptable as such to the representatives from those localities; on the other, a line contrary to natural selection, and

only theoretically reported upon, I think there will be no hesitation on the part of hon. members in this House, in deciding that the Government have acted intelligently and judiciously in accepting the line by way of Sherbrooke; and that in doing so they have fulfilled the condition of their original resolution, "to secure the shortest and best practicable line for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway system to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces."

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). I have only a word to add in answer to the speech of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), and it is this: The hon. gentleman did not answer a single word of my argument; but, on the other hand, he proceeded to abuse Mr. Light. Why did the Government accept Mr. Light as the engineer, if they have no confidence in him, and if he is not able to do the work?

Mr. HALL. Quebec insisted on having him.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). If Quebec insisted on having a bad officer, could not the Government put him aside and appoint another? The hon. gentleman said the grade will be 15 feet from Mile End to Hochelaga. If so, it would be the same by his own route. From Montreal he would have to cross at Lachine.

Mr. COLBY. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that there is a line from Back River to Lachine in operation to-day?

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). There is one from St. Thérèse to Quebec. We shall not want to pass by Mile End. I do not object to passing by Sherbrooke; but the Government promised us that we should have a thorough exploration of the whole route. Have we had that exploration? If hon. gentlemen can prove that the short line is by Sherbrooke, we will go by that route. If not, let us be at liberty not to select that route.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am not going to discuss the question as to the route by Sherbrooke, but I shall content myself by offering a few remarks with respect to Mr. Light. I did not expect to see him placed on trial here to-day. He happens to be my personal friend, and he does not need a defender. The way the matter proceeded reminds me of the old saying: "No case, abuse the plaintiff's attorney." That seemed to be the course pursued by the member for Sherbrooke. He said Mr. Light assumed a title which he does not possess. I do not think Mr. Light is a man who would take any title to which he is not entitled. In addition to the remarks of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), I must say that it was a most extraordinary proceeding for the Government to have selected Mr. Light if he is such a bad and unreliable man as the hon. member for Sherbrooke has stated; and if such were the case, the Government would deserve severe censure for having employed such an officer. But this is not the first time that Mr. Light has been placed in charge of most important works. Perhaps the member for Sherbrooke does not know that Mr. Light was one of the district engineers for the construction of the Intercolonial, and that he had four sections under his charge as engineer. He was chief engineer for the construction of the North Shore Railway; and I happened to be in the Government during a portion of the construction of that railway, and if we had found Mr. Light, who was appointed by our predecessors, such a bad officer, he would have been dismissed. But we found him a first-class engineer in all respects. As to the point made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke: engineers had very little to do with the selection of the line through Terrebonne. Politicians have had infinitely more to do with it than engineers have. If the question had been left entirely in the hands of the engineers I do not know what their recommendation might have been; but I know, as a fact, that engineers had absolutely nothing to do with the question of the terminus. The hon. member for Sherbrooke made several errors as to the cost of building the two lines.

Mr. HALL.

There is the strong point of economy in favor of the line that was selected at first, the route by St. Martin. It saves 8 or 10 miles, and a very large bridge over the St. Lawrence. I am not going to enter into this matter further at present. Mr. Light's reputation as an engineer is perfectly made, and the particular reason that the hon. member for Sherbrooke gave for attacking Mr. Light was that Mr. Light himself had attacked Mr. Schreiber. This is not the case. Mr. Light was defending himself against most extraordinary misrepresentations of his report made by Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber, for instance, made him say something quite ridiculous, and what he never said, that the distance between Montreal and St. John is only 246 miles. Mr. Light never said anything of the kind. He said that between Montreal and St. John, by the line proposed, there were 246 miles to build. Very dishonestly Mr. Schreiber struck out those two words, "to build," and made Mr. Light say that the distance was 246 miles. Mr. Light was only doing himself justice in defending himself against misrepresentations which had been made by Mr. Schreiber. I am reminded that Mr. Light has been employed as Government engineer in Nova Scotia for 20 years, and has also been employed in New Brunswick. I only want to rebut the aspersions cast on Mr. Light's character about the surveying question. As regards the general question, I am not going to enter into it, until we have fuller estimates from the Government as to the line which they propose to follow.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I desire to call attention to another point in the resolutions, namely, an omission of the line to Salisbury, and in the copy of the resolutions which appear in the Votes and Proceedings this link is not mentioned. I assume it is the intention of the Government that this link shall be a part of the short line. I find it laid down on the map I have before me, and certainly no through line to Halifax or Louisville could be considered complete without that branch, and the amount of subsidy proposed to be given should be sufficient to secure the construction of that branch. I think it desirable that in the resolution or Bill this should be specified.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Votes and Proceedings on which the resolutions appear, page 665, he will find that the point is covered. In order to meet the views of the hon. member for Charlotte I move that the resolution be amended by inserting, after the words, "harbors of," the words, "St. Andrews."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. IRVINE. I desire to ask the hon. member for Sherbrooke a question, and that is, what is the difference in distance between Sherbrooke and St. John, N.B., and between Sherbrooke and Portland, Maine, on the proposed International line; and also what reason the people of St. John, N.B., have for believing that the company will select that city as the port of the Maritime Provinces in preference to Portland?

Mr. COLBY. The hon. gentleman has addressed his enquiry to the hon. member for Sherbrooke, but with your permission I shall take the liberty of answering it, because I have a memorandum of figures and distances which I think will give the desired information. The distance from Montreal to Portland *via* Bangor is 486 miles—that is the nearest possible way that Portland can be reached by the International Railway. The distance from Montreal to Portland by a road now in operation, and available for the purposes of connecting Montreal and Portland, independently of the Grand Trunk, is 272 miles, making a difference of 214 miles; so we can hardly believe that there would be a great deal of anxiety on the part of anybody to reach Portland by way of Bangor at an excess of distance of 214 miles on an aggregate of 486 miles.

Mr. IRVINE. That is not the question I asked. What is the difference in distance between Portland and Sherbrooke and St. John and Sherbrooke? It is not comparing the Grand Trunk line between Montreal and Portland with the Sherbrooke line, but it is the difference in distances. We are led to believe that we are building a road to benefit the Maritime Provinces, and I contend that we are building a road to benefit the State of Maine.

Mr. COLBY. I have not the figures in precisely the form in which the hon. gentleman makes his enquiry, but I think from the data before him he can easily ascertain the difference in these distances. The gist of the hon. gentleman's suggestion is this: Objection has been made in some quarters to the southern line by way of Sherbrooke and Moosehead Lake, that it would have a tendency to divert trade to Portland and the harbors in the State of Maine.

Mr. IRVINE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. gentleman seems troubled with that idea, and others seem to have the same solicitude. Well, anything more senseless than that—really, I must beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I do not mean anything personal—but to anyone who has studied the situation and has looked at the figures, anything more senseless could hardly be conceived. We are shortly, I suppose, to have the Canadian Pacific Railway completed to the St. Lawrence River. We are to have the Canadian Pacific Railway connected with all the principal cities and places of business in the Province of Ontario and in the Province of Quebec, on the north side of the St. Lawrence River. We are to have the Pacific Railway bringing down, in the near future, as we believe, large quantities of produce, and large numbers of passengers from the west, seeking the seaboard; and I think we may fairly assume that it will be in the interest of that railway, in the interest of commerce, in the interest of the Dominion at large, that all freights coming down over that railway, whether they come over the main line, whether they come over the Minneapolis connection, which we hope before many years will be built to the Sault, whether they come by the Ontario and Quebec, or by any other portion of that system, to have convenient outlets to the seaboard. Now, I suppose we cannot direct these things precisely as we might wish. It would be impossible, I suppose, by building an air line to the nearest lower provincial port, to divert and control all the trade which might come from the westward seeking Europe. Those things will go, and should go, by different channels, and will be consigned by different ways. If any portion of that freight seeks Portland, seeks the Maine ports, it will go to Maine by the shortest route, other things being equal. The Portland and Ogdensburg road is completed, with the exception, I think, of 8 miles, which are graded—it is independent of the Grand Trunk Railway, independent of all adverse influences, and is open to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to any railway wishing to carry freights to Portland, by a distance of only 272 miles, or 27 miles shorter than the Grand Trunk Railway. Access is thus provided to the Maine ports if commerce seeks it, or if the Canadian Pacific Railway people, in their interest, desire it. If freight wants to go to Maine for shipment it will go to the only harbor in Maine which is at all likely, for a reasonable period, to be suitable for trans-Atlantic commerce. It will go there by a line 27 miles shorter than the Grand Trunk Railway, instead of going 214 miles by the other route, which the hon. gentleman suggests. Now, the objection made to the southern route, that it does connect with railways in the State of Maine, that it will do business in connection with that State, instead of being a well founded objection to that route is, to my mind, a strong argument in its favor. In seeking the best route to the Maritime ports we must take commercial as well as engineering considerations into account. We require a road which will

be, if possible, self-sustaining—a road which will pay—a useful, commercial road; and I am sure, all other things being equal, a railway making connections with the cities in the State of Maine and with railways already existing in that State, will stand a better chance for trade and business than a railway passing far away north, and not connecting with those systems. It is well known to hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces that Bangor is a great distributing point for a large lumbering district to the north of it. That portion of the State of Maine, which projects into Canada, which we may say, geographically, belongs to and should be part of it, has Bangor, as its distributing point; and large quantities of flour, pork and other articles consumed by lumbermen are distributed from that point. This road by Sherbrooke is the nearest way by which Bangor could reach Chicago, and the great flour and pork centres, and consequently we can compete for, and I think we may expect, a very considerable portion of that trade. We want a live commercial road, as well as a good road in other respects. Now, I had supposed, until very recently, that there could be no doubt as to where the location of the short line was to be. Just so long as we were constructing lines of railway through the Eastern Townships at our own expense, with the expectation that they would be portions of the short line, just so long as we were devoting our private energies and our municipal and provincial aid to the construction of the short line, we were not interfered with; just so long as there was an expenditure and a sacrifice, we had the monopoly; there was no question where the short route was to be, but the moment it was known that a money subsidy was to be granted other competitors entered the field. Now, no man who looks at the map, and has any knowledge of the country, can fail to see that the line from Montreal by way of Sherbrooke and Mettawamkeag to St. Andrews, to St. John, to Salisbury, the common point for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island, is a shorter line than any it is possible to obtain by way of Quebec. It is unfortunate that we have to discuss the character of those who give us information—that we have to discuss the professional reputation of the friend of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier); but what he lays before us I think we may discuss with all fairness. Now, in looking at Mr. Light's report of this mythical line, which has no existence, except in his own imagination, I do not know whether most to admire the audacity and ingenuity, or to be amazed at the disingenuousness and deceptiveness of that report. I do not think it is possible to find anywhere so much misrepresentation in so few pages as is crowded into the pages of that report. I would not say that unless I was sure that I could demonstrate it to the mind of my hon. friend, the friend of this engineer, the hon. member for Megantic. What does he do? He illustrates his report by a map, which he says is Mr. Taché's map, an authentic map, upon which he lays the down line which he advocates. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) I think knows where Sutton Junction is, and I think he knows that there is a distance of 20 miles between Sutton Junction and the point north of Waterloo, where the line actually runs; and Mr. Light, in order to deceive the public with regard to the length of this line—for I can conceive of no other purpose—he, the engineer of the Province of Quebec, who ought to know so much about it—in the map which he represents as authentic runs the line 20 miles south of where it ought to go, in order to show a curvature downwards and a curvature backwards, making an apparent difference of 40 miles to the eye. What else does this engineer do? Mr. Light tells us about his proposed combination line running from Chaudière Junction to Chesuncook Lake, where it connects with the line, surveyed by Mr. Denven Smith, and tells us that the distance

would be 105 miles. If any gentleman will draw a straight line between these points on the official map he will see that the distance by air line is 105 miles, and Mr. Light knows that through that country you must allow about 20 per cent. for curvature, so that instead of being 105 miles the distance should be 126 miles; and if you read his report you will find that he gives you the grades and the curvatures and summits and distances, although there never has been an instrumental survey or measurement of that route, and no man knows anything about the grades or curvatures or summits, except what Mr. Wicksteed ascertained by a barometrical survey, which he himself pronounces unreliable. And now let me show another little bit of disingenuousness on Mr. Light's part, which you will find if you look at page 6 of his report; and I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this point, in order that they may explain it, if it is susceptible of explanation. Mr. Light says:

"East of Mettawamkeag, I measure the distance over the existing lines of railway, through St. John to Halifax"—

Mr. Light, in giving his comparison of the distances, makes the southern route run down to McAdam, St. John, and thence to Halifax by the Intercolonial. Then he tells us why he does it; he says:

"While Mr. Schreiber estimates over 113 miles of country, which is unsurveyed"—

The country referred to is that between Fredericton and Salisbury. Then he adds:

"This fact accounts for the further variance in our figures. I have taken my measurements over the existing lines of railway from a practical conviction that the same will be in use for many a year to come."

That is the way Mr. Light throws the southern route by way of St. John to Salisbury—because the 113 miles have been unsurveyed, and because for many years that work will not be used. And yet what does Mr. Light do? He appropriates that same 113 miles, only he calls it 19 miles less than it is, as a portion of his own line. Mr. Schreiber honestly makes allowances for curvatures, while Mr. Light makes it out to be an air line, and steals 19 miles in the transaction; and that is the way he makes out his route. I say that an engineer to do that deliberately, to deceive persons who know nothing about this route or the country through which it runs, is unworthy of credit. Why had he not the honesty to say: These 105 miles have not been surveyed; I do not know the curvatures or grades, but I believe the line when surveyed will not be longer than 105 miles. But he tells us the grades and curves and distances, when there never has been an instrument put upon the line. More than that: he pledges his professional reputation, which is held so high in some quarters, to all these figures when, according to his own report, 50 miles of his line have not been surveyed, and so far as we know never have been stepped upon by mortal man. What is the secret of the grand combination line? Mr. Light was employed because he has the confidence of the people of Quebec. That is the reason he was selected. It was in order that the reports might come from a man in whom the people of Quebec would have confidence he was instructed to make a careful survey. Of what line? The very line he recommended. He selected his own line before he set out; he wrote to a member of the Government, indicating where he wanted to run the line; he ran a line of his own selection, and was obliged to condemn it in the winter after he returned. The line he had recommended and surveyed he was obliged, when he came back and looked over his figures, to condemn; but shortly after he put in this condemnatory report, he finds a good line has been found to Mettawamkeag and sees he has to do something to meet this new aspect of the case. He says: "The line now advocated passes through the said lake to Mettawamkeag. And in order to meet this altered view of the matter a revised or

Mr. COLBY.

supplementary report was submitted on the 10th of May in place of the first. The first report was his official report, but finding then that the report was going to be useless, so far as a report in favor of any northern route was concerned, and to meet the altered position of the case, he suggests this hypothetical line. He takes his distances on the map, as any gentleman may see for himself, without making any allowance for curvatures. When he finds his own line is to be condemned and cannot be adopted, he thinks of this combination line, 50 miles of which have never been walked over, no portion of which has been surveyed, and in reference to which we have no reliable data. It is too much to attempt to impose either upon the good nature or credulity of this House, to ask us to delay this important matter until further exploration be made, to see if some possible line running around by Quebec cannot be found. There are other considerations suggested by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall). The bridge at Quebec is an absolute essential to the carrying out of the line by Quebec. The bridge at Lachine is a commercial necessity; it will be built as such without any subsidy from the Government; it has been contracted to be built already by the Quebec and Ontario road; they have set aside the funds for that purpose; it is essential to their system. But in order to build the Quebec bridge, what must we do? Mr. Light says they will require a guarantee of \$5,000,000 for a period of 25 years, at 4 per cent. interest. They will require the exact maximum amount which is proposed to be used as a subsidy for this entire short line *vid* Sherbrooke. The whole subsidy for that line will be required to build the bridge at Quebec. Mr. Light says it will be self-sustaining. How? The Intercolonial, he says, will give it an immense revenue. Will this Parliament, for a moment, consider the idea of transferring the business of the Intercolonial from the Grand Trunk to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order to show favoritism to one corporation over the other? Do not we all know that the road from Richmond to Lévis would be of no value whatever were it not for the Intercolonial traffic. The North Shore road takes the business between Quebec and Montreal largely, the boats taking their share during the season of navigation. What would the Quebec and Lévis section of the Grand Trunk Railway be worth if Mr. Light's project were approved. If it were thought good policy to ruin that section of the Grand Trunk Railway line by giving the trade to the Canadian Pacific Railway, our own traffic on the Intercolonial will have to pay for it. That traffic is now carried by the Grand Trunk Railway at reasonable rates over the Victoria bridge, but if we build a bridge at Quebec and charge ourselves tolls in order to pay the interest on the cost of the bridge, we will be transferring money from one pocket to another. Whatever the Intercolonial contributes to the traffic of the bridge will be a tax on our own road. The bridge at Lachine is recognised as a necessity; the Victoria bridge is found to be inadequate to the requirements of trade and commerce, and not only is the Lachine bridge to be used by the Canadian Pacific Railway system of railways, but other railways leading to New York and Boston feel the necessity of having this bridge, and are prepared to make contributions to build it. At all events, the Dominion will be relieved from any applications for subsidy for the building of this bridge at Lachine. There are many points I would like to discuss in connection with this matter, but I do not want to weary the House. I say that the Maritime Provinces have the right to this promised assistance. There has been no controversy on that point; there seems to be no objection to granting the amount asked for, so far as we can judge from the discussions hitherto, and from our going into committee without any debate. It is only a question of route, and I say that the Eastern Townships have contributed more than any other section of the

Dominion to the great works which have received aid from the Local and Dominion Governments, in comparison with the benefits we have received from them. We have helped to build your railways and your wharves and your light-houses. We have helped to build up and improve the canal system; but where has any expenditure been made in the Eastern Townships? We have not asked for it, though we have taken our share of the public burden. Our own enterprises have been built up largely by our own contributions. The township in which I live, and which will be benefited by this road, has contributed no less than \$250,000 to railways. The counties of Sherbrooke and Compton have contributed a quarter of a million of dollars to a railway which should become a portion of this system. The county of Brome has contributed \$196,000 to railways which cross the system and will be tributaries to it, and will be benefited by it. The county of Shefford has contributed \$350,000 to railways, which, very likely, will be tributaries to this system or become part of it. I might go through the list; no less than \$1,500,000 have been contributed by the municipalities in the Eastern Townships to railways which will be portions of this line or tributaries to it, so that these people will get the benefit, and they number no less than 250,000. I say a quarter of a million of people who have contributed a million and a-half of money to railways which will be a portion of this line or tributary to it, are entitled to receive consideration at the hands of this House, and I have no doubt they will receive it, inasmuch as they never have been in a position to ask for favors of any description. This is not asked as a favor, but only to indicate that if a locality of the northern route would like to have this subsidy, there are other localities in other parts of Quebec which would be entitled to it on such considerations. But it will not be decided on these considerations; it will be decided upon broader, upon common sense and upon commercial principles. If you are building a line to the nearest Atlantic port, St. Andrews, you would go *via* Sherbrooke; because a line *via* Lennoxville is only four miles from the straight line. Draw a straight line from Montreal to St. Andrews, and it passes only four miles from Lennoxville, which is the most remote point from the air line. If you draw a line from Montreal to St. John it passes only eight miles from Lennoxville. Go by way of Quebec, and, as has been stated by the Minister, and also by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke, you get from 80 to 96 miles to the north of the air line. Draw a straight line from Montreal to Salisbury, and it carries you by this route, which is as nearly an air line as is practicable, except through a dead level, flat country. What more is wanted? It is proved to be a practicable road. I had heard certain objections made to the International road. I had heard it said that the maximum grade on that road was 74 feet, and I wanted to know the inwardness of that, and so I wrote to the engineer who located the road, and there is not, in this country, a better engineer for that purpose. He has just located 450 miles of the eastern section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he tells me that they were limited to a 66 feet maximum in locating that road. That was thought suitable for the present requirements of the road. For a short distance a 74 feet grade was used, but it was with the view of subsequently changing it, so that the grade would be 66 feet to the mile, and this engineer assured me that the whole line from Lennoxville to the boundary could be brought down, without considerable expense and without lengthening it, to 60 feet to the mile as a maximum. That answers every practical requirement. You cannot pass over the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Intercolonial Railway, or any railway between this and the seaboard, without, of necessity, passing over certain points where considerable grades exist, because we all know that those ranges of mountains which are known in the United States as the Green Mountains and the

White Mountains, extend into Canada and reach to the St. Lawrence and to the ocean. You have to cross them somewhere before you get to the seaboard, and there must be a short distance of grades which are not equal to the level grades to be found in the valley of the St. Lawrence. It has been sufficiently demonstrated that this is the shortest practicable route, and that, in every sense, whether you take its commercial advantages, or take it as being a compromise road for all these ocean ports, it is the best. The road which the Government engineer prefers in his report is not the best route to St. Andrews, for there is a shorter route to St. Andrews. It is not the shortest route to St. John, but it is the shortest route to Halifax, which is the most distant point, and it is not sufficiently inconvenient to St. Andrews or St. John to make it objectionable on that account. As a compromise road, to reach the ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and to serve Prince Edward Island, it is the best that can be drawn. Though it is not the shortest line to St. Andrews or St. John, it saves over 400 miles to St. Andrews, 300 miles to St. John and 140 or 150 miles to Halifax, in comparison with the Intercolonial Railway, and is the route which would command the largest amount of traffic. There is another thing which I desire to mention here, and which I ask those hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces to consider seriously. As my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has indicated, there is but one chartered road across the State of Maine, and that is by the Megantic route. No meeting of the Maine Legislature occurs for two years, and therefore no charter can be obtained for two years across the State of Maine. No short line can be built to the Maritime Provinces except across the State of Maine, and consequently, if this line be not adopted, you have no guarantee that for two years to come our friends from the Maritime Provinces can begin to see their expectations realised. And who knows what changes may take place within two years? The thing is within their grasp now, and they can have it if they wish. If they postpone it for two years more, who knows what changes may come over Governments, what changes may come over parties, or what changes may come over the country. No one knows what two years may bring forth. Now, a very strong desire was felt to obtain a charter on the north side of Moosehead Lake, in the interests of this same Megantic line, and at a time when it was not known which would be the best route. The company wanted to secure the best route, but they had not made a survey, and they did not know whether they would go south of the Moosehead Lake or go north of it, and they wished to obtain a charter that would enable them to take either of those routes. But they were emphatically told: No; you must have no road that does not connect with our system of railways; and would any one say that they were not right? What advantage can it be to the people of the State of Maine to have a railway passing north of Moosehead Lake and running into the Province of New Brunswick, without making any connection with the Maine system of railways? It would throw the traffic which now comes down to Bangor, the lumber supplies and everything that goes to their own cities and over their own railways, over an alien railway and to a foreign country. Well, none of us are so disinterested as to be willing to do that under like circumstances, and the people of Maine are not so unselfish as to be willing to do that either, and they refused to give a charter to a railway passing north of Moosehead Lake.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COLBY. Hon. gentlemen say, "hear, hear." Do they mean to imply that they expect that we are going to send the commerce of this country 214 miles by a roundabout way, in order to reach a Maine harbor? There are local

interests in the north part of Maine that would be injured seriously if a railway was to pass through that State, which was in no sense tributary to their own railway system, and which would enable a Canadian railway to furnish supplies to the lumbermen of those regions, instead of doing it themselves. They are within their right, and they refused to give to this Megantic road the privilege of locating a line on the north side of Moosehead Lake, and they would not permit the Megantic road to pass Lake Moosehead on the route now proposed, unless they would undertake to make a connection of eight miles with the railway running to Bangor. I know how the Bangor people feel about that matter. I have been to Bangor myself, and have had consultations with those gentlemen; I tried to enthuse them on the subject, but they would not enthuse a bit—not enough to put their hands in their pockets. They say: We have no objection to your road coming here, but we have serious objection to your road running through the north part of the State and making no connection with our system of railways, so that we can get no advantages from it. And they took a business view of the matter. I have no doubt it will be a great convenience to the commerce of that State, and I have no doubt that if the road is built *vid* Moosehead Lake it will supply the whole of the lumbering district to the north of it, and all the freights of those regions will be carried over this railway, because it is the shortest, the most direct, and it will work in harmony, to a certain extent, with their own system of railways. Now, I would impress upon our friends from the Maritime Provinces the fact that no Legislature in Maine will meet for two years to come, and if they determine upon postponing this work for another year or two, in order to see whether this mythical route may not prove to be an actual route, they incur the great risk that usually attends upon delays. I think they have the thing now within their grasp, if they choose to hold it, judging from the sentiment in the House. Last Session 135 members of the House to 28 favored the subsidy given then; that subsidy is to-day repeated and enlarged, and there seems to be no fault found with the amount; so I take it that it is conceded that the amount is acceptable to this House. The only thing to be determined on now is the route. On that point I think enough has been put in evidence before the House, together with the map that has been laid upon the Table, to show that the shortest route is *vid* Sherbrooke and Megantic, that it is the best, as a compromise route, the most advantageous to the maritime ports for commercial purposes, and that as an engineering route it is the most practicable which can be adopted. I think these points have all been established, and I am therefore in favor of this resolution.

Mr. BURPEE. I am quite willing to endorse the route as indicated by the Minister of Public Works, as well as by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, if carried out in its entirety. But the eastern portion of the route has not yet been put forward in as satisfactory a light as it was possible to do. The distance from Fredericton to Salisbury has been described as 95 miles, but it is only 85 miles. It is described as not having been surveyed. Well, it has all been measured, it has all been traced, and more than half of it has been surveyed and located, so that the road is well known. So that in these two respects it is more favorable than has been represented by either Mr. Schreiber or Mr. Light. But I would like a little more information from the Minister of Public Works. I do not find any fault with the money that is given. Considering the amount of mileage that is to be built, I think the grant is not too much. I have no doubt the Government have taken means to ascertain whether it can be built for that amount. I see by the resolution that it starts at Montreal and ends at Halifax; that would include a bridge, I presume, as the hon. member for

Mr. COLBY.

Stanstead (Mr. Colby) has mentioned. Now, I wish to know if this road is to start from the southern bank of the St. Lawrence or from the city of Montreal? Is this amount to include the cost of building a bridge across the St. Lawrence?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is nothing about a bridge. The road is to go from the south bank of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. LANGELIER. The river must be crossed. Is it proposed to cross the river at Montreal or at Lachine?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The question asked by the member was whether any part of the subsidy is to be appropriated for building a bridge. I say no.

Mr. LANGELIER. Will the road cross at Montreal or at Lachine? The river must be crossed at one point or the other. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) has stated that it is intended to cross the river from Lachine to Caughnawaga. Is such the fact, or is it the intention of the company to build a bridge directly from Longueuil to St. Lambert?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member for Sunbury.

Mr. BURPEE. Then, I take it for granted that no portion of the money will be devoted to building a bridge. Is it decided definitely whether it will cross the lake or go on the southern side?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To cross the lake.

Mr. BURPEE. Is there any estimate of the cost of the bridge across the lake?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BURPEE. How long will the company have to complete the road?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Two years to begin, and four years to complete.

Mr. BURPEE. I think that is too long a time. I would press on the Government that it should be two years to complete, instead of four. It is very important, in the interest of the whole route, that the road should be proceeded with simultaneously at different points. If the company have four years to complete, the people of the Maritime Provinces will have a long time to wait before they will get any benefit from it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the ordinary time. I am afraid the hon. gentleman finds that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been built so rapidly, that we must now build every other work with the same rapidity. This company has not equal means. They will, of course, do the best they can, as it is in their interest to build it as rapidly as possible. If the term were diminished to two years, those undertaking the work might have more difficulty in raising the funds. The hon. member has no doubt followed the proceedings in the Railway Committee, and is aware that this is a very ordinary concession made to a company undertaking a work of such magnitude.

Mr. LAURIER. A good deal has been said as to the relative merits of the different routes. It will not be opportune to discuss this subject until the Government have submitted further information. I have one word to offer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Stanstead. He gave it as an argument in favor of the choice made by the Government that the counties through which the road will pass have contributed several hundreds of thousands of dollars to railway construction. I do not want to depreciate in any way the efforts made by those counties, but I would remind the hon. gentleman that a large portion of the money which has been expended in the Eastern Townships

in the construction of railways, if not the greater portion, has been derived from the municipal loan fund.

Mr. COLBY. No.

Mr. LAURIER. In Shefford the whole of it was so derived. In other counties it was much the same.

Mr. COLBY. No; very little, except Shefford.

Mr. LAURIER. The county of Shefford has contributed \$300,000 to railways, and derived that amount from the municipal loan fund, on which it has never paid a cent, either principal or interest. We are entitled to have more information on this subject than that already given. Will the Minister explain why, in computing the distance between Montreal and Sherbrooke, the distance is computed over the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is because that road is already built, and we take advantage of the railways already built, provided they do not increase the distance much.

Mr. LAURIER. The reason I asked for an answer was this: It has always been understood that the Short Line Railway, so far as this line has been laid out, is to tap the St. Lawrence and carry over a bridge at Lachine. The hon. gentleman said there were 216 miles to build: that is, 80 miles between Chambly and Huntville, and 136 miles between the international boundary and Mettawamkeag.

Mr. COLBY. I suppose the engineer has taken the existing railways and the existing bridges. In case a change should be made, instead of the distance to be constructed being lengthened it may be materially shortened. The distance from Lachine to St. John's, Quebec is about 20 miles, the same as the other line already constructed. When you strike St. John's, Quebec, you strike a road running all the way to Sherbrooke, so instead of having 80 miles to build you have only 20 to build. The Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly road is in operation from St. John's to Waterloo, where it connects with the Waterloo and Magog, which connects with the Sherbrooke, and the line, with little alteration, is very likely the best possible to go through that country. So that the change may very likely result in utilising 80 miles of railway already built, instead of 20. That, I say, may be among the probabilities.

Mr. LAURIER. That would be utilising a portion already built.

Mr. COLBY. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. The more explanation we have the more confused we are, because it is stated that between Chambly and Lennoxville a new line would have to be built. We were not to make use of railways already existing, but the subsidies contemplated the construction of 80 miles of new road between those places.

Mr. COLBY. Precisely so.

Mr. LAURIER. Not precisely so, because we would use a portion already existing.

Mr. COLBY. I do not understand that there is anything in the report of the engineers, or in the recommendation of the Government, to prevent them making the best possible arrangement in the interests of the country. It may be that there are better arrangements than any indicated in the engineer's report, I suppose the Government resolutions are based on the engineer's report, but my own individual opinion is, that if the bridge is located as high up as Lachine, it will ultimately result in arrangements being made quite in the interests of the country, in which an economy may be effected from what it would cost to build an entirely new 80 miles of railway.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to the Government selecting the best route, but I think we are entitled to know exactly what the Government consider the best route, when they are asking for the peoples' money. The hon. gentleman says it is within the possibilities that instead of building a new line between Chambly and Lennoxville, use may be made of the line already constructed between Lennoxville and St. John's. But the Government have not so stated. The Minister of Public Works, when explaining the policy of the Government, stated that on this line 216 miles of new railway would have to be built—136 between the end of the International Railway and Mettawamkeag, and 80 miles between Sherbrooke and Lennoxville. If that be so, we know where the subsidy will go, and we can judge whether the subsidy is excessive or not. But, if instead of applying it towards building the railway between Lennoxville and Chambly, it is proposed to make use of a part of railway already existing, we ought to know it. We have a right to know what is proposed to be done.

Mr. COLBY. I do not know but this is very well as *ad captandum*, but I certainly think it is not business like. If the Government suppose that possibly it might be thought best to utilise a road belonging in part to foreigners, I do not think that they should so limit themselves in their declarations in Parliament, or in their Bill in the House, that they should place themselves entirely at the mercy of those people, and be obliged to do it. The Government state an available proposition; they state what can be done by the construction of this line, and if the hon. gentleman complains of anything, he complains that they did not preclude themselves from doing something better, if the opportunity should present itself. I think the Government acts wisely in not doing so. The Government do not know whether this road can be acquired on any terms. I stated this for the information of the hon. gentleman, as amongst the possibilities which had occurred to my own mind; but the Government do not intend to build a railway, nor do they propose to place themselves in negotiation with railway owners. The Government is not the party to move in any matter of that kind, but they need not limit themselves in such a way as to make it absolutely necessary to acquire a road which, perhaps, could not be acquired at all, and which it might not think best to acquire. I mentioned that as a possibility more favorable to the company than anything suggested in the Government resolutions.

Mr. LAURIER. I take complete issue with the hon. gentleman, even on the score of business. When the Government are asking the people to vote them the money we have a right to know how they will apply that money, and it is business that we should know exactly how they will do so. If they think there are one or two methods in which they can apply the money, let them say so. I do not object to their stating their policy, whether it is building a new railway or making use of an existing railway, but the House should know exactly what they are doing when they are voting the money. So far, the Government has said nothing of the possibilities which the hon. member for Stanstead now suggests. The explanation of the Government is, that the subsidies shall go towards building 216 miles of railway, including the 80 miles between Sherbrooke and Chambly; and if it is upon the *tapis* that the money is to be expended, not only as suggested by the Minister of Public Works, but as stated by the hon. member for Stanstead, then I say we are entitled to know from the Government themselves.

Mr. HALL. The hon. gentleman seems to overlook the fact that it is a matter of indifference to the Government or to the country whether a section is acquired and improved, or built anew. Estimating that the cost will be \$20,000 a mile for the 585 miles to Salisbury, it would

amount to \$11,700,000, on which \$250,000 a year is less than 2½ per cent. So that this subsidy which is being given is just about one-half the interest on a bond for the cost of the construction and equipment of that road, whether it is built new or acquired and improved; and the statement about the portion built and to be built, I understand, is made by the Government, not as a matter of much consequence to the House, but as determining the facility and the rapidity with which the line could be completed.

Mr. BLAKE. But I think there is a very important consideration as to that. I do not understand that we are to vote away the public money in order to aggrandise private fortunes. Nobody can deny that if there is any merit in this scheme whatever, the result of its completion must be largely to enhance the value of those lines already constructed, which are now to become, instead of isolated local lines, also parts of a great through line. They are there; somebody owns them; but is it to be said that besides paying a large subsidy towards the construction of the links which are to give them an enhanced value, we are to give the public funds in order that somebody may buy somebody else's property? I say the enhanced value of those lines is a piece of great good fortune to the proprietors of those lines, without our giving public money in order to their being bought. Let them be thrown into the common stock of the new through line, at what price may be agreed upon between the fortunate proprietors of the new combination; but do not let it be said that the public are to pay for those lines at the enhanced value they will acquire as new lines. It seems to me we are entitled to know on what basis this proposal is made. The Minister of Public Works did not think it worth while to tell us how it was that a subsidy of \$170,000 a year for 15 years, which we were assured emphatically last year was enough to accomplish this object, is now to be changed into a subsidy of \$250,000 a year for 20 years. I have given the capitalised value of this subsidy; it is an addition doubling the amount of last year. I asked Sir Charles Tupper last year how he knew \$170,000 a year was enough. He said he could not tell, but he assured us that he had made enquiries, and that it was enough. Now we are not told that more is necessary or why it is necessary, except that we see it in the resolution. Is it necessary because it is found necessary to buy the proprietors of these large roads and pay them for them? The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) said, awhile ago, that as long as there were sacrifices and expenditures to be involved by themselves, they had a monopoly. Well, they were promoting their own interest. Some of the municipalities which have paid inordinate sums and have not reaped the fruits have suffered some misfortune. I do not know whether it is intended to recoup them; I do not know whether it is intended to purchase the International line—not only to give it an enhanced value as the concern it will become as part of the through line, but also to give the money to buy it at that enhanced price. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), a little while ago, spoke of Mr. Light, whom I do not know; but he was employed by this Government to make this survey, and I suppose he had their confidence, and the hon. gentleman said he knew Mr. Light, because, as the Government engineer of the Province of Quebec, he had made a report as to the north shore in consequence of influences from Terrebonne. Well, we know what that meant; it was not because Terrebonne had more voices, but because the voice that spoke for Terrebonne in the Legislature of Quebec was the most powerful voice in that Legislature; and the hon. gentleman knows the unfortunate results that were achieved by Mr. Light, because the Prime Minister of that day wanted the road changed to suit his constituency. And to-day we have a gentleman appointed Acting Minister of Railways in this House, in

Mr. HALL.

whose charge Mr. Schreiber is, who has been directing these surveys, who is the political officer responsible for the direction of these surveys, and for the orders in which these surveys are given; and he is not in the House at this moment listening to this discussion.

Mr. POPE. I am here.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, he is here; but he is on the back benches. He comes forward now, and I am glad to see him. It is in his Department in which these surveys have been going on, but he does not take charge of the resolutions; they are not placed in his hands to move.

Mr. POPE. Nor was it under my charge the surveys were made.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I do not know to whom the hon. gentleman's deputy and engineer was allotted for the surveys.

Mr. POPE. I refused to take any part in these surveys. Sir John A. Macdonald said he would do it himself when I accepted the position of Acting Minister of Railways.

Mr. BLAKE. There is the acknowledged incompatibility in the hon. gentleman's position. That is what I complain of; I say he ought not to have been appointed Acting Minister of Railways during the time these great interests were decided, because his personal interests were such as to prevent him acting in that position.

Mr. POPE. No; I have no personal interest.

Mr. BLAKE. He is reported to have a large personal interest in the International Railway.

Mr. POPE. You should not take everybody's reports.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman won't give me anybody's report. I think it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have been appointed Acting Minister of Railways at the time and under the circumstances that this change was to be made. I think it would have been better that the political officer at the head of that Department should not have had the interest the hon. gentleman had in the solution of this question. That very circumstance was not to disqualify the hon. gentleman continuing in the Government; but he had his own Department, the Department of Agriculture and Statistics. But why should he be taken out of the Department of Railways, which had to settle this question? Now I have extracted from the hon. gentleman the admission that he felt himself he could not touch this question, and that the First Minister had to instruct Mr. Schreiber, that he had to give orders about the surveys, as the political person responsible for all this, although up to this instant he had supposed the Acting Minister was the person responsible. There was a hidden hand, and the hidden hand is now disclosed.

Mr. POPE. No; there was no hidden hand.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it was the hon. gentleman's hand, for his was the hand we saw.

Mr. POPE. It was the open hand of the Prime Minister.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it was not, because it is only to-night that we learn it was his hand. But although the Prime Minister wrote, I dare say the hon. gentleman was at his ear.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Are you sure? What a dreadful position for the Acting Minister of Railways to be in, that he could not even speak to the First Minister about an important affair. What a shocking position for him to be in. Would it not be very much better if he were not Acting Minister of Railways?

Mr. POPE. That is too thin.

Mr. BLAKE. I really think the hon. gentleman's statement is too thin, quite too thin, so thin that we understand it. It is a polite way of saying it was managed in this particular manner. Here we are with this proposal, the Acting Minister of Railways acknowledged he could not take part in it. I did not know his disability went so far that he could not say a word about it, even in private. We have this important admission, that in the decision of this matter we are deprived of the responsibility of even the Acting Minister. We want information of the principle upon which this subsidy has been fixed. Is it on the principle, which is now ascertained, that the hon. gentleman's railway and others will have to be bought, and the public money will have to be paid for them? Is it on the principle that a part of the subsidy will have to go in that way? If so, how much? When we find an addition of \$1,500,000 to the sum said to be sufficient last year, and find that addition coincident with the announcement that we require the International line, we have a right to be informed what sum of money is to go into the acquisition of the International line.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) put me a question whilst the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) was addressing the House, and of course I could not then answer it. As I said to the hon. member for Sunbury, this vote has nothing to do with the bridge at Montreal. The vote is for a line of railway to connect Montreal with St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, *vid* Sherbrooke. When the time comes to apply this subsidy due the line mentioned here, of course the Government will take care that the connection between the south shore and the St. Lawrence be made in such a way as to meet the requirements of trade and the public interests generally. There are different ways of making the connection. Of course, there is always the Victoria bridge, and then the proposed Lachine bridge. That question has not come up. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has asked what is to be done with this money, whether it is to be employed in purchasing this line or the other, or whether it is to build the 216 miles which are mentioned in the tabular statement I gave as a portion of the line which is not built, and which must be built, if we want to have a complete line from Montreal to St. Andrews, St. John or Halifax. No doubt this money will go towards securing a line from Montreal to these ports. How will that money be employed? As the hon. gentleman says, it is so much a year for so many years; therefore, the Government must see that the conditions of the vote be fulfilled; that is to say, they must have proof positive that this line will be obtained, which is considered the shortest and the best under the circumstances, from Montreal to the maritime ports. I cannot say whether there will be so much for rolling stock or so many miles built, but when I gave these figures about the miles built and to be built, I wished to show in what position was the line for which we were asking a subsidy. A portion of the line is built and a portion is not built, and the company that will be formed must show that they comply with the requirements of this vote; that is to say, that this line will be obtained, by which we can reach, for example, St. Andrews by a line not to exceed 430 miles, as mentioned here. The hon. member for West Durham said we must not use this money to increase the private fortunes of anyone. There is no desire or intention on the part of the Government to use this money in any other way than the resolution says, purely and simply, that is, to give to the company the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to the seaboard in the Maritime Provinces. That is the sole object we have in view. The amount of money is large, as the hon. gentleman says, but we believe, on the information we have now from our chief engineer, that this

sum is required. This vote is a heavy one, no doubt, but it is a vote which, after all, will give good return to the country. It will secure our connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific by the shortest route possible under the circumstances. Of course, if we do not build this direct line we would have to see our trade go from Montreal to Portland. Then all the advantages of the terminus of such a great railway in winter would be to the benefit of the United States. We do not wish this. In the same way that we have taken care that our railway shall not be tapped in British Columbia for the benefit of the United States of America, our enterprising neighbors, who have their own rival railway, the Northern Pacific, so we thought that we should not allow them to benefit at the Atlantic end of the railway; or, after all the sacrifices we have had to make, to obtain the terminus at Portland or elsewhere in the United States. We thought the railway should end on our own territory on the Atlantic shores, so as to give us the benefit of the cargoes which are to be sent abroad and the return cargoes which would secure to us the benefit of that foreign trade. Under these circumstances, we expect that Parliament will not refuse to make this sacrifice again in order to complete this system. After the large sacrifices the country has made for the opening of the North-West by the Canadian Pacific Railway, though this vote of \$80,000 a year for twenty years is considerable, nevertheless we think it is not such as to warrant a refusal on the part of Parliament. Parliament would wish to complete its work by linking the two oceans by its railway route, and therefore we believe that the vote which we are asking will be cheerfully granted by Parliament. The hon. member for West Durham has alluded to Mr. Light. As far as he is known to me personally, I have nothing against him, and I have never known anything against him, except what was stated to-night by hon. gentlemen who brought reports and statements, and of course were responsible for those statements. The hon. gentlemen who made them must have had good data, and I am only sorry that the opportunity has occurred to bring them here, because it is always a pity that a man in the position of Mr. Light should be damaged in his reputation. But if these figures are not correct, as given by the hon. gentlemen, the latter must take the consequence. The hon. member for West Durham has given his version of the way in which the North Shore was extended to Terrebonne, and so on.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it is the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. member for West Durham has added something to the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, in giving the name of a gentleman connected with the Government, one of my colleagues. I am sorry my hon. friend the Secretary of State is not here, because I have no doubt he would have been perfectly able to defend himself before the House, and I hope he will be in better health to-morrow, so that he may answer the hon. member for West Durham. As to these resolutions being in my hands, this is not the first time that one Minister takes a portion of the work of another Minister, and brings up a matter and does his best to lay it before the House and to help his colleagues. I did so the other day, in regard to the railways in the North-West and their land subsidies, though those were matters connected with the Department of the Interior. I am not Minister of that Department, but I was asked by the First Minister to take charge of that matter, and I did so, as I have done now; and, no doubt, I might ask some of my colleagues to take some of my work, if I were not in good health.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the Secretary of State, I must say that the hon. member for Sherbrooke having pointed out that it was influence from Terrebonne which

caused this change in the Act, and that it was made on the reports of the chief engineer of the Province at the time—a very unfortunate selection—I pointed out where the influence from Terrebonne was.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Sherbrooke spoke of influences, but he gave no name. It was my hon. friend from West Durham who gave the name of the Secretary of State, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend from West Durham, when the Secretary of State is in the House, will repeat in his presence what he has said.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member can report to the Secretary of State what I have said, and if he has anything to say in answer he can say it. I have no occasion to repeat my remarks. I pointed out that the influences from Terrebonne were obviously those of the member for Terrebonne, who was the First Minister of the Province.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He was not the First Minister at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. No; he was not at that time the First Minister, but he was the Provincial Secretary; he was a Minister of the Crown for the Province of Quebec in the DeBoucherville Government. The hon. gentleman has said he has no doubt Parliament will grant this cheerfully, and that it is an addition of \$80,000 a year for 20 years. But there is also \$170,000 for 5 years, which the hon. gentleman forgot to mention. And the present value of the whole, as I have said, is a million and a-half. The hon. gentleman says great results are going to be achieved by it. We will not discuss that question now; we may differ in opinion as to the magnitude of the results. Last Session I stated that I had always desired to see shorter communication between the different Provinces of the Dominion; that I thought it was a great mistake not to have had that shorter communication, even before the Intercolonial was built. I believed a great error had been committed at that time, in not accomplishing the short communication between the two Provinces, and one of the serious consequences of this step is in relation to the Intercolonial Railway itself. But that is not of prime consequence. The hon. gentleman does not tell us that he has any assurance from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they are going to take the through traffic of their railway to the provincial ports. He has no such assurance. But the company have announced their policy. We know what they propose doing. We have found them going to Portland and negotiating for facilities there. We have found them discussing the question of the Portland and Ogdensburgh. We have heard Mr. Stephen declaring publicly that they were desirous of obtaining a Portland connection, and indicating their understanding of what the people of Portland would do, in order that they might make that connection. At that time the city of Montreal was their summer port and they wanted to go to Portland for their winter port. Why? Not because they disliked the Maritime Provinces or the Province of Quebec, as some people have said. I do not believe they have any feeling of liking or disliking about it, but it was from commercial considerations that they believed they should reach Portland. I have heard hon. gentlemen in this House, at least one, say that it was hatred for the city of Quebec which actuated them. I had no idea that they were moved by either love or hatred; I thought they were passionless in the matter. They believed, rightly or wrongly, that Portland was their objective point for their through traffic. Well, if they believed that, and if they make that connection, I suppose that it will be from purely commercial considerations. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) told us that there was a line of road something over 200 miles long between Montreal and Portland, but he did not tell us what the distance would be by the proposed route. But that is not the question. The question which

Mr. BLAKE.

I put to the hon. gentleman and which he, experienced in avoiding giving answers to difficult questions, answered by a patriotic effusion, was this: Last Session we were told that this subsidy of a capital value of under \$1,900,000 would accomplish this result. This Session we are told it will take a subsidy of the capital value of \$3,400,000. I asked him to state how it was that he told us last Session that this first sum would suffice for building this road, and that twelve months afterwards he comes down and tells us that he was mistaken, and that he requires \$1,500,000 more. The hon. gentleman says it is based upon the report of the engineer. But I have not seen any report of the engineer which says that this additional subsidy is requisite, or that it will answer. It must be a verbal report of the engineer. But is that sufficient data? After we have been deceived and disappointed last year, after the experience of last year, is it enough to say that the chief engineer thinks this \$1,500,000 is necessary and that it will suffice? I say there is no satisfactory information upon which Parliament is to be called upon to agree with the Ministers who were so egregiously mistaken, as they now say they were, last year. But what were the data of last Session? Upon what ground was it that last Session we were told that a subsidy, the capital value of which is under \$1,900,000 a year, would do this work? The information was kept in the Ministers' breasts, but they told us that they had acquired it, and a confiding Parliament believed their statement and voted a subsidy. And this Session we get no more information, except the statement that they were all wrong themselves, that their information was imperfect and inaccurate, and that they require a million and a-half more. Who is to get this million and a-half, and why is it required? On what basis is it that \$150,000 for another five years and \$80,000 for twenty years are now required, when \$120,000 for fifteen years was ample twelve months ago? That is an important question, because we have no assurance in the face of these facts, that we will not be called upon next Session to vote a still further sum. I think after the experiences of last year, when the Ministers have come down and told us that they were disappointed in their expectations of last year, they ought to have brought some data, some tangible information to guide us in our decision, some information from those persons who are to take an interest in this matter, some information from the anonymous individuals who are at the back of all this transaction, which will show, first of all, that it was necessary to give so much, and secondly, that so much would do.

Mr. STAIRS. This question is so important to the Maritime Provinces, that I must ask permission to point out some of the reasons which induce me to support the line which has been selected by the Government. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has fallen into an error, I presume inadvertently, as to the length of the road provided for by these resolutions. I understood him to say that there were 216 miles to be built.

Mr. LAURIER. That is what the Minister said.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the chief engineer estimated the distance from Fredericton to Salisbury at 95 miles, and the distance as given by the Minister, I understood, was the distance which was necessary to reach St. John. But of course it is necessary to reach Halifax, which requires about 113 miles. But the whole length which it will be necessary to construct to reach the ports in Nova Scotia, will be something like 300 miles. We have heard a good deal to-night upon the question of routes and distances, and we have heard about a line by Quebec, and this line which has been chosen by the Government, represented in Mr. Schreiber's report as No. 6. I may say that a very careful examination, even before the subject was brought before the House, convinced me

that the line (No. 6) was the best that could be chosen in the interest of Halifax, and it is in that interest alone that I support it. There have been objections raised against it, and it has been said that a shorter line could have been found by way of Richmond. Now, I think if any hon. member will look at the map we have before us this evening, he will see that it is impossible to get a line that is much shorter by an air line from Richmond than the one chosen. Because, if you continue the line from Richmond to a point where it will connect with the line surveyed by Vernon Smith, which runs to a considerable distance to the north of Moosehead Lake, you will find that line goes as far north of the air line as the line No. 6 at the most distant point diverges to the south. So, even if an air line could be got to Richmond, to a point connecting with Vernon Smith's line, it would not materially shorten the distance. And when a line is carried from Richmond you would have to allow the ordinary curvature, which would make the air line that is being sought for about as long as No. 6. There has been one point touched this evening which needs a little consideration, I think. It is in connection with diverting trade to United States ports. The reason why I support this line (No. 6) is because I am convinced there is no more danger of trade being diverted to American ports by this line than if we ran a line 20 or 30 miles to the north. If the through trade of the Dominion is to go to American ports, it is quite certain that a distance of 20 or 30 miles, north or south, is not going to affect it. I believe that is certain, and think, therefore, the line chosen by the Government, all things taken into consideration, is the one which gives us the best chance of sending to the ports of the lower Provinces a good share of the trade of the west. There is another important matter that should not be forgotten. It is that the resolutions are to provide for one complete line to Salisbury, from the south shore of the St. Lawrence opposite Montreal. It is absolutely necessary that it should be one line, not a line worked or operated by different companies and under different control. The Government have entered into a contract to give the people of the lower Provinces this one line to Salisbury, Nova Scotia, and connections with St. John and St. Andrews, and possibly, at some future day, with Louisburg. If that is the case, it would be wise for the Government to consider the advisability of providing, at some future stage, that a condition should be imposed upon the company which makes the contract for the construction of the line, that it should be completed and a junction effected with the Intercolonial, and that it should not be permitted to terminate at any intermediate points. This is of vast importance to the lower Provinces, and I trust when the Bill is introduced such a condition will be inserted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to send me his suggestion in writing, so that it may be considered before we take another stage.

Mr. STAIRS. I shall have great pleasure in sending it. There is another most important point in connection with the interest of the Maritime Provinces, and it is that the line from Montreal to Salisbury shall be under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will read letters which have been received from the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which will throw some light upon this point, and will answer, to a certain extent, some of the objections urged to these resolutions by the hon. member for West Durham. In a letter dated 25th February, 1885, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, addressing you, Mr. Chairman, said :

"M. B. DALY, Esq., Ottawa :

"DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of the letter of the 24th instant, signed by yourself and Messrs. Wood and Stairs, upon the subject of the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Maritime Provinces, so as to connect it with the Ports of St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax and Louisbourg.

"OTTAWA, 25th February, 1885.

"With reference to the matter of the location of such an extension as you refer to, I beg to say that my opinion remains unchanged by the various surveys that have been made. On the contrary, my previous opinion has been confirmed, and I am fully satisfied that the best line would be a line running as directly as possible from Montreal via Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake and Fredericton to Moncton, utilising existing lines as far as practicable. I may further say that if the Government should decide adequately to subsidise such a line, it could, in my opinion, be completed within two years from the date of the contract.

"I estimate that a first-class road, thoroughly equipped, would involve a capital cost of \$12,500,000. While I am not now in a position to commit my colleagues to an actual offer to undertake the work, I feel safe in saying that with a subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 20 years the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company would be willing to enter into a contract with the Government to make the direct connection, as above stated. Speaking for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I may say that, in my opinion, if such a railway were built, the latter company would undertake to lease and operate it, provided suitable provision were made for the carrying of freight over the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax.

"I may add that Moncton would be the proper point to connect the Louisburg Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway."

"I am, dear Sir,

"Yours very truly,

"GEO. STEPHEN."

In addition, there is another letter from Mr. Stephen, of a later date, 16th June, 1885, as follows:—

"THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.,

"OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

"MONTREAL, 16th June, 1885.

"M. B. DALY, Esq. :

"J. F. STAIRS, Esq. :

"SIR,—Replying to your letter of the 16th June on the subject of the proposed short line between Montreal and the sea-ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I have to say that the route indicated therein is, in the light of our present knowledge, the best that has been proposed, and this route is preferred by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to any other that has been suggested.

"I will say, further, that it is the desire of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take up this scheme as a natural and necessary supplement to the Canadian Pacific Railway as it now exists.

"The company will be ready without loss of time to enter into negotiations with the Government for carrying out this project, as soon as the necessary legislation is obtained."

"I am, Sirs,

"Yours truly,

"GEO. STEPHEN, President."

In view of those two letters, there is a possibility, almost a certainty, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company being able to secure this line and work it to the Maritime Provinces. One of my reasons for supporting the present line is, because we have a better chance, in fact, the only chance, of securing their assistance in this work if we adopt it. I believe it is impossible for many reasons to take up the Quebec line. Great delay would certainly take place in securing the construction of a bridge at Quebec and making further arrangements to connect with the Maritime Provinces. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do not soon see a fair chance of getting trade to our own ports, it will be diverted to American ports, and it will be out of their power to prevent it. This is, to myself and other members of the lower Provinces, very important indeed. We have to consider, and I have always considered, the trade interests of our own Provinces. In view of the expenditure that has taken place in the North-West and in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people of the Maritime Provinces have a right to ask for a sufficient subsidy to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to own that road. I am sure the propositions contained in the resolutions will be supported generally throughout the Maritime Provinces. As has been ably pointed out by hon. gentlemen in supporting the resolutions, this chance is one of the most valuable that could have been found. It suits, in the highest possible degree, the citizens of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia; it suits, more nearly than any other, the people of St. Andrews, St. John, and other parts of New Brunswick. In view of these considerations, I think the Government have acted wisely, and that those who are interested will be able to support this line. If there have been criticisms against it, I think a full knowledge of the circumstances existing will justify the course

of the Government, especially when we take into consideration that it is an impossibility for the Canadian Pacific Railway to procure a connection with the Maritime Provinces by any other line, and the absolute necessity which exists for a line which will secure us connection with the railway system of the west, not only having the shortest line to Montreal, but also—which is far more important, in my opinion—having extensions into the west, to connect us with the great grain centres, not only of Canada, but even of Chicago—I say, in view of these considerations it is of vital importance that we should endeavor to get such a line worked by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LESAGE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before these resolutions are adopted in committee, I feel it my duty to say a few words on the subject, and to examine their intrinsic value. I do not intend, at this late hour of the night, to make a long speech, especially as it might be considered that I have more than a personal interest in the question, but there is a fact which the present discussion has shown to me, a fact which had not yet come under our notice, and which I would have noticed with regret. That fact is, according to the speech delivered by my hon. friend, the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), and that delivered by my hon. friend, the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), I would always have thought that in railway matters the engineers were competent authorities. I had never dared to speak on the question of the short line in this House without having under my hand the papers required to establish the position which I occupied as a member from the district of Quebec, and having, by chance, the combination line within my district, I say I have noticed the fact that it seems that all the engineers are dishonest men. The hon. member for Sherbrooke has taken as his ground for the discussion of the question in which we are interested in so high a degree, and in which he is interested personally, like myself—and I do not try to conceal that fact—that the engineers who do not agree with Mr. Schreiber are men who have made false reports. My hon. friend from Stanstead, corroborating these assertions, even went further. Not only did he pretend that Mr. Light had made a report more or less reasonable or rational, and I will even say a report signed beforehand, but he has even tried to force upon us, from a sympathetic point of view, in a most brilliant peroration, such as he is always wont to make, the question of the short line, on account of the sacrifices which the municipalities of the Eastern Townships had made in favor of the roads which are connected with this line. Mr. Chairman, I wish to put myself here in the favorable position which my county has given me on that question. It is true that the famous combination line which has been so much discussed to-night, and which has been discussed in a more or less partial manner, in my opinion, goes through the county of Dorchester, which I have the honor to represent. But I am bound to say that the county of Dorchester, which is composed of sixteen large parishes, has sent to the hon. First Minister, who was then Acting Minister of Railways, petitions signed by the great majority of the county and representing the most influential part of the population, reminding him, in the first place, of a fact which had been recorded in the Parliamentary papers by the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, who had declared that the shortest and most advantageous line would be chosen. I, as member for the county of Dorchester, and our friends thought, according to a report made in 1834 by Mr. Yule, civil engineer, that we had the shortest and the most advantageous line, and under those circumstances I have thought it my duty to ask the hon. Minister of Railways for a survey of the Etchemin valley. That was kindly granted to me. Mr. Light, provincial engineer, was sent to make a barometric survey, as far as the Maine boundary.

Mr. STAIRS.

A little later on, not being satisfied with that survey, which was not a complete survey of the valley, I renewed my demand to the Minister of Railways, who answered that satisfaction would be given to me. In the course of the two following months, Mr. Wicksteed, an engineer connected with the Ottawa Railway Department, was sent, and he said to me, in an interview I had with him: "I was sent here to make a barometric survey of the valley of the Etchemin River." I said to him: "I do not think that this will be useful, for it has already been done by Mr. Light." Mr. Wicksteed said: "It is not made over the whole road." Then he made a barometric survey from Chaudière Junction to Lake Churchill, which is about 40 miles on the other side of the Maine boundary. A little later on, I again insisted upon the Government placing us on an equal footing with the other rival lines, by granting us instrumental surveys. The answer was favorable, and I think I may remind this House that in two different circumstances my hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) and myself, have put questions to the Government, asking for instrumental surveys. These have not been made, and therefore I think my hon. friend, the member for Stanstead, has gone a little too far when he compared the various lines and when he pronounced in favor of the International. Why should Mr. Schreiber be more credible than Mr. Light, Mr. Wicksteed or Mr. Vernon Smith? They are three engineers whom we had not asked, but whom we had accepted from the Government; and when these reports are discussed before the House, we are told that they are not true, that they are exaggerated reports. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, what are we to believe? For my part, when I submitted the question to the Government, I have not made a sectional question of it; I made a federal question of it. We had the promise from the Government that the shortest and the most favorable line would be chosen. It seems to me that that promise was sacred, and when we asked for surveys, and when I had the honor to present petitions, such as those which I have mentioned, it seems to me that it was a proof that we were not making a local question of it. Bear in mind, that on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, from the county of Lévis to the State of Maine, on an area covering sixty-seven miles in length and fifty miles in breadth, there is not one solitary railway. The question now before us cannot be discussed before the House from a sectional standpoint. Sixteen parishes are saying to the Government: If you wish to carry out the policy inaugurated by the construction of the Pacific Railway, that is, to have a through line on Canadian soil, although we have not the advantage of having direct communications with the large centres, we are ready to sacrifice all that in favor of the policy you have inaugurated. We are now asking you if you wish to have the short line. Considered from the point of view of the distance, and taking into account the curves and grades, we ask you to adopt the line of the River Etchemin, if it offers more advantages. Mr. Chairman, I can say it here, I do not fear to be contradicted by the reports of any engineers. The Etchemin River valley does not need any favor. It is a bed formed by nature for a railway. It has been repeated—and Mr. Schreiber has not feared to make false statements to support his contention—he has pretended that Mr. Light made false statements. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not an engineer, I am not a railway man; I am unable to say whether Mr. Light stated real facts or not, but I say that Mr. Schreiber, when he saw fit, in order to give more weight to his own assertions, to strike off certain words from a report, in order to kill that report, put himself in a very bad position indeed. The valley of the Etchemin River, as I said just now, does not want any favors. And I repeat it, we want surveys by competent engineers, in whom we have confidence. We ask for a report made after a survey, and not a report prepared and signed beforehand; that is all we ask. It seems to me I am taking a very dis-

interested position when I stand up to-day to defend the north shore line, I who live on the south shore. I must say that I am not sectional, and if I were, I would perhaps have some reason to favor the south shore. But I hold myself above these considerations, to see only the general interest above private interests. But at the same time I desire to rectify the remarks made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), remarks which he made in good faith, I hope, but which are not correct. These gentlemen do not know the line of the River Etchemin. All that I have asked is reports by competent engineers. In this, Mr. Chairman, I do not find fault with the Government, for I know that they have been well disposed towards myself and towards my county as regards the barometric surveys. It may be there are special reasons, unknown to me, for having refused more than that, when more was asked, but still I could not get satisfaction. I have not had the advantage of visiting the location, but it seems to me that the Government, when they submitted these reports, might have made them more complete. The hon. Minister of Public Works has given us the distances between Montreal and St. John, Hervey and Halifax. How is it that the Government should have come to such an important decision, when it is found, by the discussion which has just taken place, from both sides of the House, that it is almost unanimously admitted that all the reports of the engineers were false, that some 130 miles of the line which has been chosen as being the shortest line are yet unexplored, and may, in some places, have grades of more than 100 feet? All this may be supposed, for it has been stated that the engineers have exaggerated the reports and deviated from the route. I appeal especially to the members from the Maritime Provinces, so that they may not suppose that I am dealing with the question from a sectional standpoint. It is a federal question, and my county has signed petitions, praying that the line should pass where the interests of the Dominion should be best promoted. How is it, I say, that the Government appropriates such a large sum without these correct reports, and especially when the result will be to isolate from the Pacific trade the whole district and the city of Quebec, that old city which possesses such a large and magnificent harbor, that city which is so richly endowed by nature. Still the Government decides this important question in the sense indicated by their resolutions, and we find in Mr. Schreiber's report, a report which was quoted very often here to-night, that over 130 miles of the International line have never been explored. But if, later on, the railroad could not go through there, owing to insuperable engineering difficulties, and we are not sure that that will never happen, where would we be? I am in favor of the short line; but I am in favor of a surveyed line, whatever it may be. However, I must say that I am not in favor of a line which, according to competent engineers connected with the Administration and under the control of the Minister of Railways, has not been surveyed. Why should Mr. Schreiber be more credible than Mr. Light, Mr. Smith or Mr. Sullivan, who have given locations on maps, which have been distributed to members of this House? In such a position, Mr. Chairman, I feel ill at ease, and it seems to me that the Government might have postponed the question until reliable surveys should have been made. It is evident that if all the reports which are in favor of our line are taken away from us, all I have to do is to resume my seat, and to submit to that which is inevitable. According to competent authorities, I had considered Mr. Light as an able engineer, and as a man capable of making an honest and comprehensive report to the Government and the country. It seems that I was mistaken. That is just possible; but I should like to have the proof of my error. If we go across the Maine boundary and if we strike Lake Chesuncook; if it is esta-

blished by Mr. Vernon Smith's report that on certain distances there are grades of 50 feet per mile, which may be brought down to an average of 35 feet, and when we see Mr. Schreiber pretending that the valley of the Etchemin River has grades varying between 53 and 84 feet, I, who have been living in that district for the last fifteen years, say that I am inclined to think that Mr. Light is right, in the present case. And yet I do not wish to force my opinion upon the House. I simply ask that before a question of such importance for the Maritime Provinces and for the district of Quebec is decided, especially when the line which I am patronising goes through the northern part of the State of Maine, which is the best timbered part of that State, and whose lumber must all come through the Province of Quebec, and when that line is 71 miles shorter on American territory than the International line to the south would be, I say that in the face of these considerations we should have instrumental surveys to determine which is the shortest and the most favorable route. Let it be proved to me that the International line is the shortest and the most advantageous, and I, with my whole county, will be ready to accept it. But it is not with such reports as those which are now before the House that I will accept the verdict of those who patronise the Sherbrooke and Mettawamkeag line. It has been pretended, in the course of the discussion, that Mr. Light had made a false report; and yet Mr. Schreiber has said somewhere, while criticising Mr. Light's report (page 7), that the distance from Montreal to Hervey *via* Quebec was 248 miles. This, he added, should be 406 miles. The words "to be built" had been omitted intentionally, no doubt. It seems to me that I have a perfect right to think that Mr. Schreiber is not more credible than Mr. Light, even if there should be a doubt on that point. If these reports are so contradictory, let us re-establish the position and let us have reliable surveys, and if the conclusions at which we arrive are in favor, with due regard to the general interest of the country, of a line other than our own, I am ready to say to the Government: Let it be adopted, and we will be satisfied. I am very sorry to contradict the Minister of Public Works, but it is not I who contradict him; it is an engineer's report. In the first report submitted to this House is found the description of the different lines. Mr. Light gives a comparison between the different routes for the proposed short line between Montreal and the ports of St. John and Halifax, that is to say, by two lines, one by Sherbrooke and Megantic, the other, the combination line, *via* Quebec. Here is the tabular statement which he gives:

Description of the line.	<i>Via</i> Quebec & Difference		
	Sherbrooke.	Combina- tion Line.	in favor of Quebec.
From Montreal <i>via</i> Megantic and Passadumkeag, to St. John.....	525	481	44
do do do .....			
to Halifax. ....	801	710	91
do do & Mettawamkeag, to St. John ..	481	481	10
do do do .....			
to Halifax .....	767	710	57
do <i>via</i> combination line, to St. John .....	491	481	10
Grade, maximum per mile .....	74	40	34
Curve, minimum.....		4 degrees.	
Highest point above the sea level .....	2,000	1,200	800
Power of traction .....	20 loaded cars.	40 loaded cars.	20
Cost, including bridges over the St. Lawrence, <i>via</i> combination line, to Chesuncook .....	10,240,000	8,470,000	1,770,000
Cost, including bridges in both cases, from Mettawamkeag <i>via</i> combination line to Hervey.....	11,200,000	10,500,000	700,000

Now, we have the bridge question. I shall not deal with it lengthily, because it is very late; but it would seem to me that the question of the connection between the northern and southern shore can be easily solved. The part with which I have dealt has reference to distances. I have given fac-

taken from the reports of civil engineers, which were submitted to the House. If these are not accurate, let us have new surveys. I do not say that they are accurate, nor that they are inaccurate; I do not know; but if I can contend that they are right, and if others may contend that they are not, there is such a grave doubt, in this case, that the matter must necessarily be the subject of further enquiries. We are asked: How are you going to connect the north shore with the south shore? It is the question of the bridge. I never was an advocate nor an opponent of the bridge; but it seems to me that the question is secondary. When one hundred and fifty to two hundred millions of dollars may be appropriated for an undertaking such as the Pacific Railway, it seems to me that an amount of four or five millions, when it is a question of giving satisfaction to all the eastern Provinces, which have so largely contributed towards the construction of the Pacific Railway, is a matter of a very secondary nature. It is very true that the Pacific, if it wishes to come *via* Sherbrooke to Mettawamkeag, can only do it on condition of building a bridge at Lachine. It can be calculated that a bridge at Lachine will cost over \$3,000,000, and a bridge before Quebec, with a double track, ought to cost, according to the report of Mr. Bunless, only \$5,000,000, with the abutments. Now, if we give satisfaction, from a short-line point of view, to the Maritime Provinces and to the Province of Quebec, I say the construction of the bridge at Quebec ought to be looked at from a more liberal standpoint. We have readily voted for the Pacific with pleasure and enthusiasm, of late years. We have done so again lately, and we are ready still to help it along, with all our might, until its completion. But it seems to me that we must consider, in a special manner, the interests of the great eastern Provinces, and give them satisfaction, as far as possible. For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, it would be a question which it would be interesting to discuss more fully. But at this late hour, perhaps I have already said too much, especially in the French language, before an audience which is partly English-speaking. And yet I am anxious to define the position which I occupy. I said I hope that the question of a short line ought not to be considered as a sectional question, but as a federal question. And the district of Montreal having been benefited by the Pacific—a matter of which we are proud, and which was obtained partly through the exertions of the members from Quebec—we, the members from Quebec, are in a position to tell our friends generally, that after having, for a year past voted from \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000 to complete the Pacific, we will not see it, if the present resolutions are adopted; and here is the way I explain the matter: It is because the short line question involves the whole question of the Pacific extension and of the advantages which would be derived therefrom by that district and by the Maritime Provinces. The true short line would be one starting from Montreal and going to the seaboard. We have always understood that the terminal port on the Atlantic would be a Canadian seaport. I have no objection to the Pacific reaching Portland, on account of its commercial necessities, to sustain competition or to compete with other lines. I am not against that. All our great railroad lines, including the Grand Trunk, go to Portland. The Pacific wishes to go there. I have no objection. But when we are voting such a large sum of money to bring the Pacific to a Canadian port, I say that it ought to go there; and I may add that if the Pacific wishes to go to an American port, they ought to go at their own expense; we have no need of voting any money for that. Let them do it themselves, if it suits them. I am not against the requirements of trade, but we are voting here in this House, before the country at large, a certain amount, to appropriate it to the development of the resources of the different Provinces of the Dominion; we vote in view of the results which we

Mr. LANSAGE.

expect. That is the position. We have heard the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) saying, a few moments ago, that the Eastern Townships were entitled to a share in this Pacific question. My hon. friend knows that the members from the Province of Quebec, whether French or English, are all as one man on matters concerning this Province. My hon. friend knows that we are by no means jealous of the Eastern Townships, and that on the contrary we admire them in the successful efforts which they have made for their own improvement. But there is one fact which we must bear in mind, and that is, that the city of Sherbrooke has now three railroads—the Grand Trunk, Farnham and Magog and the South-Eastern—which connect with the Passumpsic, besides the Quebec Central, which runs from Lévis to Sherbrooke. Therefore, in that respect, it seems to me, that our friends are well supplied. If we take a glance at the map of the district south of Quebec, what do we see? We see no railroad whatever. I, for my part, live in a very important district; and from Lévis to the boundary line, composed of old parishes, some of which have been settled for some fifty or sixty years, and all have been settled for at least thirty years; there is not one solitary railway for twenty leagues in a bee line and fifty miles crossways. I do not make this remark with regard to the Pacific question, but, if my hon. friend bases his claims on the amount voted by the different municipalities of that district to develop their lines of railways and give them what he calls vested rights to the possession of the Pacific, it seems to me that the complete want of railway facilities must weigh a little on the other side of the scale. And yet, Mr. Chairman, all I have asked, and all I am now asking from the Government, before these resolutions are adopted—and I regret to say that I cannot accept them without that—is, that they should give us a reliable instrumental survey, to be made by engineers in whom we have confidence. The discussion will then come up before the House, and if the short line is then located by the House *via* Sherbrooke, after having been surveyed and explored instrumentally on the whole length of the line, then I will agree to it, and I will vote for that measure; and I am sure that my county will not find fault with me. Such is, in substance, the position I now take. I hope the Government will take my suggestions into consideration, and will give me credit for the frankness of my views on this question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved to strike out, in the 7th paragraph, all the words between the words "North Shore Railway" and the words "Canadian Pacific Railway," and inserting the following at the end of the paragraph:

And if it should be expedient so to do, in order to facilitate obtaining such access, the Governor in Council may acquire the North Shore Railway, and may apply the said sum of \$1,500,000, or any part thereof, in aid of such acquisition; and upon such an acquisition, may transfer or convey or lease the said railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, subject to such obligations as the Government shall have assumed in acquiring it.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood the Minister to state that the Grand Trunk Railway had agreed to sell, and the Canadian Pacific Railway to purchase, the North Shore. Will the hon. gentleman give the terms of agreement between the two companies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The understanding between these companies is this, that the Grand Trunk Railway sells the North Shore on these terms: The Grand Trunk Railway will receive the amount paid by them as stock in the company, and by which they became proprietors of the road, and an additional sum for improvements made by them on the railway since they have had it, and they will deliver the railway free of all charges and liabilities, except the two debts of which the hon. gentleman knows. The first is the debt to the Quebec Government of \$3,500,000, for which the Government of Quebec has a mortgage, and then the sum of \$1,725,000, which forms the amount of the bonds on

the road issued by the company. The Canadian Pacific Railway will take the railway on those conditions, and will probably have, in addition, a sum of money to complete the terminal facilities at Quebec, in the way of elevators, and the renewal of certain wooded bridges, so as to put the road in the same condition as other portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman state the amount of stock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think about \$250,000 or \$260,000.

Mr. LANGELIER. There are other large claims against the North Shore Railway Company for right of way in the city of Quebec, and not only claims, but judgments, some of which have been taken as far as the Supreme Court. I would like to know whether provision has been made to secure these claims. Among the claimants, I may mention, are the nuns of the Hôtel-Dieu and the Ursuline nuns, who have obtained judgments, which have been confirmed by the Court of Queen's Bench, and have been taken to the Supreme Court. There have been two or three other judgments obtained in the city of Quebec against the North Shore Railway for damages to the passage of the line alongside the River St. Charles. These persons will lose any means to get their claims paid.

Mr. IVES. What means have they now?

Mr. LANGELIER. They have the railway.

Mr. IVES. There are the mortgage bonds ahead.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is, as I stated just now, to obtain the railway free of all debts, except \$3,500,000 of the Quebec Government and the bonds to the extent of \$1,725,000. The Government will take care that the road is delivered without the debts the hon. gentleman speak of.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman give any statement about the additional improvements which have been made by the Grand Trunk? Can he say what they consist of?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I have no information of that this evening; but the hon. gentleman will see that the undertaking of the Grand Trunk is to deliver the road free. As the Government have the money in their hands, they must see that the railway will be free of all debts before the money is paid.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman did not understand my question. The hon. gentleman stated that the price to be paid to the Grand Trunk was, first, \$250,000 for the stock and \$250,000 for improvements made by the Grand Trunk since it acquired the ownership of the road. What I wanted to know was, what these improvements consist of?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Since the railway passed from the hands of the Government to the hands of the syndicate, which is represented now by the Grand Trunk Company, a number of improvements have taken place. I think the new line mentioned by the hon. member for Megantic, for which large sums were to be paid, was one of the improvements. Then there are improvements of other kinds. Of course, the Government have to take care that everything connected with the road will be put into such a shape that all the improvements are paid for; that, in fact, everything the company would have to pay themselves if they were selling the road is paid, so that the property will be free.

Mr. LAURIER. My question was not intended to refer to the application of the money, but to ascertain what improvements have been made by the company. Apart

from the change of the line in Quebec, I am not aware of any improvements having been made by the company.

Mr. LANGELIER. And that has been paid before. Some \$250,000 was paid by the North Shore Railway since it was purchased from the Government of Quebec for these improvements.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) (Translation). Is it the intention of the Government to purchase the North Shore Railway, or is it the intention of the Pacific Railway Company to purchase it for themselves?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). According to the resolution, the Government will purchase the railway, if necessary, for it is the intention of the Government to let the Pacific Railway Company, as far as possible, purchase it themselves, and they will interfere with only if the company would not purchase it.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) (Translation). If the negotiations did not succeed, what would secure the terminus of the Pacific to the city of Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). The resolutions will show the hon. member what the guarantee is.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) (Translation). I may possibly see it, and perhaps, I do not see it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). Well! I would ask the hon. member to read the resolutions before concurrence and I am sure they are correct.

Mr. EDGAR. In the correspondence between the Grand Trunk Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which was published, I think I saw it stated that the Grand Trunk had offered certain facilities to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to get this line from the Grand Trunk without purchase. Has any reciprocal arrangement been made? Has the Grand Trunk any traffic arrangements over this line after it gets into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company sells this road to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of course the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be in the same position as if it had built the road itself, and if the Grand Trunk Company wish to pass over that road it will have the same rights as any other company has to pass over the road of another company. I have no doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be glad to facilitate the traffic of the country.

Mr. DESAULNIERS (Maskinongé). (Translation.) If I understood aright the question put by the hon. member for Montmagny: If the two companies, the Grand Trunk and Pacific do not agree, what position will be taken by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The resolutions state what will happen. There is a million and a half voted to build another line.

Mr. DESAULNIERS (Maskinongé). (Translation.) That is just the point. I do not think the two companies can ever agree. But if they should happen to come to an agreement which would satisfy the city of Quebec, which seems to me the most hard to please at the present moment, it seems to me that all the counties on the north shore would be satisfied; but in the opposite case, what is this line which it is intended to build on the north shore? I have heard quite often, since I have had the honor of being a member of this House, that the Government or the Pacific Railway Company would build a line, following nearly the direction of the present road, between Montreal and Quebec. I do

not believe any such thing. A great many members from the north shore would be anxious to know where the new road would be built. Would the Government be disposed to build a road which would run parallel to the present one? Or would they be disposed to build what we call the Great Northern, which would start from Lachute, or from a certain point on the Ottawa River, between Montreal and Ottawa? This, in my opinion, is a very important question. It is contended that this road cannot be built; that the thought of it even, is ridiculous. Well, if that question of the Great Northern is ridiculous before the House, why did the Government mention it in their resolutions? Why do they come and tell us that if the North Shore Railway is not bought by the Government or by the Pacific Railway Company, a new line will be built? Is it possible that it is intended to build it along the line of the North Shore Railway? It is impossible to suppose it. Would the people of the Province of Quebec permit that five or ten millions more be appropriated to build a railway which would run from Montreal to Quebec, alongside of the North Shore line? No; that is impossible. Well, Mr. Chairman, if it is really the intention to build a railway, which would be an extension of the Pacific, as far as Quebec, I contend that that line ought to start from Lachute or from a certain point on the Pacific line between Montreal and Ottawa. At all events, I think that, under the circumstances, the Government would do well to promise us that the new line which is to be built, will start from the Pacific Railway, on the Ottawa River, and would run towards Quebec, through the interior.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I believe the hon. member can give his fears as regards the line through the interior or the Great Northern, as he has styled it. I stated awhile ago what were the agreements which the Grand Trunk and the Pacific promised to make with the Government. Now, I have moved to amend the resolutions, so that the Government may have the power to buy, if need be, the North Shore Railway, and to sell it or lease it for a long term to the Pacific Railway Company, in case an accident should happen. But there is no fear of that. These companies are important companies, presided over by honorable men, and when two such companies make promises, such as they have made to the Government, there is no reason to believe that their promises will be broken. Therefore, I think my hon. friend has no need to fear about the construction of a second line.

Mr. DESAULNIERS (Maskinonge). (Translation.) I have no fear on the subject of the construction of a second line. On the contrary, I would much prefer that the second line should be built, but I have not understood where the Government would build this second line, in case that they should not succeed in making these agreements.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister spoke of the expenditure of \$1,500,000. As I understood him, he only accounted for an expenditure of \$500,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said \$460,000 for the Grand Trunk Railway and the balance in improving the road, giving terminal facilities at Quebec, changing some of the bridges, and putting the road in a condition equal to that of the other portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LANGELIER. Those terminal facilities are already provided for in the resolution concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway; \$200,000 were reserved for them, which is much more than will be expended. I do not know what other terminal facilities are to be provided.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On concurrence, I will bring down a statement of that.

Committee rose and reported.

Mr. DESAULNIERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:45 a.m., Thursday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to call attention to the irregular hours at which we meet in this Chamber. I do not understand the principle upon which these hours are so irregular. We arranged, some time ago to meet at half-past one; it was suggested that the hour should be two, but the Government insisted on making it half-past one. Since that time the practice has grown up of our not meeting until two, and sometimes after that hour. Relying on that practice many members have not assembled here before two; but yesterday you took the Chair at something like a quarter before two, and to-day it is something like a quarter past two. Our hour of meeting in the evening is half-past seven; by the unspoken practice, it is thought to be eight o'clock; but many times it is not until some time after eight. I do not impute this to your not being ready to take the Chair, but to the practice which has grown up, of postponing the meeting until such time as it is convenient for the Ministers to come in, when you are sent for. That is not the practice in the English Parliament, and it was not the practice in this Parliament formerly; when Mr. Cockburn was Speaker, he always came in at the appointed hour. I maintain that we ought to commence business at the appointed hour, particularly when the hour is so early as half-past one; but to come here at half-past one and wait until two, or until such time as the Ministers are ready, is nothing less than intolerable. But after what took place yesterday I shall feel bound hereafter to be here at half-past one, and I shall feel it my duty on every occasion in the future to call attention to the fact that the House has not been able to enter on business at the appointed hour, whatever that hour may be. I do not stickle at the hour, which is regulated by the rules of the House, but if it is to be departed from, it should be by common consent across the House. It is not right that the time of the members of this House should be at the disposal of the Ministers, and that the business of the day should commence at such time as they please, instead of such time as the Order of the House prescribes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true that in England the Speaker takes the Chair generally at ten minutes after the hour fixed, without regard to the requirements of the Government of the day. There, however, the Government has a very large staff of members of the Government who do not belong to the Cabinet, and who are always supposed to be in their places, especially the junior Lords of the Treasury. It is said their only business is to make a House and cheer the First Minister. Here we have no such assistance, and occasionally, as was the case with the Government of my hon. friend opposite, the Government do not come exactly up to the time, and one can understand that. There are acts of the Administration which sometimes are very pressing, and which require to be attended to, for fear of injury to the public service, and sometimes, in consequence,

we may be delayed for half an hour or so, but on the whole, I think we have been tolerably punctual.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we are as punctual as the hon. gentleman was when he was on this side.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And we did not grumble, because we knew the necessity of the Government of the day. When a subject of pressing importance is before them it has to be discussed; there may, perhaps, be differences of opinion which have to be arranged. It is not, surely, too much for any Government to ask that the House should wait half an hour on occasions of that kind; and when the hon. gentleman is on this side he will find that exigency as much as we do, or as much as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did. We must remember that the Government have very little time to consider these matters. We sit all day and all night, and we, perhaps, may be excused if we are sometimes twenty minutes or half an hour too late.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be excused, certainly, because it is impossible to get through the Government business in five months. Formerly it could be done in two months, but now it cannot be managed in five months.

Mr. BLAKE. I must admit it was an extraordinary omission on my part not to perceive, as one cause of these delays, the differences of opinion the hon. gentleman mentions, which so frequently prevail, and which require some time to be adjusted. I feel that perhaps I have been a little harsh after that open confession of the hon. gentleman; but I must say that almost immediately after the hour of half-past one was fixed, it was called two in practice, and I do not believe it is going to be anything else in the future; but while an uncertainty prevails as to the hour, every one of us is to be inconvenienced to come here and kick our heels about this Chamber for some time before the House meets. If the Ministers find it so difficult to be here at half-past one, let two be the hour, but do not let us fix the hour, and not be ready for business when it has arrived.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Call it two.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Speaker, you have heard your lecture.

#### RAILWAY CONNECTION WITH CAPE TORMENTINE.

Mr. WELDON (for Mr. DAVIES) asked, Whether the Government intend taking any practical steps during the present year to secure railway communication between Cape Tormentine and some point on the Intercolonial Railway? If so, is it the intention of the Government to ask Parliament for the money to build a branch from the Intercolonial Railway to the cape, or to propose to Parliament the granting of a subsidy for the construction of a private line? Can the Government state when railway connection between the Intercolonial Railway and Cape Tormentine will be complete?

Mr. POPE. The Government have had that question under consideration, and the result of their deliberation will be made known before the House rises.

#### SALES OF DOMINION LANDS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What sum has been received up to date on account of sales of Dominion lands, for fiscal year 1884-85? 2. What sum has been expended up to date, and charged to capital account, for surveys of lands in the North-West, during the present fiscal year?

Mr. McLELAN. With respect to the amount received for sales of Dominion lands, I have the amount up to 19th June, \$371,801, and the amount expended \$271,425.

#### CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LISTER asked, What was the amount of the contract price for the Cornwall post office and Custom house buildings? What was the amount paid under the contract? What was the amount claimed for extras, and the amount paid for extras? What was the amount paid for furnishing, and to whom was such amount paid? Was the furnishing supplied by contract, under tender, or how? Who was the contractor for the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of the contract price for the building was \$27,698,63, and that amount has been paid for the contract. The contractors claimed for extras \$12,087.30. The amount paid to them in full payment was \$8,059.20. The amount paid for furnishing was—for letter box fronts, \$1,158; post office fittings, \$2,811; hot water apparatus, \$1,575. The letter box fronts and the hot water apparatus were publicly tendered for, and the lowest tender for each was accepted. The fittings were tendered for by the contractor for the building, and judging by similar work in other buildings, the price being reasonable, the work was awarded to him. These fittings are of similar character in most of the post offices, but require modification in the details, which it is found can be more satisfactorily arranged by the Post Office Department after the building is erected. As the proper cost of the fittings can readily be arrived at, it is considered only fair that, if the contractor has faithfully carried out his contract, he should be awarded the work connected with the fittings, provided his price is reasonable; and this course has been adopted in many cases, such as Montreal, Windsor, Brantford, Stratford, Chatham, Clifton, Woodstock, Sussex, Carleton, and other places.

#### FISH INSPECTOR IN THE CITY OF ST. JOHN.

Mr. WELDON asked, Has any appointment of a fish inspector in the city of St. John been made in place of the late G. S. Young? If not, is it the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy, and when?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The certificate of qualification required by law has been forwarded within a day or two, and action will be taken on it.

#### MAJOR GENERAL LAURIE.

Mr. KIRK asked, For what purpose was Major General Laurie sent to the North-West? What duties has he performed there, and what are his duties now? What is his pay? Is he still on duty in the North-West? Is it usual to have two general officers to command so small a force as was engaged in suppressing the rebellion in the North-West?

Mr. MACKENZIE. There are three generals.

Mr. CARON. Major General Laurie offered his services to serve in the North-West Territories. Those services were accepted. He sank his rank as major general. His services were offered, as those of everyone else, to assist in quelling the disturbance in the North-West. He was placed by General Middleton in command of the base, first at Swift Current, and afterwards at Moose Jaw. He is still on duty, unless he has been relieved by the major general. We have in our force at present three majors general.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What about the pay?

Mr. CARON. The matter of pay has not been settled yet. Major General Laurie is receiving a pension from

England, and it was thought advisable to leave it to be settled afterwards.

#### THE LAST ENGLISH LOAN.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What commission has been paid to the agents on the last loan of £4,000,000 effected in London? What "allowances" have been made to parties tendering for said loan?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These particulars have not yet reached us, but I suppose they will reach us in a day or two.

#### THE ONTARIO BOUNDARIES.

Mr. MILLS. When does the First Minister propose to submit to Parliament the Address inviting Imperial legislation on the subject of the boundaries of Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that we are going to submit an Address to ask the Imperial Legislature to deal with it. I said the House would deal with the subject, and that it would be brought before the House during the present Session.

#### PROTESTANT VOLUNTEERS IN THE 65TH BATTALION.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call attention to a paragraph or statement made with reference to the treatment of Protestant volunteers in the North-West. I suppose our laws guarantee freedom of conscience and worship to our volunteers as well as to other citizens. I find a statement copied from the *Edmonton Bulletin*, of 13th June, to the following effect:—

"On Sunday morning last, about nine o'clock, Capt. Des Troismais ordered No. 2 Company of the 65th Battalion to fall in for church parade, it being the intention to have the company parade to St. Albert to take part in the services of Procession Sunday on Corpus Christi Day. One of the privates, named Cawthorne, a Protestant, refused to fall in, saying that he had promised the minister to attend the Presbyterian Church on that day. The captain demanded what right he had to promise to attend any church without consulting him, and after some words, ordered him into the guard room. Six others also refused to fall in. Col. Ouimet was then sent for, and he ordered the men to fall in. Private Conway said he would fall in, but would not go to church, and used some disrespectful language. He was sent to the guardroom. The remaining five fell in and the colonel told off three for extra guard duty, and ordered the remaining two, on their still refusing to go, to the guardroom, with Conway and Cawthorne. On Monday the four who had been sent to the guard room were brought up for trial before the colonel. Conway was not allowed to speak in his own behalf, and was sent to the bastion for eight days on bread and water. The remaining three were dismissed."

I see that, in the regulations and orders for the militia of Canada for 1883, it is provided as follows:—

"268. In assembling troops for public worship in the field, care is to be taken that they are not brought together in numbers greater than the voice will reach. Soldiers attending divine service are to wear their side arms.

"269. Every man is to be at full liberty to attend the worship of Almighty God according to the forms prescribed by his own religion, when military duty does not interfere.

"270. Men of any religious denomination, if their number shall exceed 20, are to be regularly marched to and from their own places of public worship under the command of an officer, or in charge of a sergeant, if not exceeding that number. The officer or sergeant is to remain with them during the performance of the service."

If this report contained in the *Edmonton Bulletin* is correct, a gross violation of the rights of conscience on the part of these men has been perpetrated. I ask whether the Government have any information in reference to the matter, and, in the event of this statement proving true, what steps they would propose to take?

Mr. CARON. The Department have had no information whatever about the facts which the hon. gentleman has just been submitting to the House. My attention was drawn to it, I believe yesterday, by the leader of the Government. I

Mr. CARON.

think the hon. gentleman had mentioned the fact to him. I immediately telegraphed to get all the information from Col. Ouimet and the officers at headquarters, in relation to the case. Until I receive that, it is impossible for me to express my opinion. The regulations are perfectly clear, and the rules are quite sufficient to deal with any case of that kind. As the hon. gentleman has very properly said, every man is allowed to follow the worship and go to the church he belongs to; but until I get the information which I have asked for, it is impossible for me to say anything more about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I hope the hon gentleman has communicated by telegraph?

Mr. CARON. I have.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And that the persons who are suffering punishment for the rights of conscience have been immediately released?

Mr. CARON. I am not sure that they are suffering punishment for the rights of conscience until I hear more about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When was the message sent?

Mr. CARON. Yesterday, as soon as I heard it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told me he was going to call attention to this matter. Of course, if this has been done, it is an outrage. That question, it so happens, was settled long ago in Canada, when the 79th Regiment came to Montreal. They were ordered to march to church, The chaplain was a member of the Church of England, as was usual in those days. The men grumbled a good deal, but they marched to church—under protest, however—and on the way the band played a tune. That was the last time that rule was enforced.

Mr. BLAKE. I may just call the attention of the Government to another statement that I have seen in the newspapers of this city. It is that one of the prelates in the North-West who was desirous of officiating in religious services on behalf of the bulk of the prisoners, was refused the privilege—I think it was Bishop Grandin himself. I think some enquiry ought to be made on that subject. Though these persons are accused, I do not see why they should be denied the consolations of religion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am personally in some degree responsible for that. I was aware that there was going to be a large number of prisoners coming down to Regina, and that the means of keeping them secure were very inefficient, so I sent a short telegram—I may say in cipher—to the Lieutenant Governor, stating that no person should be allowed to see them just now. I never thought it would deprive them of any religious instruction. The moment that was mentioned, a telegram was sent, of course, that it was not in any way to interfere with the right to see their own clergymen.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Since there is a general disposition to regulate these affairs in the North-West, perhaps it might be well to call the attention of the Minister to some correspondence and reports published in the *Mail* and in the *Manitoba* and other papers, regarding the treatment of the natives by the soldiers after the several engagements. I have here a correspondence from the *Mail*, dated 19th June, and it is translated into French, I will read it as I find it:

"What a distressing picture is offered by these poor families, cruelly plundered and stripped by the volunteers! The soldiers only came out of the houses of the half-breeds after having broken whatever they could not carry away; stoves, clocks, bedsteads, tables, etc., were all mercilessly destroyed by these raving maniacs. Poor mothers of families, who had only one bed and one blanket, were brutally deprived of these articles. The soldiers, being unable to carry off the bed, took hold of the blanket, and splitting with their knives the ticking, which contained the feathers, enjoyed the barbarous sport of throwing them to the wind.

"Let me now say a word to induce the Government to aid these half-breed families who have lost all they had at St. Laurent and at Fish Creek. A great many of the half-breeds in that district were loyal; others were dragged into the insurrection against their will, and cannot consequently be held responsible for the result. Moreover, in spite of the strict orders given by General Middleton, the soldiers have robbed and destroyed everything they could lay their hands upon in that region, leaving the residents in the most destitute condition.

"I see by the papers that Mr. Caron has contradicted, in the House of Commons, a report similar to the present one, written by your correspondent 'G. H. H.' Nevertheless, that report was not only strictly true, but it was even put in a very mild form. It is likely that the volunteers have not destroyed the property belonging to those loyal half-breeds simply for the fun of it. They wanted to bring home with them *souvenirs* of the campaign, and I must say that they cleaned out everything. But whether they acted through love of plunder or through a desire of carrying away with them *souvenirs* of the campaign, it is certain that they have only left skin and bones to the half-breeds. What will become of these poor people next winter, if the Government do not come to their aid, is more than I can say, but it cannot be the policy of the Government to let them starve to death."

Now, there are other correspondences which corroborate these facts, and I believe they are of such a nature that the hon. Minister of Militia will be pleased to take the matter into consideration and to see what is to be done under the circumstances. If it is true that the half-breeds have been treated in that manner by a certain number of volunteers, I believe that something more than a simple report should be had.

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) In answer to my hon. friend, who has called my attention to the facts mentioned in this newspaper article, I must say that as to that part of the correspondence which speaks of the most stringent orders being given by General Middleton to prevent such disorders as those which are complained of, I have received a communication direct from the General, stating that he had given the most absolute orders to that effect. I have even called his attention to the facts mentioned in that article, and the General has answered that, as far as he had been able to judge of the facts, he did not believe in these reports. Now, the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) has approved these reports which have been read by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), and he said that he had already called my attention to these facts; but the hon. member for Megantic forgets that he has called my attention to the fact that panes of glass had been broken in a village which had been under fire during three days. I thought there was nothing there to be wondered at. He also called my attention to the fact that an unfortunate sewing machine was broken during the fight. I then replied to the hon. member, what I repeat to-day, that the official despatches which were sent to me from the seat of war did not mention the fact that that sewing machine had been broken. As regards the facts mentioned in that correspondence, a certain allowance must be made, because, when a village is under fire during two or three days, and when it is overrun by a small army—for we then had, at that moment, quite a large number of men there—it is just possible that such little irregularities, which cannot fail to take place in times of trouble, should have taken place. But as far as I have been able to make out, from the official reports sent to me by the General, I believe that these other reports have been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The hon. Minister has referred to the questions put by me some time ago. The question I have put was taken word for word from the *Mail* correspondence; there was not one word from me, and what I have read in the *Mail* is not at all what was said by the hon. Minister. The *Mail* correspondent has never pretended that that sewing machine had been broken by bombshells or cannon balls; on the contrary, he has stated that after the fight was over the soldiers entered the houses by breaking the windows and doors. The hon. Minister has made fun of that. I believe that is not a fit subject for

joking, irony or witticisms. I did not charge General Middleton with having authorised these acts; on the contrary, the correspondence in question stated that the General had given stringent orders to prevent them. The same thing has been repeated since in other *Mail* correspondences. I did not speak of them, because I did not wish these poor unfortunates to be insulted by the answers of the hon. Minister of Militia. I now see the same thing repeated in two correspondences of the *Manitoba*, a Conservative newspaper. I believe that question is of such gravity that people might dispense with joking and irony on this subject. If the hon. Minister of Militia had friends or relations in these places he would not be so fond of joking about it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I ask that the Clerk reads the article in English.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have already read that article to the House.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings.) This is not the way to treat the House. There is no gentleman in this House who does not understand the English language, but some gentlemen do not understand the French, and I think we ought to have all this discussion in English, and the article read in English also. We are all equally interested in what is going on in the North-West.

#### OFFICIAL REPORT FROM THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the official reports and despatches with reference to the various engagements between the troops and the half-breeds of the North-West, and which I tired of asking for long ago, and which it was understood were in some shape in the hands of the Government, have not yet been laid before the House. We have not had before us up to this day a single word, officially, with reference to any one of these events, already many weeks old; and surely there must be full reports of many of these affairs in the hands of the Government.

Mr. CARON. I told the leader of the Opposition that, when the reports were received, I would bring them down, and I shall do so. I got one three or four days ago; I got a telegram from the Major General stating that he was preparing an official report concerning Batoche and Fish Creek. The leader of the Opposition cannot expect that I shall lay before the House reports before I have received them. He must know that the Major General has been on the move ever since Batoche. He has been following Big Bear north of Fort Pitt, and has been kept constantly occupied. I have given to the House all the information I have received. However short or scanty it may appear to the leader of the Opposition, I gave him all the information I had. When the other comes I will lay it on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. I gave a memorandum of what was required. There was the question of the Duck Lake fight and the evacuation of Fort Carlton. These are in the police papers, and there is no reason why they should not be produced. Then there is the fight at Batoche, of which, no doubt the general has made a report, and a considerable interval of time has elapsed since the battle of Fish Creek. There ought to be an account of that engagement.

Mr. CARON. I do not intend to bring down these papers until I can put them before the House, because the most of them are quite incomplete unless taken up as a whole.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman laughs, but it is a fact. The manner in which the troops were disposed of makes it very inconvenient to take one report and lay it

on the Table. The report of the battle of Fish Creek is almost textually what I have read in the House, and what has appeared in the papers.

Mr. CHARLTON. The returns asked for with reference to timber licenses granted within the disputed territory of the North-West and in British Columbia have not yet come down, though I have asked for them repeatedly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have been induced to rise, from the spirit of enquiry that seems to pervade this House, simply to ask the right hon. the leader of the Government whether the Grand Trunk Railway Company have yet given him the returns ordered by this House, or whether they still treat the Order of the House with contempt, and if the latter be the case, whether the Government intend to let the Session close without insisting on the company paying that respect to the Order of the House to which the House is entitled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any more information than I gave him when he last made the enquiry.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was not much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only assure the hon. gentleman the step the Government will take is under the gravest consideration.

Mr. WELDON. Can the hon. gentleman inform us when the fisheries correspondence will be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot bring it down until His Excellency returns. He will be here in a few days.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to make a few remarks on a question of privilege. The *News Record*, an Opposition organ printed in my county, thus refers to me:

"DR. ORTON SHIRKS THE VOTE.

"It will be seen by the yeas and nays, published elsewhere in this paper, that the name of the member for Centre Wellington does not appear as voting either for or against the proposition to permit wine and beer to be sold in counties that may hereafter adopt the Scott Act. In this instance the doctor evidently thought discretion the better part of valor. Hence, after taking part in the debate, when the critical moment arrived, he ignominiously shirked the vote. And in doing so we believe that Dr. Orton made a grave mistake. Because the issue is one of practical importance to his constituents, and therefore he ought to have had the courage and manliness to come squarely out and show what side he is on. But whatever view Dr. Orton may take of the question, he ought to have had the moral courage to stand his ground and vote as his judgment dictated. It was unmanly to dodge out of the House and shirk the vote. School boys are punished for playing truant; and members of Parliament being older and in positions of greater responsibility are still less excusable when at a critical juncture they desert their post and step aside from the path of duty. The doctor's best friends and warmest political supporters feel that he did wrong in dodging the vote on the beer and wine clause."

Now, it is a well known fact that I have very pronounced opinions upon this question. And not only have I expressed them in this House but also in my county previous to my election. My views are entirely known to my constituents. So far from shirking the vote, I wish to state here that though I was called away by telegraph to attend the Assize Court in Toronto, where I had a case, had I thought my vote would be counted or would not be paired, I would have run the risk of losing a considerable sum of money rather than have shirked expressing, by my vote, my opinion on an Act which I have always considered unjust in its operation, and therefore dishonest and utterly worthless as a temperance measure. I desire to state that on that occasion I requested the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) to pair with me. He agreed to pair with me, and I spoke to the whip on our side, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), and I think the fact of my being

Mr. CARON.

paired can also be testified to by the hon. the Deputy Speaker. The reason why the hon. member for Lunenburg voted on that occasion, I do not know. He has never explained to me the reason, and as a matter of privilege, I have the right to demand that his vote be struck off or mine added to the opposite side.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORY.

Mr. CARON moved the third reading of Bill (No. 141) respecting the administration of justice and other matters in the North-West Territory.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to amend the same so as to relax the restrictions imposed on white settlers as to the possession of fire arms. I think this provision of the Bill is a very objectionable one. The constitutional rule is that it is one of the rights of a British subject to have fire arms in his possession; it is in fact one of the provisions of the declaration of rights. We see in the constitution of the United States when they were copying the fundamental privileges of British liberty, a provision that Congress shall not have power to deprive any citizen of the United States of his right to bear arms. This provision originated in a country that had its border settlements, that had its difficulties with the Indians, and so far were they from being disposed to adopt the rule which the Government propose to introduce here, a rule similar to that which has prevailed in the disturbed districts of Ireland, that they have found it all the more necessary to extend the provisions of the law in that particular, and to secure absolutely against even legislative interference the right of the citizen to have arms for the purpose of protecting himself. Sir, we appreciate in this country the principle of self-government. We admit that the great mass of our population are disposed to obey—and to uphold the law, and to maintain peace and order in so far as they have the power. It would be an extraordinary commentary upon our ability to maintain free institutions if it were held that the condition of the settlers in the more distant parts of the country was such that, instead of being a class who could be relied upon to uphold peace and good government, it was necessary to disarm them in the interests of peace and order. Now, I think if there is anyone class of the community who, more than another, require to retain this inestimable privilege of British freemen, it is that class of men who, denying themselves the ordinary advantages of living in an old settled community, go out into the distant territories of this Dominion to make new homes for themselves. No doubt we have in the North-West Territory a certain class of men who do not appreciate the principles of self-government, the Indians of the North-West, and they require, to a certain extent, at all events, to be under restraint and supervision. In ordinary civil matters they do not enjoy the full rights of citizens; you exercise a certain surveillance over them, and, in a large degree, you undertake to discharge for them the duties which white men discharge for themselves. Because they do not fully appreciate the privileges which belong to free men, you withhold from them the use of firearms of a particular class. I think that is a wise provision. You deal with them in that particular just as you regulated in times past the sale of intoxicants. But, Sir, the white population are in a wholly different position, and you say to these men who are living scattered over the prairies, that they shall not be entitled, as a matter of right, to retain fire arms in their possession, that they shall not have a right to defend their homes, and to protect themselves against the attacks, against the threats of the Indians. In fact, if we were to carry out the provisions of this Bill, we would, in a great measure invite attack on the white

population; we would make it difficult to retain the white population, and we would impose serious restraints upon future settlement. I am strongly of the opinion that there is no measure which would cause a greater feeling of insecurity and excite more indignation in the minds of the people of the North-West than this proposition to place it in the power of the Government to disarm the white population. Those people are entitled to our sympathy, to our confidence. We are inviting them to go there and take possession of the waste land. We expect, in time, they will become a prosperous and contented people. We hope the country will, at no distant period, fill up with population so that they may enjoy the advantages that belong to all older and wealthier communities. But if we say to those people: You shall not have arms in your possession; you shall not be trusted; we do not believe you will seek to maintain law and order; that you will be on the side of good government but rather against it; that you need to be restrained rather than to exercise the privileges of freemen; then we are doing that which, beyond any other measure proposed this Session, will tend to create discontent and prevent the settlement of the country. Holding those views I propose the amendment which I have read. The course pursued by the Administration this Session is a very extraordinary one. The first proposition we had was to enfranchise the savages, and failing to do that, in consequence of the war and the strong feeling that existed in the country against such a proposition, the Government now propose to place the white and civilised settlers upon the footing of savages.

Mr. CARON. It is not my intention after the discussion which took place yesterday to go into this matter very fully to-day. I merely wish to answer one remark made by the hon. gentleman in addressing the House. The hon. member for Bothwell stated that by the Bill as amended the Government are attempting to deprive white citizens of the right of possessing arms. The hon. gentleman has not looked into the question so fully as he generally examines questions. On reading the Bill the hon. gentleman will see that with a permit any white citizen can possess arms. The reason why this clause was introduced was obvious. Since the troubles which have taken place in the North-West the white people themselves are very anxious to keep all arms, except those specified in the Bill, out of the hands of the Indians. The clause provides that in order that white settlers may hold arms, it is necessary that each one shall obtain a permit from the Lieutenant Governor. The reason for inserting this provision is that it will be quite easy for the arms to be traced and found. Under the circumstances the clause is a very good one. Of course it is special legislation for a special purpose, but its necessity has been doubly demonstrated by the events which have taken place in the North-West, and I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in believing that this clause should be struck out and the amendment inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I have looked at the debate in the Senate on this subject, and I confess I do not see any strong reasons adduced in support of the Bill. We must consider the condition, position and circumstances of the country and the character of the population. The character of the white population is eminently one which fits them to be trusted with arms. That is the ordinary right of British citizens, secured to them in effect by the great charter; and it is secured to citizens of the American Republic by the constitution; and it ought not to be taken away from settlers in the North-West, and the power should not be placed in the hands of the Executive to take away that right. They have done nothing to disgrace themselves so as to render them subject to such action. It is said that a white settler may possess arms if he obtains a permit. Look at the geographical area of the country and the distances which have to be

traversed, and the difficulty of obtaining a permit is apparent. We have to consider their position relatively to that of the Indians. It is proposed that the Indians shall be allowed to have smooth bores; but the smooth bores which whites use are breach-loaders. The modern gun is a breach-loader for which fixed ammunition is used; and so you deprive the white men of weapons for different purposes—I will not say for sporting purposes, because I believe there are important purposes in the North-West beyond those of sport—when you provide that white men shall not carry guns having fixed ammunition. The sporting gun of the white has fixed ammunition; the Indian's sporting gun is a smooth bore; and therefore you allow the Indian to sport, but you do not allow the white man to sport without a permit. I retain the opinion I uttered yesterday, that it is a proper thing to prevent the sale of those weapons to the Indian population, and the possession of them by that population should be very stringently guarded; but a provision which places in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor the power to determine whether any white man is worthy of having a breach-loader, rifle or revolver is one which ought not to be placed on our Statute Books.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I agree with the hon. gentleman. It will be imposing a great hardship on settlers in the North-West if they are prevented from exercising the right of having weapons with which to defend their homes. The Government should not place the white settlers under the power and control of the Lieutenant Governor and compel them to ask a permit from him. That is a great and an extensive country, and unless the white settlers have a right to have arms to defend themselves from the Indians, people certainly would not like to go into the country. I believe the Government should not place these restrictions on the white settlers of the North-West, and I consider it my duty to vote for the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have only just seen the amendment, and indeed, I have only just seen the clause of the Bill. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I think it would be a great hardship if the people settling in that country were not permitted to have arms to defend themselves. What will be the effect of passing such a provision? Will settlers want to go out there, where their lives and their property may be endangered, and where they will not be allowed the free privilege of having arms in their possession to protect themselves and their families? I think the effect of that clause will be most detrimental to the future settlement of that country, and will remain a stigma on the legislation of the country that passed it.

Mr. WATSON. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and those who have expressed themselves on this side. I believe it would be a great hardship, in the present state of affairs in the North-West, to prevent the white settlers from having rifles in their possession. I think that not only should the people have the privilege of buying arms for themselves, but that the Government should take on themselves the purchase of a certain number of rifles to arm the people there. Of course, from the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Militia, some time ago, I am not surprised at his bringing in a Bill of this description, because he as much as imputed disloyal motives to the white settlers of Prince Albert and other portions of the North-West. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the settlers of that country are as loyal as any in the Dominion, and will make good use of their arms in protecting themselves from the invasions of the red men of the west, and I hope the amendment will be adopted. So far as fowling pieces are concerned, I do not know

whether this ammunition will apply to cartridges or not; I should not suppose that it would apply to any but rifle cartridges. Of course, if shells for shot guns are to be classed as fixed cartridges, it would be a monstrous thing to pass such legislation, and to compel sportsmen to use the old muzzle loading guns as sporting pieces; and I hope the clause will be so amended that the white men may have breech loading guns in their possession as well as rifles. Rifles are used for sporting purposes in the North-West. I believe the Indians should be deprived of rifles, but that the white settlers should have all the privileges of white settlers in any part of the Dominion. The idea of the settler, when he wants to have a rifle or a revolver in his possession, having to get a permit from the Lieutenant Governor, is absurd. The Lieutenant Governor may do, as I believe he has done with regard to liquor permits for the North-West Territories—he may sign a lot of blank permits to be filled in by anyone who may happen to have a little patronage in that country, and who will give them to his friends, while any one who may be supposed to be disloyal, as the Minister of Militia would style him, or who has not sufficient influence with the Lieutenant Governor, will be deprived of a rifle to protect himself.

Mr. ORTON. I quite agree with many of the remarks which have been made on this subject. I think it is of the greatest importance that the white settlers of that country should have arms to protect themselves. I had the honor of being present at a deputation of white settlers in the neighborhood of Prince Albert, who waited on General Middleton, and presented him with an address after the battle of Batoche; and after the address was presented, the General said he was astonished to find such a large number of settlers in that country without arms, and he recommended every one of them to arm himself with a rifle. In fact, he stated that in England, people living a few miles distant from one another, kept firearms in their houses. I certainly hope the Government will reconsider this Bill. I also think that the power given to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories would not be a wise one, for, however carefully he might exercise that power, he would be liable to be misinterpreted. I do not agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). I think he is mistaken in his remarks with regard to granting blank permits for keeping liquor. I do not think that such blank permits ever were issued in the North-West, and I know very well that even the warmest supporters of the Government have the greatest difficulty in the world in getting permits from him. Nor can I entirely endorse the hon. gentleman's remarks even with regard to the white settlers. I regret to say that I have myself heard sentiments expressed by the white settlers of the North-West, which were not loyal and true to the country. I attended a meeting of the Farmers Union at Winnipeg, and I heard remarks made there which were calculated to agitate the people, and foster a rebellious feeling—in fact, to give encouragement to those who desired to rebel. I am also perfectly aware of the fact, that in the neighborhood of Prince Albert, there were some white settlers there who, during the recent troubles, were not as loyal as they should have been, and who had a great deal to do with the rising which occurred. It is a well known fact that this Mr. Jackson who was Riel's secretary, was a leading advocate of the Farmers' Union, and a strong friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. His utterances on many occasions, as told to me, were of the most rebellious character. In interviewing him, though it was said he was crazy, he recalled every step he took with reference to the encouragement he gave to Riel, and the reasons he joined him. They were certainly very peculiar reasons, but such reasons as actuated many others in that country, not from any grievances he could lay his hands on, but from some

Mr. WATSON.

general complaint against the party who happened to be in power. So far as I could ascertain, those general complaints were nothing more than arose in the minds of those who had different views from those held by gentlemen on the Treasury benches to-day. Indeed, I know well that this family of Jacksons not only had repeatedly entertained Riel in their house, but they were very bitter opponents of the present Government, because I had that from the members of the family themselves, and especially the mother of this Jackson who was with Riel. At the same time, I believe that the great majority of those who expressed those extreme and improper views in connection with the rebellion, never desired or intended in their hearts to take up arms against the powers that be, and they themselves were perhaps the most frightened, when they found that the result of their improper remarks was to give encouragement to the real enemies of our country. I certainly hope some improvement will be made in this measure, by which the white people of the North-West will, at any rate, be able to arm themselves for self-protection and other purposes.

Mr. ROYAL. I believe in the propriety of surrounding the possession of firearms by the Indians with all the necessary precautions. This course has been adopted in the United States, and I believe we have much to borrow from them in that respect; but as to the propriety of extending this measure to the white population, I have my doubts. I do not believe the majority of the white population of the North-West should be punished for the deeds of a certain portion of them who have been chiefly instrumental in bringing about the late rebellion. I believe also, that we are enacting a provision which it will be impossible to carry out. Look at the extensiveness of that vast territory, with 50,000 or 60,000 people scattered over it, and you will see how difficult it will be to put this Act into operation, compelling every white settler to make a declaration with respect to his having firearms in his possession, except by means of an army of inspectors or commissioners. It is all very well for such a law to exist in France, where the country is thickly settled, and where municipal officers are appointed to execute the law; but in the Territories, with their sparse population, I believe it is impossible, and I do not believe it is proper to enact a law the execution of which will be impossible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry I was not here at the beginning of this debate, as I was engaged in another place. A number of objections have been made to the disarming clauses of this Bill, which should of course have every consideration. Under the circumstances, therefore, I shall move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 146) to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883.—(Mr. Costigan.)

### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

That it is expedient to impose an entry fee or duty of fifty dollars on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada;

That no vessel carrying Chinese immigrants to any port in Canada shall carry more than one such immigrant for every fifty tons of its tonnage;

That the master of any vessel bringing Chinese immigrants to any port of Canada shall be personally liable to Her Majesty for the payment of such fee or duty in respect of any immigrant carried by such vessel.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I was pretty severely criticised on another occasion, because, without going altogether outside of my subject, I happened to make reference, in speaking upon the question before the House, to historical reminis-

ences. Although the question of Chinese immigration is a great deal more tempting in that direction than that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I shall not expose myself to such criticism on this subject. I shall have other considerations to-day to lay before this House. The questions incidental to Chinese immigration, which are numerous, which date from an early period in history—all the different questions which might be raised in connection with that subject have been, I think, fully laid before the House in the report which the commissioners appointed to enquire into the subject of Chinese immigration submitted some time ago. That report contains an elaborate examination of the question. I shall content myself with stating that last session a motion was made by one of the hon. members representing the city of Victoria, British Columbia, to the effect "that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law prohibiting the entrance of Chinese into that portion of Canada known as British Columbia." I must say that at the time I was rather struck with a feeling of surprise, which I am sure has been shared by many hon. members of this House, that a demand was made for legislation to provide that one of the first principles which have always guided the English people in the enactment of their laws and regulations for the maintenance of the peace and prosperity of the country, should be violated in excluding from the shores of this great country, which is a part of the British Empire, members of the human family. I then remembered having read years and years ago, when England was attacked for giving shelter, not only to suspicious strangers and to political refugees, but to men who had proclaimed the assassination of the rulers of Europe as a maxim, and had tried several times to put their nefarious doctrine into practice, that the English writers and statesmen answered that British soil was open to any member of the human family not committing upon the land any of the offences coming within the province of the laws of the country. That motion was met, after certain discussion in this House, by the declaration of the right hon. the leader of the Government, who promised those who were complaining of the evils of Chinese immigration into British Columbia, and who eloquently and forcibly put before Parliament the grievances of their Province, that the Government of Canada would take the matter into their earnest consideration, and that immediately after the Session, during the recess at least, a commission would be appointed and sent to British Columbia to enquire into the trade relations, the social relations, and those moral considerations which, it was alleged, made Chinese immigration undesirable. Faithful to the sense of duty that they were discharging towards their constituents, the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia, who were disposed to press that measure, yielded to the request of the Government, on the assurance that not later than this Session legislation would be brought in, if the enquiry, which would be made during the recess, would bear out the statements made before the House by those hon. gentlemen and justify the legislation they asked for. The commission was appointed the 4th July, and on the 8th July I proceeded, as one of the commissioners to make the investigation which the Government considered necessary to be made. I proceeded to California, the classical land, I might say, of the struggles between anti-Chinese advocates and pro-Chinese sympathisers. On arriving at San Francisco I commenced the work, with the assistance of the secretary of the commission, whose name is attached to the report which was laid before the House, and whose researches in history, have contributed so largely to the consideration, I might say complete, exposition of the Chinese question. The Government intended that the members of the commission should put themselves in communication with the people and obtain all the information that might be had from those versed in the question. About three weeks were spent in taking such information in San

Francisco, and the information obtained will be found in the report. I proceeded to British Columbia to meet there my colleague, the other commissioner, Mr. Justice Gray, who had been jointly appointed with me, and I met him in Victoria about the 4th or 5th of August. On the 9th we held our first meeting, and after that time, during three weeks, we took all the information and evidence we could reasonably expect to obtain, and the result of that we have inserted in our report. I cannot here avoid mentioning that a certain amount of feeling appeared to exist, on the arrival of the commissioners in Victoria, which found utterance in a kind of protest that was at first presented, and then, I will not say withdrawn, but requested to be withdrawn. The protest says that the Government of the Dominion and the commissioners had not given to the proper authorities in British Columbia the necessary notice to hold that enquiry. It is my duty to state here, as I did at the time, that I thought the fact being public, it having been made known by the hon. members of British Columbia and by the answer given by the Government in this House, that a commission would be held, the complaint or protest was certainly not one that was completely justifiable. More than that, a long time before the commission sat at Victoria, letters had been sent to the Provincial authorities on the 20th July and to the municipal authorities about the same time, so that all those concerned in the question had full opportunity to know that it was their duty to bring before the commissioners all the evidence they could in support of their views. More than that, the members of the Provincial Cabinet, acting upon the advice or rather the command of the House, presented in the month of May, I think, or in the beginning of the year 1884, a detailed petition to the Federal Government, setting forth that legislation had already been passed in the Local Legislature of British Columbia, and that the facts which had come to the knowledge of the authorities of the Provincial Legislature were sufficient to warrant the petitioners in their demands. That petition contained all the grievances which were then and will now be raised with regard to Chinese immigration. And the facts which it gave in support of the demand were presumed to be known at least to those who had signed the petition. However, the question of Chinese immigration is one which interests the whole Dominion, not one single Province, although up to this present moment, only one Province has raised its voice against such increasing immigration, and I dare say for the very good reason that this is the only Province where Chinese immigration has developed to any important figure. After having heard the witnesses who appeared, after having had from the authorities, both municipal and provincial, all the information and official documents that were wanted, the commissioners visited, as much as they could, the principal points of the Province to gather the information which they thought was required. We visited New Westminster. We made the journey as leisurely as we could on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Moody as far as the Thompson River, and we collected important information there in relation to the subject of our mission. I would be more tempted, if I were at the beginning of my remarks, to give a description of that most magnificent and picturesque country. Really it would be worth while in the future for tourists to come from all parts of the world to admire the beauties, unequalled in any country, of the canyons of the Fraser River on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have been a good deal over the world, I have visited more than one country, I have visited in Europe those countries which are most renowned for the grandeur, the picturesqueness, the *inattendu* of their scenery, and I have never seen anything to surpass the beauty of the sight when one arrives at Mount Hope, seeing there, what I saw, like in a dream, an anchor made by the glaring ice on the top of the mountain, as if

the hope of the country was well rested in that colony, so true to the Crown and so decided to mark its way in the path of the progress of Confederation. But I must come now to the rather prosaic part of my duty, to put before the House the work we have done, the conclusions we arrived at, and those which the Government expressed by the Bill now before the House. We visited, after having gone over that part of the country, the beautiful port of Nanaimo. I had the pleasure of meeting there our friend the able representative of that part of British Columbia, and I must say, to the credit of the country he represents, that happy days, days of wealth, days of prosperity, grand days are in the future for Nanaimo, with its mines of the greatest wealth, with its immense facilities for navigation and landing—for it is one of the features of the coast on the whole of the straits in British Columbia that vessels of the largest tonnage can come and load in still water at a natural wharf made by the granite of the shores. We visited Nanaimo and saw the works of the two great mining companies; one at the head of which is Mr. Dunsmuir, the proprietor of the three mines worked by the company; the other which is under the control and superintendence of Mr. Robbins. We could see there things of the greatest benefit to our investigation. After having accomplished that duty we came back, and with all the evidence and information necessary to place before this Parliament and this country, I might say before the world, a complete record of the question, the commissioners, with the valuable assistance of the Secretary, prepared the report which has been laid before the House. We thought it was worth our while to add to the evidence we had gathered ourselves, to the personal information we had taken ourselves without any special testimony of witnesses, a condensation of the very valuable though voluminous evidence which in 1876 had been taken before the commission appointed at that time by the United States Congress. I think it is not out of my way to mention at the present moment the steps which had been taken in British Columbia to bring the question of Chinese immigration before the Government, and to bring it to an end, as I hope it will be brought, by the adoption of the measure the second reading of which I shall soon have the honor to propose. In a paper which has been submitted to us, I see that, so far ago as 1876, a report of the Committee of the Whole House on the 9th May, was adopted in favor of legislation to prevent this Province being overrun by the Chinese population, to the injury of the settled population of the country. Later on, on the 31st July, 1878, another resolution of the Legislative Assembly was passed and concurred in against the employment of Chinese laborers on public works, the Local Government not to be responsible for the payment on contracts if the contractors used Chinese labor. In 1879, on the 28th of March, a select committee of the Legislative Assembly made a report in which they adverted to the veto by the President of the United States of an Act similar to the Queensland Act, and drawing attention to the fact that Her Majesty Queen Victoria had been pleased to sanction the Queensland Act concerning Chinese immigration, notwithstanding the treaty with China, which had always been urged in the United States as a bar to the enforcement of the different enactments of the California Legislature. I may state here that, as soon as the Government of the Dominion had decided to take this matter into consideration, we received from the Imperial authorities a communication stating that notwithstanding the commercial treaty between Great Britain and China, the Imperial authorities left the Canadian Government free to dispose of the question as they deemed expedient. In the report I have mentioned, calling attention to the fact that Her Majesty had sanctioned the Queensland Act, I find this paragraph:

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

"It has, however, been admitted that this Legislature has no power to pass the Queensland Act, as its provisions would interfere with trade and commerce, and thus conflict with the British North America Act, which confers the regulation of that subject upon the Dominion Parliament.

"As the Australians are now organising a combined movement to obtain, if possible, from the Imperial Government such measures of protection against the further influx of Chinese into their country, the time would seem opportune for united or independent action on the part of the Dominion in the same direction.

"Your committee have ascertained that several measures of an anti-Chinese tendency, and more or less restrictive in character, have been passed in New Zealand, and in Victoria and other Australian colonies, but have been disallowed by the Home Government."

In 1880, on the 21st of April, a resolution was passed by the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, asking that the Queensland Act should be made the basis of legislation by the Dominion of Canada. It might be well, perhaps, that I should mention now the principal provisions of the Queensland Act. It provides that any vessel bringing Chinese passengers as immigrants shall bring no more than one Chinaman to every ten tons burthen of the vessel, and that every such Chinese immigrant shall pay an entry fee of £10, and imposing penalties upon the master of the vessel or other persons when contravening the Act. In the 7th section there is a proviso to the effect that if at any time within three years from the date of landing or arrival of any Chinese in respect to whom such sums shall have been paid, he shall depart from the colony, the sum that he had to pay shall be remitted to him on his departure from the colony. That feature has not been inserted in the Bill before the House. On the 26th February, 1882, the British Columbia Legislature passed another resolution, and a Minute of the Executive Council dated the 7th March was sent to the Dominion Government requesting them not to employ Chinese labor on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and asking us to assist white immigration. The answer given to the provincial authorities is to be found in the following document. The then Acting Secretary of State, sent a letter to the Lieutenant Governor in the following terms:—

"I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General has had under his consideration in council the resolutions of the House of Assembly of the Province of British Columbia, which were embodied in a minute of your Executive Council of the 9th March last, a copy of which was enclosed in your despatch of the 16th of that month, in reference to the advisability of assisting immigration, and inducing the railway contractors to employ white rather than Chinese labor on the Canadian Pacific Railway in that Province.

"I have now to state, for the information of your Government, that his executive is advised that there are no means at the disposal of the Government to induce the contractors on the Canadian Pacific Railway to import and employ the labors of white immigrants on their works instead of Chinese.

"If, however the contractor desires to prepay the passages of white laborers from the United Kingdom, the utmost facilities of assisted ocean passages, and such services as can be rendered by the agents of the Department of Agriculture, will be freely afforded. Transportation across the continent is, however, at present, both difficult and expensive, and the Government have not at their disposal any means to assist such movement of immigrants.

"The advantages offered by British Columbia as a field for settlement of immigrants, have been fully set forth in authentic publications disseminated by the Department of Agriculture to promote immigration to that Province, which will, however, be difficult until the transcontinental railway through Canadian territory is completed."

The executive of British Columbia, in a Minute of Council of 19th August, 1882, which was transmitted by the Lieutenant Governor, asked the Dominion Government to promote the necessary legislation:

"For the purpose of preventing the immigration of Chinese to this Province, and for the prevention of their employment upon Dominion public works; and further to provide that in the event of a charter being granted to a railway or other public work in British Columbia, a clause may be inserted preventing their employment thereon."

In 1883, on the 28th February, the Legislative Assembly passed a resolution again making a request similar in substance to the one I have mentioned. The outlines of an Act were submitted to the Government as those which would be satisfactory to the petitioners, that is to say, the representatives of the people of British Columbia. I dare say that at

the present moment the Act they then proposed would not be satisfactory to them, and we hope that the legislation now proposed, and which is more stringent than the Bill they suggested, will satisfy the most exacting, as well as the most reasonable men who are interested in the progress of the Province. In 1884 the British Columbia Legislature sent a petition to this Government asking that "an Act be introduced by the Dominion Government restricting and regulating the immigration of Chinese." I am quoting this last and most forcible demand of British Columbia to compare it with the measure which is now before the House, the title of which and the provisions of which are exactly the same as suggested by the petition of 1884. I might now, perhaps, mention the measures of repression adopted, the different Acts passed by several colonies and nations of the world in respect to Chinese immigration into those countries. As far back as the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th, in the Island of Manila, the Chinese were found to be too numerous, too obtrusive and too much inclined to encroach upon the rights of others. We read in history that edicts and regulations were resorted to to prevent the influx of Chinese; they had become so numerous that the Spaniards took up arms in 1603, and a general massacre ensued in which 30,000 Chinese were killed. In 1634, 30,000 Chinese were still on the island. Another massacre took place in which 20,000 were killed and at that time 7,000 surrendered. Strange to say 50 years afterwards the Chinese were again masters of the island, and it was only after a strong administration had passed a decree that they were expelled in 1709. In 1762 they were still in sufficient numbers on the island to be of great assistance to the British forces in conquering it. In Java the same treatment was given the Chinese by the Dutch population who had settled upon that island. In 1730 a measure of oppression was passed against them, and in 1740 the Chinese were all deported; but a little time afterwards the race had returned in such numbers that history relates that 10,000 of them were killed. At Singapore, Penang, Malacca under British rule there are now over 260,000 Chinese, who are considered, I must say, as most valuable settlers in the interest of British trade in those islands. In the Australian colonies to which we have to look for legislation in regard to this question, an Act was passed in Victoria in 1864, which was afterwards repealed by an Act passed in 1865, which contained the following provisions:—"The master of every ship having passengers on board shall distinctly specify and state in his list of passengers, to be examined by the Collector of Customs, those who are Chinese immigrants, and in default the offender shall be liable to a penalty of £200." Penalties are also enacted against those who obstruct officers in the discharge of their duty. By the Act of 1881 a penalty of £100 was imposed upon all owners and masters of vessels who carry a greater number than one Chinese immigrant for every 100 tons register of the vessel, and each immigrant is called upon to pay £10 entry money, an exception to those penalties being made in the case of Chinese who come into the colony and who are British subjects. I must say that the provisions of the statute appear to be rather severe. In New South Wales, in 1851, legislation was passed somewhat similar to that I have already mentioned, and also imposing an entry payment of £10. If we wanted precedents for legislation upon the subject we would have to come to the United States. The Chinese restriction Act was passed on the 5th August, 1882, after an agitation that had continued from 1872 to that date, or over 10 years. That Act was not superseded exactly but was amended by an Act passed in 1884, on the 5th day of August, which came into force 90 days after it was passed, and is to continue for ten years. That legislation, as is well known, is prohibitory legislation. As to whether it has worked beneficially in California is a question which is not yet well settled. Whether it is owing to the too great

stringency of the law or to the persistency and constancy of the Chinese immigrants coming into that renowned land, it is difficult to say; but complaints are made that the Act up to this moment has not worked very satisfactorily, and has given rise to a great many suits and proceedings before the courts. So we see that almost everywhere the Chinese have grown, except where British rule prevails, they have gradually grown to such an extent that stringent measures had to be taken against them. From 1849 to 1859, after the period of the discovery of gold in large quantities in California, Chinese immigration began; and not only was it well received in the United States, but it was welcomed, it was induced to come. And when a treaty had been made with China, opening five of her ports to the commerce of the European nations that had forced that treaty on her, every one knows that in 1856 a special treaty called, I think, the Burlingame Treaty, was entered into, at the instance of the American Government, between China and the United States, creating more intimate relations with the American Government than even those which had been imposed by these European nations upon China by the first treaty. Strange to say, in that land of extreme liberty, persecution raged as fiercely as amongst the Spaniards of Manila one hundred years before, and the strong arm of the federal authority could alone prevent the renewal of those brutal massacres. "Although," an American writer says, "they had been welcomed, and they were our friends; although in 1862, they took part in the processions of the 4th of July, and were received as good citizens of the United States, if they chose to be so; yet in 1872 it would have been impossible for them to show themselves at our feasts and holidays; they would not have dared to mix in the national festivities." Between 1872 and the date of the passing of an Act of Congress the most atrocious acts of barbarity were committed upon them, under the eyes of the authorities of the State of California—committed against a peaceful population, who had been brought to American shores by American diplomacy, and by the inducements of American merchants and agents. The "Sand-lotters," as they were called, having at their head the notorious Dennis Kearney, kept San Francisco in a state of terror, and everyone who has read, knows what atrocities were committed during a long period of time, under the eyes even of the Federal authorities without repression. It is true that there the laboring element, the voting element, in a great measure, in that land of universal suffrage, prevailed, and was soon turned into a mob element—an element which was so strong as to prevent even the Federal Government from enforcing the laws of that country. That reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a little reminiscence of those days, a word of witty sarcasm attributed to the Chinese Consul General in San Francisco, and it will prove that that nation is not so far behind, or so degenerated as some people would believe them to be. The wit of the answer which was given by this gentleman, was worthy of any English or French wit. The story goes to say that one day, before the eyes of an officer, two or three young Chinese children were pelted by soldiers, first with apples and then with stones. An English gentleman who happened to be present, had remonstrated, but in vain, and had reported the inhumane conduct of the soldiers and the criminal stupidity of the officer. The Consul General heard of it, and being on his way to Washington, when he was there, he made representations to the Secretary of State, asking him that the authorities should take proceedings so as to punish the offenders. The American Minister after hesitating a little, smiled and said: "Well you know, sir, I think it is very wrong that such a thing should have happened, but you know the presidential elections are coming, and we must reckon upon the Irish votes, and the Irish population are all down on your people and they would resent any action taken in this matter. I am much afraid you will have to swallow the insult to your fellow

countrymen, as I will have to swallow the humiliation of not enforcing the penalties which should have followed the outrage which was committed." "Well, sir," replied the Consul General, "I do not know what answer to send to my master, unless I would advise him to send the Chinese to Ireland, the only place where the Irish do not rule." It was well known that in California, this bad treatment was going on with impunity, so far as the ruling and voting element in the community was concerned. Well, in British Columbia, the first comers of Chinese origin, have also been welcomed. The question of how their presence in British Columbia is now appreciated is one which I suppose this House will not have any difficulty to understand or to judge by the expression of opinion of the Legislature of British Columbia, and of the representatives of British Columbia in this House. Are we to discuss here what is the reason of this violent opposition to Chinese immigration? The opposition to Chinese immigration is two-fold. Some people say that they are a degraded race; they are a mischievous race; they are an uncivilised race; they are barbarians of some kind; and the advanced civilisation developed under British institutions, cannot suffer such an element on British territory. Others say no, no, it is not that, but they are actually invading all the different paths of industry. If you allow them to come in, they are going to monopolise every kind of labor and industry in the country, and with the hordes of hundreds of millions that inhabit the Chinese Empire, no one knows what America will become, if a check is not put at the beginning upon the invasion of these barbarians. I must say that both in California and British Columbia, opinions are divided as to the appreciation, abstractively, of the Chinese race and Chinese immigration. In California, if you consult the manufacturer or the railway contractor, the vine grower, the land reclaimer, the mining proprietor; if you consult the man who wants to develop some large new industry in the country—for California is still a new country—requiring a large amount of labor, and not having at hand all the labor, and especially all the cheap labor, which is necessary to make those works productive, they will tell you that Chinese immigration has been and still can be made useful and desirable. In British Columbia amongst the foremost men in the community, opinions are divided as to the good that has been produced by Chinese immigration and the evil which would eventually be produced if Chinese immigrants were driven out of the country. In general, the wealthy class, the best educated class, is favorable to the Chinese. There is perhaps no question that has so much divided writers, thinkers, historians and philosophers as the question of what is really Chinese civilisation and whether China is an effete nation or a nation having attained a peculiar perfection, which has stood the ravages of centuries which have gone over other nations and other societies, and under which those nations and societies have sunk and disappeared. I only mention these differences of opinion. If you open books treating upon that subject you will find opinions divided, with certainly a majority of the writers, historians and thinkers in favor of the yellow race rather than against. At the same time you will find contradictions in these appreciations. Well, Sir, what are the bad qualities or the defects which prevent us from accepting that immigration as desirable? In the whole of the investigations we have made—I do not speak of the books that have been written upon the subject—with perhaps one or two exceptions, which will not count at present, the conclusion has always been, and very naturally, the same. No doubt, Sir, Chinese immigration has been useful; no doubt it has done a great deal of good; no doubt it may still do a great deal of good; no doubt if all the Chinese immigrants were taken away from the State or the Province, great injury would be done to the State or the Province; but we prefer white immigrants to Chinese immigrants. There exists a certain natural repulsion to these people.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

What is the reason for that kind of repulsion, which I must say is almost general and natural? Is it because of the color of the race? Surely not. Though the negro population is certainly more distinct and should be more repulsive, we do not see that black immigration has been prevented by the means which have been used to prevent Chinese immigration into the different countries of the world. How is it that when people are discussing this question, they cannot avoid not only expressing themselves strongly against the incoming of that race, but using invectives almost instinctively against them? Is it by reason of their color? No. Is it by reason of their dress? Why should it be? Certainly there are other nations in the world who dress more extraordinarily than the Chinese. The garment the Chinaman wears is after all not very different from the workingman's blouse in France. Is it on account of the dress? I do not think so. Is it on account of the manner in which they braid their hair, or the manner in which they shave a part of their head? Surely not; the shaving of the head is an element of cleanliness; and I am still of opinion that the braided queue is after all not so repulsive as the methods of wearing hair in some other nations—Indians, for instance, who do not excite the same repulsion as the Chinese. Is it their religion? Why should it be? They are not fanatics; they have never interfered with the religion of others; they are peaceful in that respect. It is said that the Chinese are free-thinkers—that their religion is rationalism run to decay. Well, in some parts of the world, which are considered to be very enlightened, some people are regarded as more highly gifted intellectually than others if they put forward their title of free-thinkers, of having the right to criticise their own creed and that of others. It cannot be that. Is it their way of living? After all, when we regard it closely, it certainly cannot be their diet. They eat and drink lightly, which is a virtue with us. Is it their way of living altogether in filthy dwellings, where many are congregated together, and where ventilation necessary to life is not found? That reason would certainly have a good application, if by it bad health or diseases were engendered. Nothing of the kind—and I say it most emphatically—has been shown either in the United States or in British Columbia. All that can be said is that Chinese quarters were a most unenviable neighborhood. People at times speak as if leprosy was a common disease among the Chinese immigrants. Well, I have interrogated many of those who were able to speak on that subject, and the only case of so-called leprosy which was mentioned by any of the witnesses—and certainly not well disposed witnesses—was not only contested, but was denied by the professional man having charge of the gaol where the case was reported to have been discovered. It is true that the neighborhood of the different quarters where they reside are not tempting or attractive. This might be remedied no doubt by municipal legislation. Still, I must say that cleanliness for cleanliness, disorder for disorder, repulsive appearance for repulsive appearance, I have seen in some of the streets of San Francisco something that was a great deal worse than the worst sights I have seen in what they call the Chinese slums. No doubt this is a condition which is found in certain classes of humanity, as well amongst the Chinese as other races. I had occasion to visit some of the good Chinese restaurants in San Francisco. I visited a couple of high class Chinese clubs, and I confess that the comforts, the luxuries of life are as well appreciated and as easily found as amongst the best of ourselves. Have we repulsion for them because they lack courage? Surely not. It is true they are a timid people, but they have a kind of courage which is considered, amongst some civilised nations, as heroism. The fact is that we are naturally disposed, through inconscient prejudices, to turn into defects even their virtues. In support of my pretension I might quote here one of the writers on the subject, and one who,

in my estimation, has really taken up the subject, not only with great vigor, but perhaps in the best possible sense. He says :

"He is generally honest, it is true, but the most prominent Chinese merchant in San Francisco admitted that his race was honest simply because it was the best policy, and for no other reason. Now, a man who is honest from the mere force of logic, simply because honesty is generally the best policy, must inevitably be dishonest in the exceptional case when dishonesty is the best policy."

This is the argument the writer puts forward as one of the arguments against the Chinese. I think it would not be right to blame a people for boasting that they are honest because they have found out that honesty is the best policy. I have always understood that amongst civilised people it is a maxim which, when followed out, is rather a sign of perfection than degradation.

"The two races are further separated by fundamental differences in language, in dress, in customs, in habits and social peculiarities and prejudices. In all these respects the Chinese differ from us more than any known race. Even their virtues are not the same as ours. While they are, as a nation, more apprehensive of danger than we, and more selfish and cowardly in avoiding it, in the presence of death they display a rare intrepidity and yield up their lives with a courage which we should consider heroic in one of ourselves."

We have seen during the war which has been waging the last two or three years between China and one of the first nations of Europe, that the Chinese have proved themselves to be individually, certainly not deserving the accusation of cowardice, which is one of the vices put forward as explaining the repulsion felt against them.

"They excel us in industry and economy, but they are even more reckless and prodigal when they choose to indulge themselves."

So much for those who accuse the Chinese of natural avarices. It is true, they are generally prudent and saving, but when they are willing to be liberal their liberality really borders on extravagance.

"There is nothing in their religion or in their education to counteract or ameliorate those tendencies. Their religion is rationalism run to decay; their education is principally directed to forms and ceremonies. In fact, their civilisation is so ancient that it has become rotten."

"Thus the Chinaman has brought to us and planted within our border all the vicious practices and evil tendencies of his home, aggravated somewhat, perhaps, by the circumstance that he has lost what little restraint his home Government imposed upon him without submitting to the restraint of ours."

What is mentioned here as being something repulsive to our civilisation is, when reasoned out, not sufficient reason to explain that hatred, that natural, instinctive repulsion felt towards them. What, then, is the real reason? I have stated first, those differences in physical peculiarities, in dress, in habits, which might not be an object of special attention and special estrangement, were it not for the prejudices which, at every moment, point out to those differences and produce that repulsion. Suppose for example, says a writer, that red-headed men were rigidly excluded from general society and compelled to consort together. The result would be, that in a few generations we should have a red-headed sept, and after æons of ages it might be, or at least it might be believed that there were mental as well as physical differences between us. Physical peculiarities tend to make other and less important divergencies conspicuous, and in this and other ways are constantly operating to isolate the race possessing them from other races. I am inclined to think that physical peculiarities which now pass unnoticed might, if a prejudice were aroused against them, ultimately result in the separation and isolation of new races and septs now unknown. Upon the whole, I doubt if there is any obstacle in the way of the fraternisation of races so difficult to overcome as this one of physical peculiarities, and the prejudices, sometimes very idle and senseless, which are begotten of them. The continuation of the prejudices engendered by those differences is certainly, and has been, acting very forcibly upon the estrangement of the Chinese race amongst other nations. We are prone to generalise the fault of the

individual culprit and attach its stigma to the whole nation to which it belongs. A Chinese servant runs off with my spoons; I hasten to vociferate that all Chinamen will steal. An Indian horse-trader tells me a falsehood I feel safe to say that no Indian ever told the truth. Worse than this, the sin committed against me is taken up by my race as a sin committed against our whole family, and individual crimes are thus catalogued into national grievances. This sort of race hostility is materially strengthened by a large class of men who find their principal scope feeling and fostering race enmities.

To them the community is everything, the individual is nothing. Insult them and you may be forgiven, but insult their sept and you have committed an unpardonable sin. Lost in such a generalisation, they become morbidly sensitive as to the community's honor, fretfully irritable as to its grievances, and inordinately jealous of its rivals or competitors. For such small cattle they are capable of a great deal of harm. It is admitted that Chinese immigration has done an immense amount of good, both in the United States and British Columbia. In the States, what are the great works they not only have aided in building up, but which, without their assistance, could not have been built? These people have been the cause of the prompt, efficient, and profitable, building of the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, and the Southern Pacific, the greatest enterprises of modern industry. I am sure I will not be contradicted by those who know, when I say that they have been, not only a good element but a most efficient element, in the carrying out of the works of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What is the testimony rendered to them by those who have employed them? I was, when visiting British Columbia, brought in contact with the general superintendent, I think, at all events he was acting, and was really, the assistant contractor, a gentleman by the name, if I am not mistaken, of Michael Haney, who was conducting the works of Mr. Onderdonk the contractor. He was an Irishman of pure water, and boasted of it with reason. He had all the intelligence, the wit, the pertinacity, and the vigor of his nationality. That gentleman told me that when he came to take charge of the works he had decided—he was quite a young man, I must say, to his credit, a few years over 20—not to employ Chinese laborers, if possible, in the building of the road. More than that, I think that at the time the contractor imported from the States other workmen who were christened a rather singular name; they were called Onderdonk's lambs; they were not Chinese. Every one will understand the difficulty, in districts where there is no administration of justice to speak of, of controlling and directing an assemblage of 10,000 people. That gentleman had come with a distinct determination to do without Chinese labor. Read his testimony, and you will see that, by himself, without any other reason but the experience he had of these men at work, he came to a conclusion diametrically opposed to his former views; his testimony goes to show that, as far as practical work is concerned, as good patient laborers, as peaceful men, important to bring to success such an enterprise under such difficulties as attend the building of those roads in the wilderness, they were the best kind of people. That was the evidence which in San Francisco was given before by Mr. Crocker of the Central Pacific, and by several other gentlemen who were examined and who gave the same testimony in favor of the Chinese laborers. What is, then, the reason of that antipathy? Have they not done good work? They have built these immense works in the State of California. They have done more. One of the most important industries in the State of California is that of fruit growing, vine growing. By those who are cognisant of that industry it is plainly admitted that, without that cheap labor, that most important industry would not have succeeded; and that industry represents millions in the great Pacific State. Another one

will tell you that in the work of reclaiming lands they have done great service. I think we have in the report the evidence of Mr. Roberts, if I am not mistaken, the president of a land reclamation company there. In the evidence of that gentleman you will find that that kind of work could not be done by other than Chinese laborers, that white men could not do the work, that it was even dangerous to them; and once again I am called to ask whether their habits and their diet are against good health and the most natural physical requirements of a human being, properly behaving himself. And I say that generally they are not subject, in other countries and in ours, to those diseases which are so frightful in their ravages amongst the white men. It is a well known fact that in China typhoid fever is almost unknown. These people were employed at reclaiming lands in California which the white men could not do. The Chinese have done it to the extent in one year, of between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 acres, representing, when reclaimed, a value of between \$75 and \$100 per acre. Mr. Roberts said that the Chinese in California have been adding to the wealth of the State and to the wealth of the country generally between \$80,000,000 and \$90,000,000 in work which, without their assistance would not have been done, or which it would have taken a great lapse of time to perform. So California owes to Chinese the vine growing, the fruit growing, the land reclaiming, they have also engaged in mining. In the States, as in British Columbia, the Chinese have taken a great deal to gold mining, and strange to say in a great measure in British Columbia, as in California, they have been to a great extent engaged in taking up claims that had been worked and abandoned as worthless, and they have had great difficulties in getting licenses, and owing to those difficulties they preferred working as they have done, taking these abandoned claims and working them with a small profit, but still with a profit. It is true that I was told in British Columbia: That is wrong; it is true that these claims were abandoned, and that nobody was looking at them, but it is wrong to see a Chinaman working there, because it is future wealth for after generations, when the country becomes thickly populated, and that gold might be taken up by white immigrants. That is a very poor argument. If the Chinese were giving nothing, were producing nothing for the country, I could understand that, but in a moment I shall state what is the value of a Chinese immigrant in this country as well as in other countries. I was saying that they have done good work so far in the States and in British Columbia, and I was asking the question: Why is there such an antipathy? That antipathy exists, and the only reason, or the great reason for it, is in the antagonism between the Chinese and the other laborers. It is not to be found really in any other cause than the competition of cheap labor with laborers who want to exact a higher price. Is the object of the white laborer, in trying to force himself into the building of works and the carrying on of industries at higher wages than the cheap labor which is offered by the Chinese—is that a laudable object, and is Parliament going to come to the rescue? That is the question which this measure will decide, I think, in a way acceptable to all. But let me say that there are not differences enough between the two races to prevent them from living together, if the knowledge was not spread now all over the world that the Chinese, with his frugality, with his sobriety, with his contentment with very little, with his assiduity to labor, with his quiet, peaceable conduct when at work, is a superior instrument in the hands of the builder and of the manufacturer, especially for works of great magnitude requiring many hands, and requiring necessarily cheap labor to be brought to a successful issue. During the discussion before Congress, I think the point was made with the greatest eloquence by Senator Jones of Nevada. He used the language of a laborer. Surely few miners

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

would have been found to say what Mr. Jones has put in their mouths, but Mr. Jones in his expressions had felt really and rightly the pulse, had given the keynote of the situation in California, in British Columbia, and all over the world:

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

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

This is the feeling of the workingmen, and I am not prepared to say that it is not excusable or even justifiable. It is no argument to tell the American laborer that if he would live as the Chinaman lives he might subsist on the Chinaman's wages. It has taken the Chinaman centuries to learn to live on so little. "With the lapse of time his necessities have gradually accommodated themselves to his small earnings until now very little suffices to procure him abundance. He has made a prodigious stride toward the ideal ration of a straw per day. Early education and constant habits have so led him to practice the closest economy, that economy has itself become a habit, and no longer involves self-denial. The world around him has graduated itself down to his standard. His butcher, his baker, his candlestick-maker, his manufacturer, his merchant and his common carrier have reduced their prices to suit his measure. The doctor who attends his sick and the priest who buries his dead demand little because he gets little. Labor can afford to be cheap when everything else is cheap. But we cannot expect labor to be cheap when everything else is dear." Now, as I said before, we find a universal repulsion against the Chinese, and a desire to prevent their encroachment upon the white population. We have seen in the reviews and periodicals accounts of the progress that Chinese merchants have made. In the English colony at Hong Kong, Governor Pope Hennessy stated in 1877 that the number of houses belonging to the British and German citizens were decreasing, while the trade beneficial to the general interests of the empire was increasing. Wherever the Chinaman has got a foothold he has succeeded in all the occupations he has undertaken, and has become a most formidable rival, indeed a successful rival, to the white man. It may be asked, how is it that the Government are yielding to the prejudices of race and class in restricting Chinese immigration to Canada? Why do you not allow the Chinaman to remain if he does his duty? He has done it in a certain measure. I have heard it stated, for instance, in California, that Chinamen send home on the average \$300 every year. An examination of the earnings and expenses of a workingman shows that this cannot be correct; the Chinese laborer earns on an average about \$25 a month or \$225 for nine months' work, which is the average per year. But on the other hand he has to spend for his food, clothing and rent; and on this point we obtained information from the assistant consul of San Francisco, Huang Sing Chen, a very intelligent man, who gave a great deal of assistance to the commissioners. If the Chinaman spends \$10 or \$11 a month for food and clothing he does not save even \$100. In San Francisco the Chinese reside in hovels, but they pay a rental of \$15 to \$16 a month. In Victoria perhaps the rental is less, but, even if a Chinese pays only \$2 a month, that would make \$24 a year. Then they expend on tools and travelling expenses \$10; taxes \$5; doctors \$3 and other expenses \$5. He expends for all pur-

poses \$182 a year that would only leave him \$43 as his net earnings.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Would the hon. gentleman state how many Chinese there are living in those tenements that pay \$2 a month?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know how much the Chinese are paying for rent, but I said that, taking it for granted that they pay on an average \$2 per month for their lodging, and I do not think that is an extra amount—

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Fifteen men in one cabin pay \$2 a month.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The estimate expenses that I have given have been published on the Pacific coast, and I do not care about discussing them. I have seen eight or ten men in one tenement, and they were paying as much as \$50 or \$60 a month.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. It is not so in Victoria.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In Victoria they are better treated. That is the reason why the Chinese of Victoria appear to be a great deal better than in other places where we saw Chinese, but I am sure they do not pay \$2 for lodgings for fifteen men. Putting even a margin of 50 per cent. on that statement, you will see that each man would at least spend in the country a sum of at least \$100 a year. I know that the Chinese in their living obtain nothing but that for which they pay very dearly. I am not pleading for them. They have undoubtedly spent in the country a large amount of money, and I shall show by statistics that the goods coming from China have been in a large measure consumed by the Chinese population in the Province. Let us say that each Chinese laborer spends \$100 a year, this would give a result of \$962,900, taking 9,629 as the exact number of Chinese laborers in British Columbia. Each of them pays to the state in duties, provincial and municipal taxes, over \$25 per head, and the absolute value of the Chinese labor, a value which remains as a capital invested in the country, is not overrated at two dollars a day, making for the 9,629 laborers, at the rate of 230 days a year, a total of \$4,429,280 of net profit for the country. I have indicated the real, fundamental reason why opposition is given to Chinese immigration. I am satisfied that my statement will not be contradicted when I say that prejudice and rivalry are the main sources of opposition to their presence amongst us. But are we for that reason not to take into consideration the social and moral condition of the country where they are living? Are we to ignore feelings and antipathies? Is it not necessary, for a Government dealing with questions on its responsibility, to respect even prejudices? Are we not obliged very often to respect prejudices? Do we not respect them very often in our legislation? I think that this would alone constitute a sufficient reason for any legislation the Government may choose to enact in respect to the Chinese: that they are a stumbling block in the way of the development of the country, in the way of any Government on account of those prejudices that are founded on facts that cannot be ignored. That Chinese labor has taken the place of white labor, which might not so far have come into the country, but which must come in the future, is likely to create a sentiment in the country that the Government cannot ignore. Whatever views we may entertain I do not think hon. members would differ in the conclusion to which we arrived after the investigation I made with my brother commissioner in the United States and in British Columbia. Opinions differ on this question, but no one differs in this, that we would infinitely prefer that white immigrants should occupy the field. We examined witnesses in British Columbia, and Dr. Helmcken stated—though it is not reported in his evidence—the matter in a very clear

manner. He said the whole thing is very simple; "we want you to prevent the influx of Mongolians because we want to be here ourselves, and do not want others to be here. You will not consider it strange if we tell you that as good Englishmen we see no reason why any men except good Englishmen should live in this country." I knew in what sense the witness said that. There was no reason, he thought, for anybody living in a British colony but Englishmen. "We are despotic—you know it; as regards our customs and usages and habits we are despotic in a certain sense; and you know it." And we all know it. But we have to condone that, and to do the best we can among ourselves; but there will always be a certain amount of feeling existing, not to the same extent, perhaps, because differences exist, in regard to the Chinese; and when they come in large numbers they threaten us, not the peace of the country, and not the morals of the country, but they hurt the sentiments of the people. From the whole of the evidence taken—of course there is immorality amongst the Chinese, as there is amongst other nations in like classes—it is evident also that immorality among the Chinese does not prevail to the extent often mentioned; for if immorality was carried on to that extent, the intense feeling which would be aroused against the Chinese would lead to lynching, and no one could prevent summary justice being dealt out in cases when such crimes as have been intimated had been committed by Chinese domestic servants. We know that when similar crimes were committed in the Southern States by a race to which the white race had antipathies, lynching was the order of the day for many years. Everyone knows that no one could prevent the Chinese from being similarly punished if such outrages were committed by them. They are not better than other races, but they have virtues as well as vices. The Government cannot, however, ignore the national or provincial feeling, the feeling that prevails among the white population. A number of the witnesses examined by the commission declared that people could not keep house in British Columbia and would be obliged to leave the country, being unable to obtain efficient servants, except for the Chinese domestics. As to the immense fisheries in British Columbia the yield of which was last year no less than \$1,498,082, they could not have been developed except for the Chinese. The same may be said of the coal mining industry; the export of that product amounted, during the three last years, to 622,897 tons, or \$2,178,353. Market gardening, that great luxury of the rich and the poor, that important factor in the economy of a new country, is entirely a Chinese creation. But in spite of all those facts, the Government cannot ignore that a wave is coming up, and I say it would be a blot on the administration of the Government, not to take action as we have taken it. I may have my own personal opinion of what I have read, and of the intelligence I have been able to obtain on this question, but I agree with my hon. friends who represent British Columbia in this House, that if they were to go back to their Province without legislation of some kind being arrived at in the direction of settling this problem, the peace of the country would be threatened. Such legislation is not new. Great Britain has permitted her colonies to pass such legislation and nobody has complained. I know that some may find fault with this measure, though it is not an arbitrary, a despotic, or a cruel measure; but it will at least have the result of effectually checking Chinese immigration into British Columbia, to a very large extent; in fact I may say that it will probably almost extinguish Chinese immigration, except to a desirable extent and of a desirable kind. I have been rather surprised at some of the criticisms of this Bill. I find that some journals have called it a draconian measure, while others said it was a milk and water measure. I say the measure was necessary; I say that legislation was demanded by men who understood what

they were doing, and what are the exact conditions of things in British Columbia. It was a good thing that there should be a large influx of Chinese immigration at the time when the resources of British Columbia were at an early stage of their development, but I say the evil will be less when our great transcontinental railway is completed, although even then there are some works which will more profitably be done, some industries which will be more profitably developed, with the cheap labor which will remain in that Province. I do not think that any one will object and I am quite sure that the people of British Columbia do not object, to seeing the class come into their country who make up the respectable merchants whom I saw in the stores of Victoria, whom I met in the drawing room at a reception held by the Lieutenant Governor of that Province. To such a class I am sure nobody there will object, except the few to whose declamations reasonable men will not attach much importance. But I say that the mass of Chinese immigrants are of a class who necessarily will compete with the laboring men, with the ordinary workmen of the country, and I say it is little wonder that objections should be raised to the large immigration of that class. I noticed that the other day some resolutions were passed by a trades union meeting at Montreal. With regard to trades unions, I may say that I have my own personal opinions with regard to these organisations. I do not favor trades unions, nor do I think that strikes are good things for the protection of the laborers themselves. I think that the laborers of Montreal have shown their good sense in the fact that they have not engaged in that kind of strife for many years, since the time when they were led into a strike by that celebrated demagogue, Médéric Lanctot, and that they are not disposed to be deluded another time. They paid too dear for their experiment at that period. I think the good work of trying to find a level between labor and capital and of allaying the jealousies and ill-feeling which necessarily spring up between the poor and the rich, of trying to prevent one class from attempting to get the best of the other class—I say that this task never can be well accomplished by mere organisations on the part of those who are interested in the contest. The task is one which belongs to those who teach the virtues that make good christians and good citizens; it belongs to those who teach the virtues of obedience and contentment, in whatever calling in life; to those who will say, and who will be understood in saying, that the laborer in his quiet labor, or amongst his family after his day's work, has perhaps more real comfort and happiness in life than the man who is engaged in the legislation of his country, or the great statesman who reaches the height of honor and power, who knows little of the comfort, pleasure and real happiness which a good, kind, peaceable, and peaceful laborer enjoys in his home. I say the solution of that great problem, which is threatening the old institutions of Europe, threatening them with revolution; the great problem of labor against capital, is not to be solved by such organisations or societies, composed of those who are most interested in raising up these feelings of jealousy and enmity between different classes of the community. But I say at the same time, that it is a natural and well-founded desire of British subjects, of the white population of this Dominion, who come from either Britain or the other European States and settle in this country, that their country should be spoken of abroad as being inhabited by a vigorous, energetic, white race of people; I say that it would be much more pleasant to have this said of the Province of British Columbia, than to have that Province even if it grew richer than it is, with two-thirds of its population composed of a race which is not similar to ours, and which cannot assimilate with ours. That is the difficulty, and we know it, and it is our duty to overcome it. The Chinese government, conservative, exclusive as it is, will understand the policy of protection which we are forced

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

to adopt, notwithstanding our desire to keep friendly relations with their nation. The Chinese race, good as it is, perfect, if you like, cannot and will not assimilate with the whites—I do not say because they are too bad; I simply state the fact. It may be pretended that it is owing to the perfection of their social organisation, but I was reading the other day an article from one of the great religious writers of France, who would certainly not be suspected of being at all democratic in his ideas, belonging rather to the class of ultramontaine writers. He was comparing the two civilisations—the civilisation of China with that of Europe—and he said that the Chinese had proved the perfection of their social organisations by the fact that they had absorbed other nationalities, and not only absorbed them, but drowned them out, so to speak; because though they had a national existence extending over 42 centuries, they had been able to resist to the present day every innovation and had made of the various people they had absorbed, the same nationality as themselves, with the same laws, the same customs, the same religion, and the same institutions. For centuries past, small colonies of these people have established themselves amongst the most powerful, the most absorbing nations of the globe, and in no case have they lost a particle of their individuality, of their national character. They have one of the finest countries in the world. Every body knows that China is composed of all kinds of different climates, that its productions are exceedingly varied and that it is probably the best watered country in the world. One of the reasons why I consider that in Canada we do not stand in the same relation to what is called the Chinese question, as they do in the United States, and one reason why we are not in danger of being overwhelmed with “hordes of Mongolians,” as some would seem to fear, is in the fact not only of our race, but of our climate. There is no danger of that. I would be ashamed to be a British subject, or to be of the nationality to which I belong, if I believed for a moment that the survival of the fittest would be the survival of the Chinese race on this continent. The Chinese have said themselves that they do not want to come to this part of our country, that its climate is too cold. It is true that some have gone to New York, and that some have gone to Montreal; but the climate is too cold for them. On the shores of British Columbia where nature has been bountiful in climate, in vegetation and scenery, and then, as it were, the breeze from the old country comes to them, regenerating their nationality to such a degree that they do not even want to be buried in the land they come to colonise. They only come to the country to get labor, and in doing that they only pursue a laudable object; but they do not want to assimilate with us, and we do not want to assimilate with them. As a piece of wood in the tissues of the human body, unless it is removed, must cause disease in the places around it, and ultimately to the whole body, so the civilisation of Chinese, introduced into Christian civilisation, must disappear, or it will be a cause of danger to the community. There is no danger, it is true, to our politics, as the Chinese have not the right of voting. I asked the Consul General of China if his people wanted the right to vote. “Oh, no,” he said, “we do not want that;” and he added, with a good deal of reason, “if we sided with one political party, we should have the hatred of the opposite political party.” I suggested that perhaps the sympathy of the other side would more than compensate for that. He said, “we do not want to interfere; we are laborers who have come out here to work, and when it is done, we go back to our own country; we may have enriched ourselves, but surely we have not made you poorer.” Now, the Government have thought that the time has come to introduce legislation, which in a few words, to conclude my remarks, I will explain to the House. The Bill provides first for the payment of \$50 for the entry of any Chinaman into the country, by land or by water. The pay-

ment is to be made at the time he enters. If he returned to his country and came back to Canada, he would have to pay the second time, with the proviso that, when he has landed and identified himself, as a former resident in Canada, the money will be re-imbursed to him. No vessel carrying Chinese immigrants shall carry more than one Chinese immigrant for every 50 tons of its tonnage. Some thought that was too low, and that one for 100 tons would not be too high, but with 50 tons, a vessel of 3,000 tons of tonnage would not be allowed to carry more than 60 immigrants. It will be said probably that the steamers plying between San Francisco and Victoria every week might bring a large number of them into Canada. These steamers have a capacity of not more than 2,000 tons, and so would not be able to carry more than 40 Chinese passengers; so that, multiplying the number by 52, there would not be a large number of immigrants every year. But I think the greatest safety lies in the payment of the sum of \$59, which is quite sufficient to prevent any penniless laborer from coming. Another clause provides that no vessel carrying Chinese immigrants will have a right to land a single passenger until the master of the vessel delivers to the Controller of immigration a detailed list of all the Chinese passengers on board; and until a medical officer shall examine the passengers to see that none having any infectious or contagious disease are on board. That is a precaution against the alleged propagation of disease by Chinese immigration. The Controller of the immigration will keep a register of the immigrants and give a list of the same to the Provincial authorities. The officer of Customs can be appointed to such a position. There is a clause in the Bill providing for the appointment of an interpreter at a salary of \$3,000. One of the great objections made against Chinese immigration has been that the cost of the administration of justice was very large, because it was very difficult to obtain trustworthy interpreters who knew the language of the offenders or of the witnesses. Therefore we thought it would be well to have a Chinese interpreter, and the Government will select a man as far as possible not having Chinese proclivities. By that means the administration of criminal justice in the Province at least will be facilitated. Now, I have only one word to add. I must give this testimony in favor of those who have asked for this legislation, that no one wanted to have legislation to expel or exile the Chinese now in the Province. But they do not want to have an increase of them. Everybody knows that the work of the Pacific Railway has been carried on successfully with a large number of those men as laborers; At one time 6,000 or 7,000 were employed as such; every one knows that these men, if they are in the charge of a company, are likely to seek employment in some other great work undertaken in other countries; as they are skilled men in that kind of work, they would no doubt be like those travelling bands of laborers who in old times built up all large works in various parts of Europe. A great number of those who have been working on the Canadian Pacific Railway will emigrate to China, and those coming to the country must necessarily be superior to the undesirable class who should not be allowed to come into British Columbia. In passing this law we must not forget an important consideration. We know that the prospect of trade with China is a subject that has engaged the attention of all the Governments of Europe; and at one time a bloody war was the consequence of the refusal of that country to open its ports to the commerce of the world. The commerce of a nation of 350,000,000 inhabitants is a commerce not to be despised; and everyone will understand at the same time, what has been discussed all over the country, that the prospect of bringing Asiatic trade through the channel of the Canadian Pacific Railway would render that great national work of importance and profit to the country. Every body knows

that it is the intention of the enterprising people at the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a fleet of large steamers for the trade between China, Japan, and British Columbia. We know very well that that trade can be made prosperous. We must know, at the same time, that it would not be wise or prudent on our part to legislate in such a manner as to cause a bad impression on that nation, which, is a proud nation. I must say that every time I have met with the dignitaries of China, they have said they expected always to have fair play from us and that they respected the English people and the Government more than any Government in the world. It is true at the time they were not on very favorable terms with another nation not very far from England. I think our relations with China should be those of a people desiring to have good commercial intercourse with them. They have no reason to blame us for protecting ourselves; they would have reason to blame us if we were to pass a measure which will be considered as cruel towards their fellow countrymen. With these remarks, I move the resolutions preparatory to the introduction of the Bill. As I have said, a good part of my remarks is merely personal impressions, another part is merely quotations or expressions of opinion of others, but the conclusions I have come to are those of the Government, and I hope the House will accept the measure which is thoroughly in accord with the sentiment of the people, not only in the Province of British Columbia but in the whole of British North America.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. It is with some feeling of pleasure I rise on the present occasion with reference to this Chinese matter. I do not intend making a speech; in fact, I have made up my mind it would not be necessary to offer any remarks at all on this question, as I think the House has been informed of all the phases of this question over and over again. I simply rise to express my pleasure at the prospects the people of British Columbia have of being relieved of the scourge they have been suffering under, to a certain extent at least. It is with pleasure I support the provisions of this Bill, because, whilst it may not be all that some people would require, at the same time it is the beginning of better days, it is getting in, as we sometimes remark, the thin end of the edge. We have commenced well to-day, and I hope we will not stop until we have completed the good work. I cannot help making a few remarks on the many quotations the hon. the Secretary of State has given this House this afternoon, and which are calculated in my mind to mislead it. With regard to the Chinese paying \$2 a month rental, the evidence the hon. the Secretary of State has given is that of the Chinese agents. Now it is well known to every man who knows anything at all of the Chinese character, that they are not to be relied upon in scarcely any particular; hence this man's word in this case is not to be relied upon. With regard to the statement that these men pay \$2 a month rent, hon. gentlemen not acquainted with the question would naturally conclude that each Chinaman pays \$2 a month rent. That is not the case. In these cabins where they pay \$2 a month, and some of them only pay \$1.50, you will find 10 or 20 Chinese. That is the way they live. I desire to quote from the report of the Chinese commission, just one or two extracts from the evidence of men in that Province well posted on the subject. Many of the quotations which have been made in favor of the Chinese have been taken from American sources; I would view the matter as it concerns British Columbia, and to show you the people of British Columbia do not believe the word of the Chinese, is not difficult. Here is the evidence of the hon. Mr. Drake, president of the council in our Local Legislature:

"I have been a resident in British Columbia since 1859, practising my profession as a barrister and solicitor. The Chinese did not appear in any large number until after 1870, but even before that time they gradually absorbed all the light labor which used to be done by white

people. They first invaded the washing interests, and gradually ousted the women who did this work; then they absorbed the market-garden work, and are now the sole suppliers of garden produce; and in all the various industries which require light work they have driven all competitors from the field. The effect of this is that white people will not come to compete with the Chinese, and one consequence is that all persons requiring house-work done are driven to employ Chinese at extravagant wages. \$25 to \$30 a month is the ordinary rate of wages, and they are so well organized that if any attempt is made to reduce the wages it is impossible to obtain a servant. They will not compete against each other, and the ordinary law governing demand and supply is entirely evaded by a higher law of compulsion. If any one attempts to act for himself in this direction, the general body have means at their disposal to compel obedience to their rules. False charges are trumped up against the offender, or his fears are worked upon so that they dare not disobey their secret rulers."

They have organisations amongst themselves and ignore the laws of the land entirely.

"I have had a very large experience in Chinese cases, especially in criminal cases, and I find that where Chinese alone are concerned, a conviction is hardly ever obtained."

We often hear the remark: Look at your court statistics; they show conclusively there is not as much crime among the Chinese as some people make out. But the reason is they are seldom discovered.

"The calendar of convictions gives no criterion of the number of offences. Several murders have been committed and no clue to the perpetrators. The administration of justice obtains no assistance whatever from the Chinese themselves; if, however, the question is one between Chinese and white persons, the Chinese strain every nerve to obtain a conviction, and are utterly indifferent whether the charge is brought against the real criminal or some other white person."

"The Chinese are utterly unacquainted with truth, and it is a universal comment on their evidence that you cannot believe anything they say. They shelter themselves under their ignorance of the English language so that no cross-examination can reach them, and it is generally believed that the interpreters guide the evidence. In one case that came before me, a charge of murder was preferred against a Chinese, and he was arrested. The murder was committed at Seattle, and the presence of the prisoner distinctly sworn to. I was, however, in a position to prove that the prisoner was on his way from San Francisco to Victoria at the time of the alleged offence, and after producing that evidence the prosecutors, who were applying for extradition, abandoned further proceedings, but compelled the prisoner's friends to pay \$250 for expenses, stating if they did not do so they would have him arrested on some other charge. The reason, I after discovered, was that the prisoner had refused to pay a sum to a secret society which exists among them. They are governed by laws of their own, entirely uncontrolled by the laws of the country where they reside."

This is the class of people we are asked to legislate against here to-day.

"Prostitution of the most flagrant character is carried on wherever a few men are collected. The women are slaves and sold by their importers at prices varying from \$300 to \$600. Cases connected with the system have frequently been brought before the court, and in no case have, I think, the true facts ever been elicited. The complaint of inveighing boys into these dens of infamy, and the diseases which are there caught, are numerous and painful."

These are facts which have been referred to in this House on previous occasions, but they have been doubted, and insinuations have been made that they were not true.

"The Chinese are not settlers in any sense of the word; they are no benefit to the country as settlers; they tend to exclude a more valuable population, and even where they are engaged in numbers the employers would prefer white people but cannot get them. The numbers that are in the Province it is very difficult to estimate, as the leading merchants do not wish the numbers to be known, but there can be very few short of 18,000. It is not expected that those present should be driven away, but it is hoped that such restrictive legislation will be passed as to prevent their influx. There are sufficient numbers here to fulfil all the requirements of labor for years to come, and if restriction is granted we shall find that white labor will become more plentiful at once."

That corresponds exactly with statements made in this House on previous occasions. Now, I desire to give the evidence which has been referred to this afternoon in regard to the railways. I will give the evidence of one man, Nelson Bennett, formerly of Toronto, contractor for the Cascade division of the Northern Pacific Railway.

"Q. Do you employ many Chinese?—A. Not as many as white laborers. We employ Chinese because we are at present showing things, just because we need them. I prefer white labor if I can get it. I am partial to Scandinavian labor if that can be got. Two Chinamen are worth about one white man."

"Q. How much do you pay the Chinamen?—A. Eighty cents a day, and they furnish themselves with board and tents."

Mr. SHAKESPEARE.

Is it possible that any hon. gentleman in this House or in this country will think for one moment that it is possible for a white man to live and support a family on such wages?

"Q. And how much do you pay the white laborer?—A. Two dollars a day, and I furnish tents and they pay their own board."

"Q. Then you get the Chinaman for less than half?—A. Yes; but we get no trade from them. They furnish themselves through their own officers and stores, whereas the white men buy their provisions and clothing from us. We make a profit on that, and the difference between \$2 a day for the white man and eighty cents for the Chinaman is compensated by the profits on that trade and the greater amount of work done by the white man. Half the number of white men is cheaper for a contractor than double the amount of Chinamen. They have not much endurance. Men that do not eat, they cannot endure."

"Q. What is your system of employing them? Do you deal individually with them?—A. No; we hire them in companies or gangs. When you hire them in gangs you cannot individualize them, and consequently if you have a trouble with one Chinaman it is a trouble with the whole gang. On the other hand, if you have trouble with one white man you can discharge him alone."

They are so united, and so complete are their organisations, that, if you offend one man, they will all put down their tools and quit work, until you settle with the man who has been the cause of it.

"Q. We have been told that if a Chinaman was not satisfactory he was pointed out and at once removed?—A. Yes; and the next moment he is in another gang."

"Q. Is there anything else which occurs to you as likely to prove useful to the Commission in its enquiry?—A. The Chinaman is of no earthly account in a country. If you employ white laborers one out of ten settles in the country. We find this in Montana where we employ white laborers altogether; but on this coast where Chinamen are employed you will find 500 miles at a stretch without settlement excepting railroad employes."

I think that is an answer to the many quotations that have been made by the hon. the Secretary of State. Those people are still coming into our Province. I received a letter two days ago from one of our merchants in the city of Victoria. He says:

"Two shiploads of Chinamen arrived yesterday, numbering 803. The same day a steamship arrived from San Francisco with 97."

So that within 24 hours the population of that Province increased about 900. He says:

"It is impossible to populate the country with whites when so many Chinamen are coming in. Now that the railway is near completion, we are beginning to feel the effects, and next year will be still worse."

The idea is that when the railway is complete, these men will have no work to do, and they will be a greater curse to the people of that Province than they are even at the present time. We are told that there is no leprosy amongst the Chinese. Why, there can be any amount of evidence obtained in British Columbia on that question, and one reason why it was not given was that persons who had the information were opposed to the commission, and deemed it unnecessary, and hence they failed to appear. We are told that these Chinese in California built large works. Admitting all that, admitting that they build these large works, is it to be granted that we are to allow this element to come into our Province and monopolise all the labor there is, to the exclusion of the white men? What is the fact? There is not a year that passes by but hundreds of men go to British Columbia and have to return because they cannot get employment, and yet there is abundance of employment in that Province to-day which is monopolised by these people. Yet we are told they are such a beautiful class of people, they are so intelligent, so nice, so accommodating, so gentle, so obliging, that we should favor them and allow them to come in as they please. The people of that Province are united upon this question, as former petitions have shown, and I am happy to say that the people of the Dominion of Canada are waking up to this question, as is shown by the fact that petitions have been sent to this Parliament this Session from different parts of Canada asking the Government to legislate upon this question to prevent any further immigration of these people to this country. That shows that the people of this Dominion are unanimous in favor of

legislation, and I am happy to see there is a prospect of getting a little relief in this direction.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). It is a very old saying that every dog has his day, and a cat nine lives. Every Province in this Dominion has had what is called its day; the time has now arrived when British Columbia should have its day. The remarks of the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill—if he will not feel offended at my criticising those remarks, not in an unfriendly, though in a slightly unfavorable way—one would almost imagine were in opposition to the Bill rather than in favor of it. It would appear to me that nine-tenths of his remarks were leaning towards what he was pleased to term pro-Chinese rather than anti-Chinese. He said that the British Columbia members were not actuated solely by prejudice against the Chinese race. In that he is certainly correct—at least so far as I am concerned. I have unquestionably not the slightest prejudice against the Chinaman as an individual, but I have a dislike to their presence in British Columbia as a collective mass, because I know it is disadvantageous to the Province and distasteful to by far the greater number of those persons who sent me to represent them in this House. I have been accused of not being as strongly anti-Chinese as some of my constituents desire, still I consider that in this matter I have not to consult my own individual feelings, as the Secretary of State has done to-day, but I have to speak for those people whom I represent in this House. The hon. gentleman stated that there were apparently two classes of people who came before the Chinese commission—anti-Chinese advocates and pro-Chinese supporters. Now, the anti-Chinese advocates, I think, are confined, more particularly, to the laboring classes and to the trades' unions, than to the mechanics and the more educated portion of the people; and the pro-Chinese supporters, as he terms them, are confined almost exclusively to those people who are conducting industries in that Province—the shoe factories, the canneries on the Fraser, the coal mines at Nanaimo and similar enterprises. In the evidence taken before the Royal Commission, I think it will be found that those who are in favor of keeping the Chinese in the Province were almost entirely those who have some interest to serve by means of the Chinese presence and their cheap labor. Therefore, it is not surprising that they were willing to give their evidence before the commissioners, knowing that their own pockets would be touched if any steps were taken to drive out the Chinese, or to restrict their immigration. The Secretary of State also says that when the commissioners arrived in Victoria considerable feeling was evinced against them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there is good ground for the existence of that feeling. The people then felt and still feel that after having given expression to their wants and requirements in the Local House by a resolution which was carried by 16 to 8, and when their representatives in this House, in the present Parliament, as well as those who preceded us, have argued so strenuously and so long in favor of the restriction of Chinese immigration, I say it was a little distasteful to the people when the Government appointed a commission to go over the whole ground in so short a space of time as two or three weeks, which the representatives of the people had taken several years to explain to this House. Therefore, I think it is pardonable on the part of the people of Victoria and British Columbia if they express themselves as annoyed and surprised at the appointment of that commission. The hon. gentleman also stated that the only Province in this Dominion which had raised its voice against the immigration of Chinese was British Columbia.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said we had demands from Ontario and other places, and I mentioned the city of Montreal.

Mr. BAKER. In the earlier part of his remarks he did state that so far as he was informed only one Province had raised its voice.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that British Columbia was the only Province where the people were suffering from Chinese immigration.

Mr. BAKER. Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But as a matter of fact, a number of laboring associations in the older Provinces, in Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal and Quebec, have raised their protest against the immigration of Chinese into the Dominion. I will read to the House the following resolution which has been sent to me from the city of Hamilton:

"The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the wage-workers of Hamilton, and I was instructed by resolution of Labor Convention to forward the same to you:

"Whereas, the system of importing pauper and Chinese labor to this country by the Government of the Dominion of Canada does not in any way protect the industries of our country or increase the wealth of the producers, but the importation of pauper and coolie labor in an already glutted labor market brings and increases poverty and its attending evils. The enforcement of labor contracts made in foreign countries, detrimental to the interests of wage-earners of Canada, will result in a degrading competition that will break the noble spirit of labor and render our slavery unbearable. We denounce the actions of the Government as criminal in protecting the manufacturer and strangling competition by the many unfair advantages derived from such protection, while the producers are taxed in order to increase their number and cheapen the cost of production.

"Therefore, be it resolved, that the workingmen of Hamilton condemn the policy of the Government in allowing the importation to our shores of pauper immigrants, and call upon them to take measures to return such foreign paupers as are now in our land and to legislate against the arrival of others.

"That we demand the recall of the emigrant agents and lecturers employed by the Government and the application of the money appropriated for their remuneration to some public work upon which some unemployed Canadians can earn their bread. That we especially protest against the introduction of Chinese labor in any part of the Dominion, and call upon the Government to send back all Chinese now in Canada, or enforce such a poll tax as will drive them hence.

"That we demand the repeal of all laws that do not bear equally upon capital and labor, and the substitution thereof of such laws that will protect the laborer's rights from the encroachments of selfish capitalists.

"That the workingmen of Hamilton refrain from giving support to either of the political parties in the future, until such time as they secure by legislation, not promises, their rights.

"The flag of liberty unfurl,  
To float throughout our land,  
From power traitors hurl  
And let the righteous stand."

Now, I do not read this for the sake of condemning the Government for anything they may have done, but simply to prove that there are persons in other parts of the Dominion than that of British Columbia who advocate the restriction and even the prohibition of Chinese laborers, and some even go so far as to ask that we expel those who are already here.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. BAKER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was endeavoring to follow, with soft and humble tread, the remarks of the Secretary of State. He made reference to the report of the special commission appointed in the United States in 1876-77. I have not the advantage of having perused that document, because, like many other documents, I find it is not in the Library at the present moment; but I am convinced that the general tone of that report was strongly anti-Chinese, so far as the United States were concerned, and led to the legislation which followed in 1880. The hon. gentleman also referred to the pressure which had been brought to bear by the Local Legislature of British Columbia, as embodied in the representations made on 9th May, 1876, and subsequently on 31st July, 1878. Those were also with a view to the enactment of restrictive legislation upon the Chinese question. I think that while we are discussing this subject, which is the most important that can possibly be discussed in this House, so far as British Columbia, an important part of this vast Dominion, is concerned, it is

only fair that those who have preceded us in this House should have credit for the utterances they have made and for their humble, though, up to the present, fruitless, endeavors to secure that legislation which I am now happy to say we are really about to secure for our Province. On 8th March, 1878, Mr. Bunster, who is well and no doubt favorably known to a good many members, took up the question, and moved a resolution to the effect that a clause should be inserted in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that no Chinese should be employed upon that work. I notice also, on referring to *Hansard*, that the ex-leader of the Government of that day (Mr. Mackenzie), and also Mr. Thompson and the present Sir Charles Tupper, spoke on that motion, and did not think the time had arrived, in consideration of the fact that no detriment should be placed in the way of the contractors prosecuting the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when such a clause should be placed in the contract. I notice that one of the previous representatives of Victoria district (Mr. DeCosmos) did not speak on that occasion. The resolution of Mr. Bunster was in these terms:

"That the Government insert a clause in each and every contract let for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that no man wearing his hair longer than 5½ inches shall be eligible for employment on said work, under a penalty varying from \$100 to \$1,000, or imprisonment for three and twelve months respectively, &c., &c."

Later, on 24th February, 1879, Mr. DeCosmos enquired if the "Act (passed by the Local Legislature) to provide for the better collection of Provincial taxes from Chinese," last Session, would be disallowed or not, and was informed by the Ministry of the day that said Act and other Acts of the Legislature of British Columbia were then under the consideration of the Government; and further, that the Act to which the enquiry had reference had been declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court of British Columbia, or one of the judges thereof, and that said decision had not been appealed from. On 16th April, 1879, Mr. DeCosmos moved that the petition of N. S. and some 1,500 others, respecting Chinese labor, be considered in Committee of the Whole, but with a view to arriving at a more practical conclusion than could possibly be attained in committee, he asked the House to allow him to substitute for said resolution (of which notice had been given) the following resolution, and by that means refer the matter to a special committee: That the petition from N. S. and others of the Province of British Columbia, praying for the passing of an Act to restrict further immigration of Chinamen; also, that in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway the employment of Chinese labor may be prohibited; and that the Act of the Provincial Government of British Columbia, in placing the local rate upon the Chinese in the country, may be confirmed, be referred to a select committee, to report on the same and generally on Chinese labor and immigration as affecting the Dominion, with power to send for persons and papers; said committee to consist of Messrs. DeCosmos, Williams, Charlton, Bunster, Bannerman, Trow, Brooks, Thompson and Connell. The motion was agreed to. I beg to state, although I have sought for that report, I have been unable to find it, and I am not in a position to say whether any special report from the select committee was ever laid before the House. I am, however, credibly informed that a short report, tending in the direction in which we are now walking, was laid before the House and embodied in the Votes and Proceedings. On 24th March, 1880, Mr. DeCosmos moved that all petitions respecting Chinese, presented to this House during present Session, be printed in Votes and Proceedings, which was so amended as to read "be printed for use of members." If that has been done, I have also been unsuccessful in my research. I may say that I desire to place these facts and dates on record, as they are of the highest importance to

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

our constituents and also to the people generally of British Columbia, who are so thoroughly absorbed at the present time on this Chinese question. On 21st April, 1880, Mr. DeCosmos again moved for select committee to be appointed, to whom should be referred all petitions presented to the House during the then present Session respecting Chinese immigration, who shall report on the same, and generally on Chinese labor and immigration, as affecting the Dominion; with power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time; said committee to consist of Messrs. DeCosmos, Williams, Charlton, Bannerman, Brooks, Trow, Ouimet, Thompson, Connell, McInnes, Schultz, five of whom are to form a quorum. The motion was agreed to. I have been very desirous to see this report of the select committee, but I have been unable to find it, and I therefore can only conclude that no report was presented to the House. On 17th February, 1881, Mr. Bunster moved for a return of the duties collected on rice and powder for the year, and he entered at some length into the Chinese question. The hon. gentleman at that time endeavored to show that the duty had been taken off rice and retained on gunpowder, thereby placing the miners of British Columbia at a considerable disadvantage, so far as the Chinese were concerned. On 14th March, 1881, Mr. Bunster objected to the Chinese being included in the Bill for the naturalisation of aliens. On 12th April, 1882, in Committee of Supply, under the head of immigration, some further slight references were made by Mr. Bunster to this important subject. On 12th May, 1882, Mr. DeCosmos again refers to Chinese immigration, and quotes the United States Bill of 1876-77, to which the Secretary of State has referred, and also to the enactments of Australia, whereby £10 per head is charged upon all Chinamen coming to the colony, and also a restrictive Act, making it impossible for more than one Chinaman for every 100 tons of the tonnage of a vessel to enter the colony. Again, on 13th May, 1882, Mr. Bunster refers to the subject on a question of privilege, and objects to the duty being taken off rice while that on powder remained. Now, in the Session of 1883, this matter, as everybody is doubtless aware, was brought up in this House; and again, in 1884, not only by myself and colleague, but by every member coming here from the Province of British Columbia, and we endeavored to show, and I think successfully, that it was important, not only to the Province of British Columbia, but to the Dominion at large, that some such legislation as we are now discussing should be enacted. Even as recently as 1884 the Legislature of British Columbia enacted a law upon this subject. The principal feature to which I shall refer was that embodied in the preamble of the measure, in which they assert, rightly or wrongly, that the Local Legislature has something to do with legislation of that nature. I find, in the proceedings of that Legislature, referring to this subject, they say:

"Instead of sustaining the action of the Provincial Government and Legislature and that of the members of British Columbia in the Federal Parliament on the subject of the prohibition of Chinese immigration, the Dominion Government appointed a commission, composed of the hon. Mr. Chapleau, Secretary of State for the Dominion, and the Hon. Mr. Justice Gray, of this Province, to enquire into and report upon the Chinese question. The enquiry did not seem to be so thorough as, if undertaken at all, the importance of the subject fairly demanded that it should have been. It is to be hoped, however, that hurried and imperfect as the enquiry in this Province was, sufficient information has been obtained by the commissioners to induce them to report to the Federal Government the urgent need of restrictive legislation being undertaken during the ensuing session of the Dominion Parliament. It will be for you to consider whether, in view of the Chinese Immigration Act passed last Session having been disallowed by the Dominion Government, it is advisable to repeat legislation on the subject during the present Session."

This appears in the speech of the Lieutenant Governor to the Legislature. Further on, during the Session of that Legislature, I find that they again took up the subject of Chinese immigration, notwithstanding the fact that the

previous Act passed in 1883 had been disallowed. The petition ran in these words :

"That we view with great alarm the thousands of Chinese coolies continually arriving in the Province of British Columbia, and while we regard this country as free to every man seeking an opportunity to better his condition in life, we deem it but just and right that those who come to our shores shall not be such as to work injury to the moral and material welfare of the Dominion.

"That the unlimited admission of the race of people known as Chinese coolies does work such injury to our country, for the following reasons :  
 "That they do not come to make a home or settle in the country, or to add to the country's wealth ; but to prey upon our natural resources, and take what they earn out of the country.

"That they are leprosy in blood and unclean in habits.  
 "That they are destructive of the means by which the white mechanical and laboring classes earn a living wage.

"That there are immoral practices, debasing habits and contagious diseases, peculiar to this people, which they have already introduced to an alarming extent upon this continent, and against which we have a right to defend ourselves and our children

"We therefore humbly pray for the enactment of such laws as will prohibit any further introduction of this undesirable class of people into any part of the Dominion of Canada."

Now, that is the opinion expressed by the representatives of the Province of British Columbia, 26 in number, in the Local House of Parliament. These gentlemen represent, collectively, exactly the same people, precisely the same country, identically the same wants and requirements of those people that we represent in this Federal Parliament ; and they thus stated their objection to the introduction of any more Chinese into that Province. I do not give these utterances altogether as my own, because I do not go quite to the same extent, as regards the leprosy in the blood, or the unclean habits of the Chinese, as I am not familiar with those facts. Personally, I have never seen any Chinaman with leprosy, nor am I as well posted as some gentlemen in this House may think I ought to be, living so much among them, upon the unclean habits of that race. But for as much as this testimony is worth, I have read it, because it emanates from a constitutional authority existing in the Province of British Columbia. Later on during the Session, I notice the following :—

"That we are glad to hear, too, the chief commissioner was also instructed by His Honor to urge upon the Dominion Government the absolute necessity of either recognising the right of the Province to legislate, with a view of checking the increase of Chinese in our midst, or, failing that, to induce the Dominion Government to substitute effective federal legislation calculated to remedy the evil complained of."

Now, in view of these utterances, hon. gentlemen in this House can quite understand why we are so strenuous in our endeavors and so loud in our efforts to secure that legislation which we desire, individually as well as collectively. I notice in the *Debates* of the Local House that they complained somewhat bitterly that after legislation on this subject should have passed, to the effect that the time had arrived that legislation should ensue for restrictive and regulative measures affecting the Chinese, the Dominion Government, in their wisdom, should have seen the necessity of appointing that commission at all. However, I am willing to bow to the greater wisdom of the combined rulers of this confederacy, and to say that they must be in a better position to know why, after the resolution which was passed, it was necessary to send that commission out to make further investigation or glean additional facts. One thing is certain : the result of that commission has been the production of a very nice volume, called a report on Chinese immigration. It is highly interesting, and a good deal that is in it is certainly true. A good deal of it has been collated from such persons as have only taken a one-sided view of the disabilities of which we complain. Later on, on the 9th of February, 1884, I see they again passed a resolution in the Local House, setting forth the reasons why restrictive if not prohibitive legislation with regard to the Chinese should be adopted by this Parliament. Again on the 25th February, 1885, in the latter part of their Votes and Proceedings, I find these expressions :

"The Chinese are alien in sentiment and habits.

"2. They do not become settlers in any sense of that word. They have no intention of permanently settling in the country, but come for the purpose of trading and laboring, in order to return to their native country with the means to pass the remainder of their days in ease. The Chinese population chiefly consists of male adults, and thus—without the responsibility of providing for a family—they come in unfair competition with white labor.

"They are the slaves or coolies of the Chinese race, accustomed to live on the poorest fare and in the meanest manner, and hence their presence tends to the degradation of the white laboring classes.

"Their presence exerts a baneful influence in restricting the immigration of white labor, and especially in the class of house servants, who will not be brought into contact with this race.

"They have a system of secret societies which encourages crime amongst themselves, and which prevents the administration of justice."

This is another matter which I am not prepared to say, of my own knowledge, actually exists ; but in the opinion of a great many in British Columbia, and certainly in Victoria, whenever a Chinaman or a gang of Chinamen are suspected of a theft or a murder, or any other atrocious crime, there is always a difficulty in getting sufficient evidence among them to convict the offender, or even to discover who the principal culprit is.

"The use of opium has extended throughout the Province, to the demoralisation of the native races, and the Chinese encourage the use of this drug amongst others of our own rising population.

"And we urgently request that some restrictive legislation be passed to prevent our Province from being completely overrun by Chinese.

"And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada."

On the 2nd March, 1885, the foregoing expressions were again reiterated in the Chamber of said Assembly and (being a reproduction it is unnecessary to embody them in these remarks) formed the principal feature of the resolution then passed, viz :

"That the following address be forwarded by the Speaker to his Excellency the Governor General in Council :—

"We, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia, extremely regret the disallowance of the Act for the prevention of the immigration of Chinese, passed at its last Session.

"The disallowance of the Act, according to the correspondence, did not proceed from a view of its being unconstitutional, but because the Act was regarded as inexpedient.

"We see nothing to change the carefully considered representations and opinions which we have heretofore expressed on the Chinese question, and which from time to time have been communicated to and urged upon the Dominion Government."

Now, although I have not had time to read the whole of the Chinese report which has been presented to this House, I think my residence of twelve years in the Province of British Columbia enables me to speak with some authority on this subject without the labor of reading such a massive volume as that report. But even in that report reference is made to the fact that there exists among the Chinamen the excessive use of opium, which is being disseminated to a great extent among the juniors of the white population. I think these facts speak for themselves, and show that it is highly desirable that a class whose habits are such as are described here should, if possible, be prohibited from coming into a civilised country at all. But that in any case they should be restricted. Some of the evidence in the Chinese report is of a very tentative nature ; some of it is very much in favor of restrictive measures. I notice, particularly at page 188, the evidence given by Mr. King, a merchant of San Francisco, in which he says :

"All Chinese coolies embark at Hong Kong. Have superintended the examination of immigrants to comply with the coolie laws of the United States Government, which law enables the consul to exact large fees from every coolie, which the ships pay, and requires them to charge more charter money. \* \* \* On their arrival they are packed like hogs to such companies, having his contract *vised*, and commences his fees to ensure the care of sick, and return, dead or alive, but not his pay from the contractor, but that he shall fill his part, if able to compel him, the coolies, to do it, or prevent his return until he does. When breaking his contract the companies' spies hound him to prevent his return to China, by arranging with the steamship company, or through Chinese in the steamship company's employ, to prevent his getting a ticket, and if obtained by others for him, he will be forcibly stopped on the day of sailing by a large force of the six companies' highbinders, who can always be seen guarding them. Highbinders are men employed by these companies here to hound and spy upon these

Chinese, and pursue them, if they do not comply with their contract, as they see fit to judge it. \* \* \* The principal reason why other sections of China do not come here is the enmity and the cause of trouble arising between the two sections or adjoining counties, as now here, and the greater ignorance of this country, because those speak a different dialect from the other sections of China."

If this statement is correct, as I believe it to be, inasmuch as there are some nineteen Provinces in China proper, and at least eight different dialects, it appears to me that there will be very great difficulty in selecting an interpreter who will be able thoroughly to understand the dialects of the Chinamen who come from various parts of China. Further on, in his evidence, he says:

"Not half a dozen legitimate families can be found in the Pacific States among the Chinese. Often women who have been bought bear children, who are cared for and treated as their children, care being bestowed to raise them, especially if males. The companies only know how many Chinese women are in this country, and they never tell, fearing an outcry. Few come, except from Chinese brothels, or raised for prostitution in China, which is a business there. On arrival they are sold to live with some one man in the city or the interior, or live in some brothel in the city."

And so on. (See pages 188 to 195 of the printed report of the Royal Commission on Chinese immigration, appointed by Government of Canada.) In that testimony, which is embodied in the report of the Chinese commissioners, I think there is sufficient to show that the Chinese women are not, like Cesar's wife above suspicion, and that there exists among the Chinese, both male and female, a very low scale of morality. The hon. Secretary of State, in his remarks, did not place any very great stress upon their immorality. In fact, if I remember correctly what he said, he gave the House to understand that their morals were certainly no worse than those of the corresponding grade of white men. That I take exception to, because I know, from living in a part of the world where they are to be found in great numbers, that their morals are almost beyond description. In fact, to thoroughly describe their state of immorality I should have to use language that would entitle me to be called to order; and I shall therefore not attempt it, but leave hon. gentlemen to draw their own conclusions. It is pleasing, however, to know that the legislation which has already taken place in the Australian colonies of Victoria and New South Wales to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into those portions of Her Majesty's dominions have been assented to by Her Majesty, and that with regard to the legislation we are about to adopt Imperial objections, as the hon. Secretary of State has informed us, have been entirely waived, so that it entirely rests with the hon. members of this House to say whether or not a particular Province, laboring under so great and peculiar disabilities as those I have been endeavoring to describe, shall have legislation which will remove those disabilities. The Local Government have at various times protested against the influx of Chinese into British Columbia; they have sent memorial after memorial on the subject, and the people have done the same thing; the municipalities have also protested against the influx of Chinese. Therefore, I cannot conceive that any more testimony is required to prove that the whole people, with very few exceptions—the exceptions being those who are interested in certain industries that require Chinese labor and who desire to get the greatest amount of work for the smallest amount of money possible—raise no objection to the legislation now before the House. In order to show the objection to Chinese in different parts of the world, the hon. the Secretary of State was good enough to refer to what took place in Manila some years ago. There he clearly shows that the Chinese were in the habit of making very great encroachments on the rights of the white people. To such an extent did they do this that the Spaniards, in 1603, massacred about 23,000 of them. Subsequently, another 30,000—because it is an easy matter for a population varying from 450,000,000 to 500,000,000 to supply the gap caused by the

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

death, whether rightly or wrongly, of 23,000—came to that island, but these also, the hon. gentleman stated, in 1709, were expelled. In the spring of 1762 they came to the front again, and eventually tried to conquer that island. The hon. gentleman also referred to Java, Singapore, Penang, Malacca and the Australian colonies, and to the Acts passed by them. All these references clearly show, to my mind, it is utterly impossible to keep down the aspirations of the Chinese race; they show that if the Chinese have the opportunity to grasp (their motto being "that they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can") as it were, everything that comes in their way, no matter at what sacrifice or by what means, they will certainly secure everything they can. What an unfortunate position would this place British Columbia in, situated as she is, so far from the centre of the Dominion. We have frequently in this House had it cast in our teeth that the population of British Columbia is very sparse; that, in fact, there are not more than 26,000 or 28,000 whites there. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) was good enough, on one occasion, to tell the House that the Province of British Columbia did not possess more than 10,000 white people. In that he was vastly in error, because there are certainly from 26,000 to 30,000 white people in that Province. Unless some such restrictive Act as this is put in force, there never will be, notwithstanding the closely approaching completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a very large influx of population into British Columbia. Unless the Chinese are first removed, so as to admit of the possibility of white people coming in, with a fair prospect of success in settling the Province and in labor competition, the immigration of this desirable class will not reach any figure worth mentioning. The Governments in Victoria and in New South Wales, as everybody in this House knows, have been allowed by the Imperial Government to restrict the importation of Chinese, and their legislation has had the desired effect, of not only keeping out that undesirable class, but of affording a great impetus to the influx of the population which it is desirable and necessary these colonies should have, in order that their development may be promoted. I have no doubt the same results will follow from the legislation which I feel certain this House is about to give us. The hon. the Secretary of State, in his remarks, referred to the matter of dress. He said that objections cannot be taken to the dress of the Chinese. Certainly not. I do not know that anybody in British Columbia has ever taken exception to the dress worn by the Celestials. On the contrary, the general opinion is that it is a very cool, airy, clean and becoming dress, to the fellow who wears it. The hon. gentleman says that exception cannot be taken to the way in which they wear their hair. I think not, because their head is shaven very close, leaving enough hair to be brought down and plaited in what is commonly known as the pig-tail. No doubt this fashion of wearing the hair is very clean, and more particularly when one of this unfortunate class is thrust into prison, it is very easy to keep it clean. The hon. gentleman also said no one could object to their religion. I agree with him that no one can take exception, because we know very little about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because they have none.

Mr. BAKER. They claim to have some, I believe. The Mongolian worships a god of his own, and therefore he has, I suppose, what *he is* pleased to term religion. It is not to be found in the evidence taken before the commission that anybody objected to their religion. I do not think that such a factor has ever been, in legislation, even the most unimportant question of consideration. Their mode of living certainly is a matter to be complained of, for the simple reason that they can and do live—or, rather, they exist—upon certainly not anything more extravagant than about 20 cents a day,

and I think in that estimate I am allowing them possibly 5 cents a day more than they really spend. At this rate, the Chinaman can really live in his way luxuriously for about \$6 a month. The hon. the Secretary of State referred also to what they pay for their cabins, which, he said, was \$2 a month. My colleague (Mr. Shakespeare) corrected that statement. In fact, there were several statements made by the Secretary of State which I would like to have corrected, but innate modesty and parliamentary courtesy prevented me from interrupting his eloquent speech. As a matter of fact, they do pay \$2 a month for their cabins, but not individually; they pay collectively. For instance, Chang Wah or Wang Key may take one of these cabins, and then he gets all his cousins into it, as many as they can pack, like sardines in a box, and they divide \$2 monthly rental among them; so that, taking an average of ten for a cabin, which is a fair estimate for an ordinary cabin, each man pays 20 cents a month. I am sure their clothing does not cost \$2.50 a month each, so that the whole thing would be something under \$9. The Secretary of State places it at \$11. I consider, and I believe I am speaking strictly within the figures, that \$9 is as much as they ever spend upon themselves per month. Then, again, the Secretary of State said that the average maintenance would be about \$25 a month. I suppose, to a certain extent, he may be right: that is, if you take only those who work for wages, but there are those who are in business, who carry on the opium trade, and who carry on the business of first-class Chinese merchants, and if you take an average of the earnings of those merchants, and those who have gardens, out of which they reap large profits, and combine it with the average of the working men, you will find that the average wage-earning of the Chinese is very much higher than the estimate given by the Secretary of State. The same hon. gentleman certainly did the Chinamen the credit to say that they were essentially a liberal race. Their liberality is certainly unbounded, in anything that pertains to display, but I have never known, in the city of Victoria, any Chinaman give anything substantial to a church, a charitable institution, a hospital, a Protestant orphans' home, a Roman Catholic orphans' home, or any of those institutions which do so much good in any country. A Chinaman seldom or ever puts his hand in his pocket for a 10 cent piece for such a purpose. Therefore, their liberality is confined exclusively to one kind, that of display. If the Governor General were going there to-morrow, or any member of the Cabinet, John Chinaman would come out most liberally to entertain them, putting up most magnificent arches, and doing anything for display. Anything that pleases the eye of the Chinamen they are willing to pay for, and they are very frequently known to go in for those displays at the expense of their stomachs. It is not so when they are domestic servants. Then John Chinaman obtains and enjoys as good a dinner as anyone else, and frequently eats more heartily, knowing he has not to pay for it. My colleague (Mr. Shakespeare) mentioned the fact this afternoon, that within the last month two vessels arrived in Royal Roads, port of Victoria, and that on board of these vessels there were 900 Chinamen. To be precise, on the 22nd June, 907 Chinese arrived in the port of Victoria, B.C., by sailing vessel direct from Hong Kong and by mail steamer from San Francisco. They represent, says the *Colonist*:

"Nine hundred and seven individual reasons why the Chinese Restriction Act should be strictly enforced. The following are the names of the vessels, with number of Chinese brought:—

<i>Alden Besse</i> , Captain O'Brien.....	386
<i>W. H. Besse</i> , Captain Gibbs.....	436
<i>Martha</i> , Captain McPherson.....	35
<i>Queen of Pacific</i> , Captain Alexander.....	80
	907

To whom this large lot of Celestials is consigned is not known, though

it is believed that Tai Chong & Company have a considerable number of them."

Each of said vessels brought about 500 tons of a general cargo. The *Colonist* concludes by saying:

"How these Chinese are to be disposed of is hard to imagine, considering the fact that this fall will see work on the Canadian Pacific Railway finished, and Island Railway construction will also be completed in about nine months; we have altogether too many Chinese in this country now, and this recent consignment is like adding the last straw."

He did not state how many were males and how many were females; but I will state, without fear of successful contradiction, that there were not 10 females in the whole 900. Hon. gentlemen in this House know that we are all human, and that we all have our human failings, and so great a disparity between the males and females of an importation like that is not likely to lead to any result which would stand decent criticism; but it would be a little impolitic and lacking in good taste, under the circumstances, to discuss it in this House with so many ladies in the galleries. I shall, therefore, leave hon. gentlemen to draw their own inferences from so great a disparity between the male and female importation of Chinese, not only into British Columbia but into every part of the world. There is no doubt, in one regard, that the Secretary of State is right. I will not say that he is only right in one regard, but he is very pointedly so in one regard, and that is, that the trades' unions and working class associations are much more opposed to the immigration of the Chinese element than we are, who occupy professional positions, or are engaged in trade, for the simple reason that we are all likely, in this world, to sing out when the shoe pinches, and no doubt it does pinch the white laborer much more than it does those who employ the Chinese as domestic servants, or in canneries, or in boot factories, or in other occupations. They are brought into infinitely closer and keener competition with the Chinese and consequently are much more vociferous in their declamation and exclamation than we are, who do not feel so pointedly the grievance under which they suffer. The hon. the Secretary of State also made the remark, and I do not say this in an offensive way, because everyone in this House speaks the truth, or comes as near to it as he possibly can, that the difference in the feelings, the sentimental part, as between the white and the Chinese race, will never allow them to assimilate. The Indian, I think, in our part of the world, is the nearest approach to the Chinaman, and yet they never seem to chum up. They are never seen together. Although there are a very large number of Indian women, Chinamen never marry them, or in any way are brought into—I will not say close proximity—but have not any kind of intercourse, with them. They disassociate entirely. They have no trade relations, no relations of any kind. If that is the case, how much less likely is it that the Chinaman and the whiteman will assimilate? I would like to ask any hon. gentleman in this House if he would like to live in the same room with a Chinaman?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). You would? Then there is no accounting for taste. I think, from what we know of the Chinese race, what we know personally, and what has been told us in this House by those who represent the constituencies where those individuals so largely predominate, there is sufficient to convince us that they are a most undesirable class to be brought into our midst, and that they will never become permanent settlers. In fact, although the Secretary of State says that possibly \$43 a year is about all they take out, I know for a fact, from the statistics in the banks, that the ordinary Chinaman who works for monthly wages saves certainly from \$20 to \$25 a month, that is about \$300 a year; and about every three years, or certainly every four years, regular batches of these Chinamen go away, with from \$750 to \$1,000 in their pockets. They obtain drafts from the banks in

Victoria upon the banks in Hong Kong, and away they go, and the place which knew them once knows them no more, for ever—but they send back their cousins; so that, after they have sucked the orange and thrown away the peel, they send others to do the same; and in that way the population of British Columbia will not only be of an undesirable class, unless it is restricted, but it will never consist of anything but a transient population. The Secretary of State also made reference to some conversation which he had, either with an Englishman or with several Englishmen, and stated that they had given utterance to some such expression as this: that you know very well Englishmen are essentially arbitrary, despotic, and even sometimes cruel. Now, I deny that impeachment. I rejoice that I am an Englishman, and, although by adoption a Canadian and a representative of a Canadian constituency, still an Englishman, and I do not like to hear those things said about Englishmen, which are far from being the case. I have no doubt the hon. the Secretary of the State said it inadvertently, and not with the intention of giving offence to me individually or to any other Englishman, any more than I would say anything offensive to or of a Frenchman; but he recounted a conversation which he had had, which led to the conclusion that, in a colony which is essentially British and thoroughly loyal, as loyal as any Province in the Dominion, to the British Crown, those Englishmen who are there, (and they are a people composed principally of Englishmen), have made up their minds to this: We are going to have the Chinamen out of the country, at any rate. To a certain extent he is right when he speaks of the laboring classes. There is no doubt that they are—to use the expression that was used the other day about the temperance people—intoxicated with their success. The laboring classes at the present time are very strongly anti-Chinese, and they may be led away with their success to do almost anything, not only to restrict those who are coming in but to drive out those who are in. Now, this does not refer to those right-thinking Englishmen of which that community mainly consists, and who are composed principally of the better class of mechanics and the upper middle classes. I have already stated that we are not without precedent for legislation of this character. In Victoria, Australia, and in New South Wales, Acts have been passed, and on the 5th August, 1882, the United States passed a prohibitory measure to last for ten years. Now, if we were to pass a prohibitory measure for ten years, I think there would be no necessity after that for either restrictive or regulative legislation at all. However, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the honesty of purpose and the good intention of the Government in bringing forward this measure at the earnest and persistent requests of the British Columbia members in this House, and I think the people of British Columbia will be satisfied that if it does not give all they want it will, at least, be the thin end of the wedge, and they will hope that it will be well driven home. The Secretary of State also referred to the treaty ports of Canton, Shanghai, Amoy, Foo-choo-foo, Ning Po (and Hong Kong, of course being a British possession since the treaty of 1840-41.) Now, as I suggested last year, if the Minister of Agriculture, who so ably seconded the introduction of this Bill, would throw open only the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and Niagara, as those through which Chinese immigrants might come into this country, and then let them filter through the Eastern Provinces and through the United States, British Columbia would never be troubled with any of them. I think if these ports were thrown open as those only through which the Mongolians might enter the Dominion of Canada, very few of them would ever reach British Columbia, and then, possibly, no such legislation as we are now advocating would be needed. The Secretary of State also referred to the atrocities committed

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

by the Irish under Dennis Kearney, in California, and that the Irish ruled everywhere except in Ireland. Now, I submit we cannot accept the breaches of the peace committed by, as he termed them, the lower order of the Irish in San Francisco, or any other part of California, as being the normal condition of things in this country. It is a very safe maxim that we should speak of a man as we find him. In British Columbia, although recently we have had mass meetings held and resolutions passed, some of them certainly very loud and declamatory in their nature, and although there may have been some threats of harsh measures if legislation did not ensue, I do not think that in the minds, and certainly not in the hearts, of those people, was there any thought of perpetrating such acts as have been committed in California. Now, to show that the Local Legislature of British Columbia represent the popular sentiment in asking for this legislation, I would mention that not long ago the municipal council of Victoria—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh! carried!

Mr. BAKER. If I am a little tedious on this subject, it is because I believe that of all the measures introduced into this Parliament since British Columbia entered the Confederation there has never been one so important as that which we are now discussing, to the people of British Columbia, and therefore I am desirous of placing on record, not only the utterances of public men, but also the expression of public bodies. On the 12th March of this year, the municipal council of Victoria passed resolutions in respect to this matter, of which I have received a copy, and I believe that all the other members of British Columbia are often in receipt of similar complaints from their constituents about the Chinese. The letter accompanying this resolutions says:

"I beg to hand you copy of resolution passed at a public meeting held in the City Hall, Thursday evening last, the 5th instant; also a resolution passed by the municipal council at their regular meeting held last evening, in relation to the report of the Chinese Commission, which I have been instructed to forward to you."

Now these resolutions are not passed in order that the clerk of the municipality may have the pleasure of writing me an official letter and sending them to me for my own benefit and special edification. He certainly expects me, in my representative capacity, to do something with them, and I conceive it to be my duty to inform the hon. members of this House what those resolutions contain:

"Whereas, the reports and recommendations made by the commissioners upon the question of Chinese immigration are such as to render it necessary that this council as the representatives of the municipality of the city of Victoria, should bring before our representatives at Ottawa our great disappointment at and disapproval of the conclusions arrived at by the commissioners, Messrs. Chapleau and Gray, and express, at the same time, the views of this council thereon, and on the question generally, in order that further efforts may be encouraged for the accomplishment of the unqualified and repeatedly expressed wish of the people here, through their representatives, to prevent, by Act of Parliament, the immigration of Chinese into this Province.

"Be it therefore resolved, that this council record its unreserved dissent from the recommendations made by the commissioners, to continue to allow Chinese to come into this Province in large numbers upon the terms named by them."

The terms named by them are not such as are embodied in this Bill, but such as appear in the report, more particularly in the report of Mr. Justice Gray, who thought a small fine of \$10, or what is commonly known as head money, to that amount, should be exacted from every Chinaman entering the Province. At that time the people of the city of Victoria were under the impression that the recommendations of the commission would be the extent of legislation in this House during the present Session. That is the reason the resolutions were passed. They go on to say:

"That in the opinion of this council the findings of the commissioners are not justified by the facts: that the presence of Chinese is and has been highly injurious to the industrial population of the Province, and that our representatives in the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa be

requested to bring to the notice of the Dominion Government the views expressed in this resolution, and urge upon them, by every constitutional means at their command, the necessity that still exists for immediate legislation to restrict the immigration of Chinese into Canada as being antagonistic to the moral, social and material well being, not only of this Province, but of the Dominion at large."

Although I am sorry to detain the House with these details, owing to the unprecedentedly prolonged Session, I know that if any other member were placed in the position which I occupy in regard to this all-absorbing topic of Chinese immigration, he would pursue precisely the same course as I am adopting. I may state frankly to hon. gentlemen that I am not placing this matter in such punctiliously minute detail before the House for the sake of what is known as political clap-trap, because I am free to confess that if I should run another election, and the people who sent me here do not feel inclined to be satisfied with the candid expressions of the individual and the honest working of that individual, they are very welcome to send some one else in my place, and I do not know but that I would profit by it myself more largely than anyone else. But I certainly apprehend it to be my duty, as these resolutions were sent by a representative institution to me as a representative, to lay them before the House, so that hon. members may have in their possession as many facts as possible. The resolutions go on to say:

"Whereas the action of the commissioners, Messrs. Chapleau and Gray, appointed to enquire into the Chinese question, has, to a great extent, failed to recommend such measures as would be calculated to remedy the evil effects of the presence of Chinese in our midst, and if their recommendations were to be wholly acted on by the Government of Canada, it would necessarily fail to accomplish the object desired.

"Be it therefore resolved, that this meeting mark its disapproval of such portion of the commissioners' report and recommendation as shall be contrary to the wishes of the people of the Province, and that our representatives in Parliament be requested to urge upon the Government the necessity of immediately adopting the strongest restrictive measures as to Chinese immigration."

These resolutions were moved at that meeting by Mr. Duck, member of the Provincial Parliament, now Minister of Finance of the Province, and seconded by Mr. Theodore Davie, also a member of the Provincial Parliament, and they are certified to by Mr. R. P. Rithet, the mayor of Victoria. There can be no doubt, therefore, as to the authenticity and reliability of the resolutions I have read. I do not wish to inflict on the House all the material I have here, because we have arrived at a period of the Session when we desire to return to our homes, and no one is more anxious to get home than I am myself. At the same time, when we consider that some fifty-seven days were occupied in "Franchisee," as some hon. members called it, I need not make any great apology for inflicting on them in return a little Chinese. We have also received telegrams from our constituents, because they are, to a certain extent, uninformed even in substance, let alone details, as to what legislation is about to be enacted with respect to the Chinese, and they are even sceptical as to whether the Bill will pass or not. I have received the following telegram amongst others:—

"Mass open air meeting, citizens Victoria, last evening, four thousand people present, conclusion of appeal adopted. We demand that Chinese Restriction Bill be passed this Session, and it be so amended as to go into operation on 1st July, 1885. For years we have waited for this relief and our patience is exhausted. Full text forwarded by mail.

"(Signed) W. A. ROBERTSON."

I read these documents in common justice to those who sent them, and in order that the contents may be made known to the House and made matter of record. I shall not tire out the House by reading an excellent article from the "Resources of British Columbia," on this subject, but with the consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will hand it to the reporter to be included in these humble remarks:

#### "THE GREAT CHINESE QUESTION.

"The workingmen's meeting in Victoria on the Chinese question was remarkable, alike for the intelligence and eloquence of the speakers, and the order and moderation displayed.

"We were glad to notice that the workingmen have discovered the strength of their case does not lie in villifying the Chinese, and in raking up against them all kinds of accusations, both true and untrue, but in the great fact that it is with them, and with all of us, a question of how to avoid a desperate struggle for existence, and that, where the white man and the Chinese come into competition, the Chinese must prevail, unless the white man will descend to the same sordid level of his competitor. No doubt the white man can do a better day's work than the Chinaman, but the latter can beat him in being able to accept a continually descending scale of wages. The reason why the latter can do this is because the Chinese can herd together in the most contracted of habitations, if, indeed, their miserable abodes are worthy of being so called, and on account of their economical mode of living.

"It will be found, if our workingmen attempt to meet the Chinese on their own ground and accept Chinamen's wages, that the Chinese will accept lower and still lower wages, until the workingman is fully starved out. Besides, the Chinese are very clever workmen. What a Chinaman cannot do has yet to be determined. His imitative powers are extraordinary, and he is wanting neither in perception nor manual dexterity. What he now does and does so well, is often with little training and tools of the clumsiest description. With proper mechanical appliances and with a system of apprenticeship, it is hard to understand how any mechanic in the world, even the ill-paid mechanics of Europe, could exist side by side with such a competitor. It is, therefore, impossible for our workingmen to compete against the Chinese, and unless they receive the legislative protection to which they are entitled, they must leave the Province and seek a clime where Chinese are unknown.

"So patent is this to all thinking and observant minds, that we should be astounded at the blindness of most of our capitalists and merchants, if we were not well aware that they are blinded by that they consider their self-interests, and are utterly indifferent to the welfare of the workingman, so long as the Chinaman will work for them at less wages. We are willing to grant that a Chinaman will, on the whole, do his work more satisfactorily, in proportion to his wages, than the white man.

"He is not so strong as the white man, but then he works for half the money the white man asks, and he never 'sauces' his employer, and will keep steadily at work, seemingly indifferent to leisure. Granting that this is all true, what will the merchants and capitalists, who consider this so satisfactory an answer to the cry of 'the Chinese must go,' say, when their time comes to compete with the Chinese merchant and middleman, or 'compradore,' who will gladly accept a quarter of their profits, and who consider neither buggy-riding, yachting, nor even the Union Club, as belonging to the necessities of life. Will they then regard the question so complacently as one merely affecting the labor market? They are attempting to decry the movement as a mere political manoeuvre, and the workingmen as merely the tools of a political party, but they will find out their mistake before very long, and bitterly must they repent it if they do not discover it in time. Some time ago we were endeavoring to impress upon one of our most influential citizens the necessity of getting rid of the Chinese. His reply was: 'Well, but I really cannot see how we are to do without them. Somehow, we can treat a Chinaman almost as a woman. I can put a Chinaman in our kitchen and he is most useful there; but, you know, I could not do that with a white man, and there are no women to be had.' We will grant the truth of this reply as matters now stand, but it is eminently unsatisfactory, and the fault lies at the doors of those who make it. There are large numbers of young women, both in Canada and England, who would gladly come out and work at Chinamen's wages, as they stand at present if they were assured of employment when they arrived, and it would be very easy to establish an agency for the purpose (in London) of choosing honest and steady young women for such work. But the employers are indifferent in the matter—are accustomed to the Chinese and perhaps have got to prefer their homely features to those of a bright-faced girl. Our young women have been taught to look upon domestic service as 'Chinamen's work,' and to despise it accordingly, but if some eastern girl were introduced and the Chinese turned away, Victoria women would, after a time, look upon such employment in a different light. And this forms another and very serious grievance with our workingmen. A steady man, the man we most want, and who is certain to be of use to us, naturally looks forward to finding a wife, and, if he is wise, he well knows that he can find no better wife than among those women who have proved themselves the best servants and have become skilful household management. But this is also denied him. The woman who should become his wife is shut out by the very race that is crowding him out of his existence.

"A short time ago most of our capitalists were in a state bordering on panic, verging indeed on the contemptible, at the thought of the arrival of the Russians. They set up a great cry of 'To arms! To arms!'—towards—not the Chinese, whom they employ, but towards the white workingmen, who are going about in search of work, and who might starve for what they cared, and appealed to the loyalty of these men to volunteer to save their Queen! What loyalty can a man have towards a place that refuses him a home—that in reply to his cry for work gives him a stone? What loyalty is there to our Queen to protect a few men whose only God and Queen is themselves and their pockets?

"The workingman's reply was unanswerable—'You would have the Chinese, ask him to fight for you. We have nothing to lose, and our country is the country that will give us a living.' Her Majesty's birthday has just been celebrated with every outward token of the utmost loyalty.

"We venture to say, however, that loyalty so brilliantly displayed, is, in many of our capitalists and merchants, mere sentimental loyalty, if, indeed as much as that, which would not stand a test which would in any way affect their pockets. A good deal of money was, no doubt,

spent upon the celebration, but with many the sole reason for contributing to the outlay has been to bring money into the city. We rejoice to see the day so celebrated, because such celebrations tend to create the loyalty that is so much wanting. But what loyalty can there be without deeds? To be loyal, we must begin by being loyal to one another, and the man who pretends to be loyal to his Queen and is loyal neither to his city nor his countrymen, is a thorough hypocrite. The Chinese are loyal to one another, and will always employ a Chinaman when it is possible—but many of our merchants, capitalists and contractors are loyal neither to the workmen nor to themselves. On the other hand, the workman is expected to be loyal to the merchants and to take up arms in their defence, even if he have to give up a situation which he has obtained with difficulty, and which will, he knows, be filled by a Chinaman, directly he gives it up. We remonstrated with one merchant, who employs a Chinaman as porter, on the shortsightedness of so doing, and he replied, in mock humility: 'You may be right, but what can I do? My standing in this city is not high for my example to be followed by any one, and if I do not do as others do I shall lose in the end.' This is true as regards the individual, but it is no excuse for the merchants. Some man, of greater acuteness than the rest, should call a meeting of the principle men and get them to pledge themselves not to employ any Chinamen, after a certain date, and not to rent any buildings to them. But this is not done, because, we suppose, what is everybody's business is nobody's business.

"In the *San Francisco Chronicle* of the 19th of March last, appeared a very interesting letter from the Hong Kong correspondent of that paper, which should serve as a warning to those of our citizens who are still so blind to the danger ahead of them.

"What he writes is fully borne out by what we learn from other sources. He tells us that in Hong Kong general merchandise is coming more and more into the hands of the Chinese, all the American firms have retired from it, and only two or three of the English and German companies are left. Competition is next to impossible. The Chinese sell nearly everything that is sold at the general retail shop, and usually at three-quarters or half the price. The Queen's road is the principal retail thoroughfare in Hong Kong. At the Chinese importing shops on the road the housekeeper can get his fine groceries, his wines, liquors, and everything needed to maintain a luxurious table, at prices at which no foreign dealer can afford to sell them. He can get his furniture made by cabinetmakers who keep by them and are constantly using the sample or pattern book of the best furniture firms in London. White cabinetmakers and carpenters are unknown there. A gentleman who wishes to be well clad has no occasion to go to a foreigner for any article of dress—the Chinese tailor absolutely swarms in Hong Kong. The Chinese shoemaker is quite as apt of hand as the Chinese tailor, and so engrosses the business that he has not a single foreign competitor. The mechanical skill of the Chinese is equally remarkable; they fill alike all branches of mechanical labor; they build junks, small steamers, tugs and steam launches, the last usually under foreign superintendence, and they are the sole workmen at the docks and machine shops. Their embroidery, their carvings in wood and ivory, their pottery and their silks, are famed all the world over. The Chinese build the houses in which the foreigners live, furnish and decorate them, and then clothe and serve the occupants themselves. The pleasure of being waited upon by a retinue of Chinese servants, the *dolce far niente* of life in a summer land, the servile homage offered by an apparently subject race, create an atmosphere of self-satisfaction, a kind of glamor, which renders invisible the tyranny of the real rulers, and the indescribable subjection of the white race, which is inevitable and not far distant. To hasten their own discomfiture, the English colonists are educating the Chinese in their public schools, and fitting them to hold the positions of clerks, book-keepers and other places that require intelligence and a certain amount of education. The result will be, that speaking English fluently, and easily acquiring the necessary amount of commercial knowledge, they will soon fill the counting houses of Hong Kong, as their untaught countrymen have filled the workshops and retail avenues of city business. The type-setting and the foreign job printing and newspapers in Hong Kong, as well as elsewhere in China (and here we personally feel the rub, for no trade or business squeaks until the Chinese infringe upon it), is all done by native compositors, with the exception of a few hybrid immigrants from Macao. The business of book-binding is all done by Chinese workmen, even where, as is sometimes the case, the establishment is the property of foreigners, but most of the book-binders where all kinds of blank books are made, and not a few of the printing offices also, are owned and entirely operated by Chinese. And now comes the rub for you, our blind selfish friends! The insurance business is gradually getting into the hands of the Chinese capitalists, and they will eventually capture and absorb the shipping business; they already furnish a large portion of the engineers and pilots doing duty on the small steam craft that ply in the harbors and for short distances along the coast. They understand the making and working of steam engines, and already two shipping companies have been formed, although with indifferent success.

"We have quoted the Hong Kong correspondent because we do not pretend to be disinterested in this vital question and no man is a prophet in his own country. He sounds the knell of Hong Kong and Victoria in the following words:—'With these facts before us, it is not hard to cast the horoscope of Hong Kong. As the Chinese population increases, the foreign element will gradually disappear, or be limited to fewer avenues of business. In twenty-five years there will not be a foreigner engaged in any branch of retail trade, and few firms in shipping, banking or taking insurance risks. Foreign mechanics, artisans and clerks will, long ere that, have disappeared, having been either pauperised or driven back to their native lands by cheap Chinese labor.'

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

The foreign society of Victoria will comprise a few bankers, a few shippers, clinging by the eyelids to the wreck of ancient commercial interests, a dozen lawyers, principally supported by Chinese patronage; a handful of missionaries, a bevy of sleek and well-fed civil officials, and a few score officers in foreign flamingo uniforms, whose regiments will be needed to suppress guild riots and to aid the police.

"The question is, however, far too serious for any joking. All evidence points, as we have shown, to the certain destruction that will come upon all white traders in Victoria if our capitalists, both great and small, do not make common cause with the workmen. Standing aloof, as they are now doing, they must inevitably be discomfited. For either the workmen will succeed in their appeal to the workmen of the Dominion, and united they will prevail upon the Dominion Government to grant their just demands, or they will be defeated for want of the support which all true men are bound to afford them, and will be compelled, sooner or later, to leave British Columbia and abandon its capitalists to their just fate, of being, in their turn, crowded out by the ubiquitous Chinese.

"Chinatown is a terrible cancer in the very heart of Victoria and must be removed, whatever may be the cost, before it spreads itself over the whole of our fair city. We call, therefore, upon all our citizens to join, while there is time, the workmen in the movement, and as the workmen have, in their despair, appealed—and wisely, too—to their fellow-workmen of the rest of the Dominion, let our citizens bring all their influence to bear on the Dominion Government to grant the petition which has so long and so patiently been submitted to it. As to the workmen, we wish them every success, and advise those of the eastern Provinces to support their fellow-workmen in their distress, with all their heart and all their strength.

"The horse would not be the patient slave to man that he is if he knew his own strength, and the same may be said of the workman.

"Let our workmen steadily write, knowing no party, and agitate steadily, persistently, and with the same moderation as hitherto; and in the end victory must be theirs. Their strength is so great, if they did but know it, that they cannot fail when justice is with them."

Seven or eight years ago Mr. Bunster stated in this House that there were 3,000 Chinese in British Columbia. I may safely state, without fear of contradiction, that there are certainly five or six times that number now. Opinions differ as to how many there really are, because the Chinese always want to avoid, if possible, payment of what was formerly known as the school tax, but which is now known as the provincial revenue tax. Chinese merchants, to whom these people are consigned, do not care to have the exact number of Chinese in the city or Province known. But I find, on reference to the immigration report of last year, that the Dominion immigration agent for the Province of British Columbia says:

"Unfortunately, there were but few avenues of employment open till the island railroad was commenced in the fall, and numbers of men were thus disappointed in their expectations during the spring and summer months. Many of these called over and over again seeking work, and though willing to take Chinamen's wages, at almost any kind of labor these undesirable people are doing, yet they found it impossible to obtain employment."

Now, in the statistics which he gave, he shows that 3,183 Chinamen entered British Columbia from the 1st January to the 31st December, 1884; and I believe that that estimate is considerably under the mark. But that one donation to the present Chinese population of British Columbia, is equal to the Chinese population of the Province which existed 8 years ago, when this legislation was first sought in the Dominion Parliament. The immigration agent also says:

"Additions to the Chinese population number more than half as many again, as several Chinese from San Francisco were reported as steerage passengers and counted with the whites during the first part of the year. Nearly 200 of these people left this city a few days ago on the *SS. Sardonyx*, for Hong Kong. A few of them may probably return, but a large majority went home to reside permanently in China."

I mention these facts to show that the Chinese population of British Columbia not only is, but has been, steadily on the increase, year by year, and even within the last month testimony goes to show no less than 900 have been added to that particular class of immigrants. I also notice, in the report of the Minister of Mines, recently received, that during the year 1884 of the total number of people employed upon the various gold mines of the Province, 49 were white miners and 1,366 Chinamen, or pretty nearly three to one, in the following localities:

OARIBOO—BARKERVILLE DIVISION: Williams Creek, Mosquito and Red Gulch, Sugar and Hardacrabble Creeks, Lowhee Creek, Grouse and Canadian Creeks, Antler Creek (Upper and Lower), Cunningham

Creek (Upper), Conklin Gulch, Stouts Gulch, Steven's, Begg's and California Creeks—desultory mining. LIGHTNING CREEK DIVISION: Lightning Creek, Last Chance Creek, Van Winkle Creek, Chisholm Creek, Davis Creek, Ruchon Creek, Slough Creek and Devil's Canon, Nelson Creek, Burn's Creek, Peter's and Campbell's Creeks, Swift River and Fountain Creek, Deadwood and Barry Creeks, Cottonwood and Lower Lightning Creek—desultory mining. KEITHLEY CREEK DIVISION: Keithley Creek, Shoeshoe Creek, Harvey Creek, North Fork, Quesnelle River, Spanish Creek, South Fork, Quesnelle River, Cedar Creek, Horsefly River, Quesnelle River (from Forks 40 miles down), Fraser River (from 6 miles below Quesnelle down to Williams Lake). QUESNELLEMOUTH DIVISION: Fraser River (commencing 6 miles below Quesnelle and 30 miles up the River), Cottonwood River (from Bridge to Fraser River), Quesnelle River (from mouth 20 miles up) Hixoa Creek.

CASSIAR—Laketown Division: Dease Creek, Thibe't Creek, Defot Creek—desultory mining. McDame Creek Division: McDame Creek, Snow Creek, Quartz Creek, Rosella Creek, Poor Man's Creek, Dennis Creek, Deloire River.

LILLOET—Fraser River (from Foster's Bar to mouth of Chilcotin River, including Bridge River).

YALE—Desultory mining on bars and benches of Fraser and Thompson Rivers.

KOOTENAY—Wild Horse Creek, Moyea River and tributaries, Palmer's Bar, Bull River, Canon Creek, Quartz Creek, Dutch Creek, Finlay Creek, Quartz Claims, Kicking Horse Section, Quartz Creek, Kootenay Lake.

OMINECA—Manson and other Creeks.

SKEENA—Lorne Creek.

In other words, of a total number of 1,900 people employed in these mines, no less than 1,366 were Chinamen; and so that if at any time they chose to show a hostile or revengeful spirit towards the whites, they outnumbered them three to one, and they might create a large amount of trouble, which it would be difficult to allay in those places. Now, as already stated, the Chinese come principally from Hong Kong, but there are other ports from which, if they do not come directly, they come by way of Hong Kong, and ship from there. It is easy to imagine, with a mail steamer plying between San Francisco and Victoria, which now runs every five or six days, between the months of April and November, vessels of from 1,800 to 2,200 tons—that even under the provisions of this Act they can and probably will bring in at least forty Chinamen per trip every five days. Now, taking into consideration the fact that prohibitory legislation is in force in the United States, it is reasonable to infer that those Chinamen, particularly in the State of California, will be very prone to find their way to the ports of British Columbia, and scatter themselves through the various districts of that Province. By the vessels I have mentioned there would be forty coming in every five days, which would be 240 a month, or something like 3,000 a year, from that source alone. But that is not the only source from which they could come. We have a steamer running between Portland and Victoria every fortnight or three weeks, and it is quite possible that even in that steamer, which is one of not more than 800 tons, a certain number would come from that particular direction. Then there are daily steamers of from 450 to 550 tons from Puget Sound, and each and every one will bring in some Chinamen, notwithstanding the restrictions of this Bill. Last, but not least, we have to guard against the wholesale importation from the Chinese ports direct, that is, in vessels which do not come for the sake of the freight on their cargoes, except their live cargoes of Chinamen. They come with the distinct knowledge that they will get so much per head for the passage money of so many Chinese coolies, or, in a more refined form, it is a species of slave traffic. They are sent from Hong Kong, Shanghai, or Canton, as the case may be, to the ports of British Columbia, and then distributed through the Province. There is also the fear that some may elect to go to California, and thus cause trouble between Canada and the United States. These have been known to come at the rate of from 650 to 800 in a vessel, and as many as ten vessels in two months. Now, I do not apprehend that they will come in as large numbers as that in future, because there will not be the supply of that class of immigrants, unless there is a demand or occupation for them. At the present time, I am happy to state the British Columbia

section of the Canadian Pacific Railway is about completed, and the graving dock is also well under way. Both of these works have as many Chinamen employed as will be required for their completion, and if not there are many available from those already there, so that I think that we may fairly let the future, as regards contractors and their requirements in the matter of a Chinese working population, take care of itself. To show you how easy it is to have a large influx of Chinese population in British Columbia, I have only to mention the fact that these vessels that I have more recently referred to—sailing vessels, bringing almost exclusively live freights of Chinamen, can certainly make that passage in forty-two days from Hong Kong to Victoria. Now, with all these Chinese ports and other ports in such close proximity to British Columbia, it is much more probable, not only from the experience of the past, but from what we may reasonably apprehend in the future, that Chinese immigration will be, if not exclusively, almost entirely, directed to the Province of British Columbia, and that the rest of the Dominion will not feel tangibly that evil of which we so bitterly complain. Therefore, I think that inasmuch as this House has not only to legislate for individual Provinces, but that we are sent here to do the best in our humble endeavors for the benefit of the Dominion as a whole, it is clearly our duty to seriously take into consideration the representations which have been made by the members who represent that Province in this House, and give them, unless we see very good reasons why we should not, that which they so earnestly desire. Now, it will be a matter of some interest to this House to know that Shanghai is 5,220 miles from Victoria; Hong Kong, 5,760 miles; Canton, 5,880; Yokohama, Japan, 4,200; Hacdadie, Japan, 3,900; Auckland, New Zealand, 6,120; Sydney, Australia, 6,780; Melbourne, Australia, 7,260; Port Elizabeth, Australia, *via* Cape Horn, 10,860; Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, 2,340; Valparaiso, South Pacific, 5,880; Coquimbo, 5,760; and Iquiqui, 5,340. These are the shortest distances, being calculated on the arc of a great circle, which any mariners there may be in this House will know are the shortest distances upon which any vessel can sail. So that even with these distances between said places the Chinese ports are farther from British Columbia than British Columbia is from the capital of this Dominion, and still that Province is sufficiently well known to John Chiuaman to induce him to come over those long sea voyages of close on 6,000 miles to reach it. Now, it is not my intention to detain the House any longer upon these resolutions, as I have claimed the clemency of this House for a sufficient period. I shall not, therefore, inflict the House with any more extracts, although I have lots of them here, much as I would like to place them on record, by handing them to *Hansard* for insertion, so that my constituents might read them. We are at present, as I understand, simply debating the expediency of the resolutions before the House; the first is:

"That it is expedient to impose an entry fee or duty of \$50 on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada."

That resolution I can heartily support. I would not like to see more than \$50 imposed upon them, because I do not think it is expedient to make the monetary fine any heavier for the Province of British Columbia or the Dominion of Canada than that imposed by the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales. But with regard to the second resolution:

"That no vessel carrying Chinese immigrants to any port in Canada shall have more than one such immigrant for every 50 tons of its tonnage."

I think it would meet with greater favor in British Columbia if we made it one for every 100 tons. I have endeavored to show the large numbers that will come in, notwithstanding the restrictive legislation, and I think, owing to the number of sources from which they can be imported, that we should make this resolution a little more restrictive, and

even then it will only be equally restrictive with the law in force in Australia, namely, one to every 100 tons. With regard to the third resolution :

"That the master of any vessel bringing Chinese immigrants to any port of Canada shall be personally liable to Her Majesty for the payment of such fee or duty in respect of any immigrant carried by such vessel."

I think it is certainly highly desirable that the master of a ship should be made as responsible for everything that pertains to freight of that kind as he is in the case of freight of every other kind. In conclusion, I have only a word to say about female domestic servants. It is said that a Chinaman will perform the same functions as three female domestic servants will perform. The Chinaman certainly will perform the functions of cook, gardener, housemaid, chambermaid, and almost every other kind of work that it is possible to mention. I have shown that other labor will not come until these fellows go—that it is necessary to restrict the immigration of the Chinese, so that the Department of Agriculture, Provincial and Dominion, may be successful in their endeavors to bring out a number of the much desired class of white female domestics; and I would like to know if there is an hon. gentleman in this House, although there are some who crack up the usefulness of the Chinese, who would not prefer a bright-eyed maiden to attend his table. I think there is not a gentleman in this House who would not infinitely prefer to have his table properly arranged, his food nicely cooked, and all those duties which are necessary in a well kept household performed by white women and girls in preference to Mongolians. But we shall never be able to get them until we show, by every legitimate means, by every honest piece of legislation, and by every honestly and freely expressed conviction, that we are really sincere in our desire to prevent this very undesirable class of immigrants coming, not merely into the Dominion of Canada, but more particularly into the Province of British Columbia. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, for the patient hearing you have given me, and I only hope this legislation will pass through this House without a single dissenting voice.

Mr. GORDON. I am almost afraid to trespass on the good nature of this House to-night. I am sure it is a compliment to British Columbia that in a mid-summer Session, two or three hours of patient hearing is granted to the discussion of any question affecting our distant Province. I certainly, as one of the representatives of that Province, feel it my duty to congratulate the Government upon the action they have taken with reference to the Chinese question. I have felt, since the last Session of Parliament when the resolutions passed committing this House unanimously to a measure respecting and regulating Chinese immigration, that the Government would deal with this question satisfactorily. That the Government intended to keep their pledge to this House. At that time, it will be remembered, the right hon. the leader of the Government assured the House that it was the intention of the Government to send a commission to British Columbia to examine the question in its various details. No exception was taken to that declaration on either side, neither was any exception taken to the passing of the motion. I felt a little surprised, when the commission reached British Columbia, that exception was taken by many people to the appointment of the commission. I felt that this House had committed itself, that the Government had committed itself, to the appointment, and I, for one, felt it would be a relief to the members of that Province to have an independent commission go out and examine into this question, which had been so often brought before this House by the members from that Province. What were we doing? We were coming to this Parliament, six members of a distant Province, asking this Parliament to violate all the traditions

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

of parliamentary government in Canada since it had self-government. We were asking this Parliament to restrict people from coming into the Dominion, something that had never before been done or asked, and I felt it would relieve the members of that Province, who were acting in no other respect than from a sincere sense of their duty, if an independent commission was sent to the Province to report to the Government. I have to congratulate the Government, further, upon the fact that this Bill, which is now before the House, is far in excess of what the people expected at the time the report of the commission was published. At the time the commission was in British Columbia, there was a general feeling of distrust, that the commission was a mere pretext for avoiding the question and delaying the question. For those reasons, I shall not go into the past history of the question. I shall not enter into the details of the character of the Chinese or their habits, or the rental they pay. I assume that Parliament, when we passed that resolution last year, saw there was a difficulty coming that would reach every part of Canada, if some action were not taken. I felt assured it was no longer necessary on the part of the members from that Province to enter into the details of the character of these people. I shall not, therefore, attempt to do so to-night. I do not agree with my hon. friend, who states that he would not like to see more than \$50 imposed on them. Individually, I would like to see the tax \$500; but I am willing to yield to the feelings of the House, in order to get what can be obtained. I am in favor of giving this measure a fair, and test I feel satisfied this Parliament will, from time to time, provide any further remedy that may be necessary. With regard to the various clauses of the Bill, it may not come up to what some people may anticipate; but, on the whole, the Government, in bringing these resolutions before this House, have shown a good faith towards the people of British Columbia far in excess of our anticipation when the report of the commission was issued. I shall not detain the House, but simply express my sincere congratulations to the Government and the commission on the results obtained.

Mr. HOMER. When this Chinese question came before Parliament, in the Session of 1883, I took the position that it was premature at that time to restrict the importation of Chinese labor into the Province of British Columbia, on the ground that the facilities existing at that time for obtaining white labor were not sufficient to meet the labor requirements of the Province. The Canadian Pacific Railway, then, was not more than half completed. The Pacific division was almost entirely dependent upon the Chinese labor for its construction. Therefore, if a restrictive measure had been enacted and enforced at that time, the probability is that a strike would have been made of Chinese labor along the road, which would have caused heavy loss to the contractors, for which they could make a heavy claim upon the Government. At the same time, I stated that so soon as there was a certain prospect of securing sufficient white labor for the purpose of railway construction and carrying on the various industries of the country, I would then give my support to a measure restricting the further importation of Chinese labor. Last Session this measure again came before the House, and I took the position that the time had then arrived when we should enact restrictive measures, because the Southern Pacific Railway was completed to a point on Puget Sound, within the immediate vicinity of British Columbia. From that road a large number of railway laborers had been discharged, and by that road a large immigration was conveyed to the State of Oregon, Washington Territory, and to British Columbia. From those different sources and from the Chinese already in the Province could be obtained all the labor required for the purposes of railway construction and for carrying on the various industries of the Province, and from that time to the present

there has been a surplus of labor in British Columbia; in fact, a great deal of white labor has had to leave it within the last six months, owing to the avenues of labor being filled with Chinese. This whole question has to be considered from one point, and that is labor; whether we shall, by the free importation of Chinese labor, convert British Columbia into a Chinese colony, or restrict the importation of Chinese labor and retain that Province for the white population. That is the point which this Bill has to decide. It is my firm conviction, as it is the firm conviction of nine-tenths of my constituents, that unless a restrictive measure is enacted that Province will become a Chinese colony. The small amount of wages for which Chinese labor; the small amount upon which they can subsist, having no family to support, or, if they have, the family reside in China, where they can live very cheaply. They do not settle in the country; they make but few improvements in it; they do not assist to build up the country; they do not spend their earnings in the country, with the exception of the small amount it requires for them to exist upon. The surplus they take with them to their native country, and when one leaves the country, others arrive to fill his place, and they, in their turn, after two or five years' residence, leave, with their \$500, or \$1,000, or \$2,000, for their native country, where they can live for the remainder of their days in comfort and peace. What is the case with the white immigrant? He settles in the country; he sends for his family; they improve the country; they engage in various branches of business and contribute to the general welfare and prosperity of the country. So you will see that, owing to the small requirements of the Chinese, it is quite impossible for white labor to compete with them. Consequently, the very people whom we wish to settle in the country and to assist in building it up will not emigrate to it when they know they have to come in contact with, and to compete with, Chinese labor. Many of the immigrants who went to British Columbia in the last few years have been obliged to leave again, because they saw they could not compete with Chinese labor; that with the labor of their hands they could not realise sufficient to build permanent homes and to make themselves comfortable in that country. Unless a restrictive measure is passed, I feel sure that the business of that country, and the various industries, will all pass into the hands of a few capitalists, with Chinese to perform the labor, and that all individual enterprise will be crushed out. In Australia they passed a restrictive measure, seeing what the result would be of the free importation of Chinese labor. In California they enacted a prohibitive measure, knowing what the result would be. In neither of these countries were the Chinese equal to those in British Columbia. In California, with a population of 1,000,000 whites, they had but 60,000 Chinese, which is only 6 per cent. of the entire population. In Australia the percentage was still less, while in British Columbia we have 15,000 Chinese to a population of 30,000 whites. I shall not refer to their manners or customs, or to the immorality of those people. That is a question which has been thoroughly dealt with by others; neither do I attach that importance to these points which many do. The great question which we have to decide is the labor question. Unrestricted Chinese labor means unrestricted poverty for the white man. It means the conversion of British Columbia into a Chinese colony, from which they can spread and demoralise the whole labor market of the Dominion; and in order to prevent an occurrence of this kind in the future, I would ask every hon. member of this House to give his support to the Bill now before Parliament.

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

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 2,

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would ask the Minister in charge of this Bill if he would kindly act upon my suggestion, and make it 100 tons, the same as in the Australian Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As I have stated, the proportion is already very large. A vessel fitted out to carry 3,000 tons could only carry 60 of them. I think my hon. friends should be satisfied. At all events, if it was shown, between now and another Session, or within a year, that it had not the effect, no doubt the Government would see that the regulation would be made more strict than it is now.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I do not want the hon. gentleman to think me too persistent and importunate in this matter, but it is a matter vitally affecting my constituents, and they have urged me very strongly on this point of the tonnage; and I should fail in my duty if I did not ask the Government to accede to their wishes and to increase the tonnage.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a very good instalment. You had better take this.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). We have to be, and we are, very thankful for small mercies, but it is a very good principle in life to take all you can get and ask for more.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 124) to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 156) to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### CHINESE INTERPRETER.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to consider a certain proposed resolution (see page 2421) respecting the appointment and remuneration of the controller, the interpreter and other persons who may be appointed under the Bill regulating and restricting Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada.

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

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I really think we ought to have some explanation of the supposed necessity for inflicting this additional charge upon us. For aught that I can see, all the duties that are required to be discharged for the purpose of carrying into effect the restrictive measures that the House has consented to might be very easily discharged by the regular Dominion officials at the port of Victoria. I presume there is very little risk of Chinamen in any numbers making their way into Canada, except at one or two ports in British Columbia, where we already have a sufficient number of Dominion officials, and I say that adding \$4,000 or \$5,000 more to the yearly expenditure of the country is very objectionable. However, I shall be glad to hear what the Minister in charge has to say for this, which appears to me to be an unusual and unnecessary expense.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think the hon. gentleman is right in saying that it will be a charge. If there is no immigration there will be no need of an officer, and we can abolish the office. If there is an immigration the salary would not be a very large amount; probably \$500 a year would be sufficient, and this could be very nearly all collected from the entry fees paid by the immigrants. If the immigration is more numerous there will be more fees collected, which will be, no doubt, sufficient to pay the officers to be appointed. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that the Collector of Customs at the port of Victoria might do this work. I am sure that another officer will be required. The Bill provides that at the minor ports the Dominion officers in charge may be appointed to perform the duties of controller of immigration without any sensible addition to the salary. The only expenditure which we shall have to provide for will be that of an interpreter. I think that an interpreter is really needed. He is needed for the Chinese who will remain. There are now between 13,000 and 15,000 Chinese in the Province, and if a third of them remain an interpreter would still be needed, and it will be for the interests of the administration of justice to have one appointed. I may be told that the administration of justice in British Columbia should be supported by the Provincial Government, but it must be remembered that the influx of Chinese has taken place against the will of the provincial authorities. I do not think that there is any extravagance in this expenditure. The Bill will provide that all the Chinese residing in British Columbia shall secure a license of residence, that is to say, a certificate of residence, at the time this Bill comes into force. I do not think that the collector of Customs could really perform that duty. The keeping of a register will be a considerable task, and looking after that immigration will also take up a good deal of time. Steamers arrive at least once a week at the port of Victoria.

Mr. MILLS. How will it be with regard to the Chinese who land at San Francisco and then come over into Canada? Will they be subject to the same restrictions that are imposed upon Chinese coming directly from China?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; by land or by water, and coming from any country.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. It will be impossible to enforce the provisions of this law without the appointment of an officer to discharge the duties which this Bill creates in the city of Victoria; at least, I am sure that the Custom house officer is already fully employed. That is the principal port where the Chinese arrive. In fact, I have seen as many as 1,000 Chinese arrive there in one day.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I see no objection, certainly, to the expenditure on this account. It is absolutely necessary that we should have an interpreter in connection with the administration of this Act; but I do foresee a great difficulty in the way of the selection of a proper interpreter. It is certainly absolutely necessary, for the proper working out of this Act, that there should be an interpreter, and it will be a matter of serious difficulty to obtain such an officer, who will possess general confidence for uprightness, truthfulness, and so forth.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Will there be difficulty in obtaining such an officer at the salary mentioned in the Bill?

Mr. BAKER. Not so much on that score, but from the fact that there are at least eight different Chinese dialects, and these immigrants do not all speak the same language.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Nearly the whole of the immigration comes from one Province. I think an interpreter, judiciously chosen, would be able to do the work.

Mr. BAKER. Has the hon. gentleman any idea whether the interpreter will be an English person speaking Chinese or a Chinaman speaking English?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If possible, he will be an Englishman speaking Chinese.

Mr. HOMER. I think there will be very little difficulty in securing an interpreter. I do not think it desirable to have a Chinaman.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I hope the interpreter will not be a Chinaman. There are plenty of white men capable of speaking the Chinese language. I have conversed with one or two myself.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is quite evident that the interpreter should not be a Chinaman.

Resolution to be reported.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. POPE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 153) further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Bill is read a second time I desire to offer a few remarks. Of the \$5,000,000 of loan to be made to the railway company, I suppose \$1,000,000 is intended to go for equipment. In a printed circular, signed by Mr. Stephen, which was sent round the House, the purposes for which \$5,000,000 were required were stated. Among those was \$1,000,000 for equipment. I suppose those purposes are the purposes for which the \$5,000,000 is intended to be applied. If not, perhaps the Minister will inform me.

Mr. POPE. The \$5,000,000 is intended for paying off the floating debt.

Mr. EDGAR. I see, in the requirements set out by Mr. Stephen as those for which he wants to raise money, either by means of this \$5,000,000 or out of additional moneys which the Government have given the company facilities to raise by a rearrangement of the securities, \$1,000,000 is mentioned for equipment. It is a little difficult to understand how that can be. It will be recollected that on 2nd March I made a motion respecting certain items that appeared in the progress estimates of the railway, respecting rolling stock. It appeared that when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways he signed his last progress estimate on 7th April, 1884, and in that progress estimate he held back from the payment to the company, on the western end of the eastern section, just where the work was going on, near Callander, \$450,700; and it appeared by the very next progress estimate, which was signed by the Acting Minister of Railways, that that whole sum so held back for rolling stock was paid to the company, although no rolling stock appeared to have been supplied in the meantime. In fact, the road was not so far constructed that rolling stock on that portion was required. It also appeared that about the same time, at the other end of the eastern section, \$68,000 which had been held back for rolling stock by Sir Charles Tupper was also paid over to the company by the Acting Minister of Railways, making in all about \$518,000 that was paid over to the company, and paid by them for grading, instead of being held for rolling stock. It was not very easy to understand how that happened, and the House passed a resolution, on my motion for a return, calling for some explanation as to how that happened, and as to what information the Government had between 7th April, when Sir Charles Tupper held that money back to provide rolling stock, and 1st May, when the Acting Minister did not think it necessary to hold it back any longer, but paid it over to the company. A return has been brought down, in answer to my motion, and I find that it is explained in this way: In fact, there can be only one explanation—that the rolling stock was not required, or, of course, the money would have been held

back by the Government until it was procured. On 27th April there appears to be a letter addressed to the Minister by Mr. Schreiber, in which he refers to a memorandum of rolling stock upon the line between Montreal and Port Moody on 22nd September, 1883, and he showed that on the length of the line, 2,900 miles, there were 236 engines, 126 passenger cars, 48 box cars and 6,125 freight cars. And in another memorandum, in order to show what number of engines will be required for this line, a statement is given, showing the details of train service prior to the opening of the road for traffic from Montreal to Port Moody. They give the engines for through trains so many, local trains so many, pilot engines, shunting engines, etc., making 195 altogether, and then he adds 12 per cent. for engines in the shops for repairs, or a total of 218, while Mr. Schreiber's letter shows that there were twelve more than that, or 236. Now, if the passenger cars were in the same proportion, it would appear clear to the engineer that there was a sufficient amount of rolling stock, and he goes on that ground, and reports to the Minister as follows:—

“As the line runs through a large extent of unsettled, undeveloped country, it is probable that this rolling stock would be nearly sufficient for the traffic upon the first opening of the road; hence, I am applying the whole of the \$27,000,000, with the exception of \$286,000, to the completion of the works of construction.”

It appears that there was at that time sufficient rolling stock on the road when it was to be opened for traffic. However, Mr. Stephen, in his statement, shows that in 1884 they had expended in the additional equipment \$547,000; so, apparently, they had enough equipment on the road to open with, when Mr. Schreiber made his statement, and in the year 1884 they added one-half a million more for equipment, and still it seems that Mr. Stephen, when he comes before the House and makes a statement of what he wants the money for, says they require \$1,000,000 more for equipment, and among the items are locomotives, and so on. Now, that is rather extraordinary, and I think requires some explanation from the Minister. Of course when Mr. Schreiber sent in his letter it was not for the purpose of applying for further assistance from the Government, but in order to get over the difficulty that the Minister felt, when he allowed the money which had been kept back for rolling stock to be otherwise applied. The money was kept back by Sir Charles Tupper for rolling stock, and it was applied in the payment of the grading and other work of that kind, according to the estimates. Now, let us see for a moment if that money was really wanted for that other work. It will be remembered that on the same occasion, on asking for this return, I also asked for more information, which seemed to me to be very important, about the cost of the line beginning at 100 miles west of Callander and ending at 200 miles west of Callander—or a distance of 100 miles. The profiles of that road had been brought down to the House, and from an examination of them, and from what other information I was able to get, it seemed to me perfectly clear that the cost of that 100 miles was a very great deal less than the amount that the Government was advancing to the company for the purpose of constructing it, out of loan and out of subsidy; because, in the first 20 miles of that road they were advancing at the rate of \$23,000 per mile, and on the last 80 miles of the 100 they were advancing at the rate of \$27,000 per mile. What I contended was, that the Government should not certainly advance more than the cost of the road, and I asked the Government to bring down the estimates and the statement of quantities upon which they had based their calculations that they ought to pay the company \$23,000 and \$27,000 per mile for that work, and I also asked them to bring down a statement that the railway company could make for them, of the actual quantities of the work done, when the road was finished and paid for. In reply to that Order of the House, a statement was brought down. That statement

showed that so far as the Government estimate was concerned they had acted upon most extraordinary and loose information. It says, that the way they arrived at the probable cost of the road was by comparing it with similar work on the line of the Intercolonial Railway. They did not take any pains to see what the quantities were, or what the cost would be, although the Government had made it its business to build railways since the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It has been building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there was no difficulty whatever in the Government taking the prices in the various contracts they had made on that road, and taking the quantities out of the profiles and thus ascertain what the road was going to cost. I ventured to do that as well as I could, upon the information which was then before me, and I found that, so far as I could see, the Government, on this portion of the road, were paying to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, out of loan and subsidy, about \$10,000 per mile more than the road was actually costing them at the time; of course, giving them 9,000 acres of land grant per mile besides, and giving them the road and everything else that goes with it. Since then we have not got any information from the Government, but upon a requisition of the Government to carry out that Order of the House, Mr. Van Horne sent to the Government, and they brought down a statement of the quantities of the work done on that line, in detail, giving all the particulars and the items. Now, there is no difficulty in arriving at what the cost of that part of the line was, after we had that information. I have taken the trouble, from the data we have in our possession, to make an estimate of what that piece of line costs the railway company to build, and we know what the Government have paid them towards it. I find that taking the statement of quantities which Mr. Van Horne gave in his statement, which accompanied his letter to the Minister of the 17th of March, 1885, and taking the prices from the contract of Marks & Conmee on the higher scale of the tenders which were accepted by this Government on section “A,” 118 miles from English River to Eagle River, a remote and difficult part of the Canadian Pacific line—taking the higher scale for the earlier construction, I find this result: I find that the clearing of 1,350 acres on that 100 miles, at \$22 per acre, the price of section “A,” amounted to \$29,700; close cutting, at the prices and the quantities given by Mr. Van Horne, \$2,625; grubbing, based on the prices and quantities given by Mr. Van Horne, \$4,900. Then we come to the heavy item of earth excavation, of which Mr. Van Horne says there are 1,336,848 cubic yards. Now, there were two classes of prices in Marks & Conmee's tender—one, 26 cents a yard, and the other with 10 cents a yard added when there was a longer haul. Now, I put in a considerably larger portion of this earth excavation as being on a long haul than there was in the work on section “A” and I find that at 26 cents a yard it produces \$330,000, and a portion at 36 cents a yard \$24,000. Then there is cemented earth. That is what it is called in the statement of Mr. Van Horne, which I do not find anything analogous to in any of the tenders of these contractors. It is not loose rock, but it is cemented earth, and it was not tendered for in Marks & Conmee's tender at all, but I estimate it at double the other, 50 cents a yard, which makes \$132,898 for that item. Rock, 202,456 yards, which I estimate at Conmee's tender of \$1.55, makes \$313,806. Loose rock, 86,198 yards, at 95 cents a yard, Conmee's tender, \$81,888. The bridging was estimated for by the Government at \$1,500 a mile, which, in that part of the country, is a pretty heavy estimate; but I take their own estimate for that, which makes \$150,000. Then, service roads was an item which was not in Marks & Conmee's tender—about \$250 a mile, and that is \$25,000 more. Then, there is a large number of other works, such as rails, sleepers, track-laying, engineering, buildings, water service and ballasting, all of which were estimated by the

Government on the scale they had settled, and which they called standard, and they paid \$5,100 a mile for this service. The hon. Minister, in reply to questions I put to him early this Session, gave me the details of that estimate. That, for the 100 miles, amounts to \$510,000. The total cost, therefore, of that 100 miles, if we take these prices and quantities, about which there can be no possible dispute, amounts to \$1,605,000. Now, what amount of money have the railway company received from the Government in actual cash towards assisting them to build this section of the road? They received, first, \$23,000 a mile, on 20 miles, which makes \$460,000; they received \$27,000 a mile on the other 80 miles, which makes \$2,160,000; making, in all, \$2,620,000 in cash, which the company received from the Government this last year to assist them to build a piece of road which cost \$1,600,000, or \$1,014,000 more in actual cash than that road cost them to build. This estimate is made from figures which any practical man can test and understand for himself. In addition to that, they received 9,000 acres of choice land per mile in the North-West in respect of this portion of the road, which, even at \$1 per acre—and I have heard rumors that it is recently estimated as worth \$1.50—would make \$900,000 more; so that they received from the Government on this 100 miles, nearly \$2,000,000 in money and land more than the road actually cost them to build. Now, this is a part of the section on which it is said the company are spending so much more than they had estimated. Perhaps the other end of this section about Lake Superior has cost a great deal more than this end; but we must remember that the company got a great deal more from the Government for it, if it did cost more. For a long distance they got \$80,000 or \$90,000 a mile from the Government for that expensive portion of the road; and if the estimates which we have not got for that part of the road show up in the same way as these, the company must have got in proportion a great deal more than the cost of the construction of that part of the road. At any rate, as far as we have the figures and details, they show that on one part of the road the company have been receiving, on every mile, just about what I estimate on the data before me in March last, that is to say, \$10,000 a mile more than it cost. These are figures it is impossible to controvert; so far as this part of the line is concerned, they are unanswerable, and, in the face of that, I think we should have a little more explanation from the Government, before we are asked to pass this Bill through its second reading.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not intend to discuss this question at any length, as I think the subject has been exhausted. But I wish to consider for a moment some remarks which fell from the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). In a speech characterised by singular force, power and eloquence, he pointed out the Protean shapes assumed by the Canadian Pacific Railway in applying to this House for additional subsidies. In the first place, it was assumed that, when the original contract was made, we were treating with the millionaires, plutocrats and merchant princes of the world; that the accumulated wealth of the old world would be applied to the advancement of the interests and development of the resources of the new; that the great social problems would receive solution, and the hoards wrung from the toil and the sweat of the starving millions of Europe would be repaid with interest on the western prairies, where plutocrat and proletarian, lion and lamb, would lie down together in that pleasant paradise. It was to be a millennial period, when all wrongs would be righted, and

"Bertram's might and Bertram's right,  
Would meet on Ellaagowan's height."

The Baron Von Reinach, and the Count of Monte Cristo and their congeners would take an intelligent interest in the  
Mr. EDGAR.

Dominion generally, and the Canadian Pacific Railway particularly, and afford us precise information as to the price of gold in Amsterdam. But all is vanity and vexation of spirit. The millionaires, merchant princes, and plutocrats disappeared like the baseless fabric of a dream; and the Baron Von Reinach, and the Count of Monte Cristo, retired to their chateaux in Spain, and their castles in Bohemia. It was the old, old story over again. Some one must do the work or face the responsibility. This duty, in the last resort, devolved upon the tax-payers of the Dominion, the toilers on the sea and the toilers on the land. After assuming many shapes, after playing the parts of Claude Duval, or Jack Sheppard, these commercial condottieri had at last assumed the garb of mourning and donned the weeds of the widow and the orphan. In doing this, they manifested their wisdom. Widows have played an important part in political and social matters. As a rule for general application, the advice of the late lamented Mr. Weller to his son Samuel, may be taken as correct—"beware of vidders." But there are exceptions to this general rule. Who does not remember the charming acquaintance of the hon. member for Cardwell, the widow Machree? Who does not remember the fascinating female who melted the iron heart of the hon. member for Northumberland, the widow Murphy? Who does not remember the important part played by that estimable female in the history of the country? Who does not remember the pleasant picture painted with such artistic skill and power by the hon. gentleman? The pleasant cottage in the very heart of the great forest of New Brunswick. One knew by the smoke that so gracefully curled that if there is peace to be found in this world the heart that is humble could look for it here. The Sabbath stillness of the scene, the lovely widow surrounded by her young orphans, drawing the lacteal fluid from the patient Brindle, and the warning wail of the banshee, the baying of the blood hounds, the neigh of the iron horse, ravening for his prey. In the evening, everything was peaceful and prosperous; in the morning, all was desolation and despair. In the darkness of night, the widow's cow had drifted to her doom; but there was balm in Gilead. The knightly member came to the rescue of his fair constituents. The widow obtained compensation, and the hon. member immortality. By this kindly and generous act, he won his brevet rank in the nobility of his country. But by the generosity of his acts he was declared noble by an earlier creation, by the imposition of a mightier hand. It is no wonder that all opposition melted away like a snow ball before the noon day sun:

"And now his name sounds stirring in many a forest lone,  
Like the trumpet call of the Light Brigade when they charged the  
Russians home.  
And the bushmen pour to Bacchus libations many a score  
When they think of Peter's triumph on their wild New Brunswick  
shore.  
And in the long nights of winter when the cold north wind blows,  
When the boys are making the axe helves and the girls are  
knitting hose,  
When François mends his moccasins and Sophie warms her toes,  
With shouting and with triumph still is the story told,  
How well Sir Peter fought the fight in the brave days of old."

Well, widow Murphy has disappeared and the widow Stephen reigns in her stead. The pines of New Brunswick give place to the tall masts of the ships bearing treasure and tribute to the commercial capital of the Dominion. In the foreground the mighty St. Lawrence sweeps on its majestic way to the ocean; in the background Mount Royal looms up in all its splendor and beauty. As the chill and gray morning dawns, the widow Stephen leaves her humble habitation, her squalid cot and proceeds to Ottawa to milk her parliamentary cow. The orphans, Van Horne and Smith, smile pleasantly at the prospect of renewed refreshments. But a wail is borne upon the breeze, like the wolf's long howl on Onalaska's shore. It is the lament of the Opposition banshee; it is

the neigh of the demon horse, which has destroyed the cow of the widow Murphy and is on the track of the parliamentary jersey of the widow Stephen. Such is the interpretation which I place on the speech of the hon. gentleman. I do not believe that he is a seer or has the gift of second sight. I am more disposed to adopt the generous, enterprising policy of the hon. member for Northumberland than the cool and cautious one of the hon. gentleman. I am disposed to give reasonable assistance to the widow and to cast in my lot with the orphan. During the month of November last, I went over a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I have been requested by some of my friends to give my impressions of it, and of what has been termed our magnificent heritage in the great North-West. I may state my visit was of a very brief and hurried character, and that consequently I could only see a small portion of the country and study to some slight extent its general features and outlines. You will recollect that during last Session there was much discussion concerning the North-West generally, and the railway particularly. Among others, the hon. member for Lisgar delivered a speech characterised by great force and power and eloquence, in which he pointed out the marvellous resources of that marvellous land. It was thought by many that his picture was painted in too gorgeous and glowing colors, its hues more resembling those of a California sunset than the cool gray tints of our northern skies. I remember telling that hon. gentleman that if, instead of devoting his fine talents to speculative purposes, he had turned his attention to imaginative literature, Canada would have boasted a great writer, superior, in many respects, to Sir Walter Scott, Dickens, Thackeray and the great masters. But I must make an amend to the hon. gentleman. I must confess, from what I saw in my brief visit to the North-West, that he was right and I was wrong. Although somewhat skeptical, I was bound, as a patriotic Canadian, to believe that we had in that country a veritable garden of Eden. Yet I must confess that I started on a journey with much misgiving, feeling that, like Blanche Amory, in Thackeray's "Pendennis," I should be awfully disillusioned. As you are well aware, it was considered by many that, in taking possession of the northern portion of this continent, the Canadian Government assumed a terrible responsibility, and incurred such gigantic obligations, that if the fruition did not realise the anticipation, the result must be of the most disastrous character. It was thought we had taken a leap in the dark and that it was doubtful whether we would land on safe and solid ground or be plunged in some Serbonian bog, some bottomless quagmire, which would swallow up the prosperity, the credit, and the future of the inhabitants of the older Provinces. I must confess that I was somewhat of a pessimist, and while I was prepared to face the inevitable, yet I could not but watch the solution of this problem with much anxiety. Well, time passed, and the destinies of the Dominion were being moulded into the shape which they now assume. It was agreed on all hands that a railroad from ocean to ocean was absolutely necessary, in order to link the Provinces together. When, at last, this policy assumed definite shape, and the arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway were finally concluded, a change came over the spirit of our dreams. We had entered upon a new phase of our national existence, and it was necessary that we should assume the garb as well as the proportions of manhood. You will remember the old fable, which tells us of what occurred in a pleasant meadow, when a frog, animated by a laudable ambition, wished to rival the proportions of an ox which was grazing near it. Well, we commenced the process of inflation, and then, as a natural consequence, came the great boom, that marvellous sirocco of speculation which swept over the land and produced such singular results. Our

Castilian castles assumed the most magnificent proportions. We had entered into the pleasant land of Beulah, a land of corn and oil, of milk and honey. We had discovered the El Dorado, and, in all its pomp and pride, the New Jerusalem dawned upon our vision. It was the syndicatorial heaven; it was the land of Paradox. The colder the climate the warmer one became; the frost was to the North-West what the irrigation of the Nile was to Egypt; by a wise dispensation the Chinook winds played on land, the roll of the gulf stream on the ocean, and gave a balmy and spring-like atmosphere to the bleak regions of the north. It was a land of gold and silver and precious stones. The cattle upon a thousand hills are ours. Millions upon millions of the richest prairie, pasture and wheat lands of the world had come into our possession. The wildest dreams of the great Irish satirist had been more than realised. It was an agricultural Elysium. If you tickled the land with the hoe or the plow it laughed with a harvest. The cool mountain streams on their way to the ocean ran over shining pebbles of gold and silver, and rubies and other precious stones; and we have the authority of one of the most practical members of this House, who assured the people of England only last fall, that everywhere through the great North-West, wealth could be had for the picking up. As Dr. Johnson said of Thrane's brewery, it was the potentiality of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice. The excitement of that period of national insanity produced hallucinations not unlike the delusions of the opium eater. The lessons of the past and the perplexities of the present were forgotten, and we launched our bark boldly on the sea of speculation. It became our business to trade in the difficult and dangerous wares of the future. Well, we had entered into a very pleasant paradise; but the trail of the speculator was over it all. The dream was a very gay and gorgeous one, but alas for the hour of awakening! The banquet had been very gay and brilliant, but when the flowers faded and the lights were extinguished and the chill and gray morning dawned, our sensations were not of so pleasant a character. We had to learn the stern lesson that the doctrine of compensation obtains in public as well as in private life, that action is followed by reaction, stimulation by depression. It is the ancient doctrine of Nemesis, which keeps watch in the universe, and lets no violation of law, either physical or moral, go unpunished. We had the feast and we must have the famine. We had gone up like a rocket and we must come down like a stick. As the country was unduly exalted so it was unduly depressed. The optimists had their innings and the period of the pessimists was to set in. Then came the saturnalia of the croakers and the cowards and the descendants of doubting Thomas. All the creeping, the crawling and crouching things which fatten on the dead forms of nobler creatures flocked to their unholy feast. It was the old, old story over again, they said; history was repeating itself. It was the Darien scheme once more which lured the sober Scots to their ruin; it was the South Sea Bubble in another time and clime; it was the Mississippi Madness, with which Law deluded the Frenchmen of the regency to their destruction. The land, they said, was not an agricultural Elysium but an abomination of desolation; it is well called the "Great Lone Land," for it was never intended for human habitation; it had been intended, they said, for the *feræ naturæ*, the fur-bearing animals; it was a happy hunting ground where the Nimrods of the north and the nightly hunters of muskrats might indulge in the pleasures and secure the profits of the chase in security; it was a veritable Siberia, an Alsatia, a Cave of Adullam, into which all who were in debt and difficulty, all the outlaws from human justice and humanity might, in their exile, find congenial companionship; it was a land of blizzards, cyclones, grasshoppers and syndicators. What the locusts spared, that the syndicate devoured. The cold was

so intense that when the clergymen depicted the horrors of the infernal regions, they dared not speak of the fire that is not quenched, lest, in order to thaw themselves out, their hearers should rush incontinent to the lake of fire and brimstone. It was said that these holy men depicted the place of everlasting punishment as a cold, icy, glacial inferno, where the mercury was always solid—a place something like that terrible palace of ice in which, with fiendish cruelty, Catharine of Russia immured her unhappy victims. For mortal sins Winnipeg was the inferno where protracted punishment was meted out by a curious course of congelation; for venal offences the northern regions were selected, where the sinner would find his agony shortened. The doom of this land of the aurora borealis had been to be always cursed and governed by monopolists. As it was in the beginning so would it be to the end. The despotism of the muskrat hunters, who acted under the charter granted by the Second Charles, was not of so galling and grinding a nature as that of the muskrat hunters who acted under the charter granted by the Canadian Parliament. In the first, they had been scourged by whips in the second by scorpions. It was a land without wood or water, without trees to shelter the unhappy exiles from the scorching heat of summer or in winter from the fierce winds which swept and howled in their agony over this desolate land. It was a land where, owing to the early frosts in the fall and the late frosts in the spring, agricultural operations were uncertain and precarious. The only crop to be cultivated with any certainty was that of English and Canadian idiots. It was a first-class country for Esquimaux, Greenlanders, Mennonites and Icelanders. It was also a first-class country for other human beings to emigrate from. Well, in November last I was somewhat reluctantly induced to visit the crater of this extinct volcano, this debateable ground, this land scorched by speculation, scourged by grasshoppers speculators and syndicators, this paradise of projectors, promoters and prodigal sons. We had an exceedingly pleasant journey, and it was somewhere said that we travelled in a very humble and unpretentious fashion being desirous of realising the hardships which might attend the hardy settlers on their way to the land of the setting sun. If all who make that journey do it in as pleasant and as comfortable way as we did, they can have no reasonable ground for complaint. The weather was exceedingly fine, although the season was somewhat late. We passed through portions of many of the northern States of the Union, and so far as one could judge in the cars, we were forced to come to the conclusion that the soil of our own prairie country was superior to that of the United States. We also visited some of the large cities, among them the famous city of Chicago. Some years ago this city was described by a western poet in the following terms:—

" Oh, Sodom was some and Gomorrhah was great,  
And in Venice each man's an lago,  
But the towns of the plain were free from all stain,  
Compared with that of Chicago."

We did not see this wonderful wickedness, but we saw many proofs of the intelligence, wealth, ability and enterprise of the inhabitants of that marvellous city. We crossed the headwaters of many of the great rivers of the continent, the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Columbia, the St. Lawrence, the Saskatchewan, the Assiniboine, Red River and others. The weather was exceedingly fine, and for 14 days we carefully and minutely examined our magnificent heritage and the parts thereunto adjacent almost always at the rate of 40 miles, and sometimes at the rate of 60 miles an hour. Our view was consequently somewhat of the birds-eye character, but notwithstanding the hurried nature of our visit, we were able to take in many of the broader outlines and features of the country, and from information which we received from many gentlemen with whom we were acquainted we were enabled to arrive at certain conclusions with regard to its

Mr. WRIGHT.

present position and future prospects. We spent a portion of two days in the famous city of Winnipeg, which, like all the Western States, is one of magnificent distances. Of the future growth and prosperity of the city, I think there can be no doubt. It is surrounded by an agricultural country which, when it passes out of the hands of speculators into those of actual settlers, will prove one of the richest in the world, and when its farmers adopt the system of mixed farming instead of confining themselves to one product, as at present, their success must be assured. This statement will apply to the North-West generally. The foundations of Winnipeg have been laid broad and deep, and many of its public and private edifices would be creditable to any city on the continent. When its waste places are filled up, it will be one of the foremost cities of the Dominion. It is the centre of a colossal railroad system, which of itself will secure its prosperity. It is inhabited by an active, energetic and enterprising people, who will learn wisdom and moderation in the future from lessons of the past. Our reception was of a most pleasing and kindly character. We had a most interesting and entertaining interview with His Grace Archbishop Taché, who gave us much information concerning the past history of the country, its present condition and future prospects. We had heard much from the representatives of the Farmers' Union of the despotism which was said to prevail in the syndicatorial regions. It was once said that the Government of Louis XIV was a despotism tempered by epigrams. It appeared to us that the despotism of His Majesty, Norquay I., was tempered by a public opinion still more lively and epigrammatic. Under our English system, Her Majesty's Attorney General is one of the most important functionaries. As justice constituted is the state, so the Attorney General is the special custodian and guardian of its interests. From time immemorial his function has been to see that no offender goes unwhipt of justice. Active and zealous in the discharge of his duties, this most kindly and genial gentleman, for such I believe him to be, performed this function not wisely but too well. A public meeting was held, and it was decided that sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander, and that what was good for the unhappy prisoner could not be bad for the Attorney General. You will remember that during the great French revolution a terrible cry arose in the streets of Paris of the aristocrats to the lamp post. Well, we were told that, on the day preceding our arrival, a great cry arose in the streets of Winnipeg, of the Attorney General *à la lanterne*. With a wise discretion, which proved the highest order of military ability, he made a strategical movement not unlike the famous retreat of Moreau from the Black Forest, from the land of the meteor flag to that of the stars and stripes, and by these means saved himself from an unpleasant exaltation. The next morning we left Winnipeg about 7 a.m. and reached Regina about 5 p.m. All this day we passed over a fine prairie country, and everything we saw was new to us who came from the older Provinces. The Bell farm is one of the modern agricultural marvels. We saw everywhere the tracks of the countless herds of buffaloes which once wandered over these vast solitudes; now their white skeletons dot the plains. Innumerable prairie chickens surround every wheat stack. The lakes and water-courses were literally teeming with geese and ducks and other wildfowl. On our return, we saw a herd of thousands of cattle with its attendant cowboys, on its way from Montana, to be shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Chicago. The animals seemed in excellent condition. We saw many Indians who seemed to be well fed and clothed. We were told that they were gradually acquiring the arts of agriculture, and would soon be self-sustaining. Regina, like Brandon, Moose Jaw, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Portage la Prairie, and all the other cities of the plain, is surrounded by excellent land, admirably suited

for the culture of wheat and all other products. They are centres of great agricultural districts, and their future prosperity is undoubted. When we went to bed that night, the ground was covered with snow; when the morning dawned we were in another clime. At nightfall winter lingered in the lap of autumn; in the morning spring clasped us in her warm embrace. The air was pleasant and balmy; the sun was shining brightly; the change was as though it had been caused by magic. We had reached the country where the Chinook winds exercised their benign influence. We saw some herds of antelopes, and the scenery in the vicinity of Calgary and the country drained by the Bow River was very fine. The country, so far as one could judge from the cars, was very beautiful and pleasant, and seemed to be admirably fitted for pasture. We saw the sheep ranches of Senator Cochrane, and its flocks seemed to be in good order. About noon we had our first glimpse of the Rocky Mountains. A long line of silver, marking the limit of the great prairie ocean, a long line of coast over which the white waves were perpetually breaking. As we moved along swiftly and silently, a change came over the landscape, a strange mirage appeared to pervade the atmosphere. One could understand how the famous *fata morgana* had startled the hunters and travellers in these lonely regions. As we advanced the forms which the clouds and the mountains assumed became still more strange, weird and fantastic. In the folk lore of almost every nation there is a reference to some lost city, some mysterious land, which has disappeared from sight, but which at some unexpected moment dazzles the eye of the hunter and traveller and then disappears in the same strange manner. Plato gives us a glimpse of this in his lost Island of Atlantis. In Hypatia Mr. Kingsley tells us how the fierce Berserker came from the frozen regions of the North and ascended the Hot Nile in search of the lost city of Asgard. Mr. Washington Irving has reproduced the story in his *Adelantado* of the seven cities. And there is a beautiful Irish legend which tells us how the fishermen, off the Isle of Arran, see rising from the waves the beautiful towers and gardens of Hy-Brasail, the lovely island of the blest. As we move towards that glittering mountain range, we could understand how it was that poets and painters had not even attempted to depict those mountain solitudes. With every chance of movement there came a change in the magnificent panorama which was unrolled before us. Magnificent cities, with gorgeous palaces and cloud-capped towers, and great cathedrals appeared on every side. Now the grand and substantial architecture of the great European cities loomed up before us. Then the mosques and minarets of the Orient flashed upon the sunlight—and then a marvellous mirage—a great sheet of water, a vast inland sea; and one could fancy that, rising from its lagoons, Venice in all her brightness, the peerless queen of the Adriatic, dawned upon our vision. At last we entered the great mountain range, and the contrast between the vast prairie ocean and the vast sea of mountains was so great that we are lost in wonder and awe. That mountain rampart it appeared impossible for humanity to scale or conquer. Involuntarily the words of the Second Spirit in “*Manfred*” sprang to our lips. The mountains were so gigantic and colossal, the human beings threading their recesses so weak, puny and small, we could not but imagine the genius of the place addressing us in the words of the famous invocation:

“Mont Blanc is the monarch of mountains;  
We crowned him long ago  
On a throne of rocks, in a robe of clouds,  
With a diadem of snow.

Around his waist are forests braced,  
The avalanche in his hand;  
But ere it falls, that thundering ball  
Must pause at my command.

The glacier's cold and restless mass  
Moves onward day by day;  
But I am he who bids it pass,  
Or with its ice delay.

I am the spirit of the place,  
Could make the mountains bow  
And quiver to their cavern'd base—  
And what with me would'st thou?”

Heine tells us, that once when he was in the mountains of Jura, he was so impressed with the awful sublimity and grandeur of the scene that he forgot he had been the arch mocker and scoffer, and skeptic of his age; that he had laughed at and scorned everything that men and women held in reverence and honor; that he had tarampled every system of human belief under his feet; that he had subjected everything divine to his scathing analysis and merciless criticism, but when a little child came to him with her catechism in her hand and said, “Sir, what do you believe in?” He bowed his head reverently and replied, in the words of the grand formula of the Christian faith:

“I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.”

I think that every one must experience this feeling who enters those mountain solitudes, and of necessity must look from the finite up to the infinite. On we speed through mountain passes and defiles, the Devil's Head and many a castellated crag looking down on us with grim defiance, until, sweeping by Silver City and many a mountain hamlet, we reach the line which separates the great North-West from British Columbia. Then we give three cheers for the Pacific Province; and some of us thought sadly of the kindly, able and genial gentlemen who came to us from their far off western homes, who won all hearts by their kindness, frankness, and manliness; who always defended so bravely the rights of their magnificent Province, and who, alas, too many of them, sleep the sleep that knows no waking. At last we reach the summit. It was in the dusk of the evening, “amid the gloaming and the mirk,” that we descended into the valley of the shadow of the great Columbian pass. Here the scenery was superbly grand. Above us towered the hoary and snow capped head of Mount Stephen; far, far below us was the great canyon at the bottom of which the silver thread of the river went on its flashing and dashing way to the ocean. The mountain sides were covered with shrubbery and timber, and as the shadows flitted to and fro, with every passing moment we had a change of scene. We were moving slowly along the mountain side on the verge of the dread abyss, drinking in at every pause the awful grandeur and sublimity of the scene, a whisper reached us: “Have you any dear friend in Canada you would like to see again; for if a bolt should break, or a wheel give way, your journey will be a short one.” We replied there were many in Canada whose hands we would like to clasp once more, but that to some extent we were fatalists, and quoted the old Moslem proverb:

“On two days it steads not to run from your grave:  
The appointed and the unappointed day.  
On the first, neither balm nor physician can save;  
Nor thee on the second, the universe slay.”

We also quoted the more cheerful philosophy of the Boston transcendentalist who, when a horse ran away, said that she trusted in Providence until the breeching broke, then matters became mixed and she lost confidence in things generally. We said that the Saskatchewan had so far borne us faithfully and well, and we trusted her good conduct would continue to the end. The fact that she was constructed for the directors and not for the commonalty, did not diminish our confidence in her, and if she should go back upon her record; if, at an imprudent moment, she should kick over the traces; if a coupling bolt should

break, or the breeching should give way; if *facilis est descensus* might be freely translated into a rough and tumble descent into a canyon, where could we find a quieter spot in which to await the sounding of the last trumpet? Where a more magnificent mausoleum than that great canyon? Where a grander headstone than Mount Stephen while the Columbia would chant for us a perpetual requiem, and the good Saskatchewan would clasp us lovingly in her arms, and scare the coyotes and the mountain wolves from their prey? The answer was as old as the time of Homer. You will remember that Achilles says he would rather be on earth the meanest herdsman of Admettus, than be in death the greatest king that ever reigned in Hades. A magnificent mausoleum down there may be all very fine, but I would much rather be with my poor little girl in Montreal. I may state that the danger of a descent was more apparent than real, and that it is the intention to obviate the necessity of descending this pass by the construction of a tunnel which can be done at a comparatively trifling cost. The next morning we visited the Golden City, the point where the Kicking Horse joins the Columbia River. The weather was very fine, and as we walked a portion of the way we had a very pleasant time. The scenery here is very grand. Far up the mountain side we saw tote roads over which innumerable teams were drawing supplies for the railway. Every now and then the carcass of an animal marked the spot where a mis-step had been made. We crossed the Kicking Horse eleven times, passing through four tunnels. Some of the bridges were not unlike that of Al-Sirat. In Golden City we found one of those mountain settlements so graphically described by Bret Harte. Railway men, Mounted Police, hunters, gamblers, miners and Indians form a strange social conglomerate. We saw the outcasts of Poker Flat; we shared in the luck of Roaring Camp; Miggles and Mlies appeared in bodily form before us. I wished to form the acquaintance of Brown of Calaveras, and Tennessee's partner, but as they were engaged in a protracted game of draw, whatever that might be. I could not do so. The scenery in this vicinity was very wild and grand. The white crests of the Selkirk Range in the distance, the flashing river below, the mountains raising their heads towards heaven, the strange inhabitants of Golden City—all formed a picture which Bierstadt or our own Canadian Forbes, alone could paint. Bret Harte's lines breathe the very spirit of this wild region:

“ Above the pines, the moon was slowly drifting,  
The river sang below,  
The dim Sierras far away uplifting  
Their minarets of snow.  
The roaring camp fires, with rude humor painted  
In ruddy tones of health,  
The haggard face and form of those who fainted  
In the fierce race for wealth.”

There was a little cemetery on the mountain side in which was a newly made grave. We were told that a few days before a man had passed in his cheques: that is, had been shot. It was said to have been a case of self-defence, of wild western justice. The victor had been admitted to bail, pending his trial in a higher court, and was now working in sight of the little mound which marked the spot where the vanquished was so quietly sleeping. We were much impressed with the appearance and soldierly bearing of the detachment of Mounted Police at this place, under the command of Captain Steele. We thought that these brave young Canadian soldiers were a credit to the country and the service to which they belonged. The officers appeared to be admirably fitted for their difficult and trying positions, and we were assured they were officers and gentlemen, in the highest and best sense of the word. We heard of many instances of their bravery and dauntless courage, and also of their coolness in dealing with the fierce western Indian and  
Mr. WRIGHT.

the fiercer whites of those regions; we were assured it was impossible to estimate too highly the services which this force has rendered to the cause of law and order in these western isles. I say this the more willingly, because it appears to me at this time the force is under a cloud which I trust will be soon dispelled. Here I may perhaps be permitted to say a few words regarding the railway itself. It appeared to me that the manner in which this road has been constructed through the rocky mountains was one of the modern engineering marvels; the courage, practical ability, and engineering skill, displayed in the performance of this most difficult work, is, I believe, unparalleled in railway history. In Mr. James Ross the company have secured the services of a gentleman admirably fit to cope with the difficulties of the situation. The great success achieved by him in the Rockies will doubtless be followed by like results in the Selkirk Range. So far as the railway generally is concerned, I should say that not only has it been constructed with extraordinary rapidity, but in a most substantial and workmanlike manner. The testimony of all with whom we came in contact was that the General Superintendent, Mr. Egan, and the officers generally of the western section were not only men of great practical ability, who thoroughly understood their business, and who also are endowed with a spirit of kindness and courtesy to the general public, which is worthy of all praise. The same may be said of Mr. McTavish and the officers of the Land Department. Well, we had reached the end of the track. We had had an exceedingly pleasant journey, but we had failed in one object of our mission. We expected to follow the grizzly to his lair and to obtain some of the spoils of the chase. There was a mysterious disappearance of one of our party, who wished to secure the skin of a grizzly, but his search was in vain, and he returned to us a sadder and wiser man. On our way back, we remained a few hours at Regina, where we received a warm welcome from many old friends. Thence we proceeded to Winnipeg, thence down the Kaministiquia, passing on our way that historical building, the Neebing Hotel; thence, after a pleasant voyage around that magnificent sheet of water, Thunder Bay, we landed at the prosperous town of Port Arthur. The scenery in this vicinity is exceedingly romantic and beautiful. Although the country adjoining it is somewhat broken and undulating, we were assured that in addition to its unlimited wealth it possesses in some parts agricultural capabilities not unlike those of the famous Eastern Townships. I have a vision of a splendid building composed of the red stone of that region, perched on the great eminence which overlooks that magnificent sheet of water, where letters and customs will combine to add to the prosperity of the inhabitants of this region. Thence we went to Nepigon, passing over a portion of the famous bridge which is one of the finest structures of this kind that I have ever seen. It is composed of the red stone of that region, and its appearance is very beautiful. Thence back to Port Arthur, where we had a most hearty welcome, and so home. I will give briefly my own impression of the country through which we passed. Some time ago, I read in an American paper a statement which will apply to the country we are now considering. A distinguished American statesman, who resides in the vicinity of Boston, lost by death a young and beautiful wife to whom he was devotedly attached. Brooding over her loss, he would not be comforted, although many a fair consoler offered to supply her place. With the enterprising and adventurous spirit of his race, he determined to follow her into the celestial, as Orpheus did his bride into the tropical regions. Accordingly he consulted a famous medium, who was armed with all the powers of modern mystical science, and by the process of what is termed materialisation she stood in all her pristine beauty before him. The interview was very tender and touching, and can be better imagined than

described. At length he enquired as to the intellectual culture of the inhabitants of the celestial abode, whether the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Oliver Wendell Holmes were properly appreciated and whether the system of lectures was in consonance with the civilisation of the age. Receiving satisfactory replies, he inquired as to the surroundings of the celestial city. In a tone of mingled beattitude and regret, she told him it was beautiful exceedingly, so beautiful that the imagination could not conceive nor the tongue describe it, but, she said, of course, it is not Boston. Well, one touch of nature makes the whole world kin. There is some spot on earth which is our home, some little hut among the bushes which is dearer to us than the whole world besides; and I venture to say that to-day the brave hearts from Severn and from Clyde and from the banks of Shannon who uphold the honor of England on the hot sands of Egypt, and the brave Canadian boys who uphold the honor of Canada in the frozen regions of the north, before they gather themselves together for some desperate charge, cast one lingering look towards some English, Scottish or Canadian home, some little Irish sheeling far up the mountain sides, where the dear ones at home are praying for the brave lads who have loved them, and who, they know, will win the day for their Queen and country or die, as becomes men of their race, with their face to the field and their feet to the foe. Well, notwithstanding the vast expanse of fertile prairie land, notwithstanding those magnificent mountains, notwithstanding the marvellous resources of this marvellous country, to me it is not the land of my birth, it is not the great Province of Quebec, it is not the county which I have the honor to represent. I would not advise the inhabitants of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, or British Columbia, who are at all in comfortable circumstances, to leave a certainty for an uncertainty. If they apply the same patience, perseverance, the same energy and courage, in the old land, which is necessary to success in the new, they do not require a change; but if they must leave the homes and the graves of their fathers, if the restless spirit of our race is upon them, if the blood of the old sea kings runs hotly in their veins, if the nomadic spirit impels them irresistibly to a change, if they are animated by the spirit of the grand old French missionaries and explorers and voyageurs, I would say in God's name, go forth, not to the United States, but to the land over which the old flag still flows, and where the men of the best blood of the Dominion has laid the foundation, broad and deep, of a mighty empire, where you can have every variety of soil and a salubrious climate, where you can obtain an honorable independence on the cheapest and easiest terms. Montesquieu tells us that the lands which a man inhabits, the air he breathes, the mountains and rivers which are his neighbors, the climate and all the impressions which result from it—in a word, the external world—exercises upon him the greatest influence. He says: "Give me the map of a country, its configuration, its climate, its waters, its natural productions, its geology, its botany, all its physical geography, and I pledge myself to tell you what will be the man of that country and what place that country will occupy in history." It appears to me there can be no doubt of the place the North-West will occupy in history. It must, of necessity, be a great one. I was forced to come to the conclusion that in that country we had a land where many millions of the toilers and proletarians of the old country could find happy homes; and I have great authorities for coming to this conclusion. Their Excellencies Lord Dufferin and the Marquis of Lorne, specially studied this country with the view of understanding its capabilities for colonisation and settlement; and they were convinced that it was admirably adapted for both. Then the members of the British Association, who visited that country last fall,

tell us the same story; then, every member of our House who has gone there confirms their statements. A gentleman of my own acquaintance, who, for 20 years, was a neighbor, Mr. John Mather, of whose integrity, judgment, and reliability, there can be no doubt, has assured me those statements are literally correct; and when I was in the North-West I formed the acquaintance of a gentleman, whose name is a household word through that region, and who, I believe, has done us yeoman services during this emergency, Mr. Taylor, the American Consul at Winnipeg, who assured me, as he has assured the public in his speeches and writings, that in that great North-West we have the wheat fields of the world. I was forced to come to the conclusions that in that country we have a land of which the Dominion may be proud. It is a land inhabited by a people in the very flush and prime of manhood, the very flower of the Canadian people; a land where the weather is at times exceedingly cold, but at the same time bracing and healthy. Its inhabitants bear upon their countenances the impress of its healthfulness, whose women have exceedingly lovely and rosy complexions, and the men are pictures of health and manhood. I told them I thought in that healthy and bracing climate they had discovered the fountain of perpetual youth which Ponce de Leon sought so long in vain. It is a land where a man of moderate means and courage and perseverance can obtain an honest independence on the cheapest and easiest terms, where the toilers of the world can stand erect and call no man master. I would advise everyone who wishes to escape from the sorceries of this western enchantress not to enter within her borders; she casts a glamor upon all who do so, and makes them perpetually her slaves. It was said of the Norman nobles who were sent to conquer Ireland, that they became so enchanted with the beauty of the green isle, the loveliness of the women, and the bravery of the men, that they became more Irish than the Irish themselves. So I think it will be with all who enter our western domain. I trust that all who do so will have as pleasant a trip as I have had, and leave the country with as many pleasant and kind recollections.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. POPE. I propose, after the word "dollars," in the 5th line, to amend by inserting the words "or equivalent thereof in sterling money of Great Britain."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. POPE. I propose also to strike out the words "and also including the interests of the company in railway lines leased to it." This includes leased lines, which will be covered by the bonds which it is proposed to issue, and consequently the rights of the company in the leased lines would be kept by these bonds during their currency for 50 years. The object is, that the company may hold their leases on these lines. It does not change the hold of the Government in the slightest degree, until the whole amount of the loan is paid in. There can be no object in the world in having these as security for the bonds; in fact, I believe that it will not enhance the value of the bonds, though it may be a great drawback to the company.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, of course, a consequential amendment is to be made, creating a lien, I suppose in the same shape as the Algoma branch.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. But that plan will have this result, that the general public, whom it is proposed to invite to take these bonds, will have a less security than as arranged under the resolutions and under the Bill as it now stands,

and all those inconveniences which were suggested as possible to follow from the statement of the company, as to the importance of the leased lines to the whole enterprise, will follow, in so far as the public takers are concerned. I do not intend to renew the discussion, but simply to re-state the proposition which was made the other day, and which I understood had been conceded, which was, that according to the company's statement many times repeated, and particularly according to their report, and the speech of their president the other day, the leased lines were essential to the proper and profitable working of the enterprise. These essential attributes to the proper and profitable working of the enterprise it is proposed not to embrace in the security to be offered to the public takers of the bonds, and by consequence it is intended so far to render the bonds less inviting.

Mr. POPE. I may say that, from information the company have got, they think it will not render the bonds less valuable, but that it will be more difficult to dispose of them without this arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that the company is of opinion that the fact of the bonds being a charge on these leased railways will affect the sale of the bonds, on the ground that it will be considered in England that they are more or less responsible for the rental of these leased roads. I do not see the argument myself, but that is the reason given; and the company express very strongly their belief that, from the habits of the people who deal in these kinds of things, the fact of there being a mortgage on these leased lines, which lines are subject to the rental which is to be paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway, complicated matters with the Canadian Pacific Railway so much that it will operate against the ready sale of the bonds. Of course, we can have no objection to assisting them in the sale of their bonds as far as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has, on one question, at least, differed from the Canadian Pacific Railway; but though he does differ from them, he still yields to their wishes notwithstanding; and it is just possible that this is not the only difference of opinion, in which, notwithstanding, the views of the Canadian Pacific Railway may prevail. The hon. gentleman says he wants to assist them sell their bonds. Well, I presume the English negotiators of bonds—I admit they have been fooled very often, it is true—well, I admit they have been fooled very often; but I presume they have an ordinary measure of acuteness, and it will depend on this consideration: Do they think there is profit, direct or indirect, on these leased lines or not? If they do, they may think the loss of the bonds will affect them injuriously. Surely, if they think the leased lines are an encumbrance on the main enterprise, they would rather be without them. Either one of two things—the report is true, or the bonds must be less inviting to the public.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think so. The road is free from encumbrance, except these bonds. These bonds are the first charge on the railway. The railway is of more value than the encumbrance. They say: We have a lien here; we have not looked into the security; we are satisfied with having a first charge on the \$35,000,000, and we do not want to see whether it is in the interest of the bondholders or not to pay the rental and keep the leased lines.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps it may be so. If it is so, it certainly is an extraordinary commentary upon the accounts we have had of the value of these leased lines. But to accomplish the result the hon. gentleman now desires to accomplish for the public investor, he says how very important it is to arrange that that obligation should not exist—in fact, that he is so much afraid that investors would not touch the bonds if they were on the leased lines at all.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say they would not touch them.

Mr. BLAKE. That they would not touch them at so good a price—that their value would be impaired if the leased lines were covered by them. We all remember the story of the worthy gentleman who had a clean piece of paper to which he appended his name, and who said that it was worth a penny a moment ago, but it was worth nothing now. This is a little like that. The leased lines are so very bad that if we stick them into the security they would only make it worth less than before. But if the investor says: I have a clean thing without these lines; there are obligations upon them and they may not be paying their way, and I may be brought in to pay their way for them; you see how important it is that there should be a clean thing for the investor, and that the accounts should be kept so that if they do not pay their way and there is a little deficiency, it should not be thrown on the main line of the railway. This investor, who has been pictured to us as so very skittish, and so very apt to shy at the security if it covers the leased lines, may say: I perceive that the Government of Canada have taken a security on those leased lines, but they do not offer them to us; how is that? Oh! we thought you would not like it; in point of fact, there is nothing in those leased lines, and you are better without them. Well, if that is so, there is a possibility of the leased lines not paying their way? Yes; we do not like to mention it, but that is the fact. Then, is it quite clear, if there is a deficiency in the leased lines, that that deficiency will not come out of us? That is what I pointed out to the hon. gentleman; I pointed out the importance of a separate arrangement. I fancy the shy investor, if he takes so shaky a security, will want to see that he is not charged in any sense with the rentals of those leased lines, in case there is a deficiency in the profits of the leased lines themselves. There is no such provision now, as I have explained. The company have declined to keep their accounts in any such way. They are keeping the accounts of the whole railway as one concern, rendering it impossible for us to tell whether the leased lines do or do not make a profit. That fusion of the main enterprise with the leased lines, which the hon. gentleman thinks will be so alarming to the public investor, has taken place, in practice, and the proposals made on this side of the House, so far to separate them as to have the accounts separate, so that they will show how much money the leased lines earn or how they are deficient, have been rejected.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is here that it is proposed to bring in the charge on the leased line, in the same manner as the charge is now kept on the Algoma branch by the Act of last Session. I propose to add the following words:—

And the interest of the company in any railway line leased to it shall also be charged with the said lien and charge to the same extent and in the same manner as if the same had been expressly included as being so charged with the property and securities mentioned in the said Act; provided, that the rights vested in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to exercise, from time to time, any powers granted to any of the companies whose lines are leased to it, may be so exercised, if and when such exercise is specially sanctioned by the Governor in Council."

On the preamble,

Mr. BLAKE. It is to be observed, after what the hon. member for West Ontario has said, that the paper which has been brought down indicates that of the sum of \$700,000, which was provided by the loan of last Session for equipment, some \$286,000 only has been applied to equipment, and the difference, \$414,000, has been applied to construction. Therefore, the proposal which is now made, one element of which is, we would give a million dollars for

rolling stock and equipment and another sum for fixed equipment, is an element which is required in consequence, admittedly now, of the provisions of last Session having been inadequate even to complete the road, according to the narrow and, to my opinion, absurd interpretation placed upon the word "complete" in the course of discussion. The \$27,000,000 was to complete. Of that \$27,000,000, \$1,700,000 was for equipment, but \$286,000 only of the \$1,700,000 has been applied to equipment; \$1,414,000, which was to be applied to equipment, has been applied to construction, and we are now giving more money to complete that equipment, which was to be provided for out of the \$27,000,000, but the sum which was to pay for that has been used in this so-called completion, leaving this equipment unprovided for.

Mr. POPE. The engineer reported that the equipment was sufficient to commence this operation. My hon. friend says that was done in May. I do not think it was; but it was done; so it is immaterial when. The hon. gentleman can understand how this \$1,000,000 is put in here to finish the furnishing of the rolling stock which the company will require after the road is fairly opened. The engineer reported at that time that there was rolling stock enough to commence operations, but not to carry on a large operation.

Mr. BLAKE. I hold in my hand—not literally, but I have it in an apartment very near here—the engineer's statement, under his own hand, made last Session, and handed to me by Sir Charles Tupper, showing the details of the estimate of \$27,000,000, and it comprised \$1,700,000 for rolling stock and the balance for construction. He then estimated that \$1,700,000 would be wanted for equipment. A little later, he declares that only \$286,000 is wanted for equipment, but the balance is required for completion, and he takes the \$1,400,000 reserved for equipment and puts it to construction; and, that being done, before the road is completed they come down and tell us that \$1,000,000 is wanted for equipment and some hundreds of thousands or millions more for fixed equipment; so it is plain that there was a playing with these estimates, and that the sum was used because it was wanted for construction. The engineer stated that he was reserving an adequate amount for completion, that is, \$1,700,000. They found they had not enough to finish, and they took \$1,400,000 and put it to completion, and now they say: We want more, and it is evident it is because the estimates of last year wholly failed to borne out, even upon the construction of the meaning of "completion," which is something you can look at but cannot go upon.

Committee rose and reported.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in, on a division.

#### SUPPLY — GOVERNMENT PRINTING AND ADVERTISING.

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

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter which is of considerable importance, with regard to the public expenditure, and at this late stage of the Session I will be as brief and as concise as possible. I have given considerable attention to the question I am about to bring before the House, and I have found that the following sums have been spent during the year for printing and advertising, outside of the regular contracts, according to the Auditor General's report—advertising, \$54,079.85; printing pamphlets, maps, etc., for the Agricultural Department, \$81,667.06; half the amount paid for the Rev. Mr. Bray's pamphlet, which was charged to

Dominion lands, \$2,500; paper used in printing pamphlets, \$27,660.79; advertising and printing for Intercolonial Railway, \$28,319; printing Civil Service list, \$7,688.74; total amount expended, \$201,915.44 altogether, outside of the sum paid to the contractors for the parliamentary and departmental printing. Before proceeding, I wish to refer to a statement made by the hon. the Minister Customs in the House the other evening, with regard to a statement which was made by myself, with reference to the amount which was paid by order of the Court of Exchequer, on a judgment given by that court, to McLean, Roger & Co., for damages sustained by them for extra printing which was given out to other parties, which should have been included in their contract. The Minister of Customs said:

"I call the attention of the committee to the error of the hon. member for Brant, quite unintentional, no doubt, in reference to the time covered by the suit entered by McLean & Roger, by which they obtained a verdict of over \$69,000. He said it covered a year of printing done during this Administration, and to prove that satisfactorily, he said the suit was not entered for a year or eighteen months after this Government came into power. The action was not entered into until a year or eighteen months after this Government came into power, and it was only after the last Session of Parliament that it was finally adjusted on the award made by the Exchequer Court. The hon. gentleman is in error in saying it covered any part of the printing done by the present Administration. I think I can establish that fact, for I have the dates and the items in my office, and will be happy to show the hon. gentleman that he is in error.

"Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I was so informed by an authority I have no reason to doubt, but if the hon. gentleman will show me, as he says he will, a convincing statement, I will be convinced. I think my authority is very good, and until I see those statements, I am not prepared to admit I am wrong.

"Mr. BOWELL. From my experience of the hon. gentleman, I do not expect him to admit that he is wrong. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the confidence he places in me. He is not prepared to accept my statement when I tell him I have the proof, but says he has the statement from a gentleman who is a good authority."

Now, when I made that statement I thought I had good authority for it, and since that time I have taken the trouble to obtain an extract from the court record, which is as follows:—

"Exchequer Court.—Alexander McLean and John Charles Roger vs. Queen.

"Action commenced by petition of right, dated 14th January, 1880. Petition filed 22nd April, 1881. Award covered from 1st October, 1874, to 31st October, 1879. Amount of award, \$69,781.43."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that the elections were held in September, 1878, and the present Government was formed in October of the same year, and consequently, according to this record, one year and one month was included in the judgment which was given by the Court of Exchequer, giving McLean & Roger damages on the account referred to. I think I have satisfactorily answered the statement which was made by the Minister of Customs, and the House will see now that he did me an injustice in making the statement he did to the House. Furthermore, I will refer to a statement which was made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) in reference to—

Mr. BOWELL. Let me ask the hon. gentleman, before he goes further—for if I have been wrong I shall be glad to be set right—if he examined the records to find what dates were included in that account from September, 1878, to October, 1879; or has he just taken the record of the dates?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have just taken a record of the dates.

Mr. BOWELL. Then, you did not examine the account to see if there was any of the work performed between the time of the elections in 1878 and 1879?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It included one year and one month of the time of the present Administration, and I fancy, from the record they have made since in giving work to outside parties, that there cannot be any doubt with regard to the amount that was given during that year and one month.

Mr. BOWELL. You verify my opinion of you.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. At all events, I think I have established the fact that the statement I made was correct. I did not refer to any amount that was done under this Administration; but I think I have established, beyond doubt, that the Minister of Customs did me an injustice in that statement, and that my statement was correct. I wish also to refer to another matter which was discussed at that time, with reference to the publication of the Report of the Geological Survey. It was stated, during that debate, by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in relation to the Geological Survey Report:

"It was originally printed, I believe, by Mr. John Lovell, of the city of Montreal. When the hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, it was transferred to the *Herald* office, the late Senator Penny and Mr. Wilson being at that time the proprietors of the Montreal *Herald*. It remained in that office until the change of Government, and then the managing director of the Montreal *Gazette*, finding that a job of this kind had been done at the Montreal *Herald* office, made application to have it done at the *Gazette* office, and it was done there; but it was done at a price very much lower, and the price now arranged to be given, and to be given for it next year, is very much lower than the price paid to the *Herald* office during the time they had it."

Furthermore, I wish to quote from the same *Hansard* a remark made by the leader of the Government, who said:

"The hon. gentleman says that the Geological Report was printed at Montreal by his directions, in consequence of the Director General living there. It was given to the Montreal *Herald* in his time at a higher price than it has been done for since by the Montreal *Gazette*."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to show the correctness of the statement I made on that occasion by an authority which I think this House will consider good; it ought not to be disputed, at least by the gentlemen who sit on the Government benches—I give the authority of the Montreal *Gazette* as to prices paid for this work in the time of the Mackenzie Administration. The Montreal *Gazette*, of the 18th April, said:

"During Mr. Mackenzie's term, and during the earlier years when it was printed by the *Gazette*, it was done at what are called confidential rates, that is, 50 cents per 1,000 ems, but the Government have recently changed this, and now pay for it at what are known as the Ontario rates, that is 35 cents."

I will also quote from the Toronto *Mail*, the Ontario organ of the Government, which said, on the 21st of April:

"It was found that the Government had simply continued the system as to the printing of the Geological Survey Reports which was inaugurated by the Mackenzie Government. The only difference under the two administrations is, that the price now paid is much less than it was in 1874-78. During the latter period the cost of printing the Geological Survey Reports was 50 cents per thousand, whereas it is now only 35 cents."

Now, I think I have established the fact by these authorities that the work was done during the Mackenzie régime at 50 cents per thousand. The Montreal *Gazette* says so, the Toronto *Mail* says so, and I believe the records of the House will say so; consequently, there cannot be any dispute with regard to that. Now, I want to show the House that the statement made by the Montreal *Gazette* and the statement made by the Toronto *Mail* are totally incorrect, and in order to do so I will refer the House to the account which is published in the Auditor General's report, page 209. The account for the work is published in full, and it shows there were 3,500 copies of the report published at the Montreal *Gazette* office. The composition was paid for at the following rates: 181,000 ems, plain, at 50 cents; 434,000 ems catalogue at 75 cents; 25,000 ems tabular at \$1. Or all told 640,000 ems at an average price of 69 cts. per thousand. I think I have established beyond a doubt the truth of the statement I made, that a very much larger price is now being paid for this work than was paid for doing it during the Mackenzie régime. I have established the fact by quotations made from the Toronto *Mail* and Montreal *Gazette*, and I may refer to the Auditor General's report to show that he also thinks an exorbitant price is paid for the

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

work. In a letter he addressed to the Director of the Geological Survey he says:

"Please let me know why your report for 1881-82 and Mr. Macoun's report, were printed at the Montreal *Gazette* office instead of by the parliamentary contractors at Ottawa. I estimate the difference in cost at \$790.10."

I think I have established beyond doubt that the statements I made, with respect to this work given to the Montreal *Gazette*, were correct; and therefore I leave that branch of the subject. I now desire to call the attention of the House to another matter which is referred to in the Auditor General's report, and has been referred to in this House before, and that is, the printing of the Civil Service list by the St. Hyacinthe *Courier*. The Auditor General has endeavored on several occasions, as can be seen by letters which are to be found in his report of last year and the year previous, to overcome the difficulty which has arisen with respect to the prices to be paid by the Government for printing given to outside parties. The Auditor General, I suppose, is endeavoring to discharge his duty in this matter, and he has had some difficulty in bring the Government to believe that he is right, or, at all events, to agree with him in the position he has taken, with respect to payments to be made for this class of work. The printing of the Civil Service list amounts to a large sum of money. The Government saw fit to purchase for the proprietor of the St. Hyacinthe *Courier* the type to be used in the publication of those lists, at a cost of \$3,931.12, which ought to have been given to the regular contractor at much lower rates. The Auditor General calls the attention of the Under Secretary to the fact that \$1,857.34 were charged in excess of the prices which the regular Government contractors could have charged under their contract. But, contrary to the opinion expressed by the Auditor General, that this amount should be deducted from the account rendered by the St. Hyacinthe *Courier*, the Treasury Board, after considering the matter, decided that the ruling of the Auditor General should be set aside, and that this money should be paid to that newspaper, in spite of the protest entered by the Auditor General. I observe that the Secretary of State has another pet this year. The report of the Chinese commission was given to the Montreal *Minerve*, and was printed by that journal. In the Supplementary Estimates I find the sum of \$4,369.60 provided for the payment of that work. I have not had an opportunity to examine that account, but I am perfectly satisfied the work has been done at what are called confidential rates, and the prices paid are very largely in excess of the prices at which it would have been done by the regular parliamentary contractors. I believe an hon. member of this House is interested, if not directly, indirectly, in that newspaper, which is published in the city of Montreal. The Minister of Militia has also his pets, and two years ago he purchased type for Mr. Foote, of the Quebec *Chronicle*, for his use in printing the militia list. I find this year that the militia list has again been issued in the same form, and, I suppose, by the same party. Furthermore, I observe, in addition to publishing it in that shape, the Minister of Militia has seen fit to publish the same list in his report. He has had the type reset at Ottawa, and the list forms a large number of pages, and thus adds to the cost of the report. I can understand readily why he directed the work to be given to his friend in Quebec. That, I suppose, was to be considered as a legitimate perquisite, and it seems to have been not only necessary that the information should be thus printed in special form, but that the Minister should have it printed in Ottawa, and embodied in his annual report. I fail to see any necessity for extravagance of this kind being perpetrated by the Government. A few words with respect to the advertising given by the Government to the newspapers. Any hon. member who gives the subject the

slightest attention must come to the conclusion that a great deal of extravagance is indulged in by the Government in dispensing advertising patronage to the Canadian newspapers. The advertising given out last year by the Government, according to the Auditor General, amounted to \$54,079.85. I will give some of the items: *Belleville Intelligencer*, the organ of the Minister of Customs, \$271.86; *Bertin News*, \$232.82; *Brockville Times*, \$206.80; *Montreal Gazette*, \$737.70; *Montreal Herald*, \$246; *Shareholder*, \$719.90; *Star*, \$619.80; *Quebec Chronicle*, \$808.31; *Toronto Mail*, \$1,278.55; and other amounts in proportion, I suppose, to the importance and influence of the organs of the Government. In the city of Ottawa, I find that the *Citizen* got \$515.17, and the *Investigator* \$147.90.

Mr. LISTER. What paper is that?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). There is something strange about that paper. It is a paper which I find is published semi-occasionally in the city of Ottawa. It makes its appearance once a year, when the House is about to meet, and I have here a specimen of this publication. Its editorials are devoted to lauding the good qualities of some particular Ministers of the Crown—and I have no doubt they are possessed of many good qualities—and in speaking in high terms of praise of their abilities as Ministers of the Crown. You see the size of this journal, and I do not think it circulates to any great extent outside of this building. I know we are all favored with one copy when we come here, but I never happen to see another after the first. This little journal, I find, contains an advertisement from the Department of Public Works, another from the Department of Agriculture, another from the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands, another from the Department of Public Works, another from the Department of Marine, another with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, another from the Department of Public Works, another from the Post Office Department, and another from the Department of Inland Revenue. Now, I think that is a very good exhibit for the little *Investigator*, and for the work that journal performed last year it was paid the sum of \$147.90. Then the *Regina Leader* got \$1,710.68, and I think I may refer to an account which was rendered by that journal.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the editor?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin is the editor, and he seems to be a particular favorite with the present Government. I find in the Auditor General's report, page 367, that the *Regina Leader* rendered an account for the publication of mining regulations, and in one charge which helps to make up the amount I mention, I see that the Queen's Printer has seen fit to raise the amount of the account which was rendered, that gentlemen evidently thinking that the *Regina Leader* man knew nothing about his own business, that he did not charge enough, and consequently he increased the price \$31.93. I find that he dealt in the same liberal way with the *Winnipeg Times*, the account of that paper for publishing the mining regulations having been raised \$35.78. Furthermore, I find that the *Brandon Mail* rendered an account for the same work, and that the Queen's Printer raised the number of lines which the proprietor of that journal charged for, and he was paid a larger sum than he demanded in the first place. I think it must be admitted, from these facts, that this Government acts in a very paternal way with regard to their newspapers, and it is also evident that the officers of the Government have an idea that the men who publish newspapers in support of the Government do not know their own business, and do not know how to charge enough, and when their accounts are brought down to the Department, they are raised to the sum which the Government thinks they are entitled to receive. That certainly is very generous treatment. I would just say, in connection with

this matter, that I believe a vast amount of money is being squandered annually by this system of advertising. When they advertise for contracts to be let, the advertisements are distributed all over the Dominion, whether there is any chance or not of the advertisements proving of any benefit to the Government or to the country. I think there is a fearful waste of money in this regard, and it is evident that the money is spent more for the purpose of subsidising the organs of the Government than benefiting the public service. Besides this amount of \$54,079.85, which I have referred to as having been paid for advertising by the several Departments, I find that \$28,319 was paid for advertising and printing for the Intercolonial Railway. This work was dispensed among the organs of the Government in the Maritime Provinces principally, some of them receiving very large amounts of money, footing up, in some cases, to \$1,000 for this work. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House to some facts in connection with the work which is given out by the Department of Agriculture. I find the following statement in the *Ottawa Citizen* of the 22nd April, headed "Facts about the Pamphlets":

"The number of publications issued and circulated by the Department of Agriculture in 1884 was, at all points, 2,597,579. The total cost of this service was, in the calendar year, \$80,066.01, including paper and all charges for freight."

By referring to the Auditor General's report, I find that the *Ottawa Citizen* made a mistake of only \$27,660.79. That can probably be easily accounted for by the fact that the *Ottawa Citizen* is one of the favorites of the Government, and receives its proportion of patronage, sometimes in a very liberal way. This year the proprietors of that paper have not been favored so extensively as in former years, but they received an advance, amounting to \$1,600, for work which was not done, which was not delivered, and of which no account can be given. In addition to that, they were paid over \$500 for advertising, amounting in the whole, to over \$2,100 in the past year. I do not wonder so much at the *Citizen's* statement, which I have read from that journal, and which I have conclusively proven to be incorrect. It is evident that it is the intention of the organs of the Government, the *Montreal Gazette*, the *Toronto Mail* and the *Ottawa Citizen*, to misrepresent everything they possibly can with regard to this printing matter; but I feel it to be my duty, as a member of this House, to reveal the facts in connection with the matter, so that the country will thoroughly understand them. And in connection with the publications issued by the Department of Agriculture, I do not believe that they are issued in a way which will be of benefit to the country. I have been astonished, ever since I have been a member of this House, at the way in which this literature is given out to members of this House, to be circulated throughout Ontario and the other Provinces. We are told that this literature is prepared and printed at great cost, for the purpose of inducing immigrants to come here, and when we come down here, we find some members busily engaged in this House, during three months, in directing pamphlets, which have been printed by the order of the Department of Agriculture, to their own constituents. I think it is safe to say that tons and tons of this literature, which is supposed to be published to induce immigrants to come to this country, is sent by members to their constituents, to show them that they remember them here. Now, I think this system ought to be put a stop to. I do not think it does either the members themselves or their constituents any good, or tends to increase the population of this country, to circulate that kind of literature in this country. If it is to be circulated, it ought to be circulated in countries from which it is expected to obtain immigrants. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to some of these publications, and to give some particulars as to the price at which they have been printed, and the number of editions that have been published. I think it is important that the

House should be put in possession of these facts, which I have gone to considerable trouble to collect; and I wish to state here, from my experience in the newspaper and printing business, that I am positive the statements I am going to make are strictly true in every respect, and are incontrovertible. I ask the criticism of any gentleman in this House or out of it upon them, and I defy any contradiction of the figures I am about to give. Of the tenant farmers' report, there were a large number of editions printed; and in order to show how this patronage was dispensed, I wish to state that the journal to which I shall refer first, the *Hamilton Spectator*, is the property of a company composed of Messrs. Southam & Carey, and some other gentlemen, and that the same firm own a job printing office, connected with the *Toronto Mail* newspaper. I find that in July, 1883, that company received an order for 50,000 copies of the tenant farmers' report, for which they were paid \$3,134.40. In May, 1884, they received another order for 53,000 copies, for which they were paid \$3,458.86. The *Toronto Mail* job office, which is owned by the same company, also received an order, in May, 1884, for 51,158 copies of the same publication, which cost \$3,126.04. Then I find that an account was rendered by the *Spectator* company, without any date, for 51,479 copies, for which they were paid \$2,979.99. I presume that the date was the same at which the other order was given to the same company for the same work. The Auditor General, in his report, notes that no date was attached to this account. Then, the same company were favored with the publication of what is known as the Guide Book. On the 26th of June, 1883, they delivered 54,000 copies of that book, for which they received \$3,205.08. On 18th August, 1883, they had another order for 31,000 copies, for which they were paid \$1,992.81, and I find that to this amount must be added \$1,500, which they drew during the previous year on account, and which was referred to in the Auditor General's previous report. The total amount paid for this work, to the *Spectator* company, was \$17,897.18; and they also received advertising, in addition, to the amount of \$301.02; so that the total amount which went to the *Hamilton Spectator* company during the last year, for printing and advertising, was \$18,198.20. Now, I wish to go into some of the details of this account. There was paid for composition, at 35 cents a thousand, on those orders, \$747.04, which would have cost, at the contractors' price, 10 cents a thousand, \$71.20; so that the excess paid to the *Spectator* company on composition was \$675.84. They were paid for press work, 20,865 tokens, at 30 cents., \$6,259.50. They were allowed to charge for 20,865 tokens of 250 impressions each—because that is what a token means—when only 10,433 tokens were printed, which the contractors would have done for 10 cents a token, amounting to \$1,043.30; so that the excess paid to the *Spectator* company was \$5,216.20 on press work alone. Now, I cannot see why those journals which are favored with the patronage of the Government should be allowed to charge for work which they do not perform. I see by the accounts which have been rendered that they are not only allowed to charge for double the amount of work they actually performed, but they are paid for it at 30 cents a token, whereas the Government contractors are only allowed to charge 10 cents a token, which I consider is a gross outrage. For stitching, covering, folding in maps, etc, the *Spectator* company charged \$10,425 for the tenant farmers' report and the guide book. This work could have been contracted for, at ordinary binder's rates, for say, \$7 per 1,000, or \$2,030, which shows an excess paid for binding to the *Spectator* company of \$8,395. So that they received on these jobs a total excess of \$13,287.04 over the regular prices on work which cost \$17,897.18. It was not only necessary to feed the *Hamilton Spectator* at the rate of \$18,000 a year, but this same tenant farmers' report was given to the *Montreal Herald* office; for I find

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

that on the 19th of February, 1884—I believe that was before the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) became proprietor of that journal—the *Montreal Herald* received an order for 50,000 copies of this same pamphlet which was printed by the *Hamilton Spectator*, for which it was paid \$2,767.20, at the same extravagant rates which were paid to the *Hamilton Spectator*. I find that the Government not only dispenses this patronage to the journals which support them, but they do not forget their other friends, for I find that the Allan Steamship Company, which has recently been subsidised to the extent of \$126,000 a year for carrying the mails—which is considered by those who know what that service is worth, to be double what ought to be paid for it—is favored by having its advertisements placed in these pamphlets free of any charge. It is not in the interest of the country that the Allan line should be favored above all other steamship lines, by having their advertisements printed and circulated at the expense of the Government. Now, I will devote a little attention to the patronage which has been given to the *Montreal Gazette*. I find the *Gazette* was favored with the printing of a pamphlet on British Columbia during the past year, and published five editions of that pamphlet—a 32-page pamphlet, with cover and map. The account was rendered 5th October, 1883, for 185,000; in January, 1884, 140,000; in March, 1884, 54,000; in April, 1884, 56,000; in June, 1884, 25,250; or, all told, in a little over eight months, five editions, amounting to 460,250 copies, at a cost of \$9,211.15. I find that the composition of these pamphlets was paid for four times, although stereotype plates were used in the printing, and the composition was paid for at 35 cents per 1,000, which, multiplied by 4, makes the total amount paid at the rate of \$1.40 per thousand, fourteen times more than the contractors' rate, 10 cents per thousand. I admit the amount paid for composition is not very much, because it was not a large pamphlet. It was composed of 32 pages and contains 185,000 ems, but still the difference paid the *Montreal Gazette*, as contrasted with the contractors' rates, amounted to \$117.30. There was paid for press work for these pamphlets, 11,046 tokens at 30 cents, \$3,313.80, when only 5,523 tokens were actually printed, which the contractor would have charged for at 10 cents per token, or \$552.30, showing an overcharge of no less than \$2,761.50 on press work over and above what the contractors would have charged, or five times the contractor's price. For binding 460,250 copies, the price charged was \$4,768.02, and the work could be done for \$4 per thousand in any bindery, which would amount to \$1,841, or an excess paid on binding of \$2,927.02. The following are the overcharges to which I have just referred:—

Excess paid on binding.....	\$2,927 02
“ “ composition .....	117 30
“ “ press work.....	2,761 50
	<u>\$5,805 82</u>

Thus, on a work which cost, all told, \$9,211.15, there is an overcharge of \$5,805.82 over and above the ordinary business profit. But this was not all the *Montreal Gazette* got during the past year, in the way of Government pap, as the Public Accounts reveal the following payments:—

For pamphlets for Immigration Department..	\$9,211 15
Printing Geological Report.....	2,876 14
“ reports on fossil plants.....	126 45
“ proceedings Royal Society.....	5,321 29
Advance for work in process.....	1,500 00
Advertising .....	737 70
	<u>\$19,772 73</u>

And I find there was an advance made on the work in progress, and in this regard the *Gazette* is in the same position as the *Ottawa Citizen*. It is very convenient for the organs to have the Dominion Government acting in the capacity

of their banker. When hard up they draw on the Government for sums ranging from \$500 to \$1,500. The *Gazette* drew for work in progress \$1,500, and received for advertising \$737.07, making a total of \$19,772.73, for printing and advertising, as the total amount the *Gazette* received. It is said I have no right to put in this amount the sum paid for printing the proceedings of the Royal Society. True, that account was not rendered in the name of the *Gazette*, but the order was given to Dawson Bros, of Montreal, who get their printing done at the *Gazette* office, and this report was printed there, because it bears the imprint *Gazette*. It must be admitted that the *Gazette* had to furnish the paper, to print the book, and to pay for the binding; and by the accounts rendered the Government it is impossible to say how much was paid for binding and paper. Take off \$1,772.73 for the paper which was used in the publishing of the book, and for the binding, and that is double the amount which might properly be allowed for it—the Montreal *Gazette* pocketed, during last year, \$18,000 for printing and advertising. I do not know that the “exigencies of party” require that the *Gazette* should be paid this exorbitant sum for Government printing. It is not in the interest of the country or to the credit of the Government that they should pay these large subsidies to the chief organs in Montreal and elsewhere. Furthermore, I believe there is an Act in force with regard to the independence of Parliament, in which it is provided that no member of the House shall have any interest in a Government contract. I do not say that any member of the House is directly interested in the *Gazette*, but I believe it is the general opinion that a gentleman who occupies a seat here has some indirect interest in that paper. It does not add to the independence of Parliament that by the organisation of a company a member of this House can have an interest in Government patronage, and that these exorbitant prices should be paid. Now, I find that the Quebec *Chronicle* has been favored again. It was not sufficient that the hon. Minister of Militia should purchase type for Mr. J. J. Foote, of the Quebec *Chronicle*, to enable him to print Militia lists, and he was favored with four editions of the pamphlet “What Farmers Say,” from 10th April 1883, to February, 1884, and the actual amount paid to the Quebec *Chronicle* was \$3,780.46. The composition was paid for, considering the number of editions published, at \$1.13 instead of 10 cents, or 11 times the contractors’ price. The press work was paid for at 30 cents instead of 10 cents, and for double the quantity of work actually performed. I will not refer to very many more of these interesting accounts, but there is one document which deserves particular attention, and that is the pamphlet which you all had an opportunity of seeing here the other evening, when it was produced by the member for Queen’s P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the celebrated National Policy pamphlet, published by the Rev. A. J. Bray, of Montreal. There is a history connected with this pamphlet. I have authority for stating that the speculation was entered into in the city of Montreal by the Rev. Mr. Bray and some associates, for the purpose of getting up an advertising scheme. They formed a company for that purpose, and, after having soliciting orders for and obtained a large number of advertisements, they thought it would be advisable to draw upon the Government for a slice. The Rev. A. J. Bray had been of service to the Government in many respects in times past; he was a friend of the Government, and he naturally thought the Government would be very likely to patronise his little book. It is not necessary for me to refer to the contents of that book. It has been shown that, instead of being useful as a medium for securing immigration to this country, it was worse than useless. It has been asserted that Mr. Stewart, of Montreal, now the publisher of the *Times*, was interested in the publication. The Minister of Agriculture stated the other night that he gave the order for this work to Mr. Stewart. I will not dispute the correctness of

that, but Mr. Stewart was acting as the agent of the Rev. A. J. Bray in this transaction, and he did not secure any of the plunder for this job. He tendered, as all the newspaper and job offices in Montreal tendered for it. His happened to be the lowest tender, and he received the work, but he received no portion of the plunder which was given to the Rev. A. J. Bray in connection with the publication of this pamphlet. It appears to me that the Government must have been ashamed of this matter themselves, for the simple reason that I find, by the records of the House, that it was ordered by the First Minister that 2,500 copies of this work should be charged to the Dominion Lands Department. It was rather too much for the Minister of Agriculture to carry such a load as the payment of \$1 a piece for 5,000 copies of this publication. I believe the whole \$5,000 was wasted, because I do not think it was any benefit to the country to have that publication circulated. It may have been a benefit to the hon. gentlemen whose portraits were given to the public and whose characters were depicted in such glowing terms in a few pages of that pamphlet, but in the interests of the country I do not think it was necessary that the publication should have been purchased at all by the Government; and I will state that, after figuring on the work, I find that the Government paid, in excess of the actual value of that publication, no less than \$3,500 to the Rev. A. J. Bray. This order to the Rev. A. J. Bray is about on a par with the job which was given to the Stephenson Brothers in the town of Chatham, that is, the publication of the report of the Royal Commission in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be remembered that the Messrs. Stephenson, who are sons of a gentleman who now holds an office under the Dominion Government in the North-West, and who was at one time the member for Kent in this House, and a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, received the order for printing this Royal Commission report; that they never touched the work, never set a type in connection with the publication of that work, never read a proof, never handled the copy in any way whatever; but they were favored with the order for that work, and came to Ottawa and handed the work over to the Government contractors, who did it at their regular rates, I suppose, or probably more than their regular rates, taking it second hand. At any rate, the Messrs. Stephenson pocketed \$3,000 in clear cash for this work which they never touched. This was a wilful waste of the public money, and this matter of giving the Rev. Mr. Bray \$3,500 more than the pamphlet actually cost was also a wilful waste of the public money. There is another interesting job which I wish to refer to, and this is probably the most interesting of all the interesting jobs I have referred to as yet. It appears that the Government or the Minister of Agriculture deemed it was necessary, in the interest of his Department and in the interest of the country at large, that this Government should publish a pamphlet in German, and they looked about to find some man who would undertake the work. It happened that they struck Mr. H. W. Bennett, of the Prescott *Messenger*. I do not know how it came about that he was picked out among all the newspaper men of the country for the publication of a German pamphlet, for it must be obvious to the House that he was in no way in a position to publish German work. It was stated in another place in this House that before he got this order he was interviewed, or he interviewed some member of the Government in regard to this work, and he was promised the work if he would furnish his office with German type. It is well known to every member of this House that Prescott is not in a German settlement, and that there are very few, if any, Germans within the reach of the circulation of the Prescott *Messenger*, and that no German work is required to be printed in that neighborhood; and it seems strange that the Government should pitch upon Mr. H. W. Bennett to do

this work; but, at any rate, they did, and we find that he was favored with two orders for the guide book in German. In September, 1883, he received an order for 30,000 copies, for which he was paid an advance of \$379.70 previous to the delivery. For this order he was paid \$4,107.50. The composition was allowed at \$1 per thousand. It is well known to every practical printer in the country that German composition is charged for at no greater prices than English composition, and that a German newspaper man charges the same for the composition in German as the proprietor of an English newspaper would charge for the composition in English. But we find that this favorite of the Government was allowed \$1 per thousand for composition, and was allowed for press work at 30 cents. In May, 1884, he got another order for 20,000 more of this pamphlet, for which he was paid \$2,764.15, and for the composition again at \$1 per thousand, and the same for press work; he was allowed to charge, like all the others, for double the amount of press work that he actually did. Well, after this matter came up in the Public Accounts Committee, I received a letter from a German publishing house in the county of Waterloo. The proprietors of that journal asked me to send them a copy of this German pamphlet, and a copy of the account which was rendered to the Government. I complied with their request, because I wanted to have some one to back me up in the statements I was about to make to the Public Accounts Committee and to this House, in regard to these printing accounts, and I received a letter from the publishers of that German newspaper, in which they say that "after a careful calculation the work can be done here for \$1,800;" and the letter further says "that the foreman of another office in the same town also made an estimate and he arrived at the same figure." Now, it will be seen, as I have said, that the total cost of this work was \$6,871.65. The sum this work would have cost if the order had been given to any German printer in this country would have been \$1,800, which shows that the excess paid on this job was no less than \$5,071.65. The excess paid on this one pamphlet would buy a steam press, a steam engine, and all the type that would be required to furnish the office of the *Prescott Messenger*. In giving this work to the *Prescott Messenger* the Government presented to the proprietor of that paper enough money to buy his office and furnish it with all the material he requires in his business, together with a power press and a steam engine to drive it. I do not know that I will particularise any more of these jobs, but I will just call the attention of the House to some of the statements that were made by the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches when they were in the cold shades of Opposition, with regard to the course they would pursue if they were ever favored with the confidence of the people of this country again. I find that Sir Leonard Tilley, in the election contest of 1878, stated as follows:—

"Had the Government of which he was a member been in power during the last five years, he was satisfied that the average expenditure would not have exceeded 22½ millions, where the Mackenzie Government had levied 24 millions."

I find that Sir Charles Tupper, in a speech in the House, before the election, in 1878, said:

"I trust I have satisfied the House that it is not a question of high or low taxation any further than this, inasmuch as we governed the country with smaller taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without these extravagant expenditures which have been made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power. All that we ask is, not that the taxation of the people shall be increased—because we do not require so much money as hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future; but that the money shall be levied in such a way as will furnish employment for the people and provide the means of having the taxation which is levied upon them."

Now, I am not going to enter into a discussion of the subject opened up by these statements. I am not going to refer to

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

the fact that they have failed to furnish employment to the people, and therein they have failed to provide the people with the means of paying the taxation which is levied upon them. They have kept their promises by increasing the annual expenditure of the Dominion from twenty-three and a half millions to thirty-three and a-half millions! This is a fair sample of the economy practised by those hon. gentlemen, after all the professions they made before the elections of 1878. Then I find that Sir Charles Tupper said in the House, while in Opposition:

"I say the Government have no right to have a surplus. If they have a surplus, they should endeavor to get rid of it by lightening the taxes on the people."

Well, they have had surpluses, but they have not carried out the doctrine which was laid down by Sir Charles Tupper. They have been boasting of their surpluses for years past, but they were obtained by imposing an exorbitant taxation on the people of this country. I would like to ask what they have done with their surpluses? They have got rid of them, not by reducing taxation, but by extravagant expenditure in every department of the public service; by creating offices for relations of their own and for relations of their political friends; by giving extravagant aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; by bonusing purely local railways, to keep their supporters solid, and by giving large grants to railways in which members of the Government themselves are interested. Now, Sir, I do not think it is right that the people's money should be expended in dispensing advertising patronage to organs of the Government, and subsidising them in this manner. I do not think it is in the interests of the newspapers themselves. A newspaper that has to be fed in this way at the public crib does not deserve the confidence of the people. I say it destroys its own influence—though it may not destroy its influence with the Government—but it destroys its own influence in the community where it circulates. On several occasions we have had notable instances of the influence which was possessed by independent journals, journals which are not afraid to speak their own mind. I would just refer incidentally to the noble instance which was furnished by the *Montreal Witness* two years ago, when, in the interests of the public who travel by sea it ventured to expose in its columns the treatment which had been received by immigrants who came over in the Allan line of steamers. It is well known that the Allan Company is a powerful corporation—it is probably the most wealthy to be found in Canada. It has great influence in Montreal, and it has great influence with the Dominion Government, as we have found in times past. That company saw fit to enter a suit against the *Witness* for \$50,000 damages for having libelled, as they said, the company, by publishing the article complained of, showing the public that the company was not treating immigrant passengers by their steamships in a proper way. The suit was fought out in the courts, and to the credit of the jury which tried the case it found a verdict for the defendants. If the *Montreal Witness* had been a subservient journal, if it had been fed with Government pap, if it had been fed with Allan line pap, if it had depended for its life upon any Government or corporation, as these organs seem to depend upon this Government for life and subsistence every day, it could not have had independence to make the statement it did make in the interest of the public at large. That was a notable instance of what a free, untrammelled and independent press can do for the benefit of the people. Where do we find the organs of the Government, the *Montreal Gazette*, *Toronto Mail*, *Hamilton Spectator*, *Regina Leader*, all those journals which are fed so systematically by this Government? We find them constantly praising this Government. Every iniquity practised by this Government is ignored by those journals. They see eye to eye with the Government on every public

question under discussion. We have had noteworthy instances of this during this Session and last Session. We found, notwithstanding the fact that this Government was wasting the public money, by expending extravagant sums in aiding railways, for the purpose of consolidating their following in this House—that the Government was advancing immense sums to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and this year has been doing the same thing—those organs all sang the same tune. They never can criticise fairly any action of the Government, but they sink their independence completely. They lose their influence, or ought to lose it, with the intelligent electors of the Dominion. During this Session, notably in the case of the Franchise Bill, those organs have made some queer statements. The *Montreal Gazette*, as has been stated by the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had—I was going to say independence, but I hardly think that word would be applicable; but it did state with respect to that Bill, especially the clause relating to Indians, that if the Bill really meant what was said by Opposition organs that journal would oppose the measure. It was proved in this House that the Bill did really mean what the Opposition organs said. We had the evidence of the leader of the Government himself that the Opposition interpreted the Bill properly. Did the *Montreal Gazette* have sufficient independence, after this was made plain, to carry out the resolution which it made—that it would oppose the Bill if it contained any such provisions? Not a bit of it. The *Montreal Gazette* was whipped into line, as all the organs are, if ever they manifest the slightest independence. The *Montreal Gazette*, *Toronto Mail*, *Hamilton Spectator* and *London Free Press*, and all those journals receiving patronage from the Government, sang the same tune. They misrepresented a great deal of what was said in this House by the Opposition, and from day to day, week to week, month to month, during that discussion, they misrepresented the Bill, the views expressed by the Opposition, and they sustained the Government which paid them for doing so. We may have a partisan and subservient Senate, as I believe we have; we may have a corrupt Government, as I believe we have; we may have a venal House of Commons, as I believe we have; but with all these, if we were possessed of a free and independent press, the country might hope, in time, to throw off all those barnacles from the ship of State and eventually secure honest government.

An hon. MEMBER. Like the Government in Ontario.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). We have it in Ontario—that is where we have honest government. But when the press of the country is a purchasable and purchased press, there is not much safety for the Dominion. When public opinion is led by men who are openly bribed to mislead and misrepresent public questions, there cannot be much hope of the purification of the public service. I hope the facts I have presented to-night will be of service to the Government and of service to the newspapers to which I refer. It would be more to their credit if they acted in a different manner with respect to this printing question. I know for a fact that after the first Session I was down here, after I took a little trouble to investigate the accounts and expose the jobs being constantly perpetrated, immediately afterwards there was a perfect swarm of proprietors of newspapers round the office of the Minister of Agriculture, asking him for pity's sake to give them a little patronage. I have no doubt that he was induced to dispense a little more patronage than he otherwise would have done had not an exposure been made. But I hope, for the future, the members of the Government will see that it is their duty to conserve the interests of the people and be a little more economical in their expenditure in this regard.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We had a threshing bee in another place over the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and having at that time pretty thoroughly separated the wheat from the chaff, I do not propose at this time to detain the House more than a few moments, while I refer to two or three of the more palpable mistakes into which the hon. gentleman has fallen. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has dealt with three classes of patronage—as he calls it—which is given to some of the newspapers of this country. The first of these is the printing of the Report of the Geological Survey; and what I want to point out in regard to that is, that the Geological Survey Report forms no part of the contract for the public printing, but is expressly, by arrangement with the contractors themselves, exempted from it, and for the reason that the work is of a character which it was believed by those in charge of the Geological Survey Department could not be done, or ought not to be done, in the same style as our ordinary Blue Books are printed. I think, if the hon. gentleman has looked at the volumes of the Geological Reports—I do not say as they are printed now, but as they have been printed during the last ten or twelve years—and will compare them with the ordinary Blue Books of Parliament, he will admit at once that there is a vast difference in the character and style of the work, and that it would not be creditable to this country to send out books of that kind, if they were printed in the manner in which our ordinary Blue Books are printed. But I desire to call the attention of the House to what seems to be a rather disingenuous statement by the hon. gentleman. When discussing this matter the other evening, I said the Government had reduced the price of printing that report. Formerly it was printed by the Messrs. Lovell, in Montreal, and when the late Government came into office the printing was transferred to the *Montreal Herald* office, and for the first time went into a newspaper office to be printed, as distinguished from an ordinary job printing office. The price paid for it then was 50 cents per thousand ems—the ordinary composition price for that kind of work—and the hon. gentleman has charged me with having misstated the price as now paid. I notice by the *Hansard* report—and, if I remember aright, I corrected it in the revised edition—that I am made to say, in the daily edition, that the price which has since been paid has been a very much reduced price. The statement which I did make, the statement which I thought I was careful in making, was that the Government had now reduced the price, and that the price now paid was very much less than what was formerly paid. That was brought out in evidence in another place. The hon. gentleman quotes from the Auditor General's Report, that the price paid last year to the printers of the Geological Survey Report was 50 cents for ordinary composition, 75 cents for other classes of work, and \$1 for other classes of work; and hon. gentlemen about him cheered those statements, as if they implied that whereas, during Mr. Mackenzie's Administration 50 cents was paid, a higher price was paid now. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman, if he is a printer, knows that the price of 50 cents, paid during the Mackenzie régime, was increased to 75 cents for certain classes of work, and to \$1 for other classes of work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The *Gazette* does not say so.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman knows as a printer—and therein comes the disingenuousness of his statement, which has been contradicted by what is practically the sworn testimony of the officers of the Government, examined before the Public Accounts Committee—he knows that when he undertakes to assume that because 50 cents is stated, that means 50 cents for all classes of work. If any one went into his office and asked him what he would charge for printing a particular job, and he said 50 cents a

thousand, he knows perfectly well that if he got the job, under the well established rules of the trade, for tabular work and for figure work, he would be paid certain higher established prices, and that without these being even mentioned, they coming in under the regular rules of the trade; and I state here, on my responsibility, that that same principle of accounting applied during the time Mr. Mackenzie was in office. So much for that particular work. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the printing of the proceedings of the Royal Society. Now, that matter was dealt with in another place, and the hon. gentleman ought to have known, if his memory had not failed him, that the statement he made to-day was calculated to deceive this House. He knows perfectly well that the Government had nothing whatever to do with the printing of the Royal Society's Report. What the Government, or, rather Parliament, did, was to vote \$5,000 to the Royal Society, to enable it to get its transactions printed, and it was no matter of patronage by this Government in connection with the printing of that work. Then the hon. gentleman says that the *Gazette* office got \$5,300 for the printing of that work. The hon. gentleman knows, or he ought to know, that that statement is incorrect. I have in my hand a letter which was obtained from Dawson Bros., by the manager of the Montreal *Gazette* office, in answer to a letter from him, in which Dawson Bros. explain how that work was done; and though it is a matter of business which does not affect Parliament in the least, with which Parliament has nothing to do, I will read the letter. The letter is dated on the 24th of April, after the discussion took place in the Public Accounts Committee. It is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 23rd is before us, and in reply we beg to say that the printing of the Royal Society transactions is entirely in our hands, and that if we had the work done at your office it is because we found there the best facilities for doing the work.

"The volume is a large one, and being divided into five sections, going on simultaneously, each section being, moreover, composed of the contributions of many authors, it demands the lock-up of a very large mass of type, both in small pica and long primer, but especially in small pica. The work must therefore be done in an office like yours, which has very large fonts of these styles, and can permit them to be locked up for an indefinite time.

"Yours truly,  
"DAWSON BROS."

Now, Sir, as a matter of fact, the amount received by the Montreal *Gazette* office for the printing of that report was simply a matter of composition and press work, and was not half the sum mentioned by the hon. gentleman. The Messrs. Dawson supplied the paper; they did the binding; and a committee of the Royal Society, headed by Dr. Sterry Hunt, the chairman of that committee, supervised the printing. They came to the office and read the proofs, and it was a matter with which the Government had no more to do than they had with the publication of the admirable work of Mr. Bourinot, which was also printed at the *Gazette* office, and for copies of which the Government, I believe, subscribed; and therefore, with as much propriety, it might be said that that was Government patronage bestowed upon the Montreal *Gazette*. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the matter of pamphlets, and again he is disingenuous. He referred to a particular pamphlet called "British Columbia" and he tells us that there were five editions of that work, and that the composition was, therefore, charged five times over; and he went on to show what an extravagant job that was, and how utterly extravagant the Government were in permitting it. He said, if that work had been done by the public contractors there would have been but one composition, and that the *Gazette* got some seventeen times much—

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Fourteen times.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell)—fourteen times as much as would have been obtained by the Government printers. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that the Government  
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

printers in Ottawa are perpetually printing extra or new editions of the same work. Take, for instance, blank forms from the Customs Department. A certain number are ordered, and if the printer is skilful, if he knows his business—and judging by the success of the contractors in their work, upon which I congratulate them, a success which I do not begrudge them—if they are skilful, they have every one of those forms stereotyped, and every time a new order is sent to them, precisely the same composition is charged, as the hon. gentleman knows; and, therefore, if this work went to the contractors here for five editions, they would not charge only one composition, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, if the same work was repeated over and over again, they charge every time a separate composition. But one point was, that there was an enormous price paid for the work in connection with the matter. Why, Sir, when I tell you that of this \$9,000, which the hon. gentleman said was paid for the 460,000 copies of this pamphlet, the amount paid for composition was \$17 for each edition, this House will understand how scrupulously honest the hon. gentleman was, and how exceedingly careful he was not to deceive the House in any way in the statement he made. But with regard to this and other pamphlets, what are the facts which were brought out in evidence by officers of the Government in the Committee of Public Accounts? There it was established that since 1872 there has not been one single pamphlet printed by the public contractor. This work has always been done in the same way; the late Administration—and I am not using the *tu quoque* argument, but am dealing with the facts as they exist—gave out similar pamphlets to outside offices owned by friends of the Government, and not one single pamphlet was ever given to the public contractor. The same policy has been pursued by this Government, with this difference, that the price has been very largely reduced. The hon. gentleman knows the evidence which was given by the Queen's Printer in the Public Accounts Committee, and he knows that on one edition of the pamphlet relating to British Columbia, of 56,000 copies, at the prices which were given for that kind of work by the late Administration, the cost would have been \$1,506, while the price actually paid by this Government was \$1,034, or nearly 50 per cent. less. On another pamphlet, "What Farmers Say," of which 50,000 copies were printed, the price which would have been paid under the former Government was \$2,653.50, while the price paid by this Government was \$1,495.67, and these figures were made up in the office of the Queen's Printer and were given in evidence in the Committee of Public Accounts, the hon. gentleman knowing all the time that that evidence had been given. Then, the hon. gentleman has referred to the matter of advertising, and he tells us that it is an outrage that advertising should be given to friendly newspapers. Does the hon. gentleman not know that advertising must be given somewhere—that the Government must advertise? If they do not advertise—if they let contracts, for instance, without advertising—I venture to say that the hon. gentleman would be the first to blame them for it. The advertising, therefore, must be done, and does the hon. gentleman not know that it has always been the practice of all Governments to give the advertising to papers friendly to them? That is a legitimate patronage which the press has, and it is about the only patronage the press generally has, in connection with the political party which they favor being in office. If the hon. gentleman will look back to a historic event which took place in this country in 1864, he will find that the late George Brown, the leader of the Liberal party at that time, when the coalition which led to the adoption of Confederation was formed, issued a circular to the Reform newspapers throughout the Province of Ontario, in which he stated that if they supported Confederation they would have the patronage of the Government; whereas, if they would not support it they would not have the patronage of the Government. I remember my hon.

friend, the late Senator Penny, denouncing that circular as an outrage—as an insult, in fact, to the press of Canada. But it was defended in the *Toronto Globe*, on the ground that the advertising patronage of the Government always went, and must always, in the very nature of the case, go to friendly newspapers, and to friendly newspapers practically alone. But I find that this Government have not been confining themselves to friendly newspapers. The hon. gentleman, for instance, stated \$600 as the amount received—over the average of the newspapers he quoted—by the *Montreal Star*. Everyone knows that the *Montreal Star* is not a Conservative or Ministerial newspaper; everyone knows that it boasts of being a thoroughly independent newspaper; but those who read it carefully know that it has always three words for hon. gentlemen opposite for one that it has for this side of the House. But it is a paper with a large circulation—perhaps a larger circulation than any other paper in Canada to-day.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The Government want to get it over.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I venture to say the hon. gentleman would not make that statement in the presence of the proprietor of the *Montreal Star*. It shows, Sir, that he, a newspaper man, he who once occupied the position of president of a press association, if I mistake not, so degrades the profession to which he belongs, so fouls his own nest—and every one knows that it is an ill-bird that does it—as to say that \$600 can turn over the *Montreal Star*. Shame on him, Mr. Speaker! A gentleman occupying the position he does ought not to make a statement of that kind. He knows it is not true. I know that statement is not in order; but I trust, Sir, under the circumstances, with an insult of that kind cast at the press, that one may be permitted to transgress the rule of order to the extent of saying that he ought, at any rate, to know it is not true. Then, the hon. gentleman dealt with the question of the independence of the press. Well, Sir, I do not think the press is on its trial here. The Government are on their trial, always on their trial, not only when Parliament is sitting, but during the recess as well; and, looking at their records in connection with public printing, remembering that they have not done what hon. gentlemen did when they were in office, distribute the ordinary printing of the Departments to their friends, but have simply continued these two classes of work, or rather one class—because the Report of the Geological Survey is not in the contract at all—have simply continued the policy with regard to the printing of these pamphlets, but at a much lower price than their predecessors were in the habit of paying, I venture to say that they can very well appeal to the public judgment as to their treatment of this particular question. The hon. gentleman made a statement with reference to the Messrs. Allan having an advertisement in one of these pamphlets. That was also explained in the Public Accounts Committee. They got that advertisement as a compensation for circulating the pamphlets through their 1,200 agencies in Great Britain. It was about the cheapest way in which that could be done, and it was paid for in that way. I do not intend to delay the House on this question any longer. I thought it necessary to make these few statements in reply to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I wish to say a word of personal explanation. I wish to say that the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has twisted the expression I made about the *Montreal Star*. The imputation I wished to cast was on the Government, not on the *Montreal Star* at all.

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

(In the Committee.)

Subsidy to a line of steamers to run fortnightly between France and Quebec, provided the French Government appropriates a sum equal to the amount contributed by the Dominion of Canada for the same services..... \$50,000

Mr. BOWELL. I asked to let this item stand, particularly on account of the statements made by the hon. member for Montmorency, and also to be enabled to lay before the House a statement of the contract into which the Government has entered with the Halifax Steamship Company. Before entering into the question of the contract, I desire to state that I asked the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who was personally acquainted with Mr. Wood, the agent of the line, to telegraph and ascertain the facts as to the correctness of the statement made by the member for Montmorency. These answers are very explicit. When the hon. gentleman reads them, it will be found that the statements made on the authority of Messrs. Plamondon & Auger, in the *Quebec Chronicle*, are entirely unfounded. A contract under this item has been entered into with the Halifax Steam Navigation Company. The contract is for a fortnightly line between Canada and Havre, sailing alternately from the St. Lawrence and Halifax, from the St. Lawrence during the seven months following the opening of navigation, and from Halifax the remainder of the year. When a full cargo cannot be obtained in Canada for France, the company are to be permitted to go to Boston or Portland for cargo, but in all cases they must stop at Halifax or some Canadian port. The duration of the contract is five years. During the first three years there are to be 20 round trips, and during the last two years fortnightly trips all the year around, the subsidy in no case to exceed the \$50,000 voted by Parliament. They are specially permitted to call at Charlottetown and Pictou if any cargo can be obtained at these points. Goods for Canada must be landed in Canada before the vessel sails for any other port. All steerage passengers shall be landed in Canada and not ticketed or re-shipped for the United States, Canadian merchants to have preference, and special provision is made against discriminating rates against Canadian ports. Most hon. gentlemen at all acquainted with the trade from the United States and Canada must know that in many cases discriminating rates were established in favor of American ports, but special provision is made that Canadian merchants shall not be placed at a disadvantage compared with the Americans. Their service was to commence 1st of April, 1885; the steamers to be first-class, special survey at Lloyds or the French Bureau Veritas, with a carrying capacity of 2,000 tons, and speed not less than 11 knots, and to be managed by first-class officers. They are obliged to carry whatever mails are given to them at the different ports at which they call, and to deliver them at their destination, without any additional charge to the Government, other than that which is paid for the all-round trip, \$2,000. The contract may be declared void at any time by the Finance Minister, in case of a violation of any of the conditions of the contract, and he is to be the sole judge as to whether the contract was violated or not. These are the terms of the contract into which this company has entered with the Government. The question of building up a trade between this country and France has been discussed in this House so often, almost every Session for the last seven or eight years, that I do not deem it at all advisable to repeat what has been said on former occasions; but I am glad to know, from the telegrams received, that the vessel has been able to obtain a cargo in Canada, and that there is every prospect of its succeeding. We only hope it may, in order that the desire of Parliament in voting this sum may be realised.

Mr. STAIRS. The following are the telegrams sent and received. I sent the second one, as the first did not seem to be understood:—

"To Joseph Wood, Halifax, N.S. :  
"OTTAWA, 30th June, 1885.

"Criticism in House to-night on refusal of *Ulunda* take freight at Quebec, Langelier said, agents said steamers would not take any there. Wire me full particulars refusal to take deals, and particulars of any other freight.

"(Signed) JOHN F. STAIRS."

"OTTAWA, 30th June, 1885.

"To Joseph Wood, Halifax, N.S. :

"Refer to letter in Quebec *Morning Chronicle*, 3rd June, respecting refusal to take cargo Quebec in connection mine to-night. Give an answer to it.

"(Signed) JOHN F. STAIRS."

The following is the answer received :—

"HALIFAX, 30th June, 1885.

"John F. Stairs, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa :

"No freight offered at Quebec to *Ulunda*. Quebec agent enquired day before she sailed if we would offer room for deals. I refused, because nothing was certain, and steamer ready to leave; 100 tons got in Montreal. Positively we were never offered any deals. Please inform House we could not afford to stop 2,000-ton steamer at Quebec waiting doubtful cable from France. It was a broker's enquiry of no value whatever.

"(Signed) JOSEPH WOOD."

As I thought, very likely, that Mr. Wood, the manager, had not access to the letter from the Quebec *Morning Chronicle* quoted in the House, I sent him the following extract :—

"Plamondon & Auger write to Quebec *Chronicle* of 3rd June : 'What is the reason that the pioneer vessel, the first of the line between Quebec and Havre, refuses to take freight at this port. We have contracted for and made sales to several parties in France, with the expectation of being able to ship by this line. To our great surprise, we were told by the agent for the line at Quebec that the steamer *Ulunda* will not be permitted to stop here for freight, although this line receives a large subsidy from the Dominion Government.' Were any orders given that this or any other steamer of the line would not stop at Quebec. Contradict this explicitly, if not true. Your telegram yesterday not clear on this point."

And I received the following reply :—

"No orders were given not to stop at Quebec. On the contrary, I stopped *Ulunda*, on arrival, 25th May, at Quebec; kept her there three days; got not a single offer of cargo; sent her to Montreal; kept her there five days; got 100 tons; ordered her right away, when ready. Quebec enquiry for deals came too late, and, as already explained, was only enquiry. The statement that we refused to stop at Quebec for cargo is entirely false."

Then I sent another :

"I understand *Ulunda* got nothing at Quebec. Of what description goods did Montreal cargo consist, and what from Halifax on both trips?"

The reply is as follows :—

"Montreal cargo all potash; Halifax cargoes, lobsters. Twenty cabin, four steerage passengers. Eight thousand cases lobsters here now waiting our steamer."

I presume that refers to the sailing of the next steamer which is to go. I think the telegram sent by Mr. Wood is sufficient to show that the statement made in Quebec, as to the refusal of the steamers to take this freight, is not correct. This trade between France and Canada is a most important one to the people of Canada, for this reason: that it is impossible for us to ship goods to France indirectly without having to pay an extra amount of duty. That is a very great disadvantage under which we lie. It may be probable that it will take some time to build up this trade, but I think that, if the people are content to accept such services as this line of steamers can give, as the trade develops, better facilities can be provided. If we have no direct trade with Canada the exporters of our products to France are at a great disadvantage, because the trade with the United States is large enough to go directly from their own ports. It has been true, in the past, that some portion of the products of Canada have been sent through the United States, and, in order to secure entry into France at the ordinary rates of duties, they went as American goods. I think it would be well, if this subsidy encouraged the trade sufficiently, to

Mr. STAIRS,

support a good line of steamers, so that in time it might be carried on without any subsidy at all.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is very desirable that the Government should be prepared to give to the House some information upon the character of the cargoes, and their amount and value, which go from Canada to the continent of Europe, and come from the continent of Europe back to Canada. We have three lines of steamers subsidised by the Government, and hon. gentlemen pretend to justify these subsidies, on the ground that they are to build up, at an early day, a trade between this country and the continent of Europe. The statements of the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) and the Minister of Customs, go to show that these lines of steamers are practically running between American ports and the continent of Europe, and they are subsidised to call at our ports. It shows how small is the amount of freight carried from Canada, because, if there were any considerable amount, it would not require a subsidy to induce those steamers to call at Halifax or other points on their way between American ports and the continent of Europe. I think the statement made by the member for Halifax and the Minister of Customs shows that really there is at the present time very little trade indeed between Canada and the continent of Europe, and in my opinion there is nothing that will justify the very large expenditure incurred by the Government.

Resolution to be reported.

#### TRADE RELATIONS—NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE DOMINION.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the question of the Minister in relation to a very important question in connection with the trade between Canada and Newfoundland. I received the following telegram a short time ago :—

"Newfoundland duty on Canadian flour \$1 a barrel, gone into force. Newfoundland merchants telegraphing their correspondents here to stop jobbing."

This is of great importance to the trade, as it is an important object to ascertain whether any steps have been taken, and what they are, to avoid this difficulty in the trade negotiations between Newfoundland and Canada. I would like to know if the Ministry can give me some assurance that the matter is being arranged?

Mr. BOWELL. Telegrams of a similar character have been received by the Government to-day, and we expect to deal with this to-morrow in some way. The Parliament of Newfoundland imposed an extra duty upon certain products coming into that country from other countries that have the right of fishing in their waters, in case they should put a duty upon the fish they have caught in Newfoundland and shipped to their country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it likely that some amicable arrangement will be entered into?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2 a.m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—CIVIL SERVICE VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. EDGAR. I should like to ask a question of the Government in reference to some members of the Civil Service who are out as volunteers in the North-West. I have observed that some of the educational institutions and the Law Society of Ontario, I think, have allowed students who have gone out on service with the militia to have their standing as if they had passed the examination. I would suggest to the Government whether, as a Civil Service examination has taken place while these troops have been out, it would not be worth while for them to see the propriety of not allowing the examination to be lost for the members of the service who are out in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This question has been, and is now before the Government, as to the manner in which the civil servants who have gone out to fight the battles of their country shall be recompensed for their services at the front, as well as the services of all other militia men.

## CULLING AND MEASURING OF TIMBER.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 154) further to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the hon. Minister promised us some information the other day in reference to the mode of inspecting spars and masts, by what measurement they were inspected, and what was the standard measurement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I find that the measurement adopted in Quebec is similar to that adopted in the other Provinces.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the measurement is obtained by multiplying the diameter by the length. I do not see how the measurement in board measure can be obtained in that way.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.) The contents of the stick is not the question which arises in regard to the sale of masts and spars at all. The length of the mast and spar must be in a certain proportion to the diameter. It is not computed by board measurement at all. The stick is to be three times in feet the diameter in inches at one-third from the bottom.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the Minister what was the total loss on this to the consolidated revenue for the last year or two? What were our net receipts and expenditures?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The receipts are about \$43,000, and the whole expenditure \$71,000 in round numbers, leaving a loss to the revenue of \$28,000. That was due to the falling off in trade, and partially to the reduction of the fee that was formerly charged. But the present Bill does not propose to increase the charges upon the consolidated revenue;

on the other hand, there will be much less of a charge than at present; there will be a reduction of, I think, \$3,000 or \$4,000 by this arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We were promised that although at the time the deficit could not be extinguished, it would be gradually reduced to nothing. It is clear that \$20,000 a year is a large sum to pay. It looks very much as if an unnecessary number of pensioners were being placed on the public Treasury, which is neither in the interest of the country or of the trade.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is becoming more evident every day that reductions must be made both in the culling department and the different offices. I propose to work out the reduction, and to commence it by the reductions proposed in this Bill, and next year to effect a saving in the offices at Quebec. Next year the reduction will amount to from \$5,000 to \$6,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We shall be glad of that. Can the hon. gentleman say, approximately, within what space of time he will be able to make the receipts equal the expenditure, or what does he suppose will finally be the extra charge under this Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It depends greatly upon the lumber trade; and all I can be expected to do is to assure the House that this reduction of staff and, therefore, of expenditure, will be made. It is quite evident that the staff is too large. With respect to the objection of increasing the number of pensioners: that is one of those things which is unavoidable. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they found the necessity of dealing with this Department. They found the staff too large, and they reduced it by placing on the retired list 26 or 27 cullers. I do not propose to add more than 8 or 10 to that list, and that at the same rate as those who were previously retired.

Mr. LANGELIER. What authority will decide as to whether cullers are incapable, by reason of age or otherwise, from pursuing their business? There is nothing in the Bill to show what is the authority to decide that point, which is one of great importance.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman will have to place a little confidence in the Department fairly administering the law.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not object to the Department deciding the question; but the Bill does not state whether the Minister or supervisor of cullers will decide it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first action taken will be by the supervisor of cullers at Quebec. If he certifies to the Department that "A" and "B" have reached that age when they are incapable of performing the duties of culler, then the cases will be taken up by the Department. Several communications have been made to me by gentlemen who differ in politics from the party at present in power, as to how the men will be treated. I have in all cases assured them that no man will be removed for political purposes. If he is incapable of performing the duty, then he will be placed upon the retired list. That is all the assurance I can give.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.) I am pleased to hear the Minister state that no culler will be removed for political reasons. In 1877 the Bill was introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue, which contained a provision nearly similar to that in this Bill. I am sorry to say that a good many cullers were removed for political reasons at that time. I would suggest that "1880" be replaced by "1878," and that the words, "all who may since be employed," be added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it not time to consider whether there is any real propriety or necessity in

having those persons pensioned after a certain period of service. They are not civil servants. I would not interfere with those who are now members of that distinguished fraternity, but why should everyone who undertakes to be a culler be qualified to receive a pension, when it may appear, for some reason, that it is undesirable to employ him any longer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I thought I had given the reason already. I had before me the example of our predecessors in that case, and I do not think it will be fair to those who are now engaged in that service to depart from the rule which has been followed so long. It must also be remembered that the lumber trade has contributed a very large sum to this fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The case stands thus: That the country is taxed \$28,000 a year for the purposes of this trade. I agree with the hon. gentleman that so far as the men who are at present actually engaged, and as to whom it may be said that some kind of understanding has been arrived at, it may be impossible to refuse them a retiring pension. But the question is why the cullers who may hereafter be appointed should be pensioned, while the country is taxed to a considerable extent for the benefit of the cullers or the trade? It is true, a part of this money comes from the lumber trade, but at the same time there is a steady annual deficit, which is paid by the country at large.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). As I understand the Bill, there is no provision for pensioning cullers who may be attached to the office hereafter, but only those who are employed at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister, apparently, does not so understand it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). That is how I understand it, and I think if the hon. gentleman looks at the Bill, he will so understand it too. As to the country being put to the expense, I would just say that up to, I think, 1874, the fees which were collected from the lumbermen in connection with the culling of timber in Quebec, were much in excess of the requirements of the office. It is true there have been some deficits, but I think, taking the whole receipts since Confederation, it will be found that there is still a small surplus in favor of the office. This Bill provides that the Governor in Council shall have the power to raise the tariff of fees whenever it may be necessary to meet the expenses of the office, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Inland Revenue, for the time being, will exercise that power when it is found that the surplus previously collected from the lumbermen shall have been exhausted. With regard to pensioning the cullers, a larger number of them were employed in the office than was deemed necessary, and in 1877 the then Minister of Inland Revenue—from the pressure which was brought to bear on him by members in the trade—of there being a large number of cullers who were wholly incapable of discharging their duties, deemed it expedient to reduce the staff considerably, and I do not think it would be considered fair to discharge these men without making some provision for them. The sum of \$200 was regarded by the Government, of which the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) was a member, as a fair annuity, and it is not now proposed to increase it. Therefore, as it does not apply to those who may hereafter be appointed, I think there can be no objection to the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is clearly understood and stated that that was the case, it would meet the objection I raised. What I objected to was, that when there was a serious deficit every year, every man should be entitled to a pension on retiring. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is right in saying that when we found that there were employed a great many more cullers than were wanted, in the interests of the country and the trade, at  
Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

large salaries, some such arrangement as he mentioned was proposed. I think it saved a good deal of money to the country, and, if I remember aright, the hon. member for Renfrew was one of those who complained of the unnecessary burdens which were placed on the trade.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the Minister state what is the balance still to the credit of the fund, if any; also the amount of the deficit for the last financial year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I understand, the surplus has been exhausted, and there is a slight balance on the other side of the ledger.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what I understood. I think the surplus was exhausted at the last financial year, and I think there is about \$30,000 on the wrong side.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, I think it is about \$18,000 or \$19,000. With regard to the question put by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) the Bill does not establish the principle of gratuities to that class of officers. It recognises the general principle that where an office is abolished in the public interest the holder of the office is entitled to consideration. It is only in cases where a reduction is made in the staff in the public interest that the granting of annuities would be considered at all. It will be several years before a new appointment is made, at any rate.

Mr. BLAKE. On that subject I wish to make this observation. You are dealing with what is apparently a diminishing industry. On two occasions there has been a reduction in the staff, because it was too large for the current exigencies of the office. Now, it seems to me it would be well for the future to make an express provision which would disentitle those who come in from any expectation of an annuity. Then the men who came in would come in upon that risk and understanding. As a general rule, when men come into a public office, it is supposed to be permanent—that the public service would continue to require them. In this case there are serious risks of the public service not requiring them, as has occurred on two occasions, and it seems to me the hon. Minister should make an express provision to disentitle them from any expectation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I agree thoroughly with the hon. gentleman; but no such change may take place for perhaps ten years, and I do not think we should bind the actions of any future Parliament. Men who accept the position ought to consider its uncertainties.

Mr. BLAKE. But after this debate, if the hon. gentleman appoints new men without such a clause, the expectation would be created, and the Parliament will not be free to act in the future when another reduction may be made. What we want to do is to prevent the raising of a claim, which we can only do by declaring the conditions on which the men are appointed.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This Bill makes no provision outside of those already employed. It does not provide for any gratuity to those who may hereafter be appointed. Therefore, it lies with this Legislature to deal with those cases which arise hereafter, and if Parliament in future sees fit in its wisdom to grant a gratuity, I do not see that we can prevent it.

Mr. BLAKE. We cannot, by any law we pass to-day, prevent a future Parliament from doing it in its wisdom, if it pleases. But we may impose an equitable obligation to do it. I know that in 1877 when we made a reduction we paid a gratuity, and in 1880, when we made another reduction we paid a gratuity; and when we have the Minister declaring that that was in accordance with the general policy of the

country. I think the probability is that in ten years hence, if we are called upon to reduce the staff, we shall say that these men entered the office on expectations based on two former occurrences and on the statement of the Minister also as to the policy that we are not free, but are tied. Of course, the Parliament is not tied by our Act, because it may be generous if it chooses, but it may feel bound, under the circumstances I have stated, to give a gratuity that it would not give if it were free.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest that after the words, "until 1876" you insert "or who may be employed up to the time of the passage of this Act only."

Amendment agreed to, and committee rose and reported Bill with amendments.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the Bill be read the third time to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. Not to-morrow. We do not sit to-morrow, it is the 4th of July.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman propose that we should adjourn on the 4th of July?

Mr. BLAKE. No; the hon. gentleman refused to propose that we should meet on the 4th of July.

Mr. MILLS. We sat on the 1st of July and voted several millions to the State of Maine to build a railway there.

Mr. BLAKE. And we are carrying out the Act on the 4th. Bill ordered to be read the third time on Monday.

#### MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CARON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 152) to amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883. He said: The object of the Bill is to give authority to the Government to increase the number of the permanent corps now in existence from 750 to 1,000 men. This Bill is required to provide for the establishment of the two new schools of infantry, one to be established at London and the other at Winnipeg.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say briefly that the impression remains which I entertained before when the hon. gentleman proposed the change in the law of which this is an extension, that much more could be done by another use of the public money which is to be expended in this, and particularly with reference to the North-West. My opinion is that a more liberal encouragement of the formation of local corps through that country would be an infinitely wiser and more effective application of the public moneys for the advantage of the country than the establishment of a corps or school at Winnipeg.

Mr. MULOCK. For how long are these men to be enrolled?

Mr. CARON. Three years.

Mr. BLAKE. That is all in the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. No, it is not in the Bill. The Militia Act, section 21 provides that the 750 men thereby authorised shall be in the service for periods of three years continuous service. This Bill does not so provide, but says "for continuous service." Is there to be any limit of time or are these men enrolled for an indefinite period of time? Is this the commencement of the creation of a standing army for all time. I think it is a mistake to drop the words "three years," and I suggest that the Minister should amend the Bill by inserting them before the word "continuous." If he does not, I shall move the Bill back to Committee for this purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to ask your opinion, Mr. Speaker, as to how far this Bill is in order. It is in terms a Bill to authorise an addition to the number of men of 250. The Act provides that the whole strength of the force which Her Majesty is, by the 21st section of the Consolidated Militia Act of 1883, authorised to raise, may be any number of men not exceeding 1,000, it provides that 250 more men may be raised. The Consolidated Militia Act, of course, provides for the pay of all the men who may be raised. The practical result of this Bill, if it should be passed in this shape, is therefore to provide for the payment of 250 more men. Can that be done without a resolution and by such a clause as this?

Mr. SPEAKER. The money must be voted in the Estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course there is an annual vote for the militia, but the rate at which the militia officers are to be paid is fixed by the Act.

Mr. CARON. This is only taking authority to increase the number of men. The pay of the men must come before Parliament, and, if it is not authorised, of course the men cannot be paid, but I do not see that it is necessary to introduce resolutions before this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The point is really a very important one. I do not so much say it is necessary to initiate this measure by resolution any more than it was to initiate the Consolidated Militia Act by resolution, but the Consolidated Militia Act, which provided for the creation of this force, provided also for the pay of this force, and the resolutions providing for the pay, although there is an annual vote, were brought in, and properly so, in committee, as the journals, which I have here, show. The clauses providing for the pay were in blank, and they were put into the Bill in committee. This proposes to deal with the existing statute, which provides for the pay of all the forces to be raised under it, and you propose to add to their force; and, of course, if the Bill passes in this form, you add to the charge because you make the money clauses applicable to 250 more men, or one-third more. Therefore, if the Bill passes in this shape, we shall, without a preliminary committee, have practically added to the public charge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that, when the resolutions were moved in the first instance for the Militia Bill, the object was not to determine by those resolutions the sum of money to be paid for the militia, but to determine the rate—at all events, that is as far as I recollect it—the rate per man, to say how much money might be paid to the men who would serve under that Militia Act. That has been done. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia does not ask to change that rate, but only says that instead of 750 men we ask that the number shall be 1,000 men. The rate remains the same, and the amount of money will be put in the Estimates if this is passed, and then the House of Commons will determine whether that sum is in accordance with the rate fixed by the House of Commons for the militia. But we are obliged every year to come down and ask the money from Parliament notwithstanding that these resolutions were passed. The rate of pay is to be the same for the 250 additional men as for the 750. Of course the question that has arisen is a very nice one, and it may as well be settled now; but I think there is something in the statement I made to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I will explain to the hon. gentleman my view of that matter. When the Act was passed it was proposed to authorise the creation of a force of so many men at such a rate of pay, and by multiplying the rate by the number of men you understood the total amount of public charge that was being authorised by the Act. Of course, it was understood that it would be necessary to vote the

Estimates every year. But, notwithstanding that fact, we had to have a committee before we could get the clause into the Bill. What is proposed now is to increase the number of men to whom the rate shall be applicable, to make it 1,000 instead of 750, and thus to increase the public charge. Parliament did not say that the Government shall have any definite power of raising the number of men at their will. Parliament said: You may raise and pay 750 men at this rate, and we know what we propose to do. But if you now add one-third to the number of the men you add one-third to the public charge, and that you do without a preliminary resolution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so, but would it not be better to ascertain the facts by seeing what that resolution was. I have not seen it. Perhaps the resolution was only to determine the rate for each man without determining the number.

Mr. BLAKE. That is so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the resolution did not state that it was a force of 750 men, I think we could go on with this in the same way.

Mr. BLAKE. The resolution had reference to the legislation before us. We had a Bill before us authorising the creation of a force not exceeding 750 men, and we had a resolution before us authorising the pay for the force at such rates, therefore we had the whole effect of the proposal before us. That is not the case now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, we have the number of men and the rate that is fixed by law to be paid them.

Mr. CARON. I beg to remind the leader of the Opposition that these resolutions state that no sum of money shall be paid without being included in the Estimates. The rate of pay which was introduced into the Bill was to fix the salary that would be given to the officers and men. As it now stands we could have paid the officers and men belonging to the different schools out of the sum voted by Parliament for the ordinary militia; but this Bill does not preclude the Minister of Militia from paying the schools of infantry and the schools of gunnery out of the ordinary sum voted by Parliament every year for militia purposes; consequently I thought, and I think now, that it was not necessary to initiate the Bill by a preliminary resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find on the Journals of 1883 that a resolution was then introduced, on which a clause in the Militia Act was founded, which regulated the rate to be paid to the various branches of the service. The resolution was:

"That it is expedient to provide that the pay of the officers and men of the active militia land force, for each day's drill of three hours, under section 45 of the Bill to consolidate and amend the laws affecting the militia of Canada."

But that is not the section which is now being amended. The section now being amended is section 21 of the Consolidated Militia Act, and that does not appear to have been founded upon a resolution. That clause provides that a certain number, not exceeding 750 men, may be enlisted for continuous service out of the force authorised by the Act. Now it is proposed to empower the Department to increase that force to a number not exceeding 1,000, but the pay for that force has to come before the House by a Message and be voted annually, and if it is not voted annually the force cannot be paid and will have to be disbanded. I do not think, therefore, under these circumstances, that it is necessary that this clause should be founded upon a resolution.

Bill read the second time on a division, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. BLAKE.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CARON. In order to make it perfectly clear I propose, after the word "for," to add the following words: "periods of three years of continuous service."

Mr. BLAKE. I think the original clause provided for a division into three corps. The present proposal is very much larger, because it proposes to give power to divide this 1,000 men into as many corps as you see fit. Is it the intention to take that power deliberately and to divide this number into more than five different corps?

Mr. CARON. This is the reason why I put this into the Bill: Take, for instance, the school at Winnipeg. It was the intention to organise a corps of 150 men. This year I do not propose to organise a corps stronger than 100 men. But it may be necessary, in view of the situation, instead of having one corps of 100 men, for instance, to have one of 200 men. I thought that if Parliament knew that the Department could not go beyond the strength of a 1,000 men, it would leave discretion to the Department to divide that force as circumstances might require.

Mr. BLAKE. That does not answer my question. The hon. gentleman's point is concentration; mine is division. His original Act provided for not more than three companies of infantry. What the hon. gentleman suggests is that, although he wants to take power to have 250 more men who may make two companies of infantry nominally, he may wish to have those 250 under one command and at one place. That would still be accomplished if he provided that there should be not more than five companies of infantry. But by the proposal he now makes he takes power, by dividing the force, to have seven, eight or ten companies of infantry. If you have troops at different points, it is impossible to maintain them at the same expense as if they were all at one point. I do not see any objection to the whole five companies being at one point at one time, and although the Minister's intention is to have them at London and Winnipeg, he might have them all at Winnipeg for a time. By his present proposal the hon. gentleman may divide the force into ten companies instead of five, and have them at ten different points, and then the expenditure would be increased.

Mr. CARON. The intention really is to create two new companies of infantry. I have no objection to insert that in the Bill—the force to be divided into such corps as is provided by clause 21 of the Consolidated Act of 1883, with the addition of two companies of infantry.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this the whole provision which the hon. gentleman proposes to submit to Parliament this Session with respect to the North-West militia force?

Mr. CARON. It is. When the Estimates were up I had occasion to state that the corps which were organised in the North-West during the troubles as permanent corps will be retained as part and parcel of the militia force. But outside of the 91st and 92nd, the militia will not be increased beyond what is contemplated by this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the reports of the hon. gentleman's local officers and of the officer who is commanding the forces confirm the fact which I have dealt upon, the extreme importance of the formation of local corps and perhaps of mounted infantry corps in various points of the North-West. My opinion is that special attention should be given to the formation of those corps, and that in a country sparsely settled as that, with settlements so remote, it is of extreme consequence that this subject should be dealt with, and dealt with this Session.

Mr. CARON. I call the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the fact that the corps which it is contem-

plated to organise will be a mounted infantry corps. Whatever decision we have arrived at has been reached after consultation with the Major General. He believes that with the increased Mounted Police force and the corps we are going to organise in Winnipeg, the force will be quite sufficient.

Mr. WELDON. How many officers from the Maritime Provinces are in the infantry schools? There is not one, I believe.

Mr. CARON. It is not considered an advantage to appoint an officer from one locality to a school in the same locality. In other schools there are officers from the Maritime Provinces who have proved themselves thoroughly competent. Mr. Seers is a cadet of the Royal Military College.

Mr. WELDON. He is an officer of the 38th regiment of the Imperial service.

Mr. CARON. That may be so. Whether he has served in the English army or not, he remains a Canadian and a cadet turned out by the Royal Military College. He is like Mr. Freer in this respect. I thought it would be of great advantage to have cadets who had been in the army and seen active service, and those officers to whom I have referred both served in Egypt.

Bill reported, and, as amended, concurred in.

#### MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 155) for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I would suggest that the word "Crown" should be put in after the word "all."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs if he has any idea of the quantity of land which will be transferred to Manitoba under the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I have not.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated that so far as the surveyed parts of Manitoba were concerned, calculations were being made in the Department of the Interior, with a view of supplying the House with that information.

Mr. BOWELL. I certainly did, but when we were in committee, when the hon. gentleman was absent, I stated that I was unable to obtain the information.

Mr. WATSON. Has the hon. gentleman looked over the reports of the different surveyors who have surveyed the lands south of Lake Manitoba, as to whether that land will be included?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not looked over them, but I am satisfied that the reports would not give such information as the hon. gentleman asks for, from the simple fact that the handing over of the swamp lands was not contemplated when the reports were made.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman misunderstands my question. These lands were reported on, and on looking over the reports it might be decided whether or not they would be included.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the condition of that particular lot of land is extremely unsatisfactory. One hon. Minister, in discussing this question, said it would be premature to decide it; that it should not be decided now, but at a subsequent time; that Parliament should be left in the dark for the present. I think we should know what sort of a bargain we are making. It might be impossible to know how many acres there are, but I think that with regard to the surveyed portions of the Province, an approximate estimate might be formed, and the general principle of decision which has been reached—especially as the bargain is not left to form the subject of subsequent dispute—as to what the meaning of the term "swamp lands" is, with reference to those particular lands which were not long ago cultivable lands not covered by water, but have since by reason of the overflow of the lake, been covered with water. I say whether these lands are included or not, is certainly something which we ought to know. Is it to be a matter of negotiation or arbitration to clear away the doubts, or are we to have a repetition of the plan of having it clothed in designed obscurity, the legislation we are passing as we did in another piece of legislation the other day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is almost impossible sometimes to find a definition which is more explicit than the word itself. You cannot find words to explain more clearly what "yes" means or "no" means, than the words themselves. So with the word "swamp," a term which is as well known in the country as dry land. It has its meaning. It certainly does not mean land periodically overflowed by water or by inundation. It is swamp land, or marsh land, as understood by everybody—where water and earth and liquid mud permanently cover the land. Everybody knows what a bog in Ireland is, and everybody knows what a swamp in Canada is. The check provided for here is sufficient to guard against the Government giving away any other land; we do not leave the Province of Manitoba to decide what swamp land is, because it must be proved to be such to the satisfaction of the central authority here. I do not know that we can make it any more explicit. Swamp means a swamp, marsh means a marsh, water means water, yes means yes, and no means no.

Mr. BLAKE. We are still in the bog. The hon. gentleman has told us it is difficult to define the term more clearly than yes or no; but what I object to is that the hon. gentleman has not given us yes or no. I am not asking him at this moment to alter his definition; I am asking what his definition means as applied to the lands of the particular locality I referred to. The hon. gentleman says the difficulty has not arisen in the United States. I do not know anything about that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We did not hear of it.

Mr. BLAKE. It may have arisen, because I am afraid a good many things happen that neither of us hear of. But the circumstances are peculiar as to those particular lands, and they may not have arisen in another country. The hon. gentleman says it is very clear what swamp lands mean. If it is so clear, he will have no difficulty in telling me whether those are swamp lands or not.

Mr. BOWELL. This is not a new question. It came up the other day, when I stated that the lands referred to by the hon. gentleman do not come within the meaning of this Act—that lands temporarily overflowed by water could not, in the meaning of the Act, be considered swamp lands. I specially referred to the land overflowed by Lake Manitoba, which if reclaimed by lowering one of the outlets of the lake and allowing the surplus water to flow into Lake Winnipeg or some other lake, could not under those circumstances be considered swamp lands.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say I do not like this legislation. I objected to it the other day and gave my reasons. I think it is entirely ambiguous, and is going to lead to a vast amount of correspondence and a great deal of difficulty with the Province of Manitoba. I think the Government should be more definite in their legislation. If they have made an arrangement with Manitoba to give them the swamp lands, they ought to find out what they are giving; they ought to know what they are doing. But this general power to take swamp lands is something entirely too indefinite for the legislation of this country. When asked what swamp lands were, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs said he would put the same definition upon the term as was put on it in the United States. It is a matter of notoriety that some of the greatest swindles in that country have occurred under this term—that great corporations have obtained—under the guise of swamp lands, good coal lands and fertile agricultural lands. We do not want a repetition of that in this country, and when this matter comes up again in a few years, we do not want Manitoba to claim the same definition of swamp lands as that which has prevailed in the United States. I hold in my hand a definition which I think would cover the ground: swamp lands are, first, muskeg; second, a permanent marsh; third, lands which are perennially wet and undrained, and useless for agricultural purposes.

Mr. BOWELL. The last one, I think, would cover the whole.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well, take the last; but do not let us legislate in this ambiguous way, and call up trouble on ourselves and have the time of Parliament taken up in the future in discussing Manitoba's claims and rights in this matter. I think, when we are giving away a portion of a whole Province, it should be something more definite than that provided in the Bill before the House.

Mr. DAWSON. In the State of Minnesota, near the boundary line, for hundreds of miles together, the lands are swamp lands. They are not necessarily bogs or swamps, but they are declared to be swamp lands for a certain purpose—for taking them over to the State. There are mountains and valleys in those swamp lands. They are not equal to prairie lands, perhaps; but in those swamp lands there is a great deal of good land, and it is an arrangement made between the Federal and the State Governments as to what lands shall be given. I suppose that definition would be applicable to this case.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a valuable contribution; the hon. First Minister and myself know more about swamp lands in the United States than we did a few minutes ago. The hon. member for Northumberland says that some of the greatest swindles in the United States have occurred under this term, and my hon. friend who is familiar with the State of Minnesota, says that mountains come under the definition of swamp lands, and that lands which are not swamps or bogs may be swamp lands for the purpose of being transferred. If that be so, I think we are in a very serious predicament when we propose to use this term, which the hon. gentleman says is as plain as yes for yes and no for no, particularly when we have a marginal note attached to the Bill by the Minister of Customs, which says we are going to use the term in the same sense as the United States has used it, with the consequences the hon. member for Northumberland and the hon. member for Algoma have just stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be that in the State of Minnesota mountains are swamps. I do not think that in the rest of the world they have been accounted swamps, unless Nosh called Mount Ararat a swamp, which was covered with water when his ark struck there; but mountains are certainly not swamps according to Johnson's  
Mr. BOWELL.

or any other dictionary. The hon. member for Northumberland says he wants this term explained in such a manner that there will be no further trouble. There would be further trouble if we did not pass these resolutions. We have made a bargain with Manitoba, and the Legislature of Manitoba has passed a Bill adopting these terms. If this Parliament does not approve of this arrangement let it say so, but the whole thing is up, and we must take the consequences.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Both parties are subject to the interpretation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought hon. gentlemen opposite were, as a general rule, in favor of State rights. I think I have heard some of them say the lands should be handed over to the Province of Manitoba—that Manitoba should be in the same position as Ontario and Quebec, and have its own lands. But what we really desire to do is this: The original arrangement was made, as the House knows, at the time the lands were supposed to be much more valuable than they are believed to be now—during the time of the boom. The Province of Manitoba agreed to drain certain swamps on condition of getting half the recovered land, the Dominion keeping the other half. They tried the experiment, they spent the money, and found that they lost by the operation. Subsequently, looking at the example of the United States, of giving the swamp lands, we said: We cannot ask the Dominion Parliament—it is not likely that the Dominion Parliament would vote money, for the purpose of draining those swamps and making them fit for settlement; and therefore we had better hand those lands over, so that the enterprise and capital of the Province of Manitoba may be employed in draining those lands whenever they think it will pay them to do so. If we did not do so, then those lands must remain in their present state. The Dominion of Canada will not, I think, in our generation spend any money in draining the swamps. Then we ought to allow the Province of Manitoba or capitalists to do so. I have little doubt that the Government of Manitoba will find enterprising capitalists who will take up a swampy country, and agree to drain it, for a certain proportion of the lands, and that country will be made fit for settlement and population, and indirectly will be of great service to the Dominion by adding to the wealth and to the population of the country, although we give up the swamp lands which in our hands would be utterly valueless.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman speaks as if we had some objection to the bargain. The question which we are now considering is what the bargain is. We want to understand that. Then the hon. gentleman says that hon. gentlemen on this side said they thought Manitoba should have her lands, and that we are now objecting. We are not objecting to Manitoba getting the lands, but we want to know what she is getting. He says we are in favor of State rights. Yes, but we are not in favor of State quarrels; we are not in favor of putting a state of controversy between Manitoba and the Dominion, or of leaving the bargain practically at the option of the Dominion to put further pressure upon the Province in connection with the interpretation of it. We want the meaning to be made as plain as circumstances will permit, so that there may be no ground for controversy in carrying out the bargain, so that the settlement itself shall not be the cause of quarrel, dispute and controversy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That might be, and the arrangement might be clearer if, in the settlement, the word "swamp" was defined, but it has not been defined, and they have passed their law accepting the swamp lands under this arrangement, and if we define the swamp lands in a way different from that in which they would look at it, we would

start with a quarrel instead of ending with one. The hon. gentleman admits that he is willing that Manitoba should have the lands within the Province. Then, the larger and the wider the construction is, and the more lands they get under their claim, the more agreeable it will be to the hon. gentleman. The arrangement being made, and the word "swamp" not being defined in their Act, it ought not to be defined in our Act. It may be, from the point of view of the hon. gentleman, that it would have been better if the word "swamp" had been explained in their Act, and then we could have had the same explanation in our Act; but it would be no use for us to put it in without their consent, and have the arrangement upset *ab initio*.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the difficulty arises from the imperfect character of the bargain the hon. gentleman makes.

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

Mr. BLAKE. He says it would be better to have the definition in the arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said from the hon. gentleman's point of view.

Mr. BLAKE. I think from the common sense point of view it would have been better to have a definition of the word "swamp." The hon. gentleman has made a bargain which is, as it now appears, inadequate, vague, obscure and likely to lead to trouble.

Mr. POPE. If a swamp is drained, that would be swamp lands.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the Lake Manitoba lands?

Mr. POPE. They are exactly in the same position.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. If they are swamp lands.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that if they are swamp lands, they are swamp lands.

Mr. POPE. It cannot be supposed, when you are going to give the swamp lands to the Province, that you are going to give lands fit for nothing. It would be no object to give them lands that were not worth a copper after they got them. The best lands we have in the country may be and are swamp lands. Any agriculturist who is accustomed to drain lands knows that the land, when drained, which has been the deposit of years, is often the finest in the country, and yet that is swamp land. I do not think there will be any difficulty at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman was permitted to decide for both parties, there would be no difficulty, if he remained in the same mind for two days; but as he is not to decide for both parties, and as he differs pretty completely from the Minister of Customs in the circumstances I have brought forward, I am afraid there will be some difficulty.

Mr. WATSON. In looking at the return of a report of the survey, I find that Mr. Guerin, in 1881, reported to the Government as follows: He made a calculation that 696,320 acres are to-day flooded, that is, around Lake Manitoba, which might be lowered by an expenditure, which appears to be a very extravagant amount; but he intends to make a canal from Lake Manitoba to Lake Winnipeg, from the Fairford River and through Lake St. Martin. The total amount of plant and work and keeping this in repair he estimates at \$281,000. He puts the value of the land, when the water is lowered, at \$2 an acre, which would be \$1,692,640. This report of Mr. Guerin is commented upon by Mr. Perley, and he states to the Government that Mr. Guerin has made a very careful examination of the lake and of these lands. I would call attention also to the correspondence between the Minister of Public Works of

Manitoba and the Government. Under date of the 25th June, 1881, the Minister says, in his report:

"I beg leave to report that the settlements in the vicinity of Lake Manitoba affected by the overflow of the waters of the said lake are suffering severely from the superabundant water; that many of the settlers have, from this cause, been unable to harvest any crop for three or four years"

Now, I consider that any land that would be overflowed for four years, so that the settlers could not harvest their crops, should be deemed swamp lands. That was in 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881, and they have been vacant since that time, though the lake has receded somewhat; but they will not be occupied unless the lake is lowered and kept lowered:

"Constant appeals for relief are made to this Department by the settlers in the affected localities. These settlers complain that unless immediate relief is accorded them, they will be forced to appeal to the American Consul here for a location in the United States."

The Government have apparently paid very little or no attention to the reports sent in by the Local Legislature of Manitoba, by the Minister Public Works of that Province, and by other deputations, for this lake remains without a dollar having been spent on it since 1881. I know that the Local Government, from the reports which have been made, expect that these lands around Lake Manitoba will be transferred to the Province; and I think that, after the reports that have been made and the action of the Government as to these lands, and the number of years they were covered with water, the Minister of Agriculture and other gentlemen might be able to state whether it is the opinion of the Government that these lands should be termed swamp lands or not. We ought to have some clear idea as to what construction shall be placed on this term "swamp lands." The Minister of Customs says that these lands will not be termed swamp lands, but the Minister of Agriculture states that, in his opinion, they would be termed swamp lands. According to the report of the Minister of Public Works, the settlers in that vicinity could not harvest a crop for four years, on account of high water. Surely, lands of that description ought to be termed swamp lands. They cannot be termed agricultural lands, and the question is, whether, under this Bill, those lands would be termed swamp lands or not.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the term "swamp," if it is synonymous with "swamp lands," is vague, and may lead to some confusion. If you turn to Worcester's Dictionary, you find the definition there given is:

"Spongy land; low ground, filled with water; soft, wet ground, marshy ground; land wet and spongy, usually covered with water."

Now is it proposed to assign to the Province of Manitoba all lands that come within any one of these definitions? How are you to deal with the case of a section, a part of which may be considered swampy and a part of which may be good arable land? Is the Province of Manitoba not to get the whole section because a portion of it may be deemed swampy, or is it to lose the whole section because it is not all swamp? Or what portion of the section is it to get? When the contract was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, if I remember rightly, it was provided that in case a certain quantity of a section was unfit for cultivation, the company could reject the whole section.

Mr. DAWSON. I have discovered precisely what a swamp is now.

Mr. BLAKE. Don't get into it.

Mr. DAWSON:

"Low ground, saturated with water; wet, spongy land; a quaggy, boggy place; a marsh; a bog; a morass."

"Where wild Oswego spreads her swamps around."

"A swamp differs from a bog and a marsh in producing trees and shrubs, while the latter produce only herbage, plants and mosses."

Mr. BLAKE. I do not find any mountains in that description.

Mr. TROW. I wish to ask the First Minister if any swamp lands have heretofore been ceded to Manitoba under a previous arrangement. I ask, because there is a very large swamp in the Boyne settlement, which, some years ago, I think, was ceded to Manitoba, and they undertook to drain it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot, without notice, answer that question. I know the Government of Manitoba say they lost money by the operation, but whether the land has been reclaimed I do not know. I will enquire and see.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose, if any land has been reclaimed in the past by the Local Government spending their money upon it, that would be transferred under this arrangement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If any portion of those lands have ceased, before the passing of this Act, to be swamp lands, they will not go over to Manitoba.

Mr. ROSS. I may say that the Local Government did get some lands from the Dominion Government, because the latter had an auction sale, and sold a large quantity of those lands three years ago. If they sold them they gave deeds for them, and if they did that, the Local Government must have got a grant from this Government. I refer to the lands in the Boyne marsh.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) spoke of the land arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I think there is a difference between that company and the Province of Manitoba. In this case the Government have it entirely within their power to say what the term "swamp lands" shall mean; but, in the other case the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had it entirely within their power to say what lands they should accept.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the objection taken by the hon. member for North York ought to be considered by the Government. You can scarcely travel over the North-West for more than two or three miles without finding portions of sections that form large "sloughs," as they are called in that country, which are swamps, or bogs, or marshes, or something of that character. Now, I think the Government and the House ought to understand what they are doing. Suppose there is a quarter section or whole section of land upon which there is one of these sloughs, which is mud, grass and water, all mixed together, would that be conveyed under this Bill? or would the whole section go, in case three-fourths of that section was dry land and cultivable? Would it be construed as it is in the American Act, that wherever a portion of a township is swamp they take the whole township? I am afraid that is the construction that will be put upon this Bill by the Manitoba people. It is true that our Government may put a different construction on it, and if so, that will lead to correspondence, to expensive negotiations, and new arrangements, and will lead to the time of this House being taken up in discussions.

On the preamble,

Mr. MITCHELL. As we have now got through the Bill, except the preamble, if the Government would amend it, so as to give all ungranted lands, all lands not given to railways and not granted to individuals, all lands not granted to benevolent institutions, to the Province of Manitoba, they would get my entire support. I would rather see that done than to see this Bill pass in its present shape. That would be a finality; but the effect of this Bill would be trouble, negotiations of all kinds and expense.

Bill reported with amendments.

Mr. DAWSON.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The Resolution respecting the appointment and remuneration of the controller, interpreter and other persons who may be appointed to restrain and regulate Chinese Immigration into the Dominion of Canada was concurred in and referred to the Bill (No. 156.)

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 156) to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. BAKER. I should like to repeat my suggestion, that the tonnage should be increased to 100 tons. I have been particularly urged to press this on the Government, and I would be failing in my duty if I did not do so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman will see—as has been said by his colleagues—that the beginning is a good one, and if the first experiment prove that this is not strict enough, the regulation will be made more strict.

On section 8,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move that the section be amended by adding, after the word "payment," "in default of payment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months." And, also, after "Her Majesty," "and shall be seized by any officer charged with the duty of carrying this Act into effect, and be dealt with accordingly."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 11,

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would move the insertion of the following words: "and such other books and documents as he may be instructed from time to time to keep."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That goes by itself.

On section 23,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been informed, and I think the information valuable, that if six months from 1st January were allowed, a number of Chinese would, within that time, secure what is called double residence, by coming from San Francisco to British Columbia, and they would return immediately, after obtaining the certificate, which might be traded away, as opportunity might offer. I therefore propose this amendment:

That as regards any vessel sailing from any port on the continent of North America, this Act shall come into force one month after the passing thereof, and as regards ports in China, six months after the passing of the Act.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would respectfully urge on the Minister that the whole Act should come into force on 1st October of this year. For vessels arriving from China, and be operative in ten days from its passage as far as the United States are concerned. The distance between Hong Kong and Victoria can be traversed in twenty-eight days. So that information can be conveyed after the passage of this Act in, say thirty days, which would be ample time to warn every person there who had the intention of leaving, to go into British Columbia before the Act came into force, and ample time would be afforded to intending shippers of Chinamen to complete their contracts within a reasonable time. I am not underrating the intention of the Government, because we are all delighted with the Bill as far as it goes, and have reason to felicitate ourselves upon the success achieved therefor, and which we hope will very nearly if not entirely meet the requirements of British Columbia, but it would give the people of British Columbia still greater pleasure if my suggestion were adopted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is not reasonable. The period of twelve months was first mentioned, because we, too, thought that a reasonable time, but representations having been made by my hon. friend and his colleagues from British Columbia, we thought that probably if a year was given a large number of immigrants might come in in some other way. I think the concessions we have made in that respect will be quite sufficient, and if we adopted the suggestion of the hon. gentleman it might interfere with the contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I am deeply sensible of the concessions the Government have made, nor am I unreasonable in my request now made, but if the hon. gentleman were in my position he would advocate precisely the same provisions as I am advocating now.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I dare say; and if the hon. gentleman were in my position he would do as I am doing now.

Mr. BAKER. That entirely depends upon circumstances. Bill reported with amendments.

#### THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise, be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, for the purpose of amending the same. He said: The first amendment is as follows:—

By inserting at the end of the paragraph of the second clause, defining the meaning of the word "city," the following words: except the cities of Hull and St. Hyacinthe, in the Province of Quebec, which, for the purposes of this Act, shall be held to be towns.

I explained, in the discussion before, that the value of property in these two cities is not equal to that in most other cities, and we propose that for the valuation of property they shall be considered as towns; otherwise, a good many men who now have votes might be disfranchised. Then the definition of farmer's son have been altered a good deal by extending, its meaning for the purposes of the Act; but there is no provision made for the meaning of the son of an owner of real property other than a farmer. Therefore, I propose this amendment:

By inserting at the end of the paragraph of the second clause defining the meaning of the expression farmer's son, the following words: Son of an owner of real property in cities and towns, means any male person, not otherwise qualified to vote, and being the son of an owner and occupant of real property, and includes a grandson, stepson, or son-in-law; and, in counties, means any male person not otherwise qualified to vote, and being the son of an owner and occupant of real property other than a farm, and includes a grandson, stepson or son-in-law.

Then, in accordance with a promise I made, the Bill was amended on the suggestion of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), to provide that in the case of tenants in counties, where the residence is not specified in the assessment roll, the valuation of the property should be *prima facie* evidence of the right of the tenants to vote, if the property is assessed at \$150; but by some accident that provision is not made *quoad* cities and towns, and therefore I propose that the Bill be further amended:

By inserting after the word "certificate" in the last line of sub-section 4, of clause 3, the following words: And providing, further, that where, on any revised or final assessment roll, the amount of the tenant's rent is not stated, the fact that the real property in respect of which he is entered on such roll as the tenant thereof is assessed in cities at \$300 or more, or in towns at \$200 or more, shall be held to be *prima facie* evidence of his right to be registered as a voter.

Mr. MILLS. When the Bill was last under consideration the hon. gentleman said it was the intention of the Government to provide that a judge might be the revising officer within his own judicial district, and also to provide that the judge should not only sit for the electoral district within which he might reside, but also for part of an electoral district which might be within his judicial district and outside of the electoral district in which he resided. The schedules of the Bill were amended accordingly; but the various clauses of the Bill would require some amendment

in the same direction, and the hon. gentleman said he would have amendments prepared by the law clerk, but he has not mentioned them now. I would like to know whether he has these amendments ready;

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the 13th clause we can insert the provision that the judge can be appointed revising officer for an electoral district within his county, or for any portion of an electoral district within his county. That would meet the case, I think.

Mr. MILLS. So far as that particular clause is concerned; but if the hon. gentleman adheres to the promise he made, and I suppose he does, to make provision to that effect, when we get into committee it will be necessary to make some little alterations in other sections. For instance, the revising officer is to have an office within the district. Section 15, in one part, provides that if the list is not printed the revising officer may charge for a copy of it at the rate of 6 cents for every 10 names, while according to the first part of the section he must have the list printed, and then the price will not exceed 5 cents a copy. My impression was, that part of this clause was struck out, but it is clear that if this was to stand, the revising officer would never have the list printed, because it would always be to his interest to furnish the list at 10 cents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We can amend that by unanimous consent.

Mr. MILLS. As the 28th clause stands at present, it is not the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to cause to be printed in the *Gazette* any portion of the voters' list until the entire list for the electoral district is completed; so that, if there was one polling division in which the list was not completed, the list of the whole electoral district would be inoperative. Other sections assume rightly that the list for any municipality, when it is completed and certified, should go into operation. It will, therefore, be necessary to amend section 28, to make it correspond with the other sections. Section 44, for instance, is not consistent with section 28, as it now stands. Then, I would compare section 44 with section 58. Section 44, I apprehend, is intended to operate, not in the first election or in the preparation of the first voters' lists, but in all subsequent voters' lists; but section 58 is intended to apply in the case of the first voters' list. It would be better for the First Minister to strike out the first three lines and a-half of section 58, and allow the proviso to stand for the whole section. I mention this, so that when we go into committee, if there is no objection, the committee may revise all these sections.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the slightest objection to that, because we ought to have the Act as perfect as possible.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman also proposed to make some amendment with reference to the Indian voters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I asked the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) to give me a copy of the amendment he proposed to move.

Mr. MILLS. Would the hon. gentleman object to amending the law relating to Indian voters in such a way as to provide that the Indians who reside upon their reserves and vote should be enfranchised Indians, leaving those off the reserves to qualify the same as any other party?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is reopening the whole question.

Mr. MILLS. Not necessarily.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot do that.

Mr. MILLS. I am only mentioning matters about which, I think, there will be no controversy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we can consider all these matters, except that in reference to the Indians, included under my motion.

Mr. MILLS. We had better go into committee to reconsider the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; we cannot do that.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the First Minister would allow the amendment of which I gave notice to be considered at the same time, in reference to Indian agents interfering. I was obliged to leave, and in my absence the amendment met with some criticism from some gentlemen on this side of the House, and was not adopted, though the First Minister was agreeable to the adoption of it. I have since been able to satisfy those who objected to it that it might be considered of some use.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we would get on faster if I were to move my resolutions, and the hon. gentlemen were to move these clauses in their proper order.

Mr. EDGAR. There is one amendment which I am sure the hon. gentleman will adopt, because it is clearly an omission. It was agreed that the actual value should be *prima facie* evidence of the rental of a tenant, if the rental was not on the assessment roll. The provision has been made for counties, but the hon. gentleman has forgotten to make it in the case of towns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is part of my present motion.

Mr. MILLS. I see the hon. gentleman, in the definition he has given, speaks of "Mongolian or Chinese race." I do not remember that the word "Mongolian" was in the amendment, and that would exclude the Japanese, whom the hon. gentleman did not propose to exclude.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word "Mongolian" was there, decidedly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has a copy of the motion I made, and I think it would save time if he would put that in with his other amendments. I have noticed that any motion made by him seems to prevail much more readily in the committee and in the House than if it were made by anyone else, and I think it would expedite matters if the hon. gentleman would put that in with his other motion.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move the first amendment which I read, as to the interpretation of the word "city."

Mr. MILLS. I think it is pretty clear that the hon. gentleman's amendment is made purely for political considerations, and is not based upon any principle. When this subject was under consideration we reminded the hon. gentleman that in the case of the town of Sandwich there was a population of about 1,000 inhabitants; that in the case of the village of Leamington there was a population of 2,000 and upwards; in the case of the village of Essex Centre there were over 2,000; in the village of West Tilbury, over 2,000; Wallaceburg, over 2,000; in the town of Bothwell there is less than 1,000. The principle upon which the hon. gentleman professes to proceed, that these are towns rather than cities, does not apply to these two cases alone, but to a score of other instances that were pointed out by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) when the Bill was under consideration.

Mr. MILLS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot go into the populations and sizes of all the various villages and towns, but we take up these two cities, which were, properly, ambitions. They ought to have remained as towns; then there would be no difficulty. I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating that this amendment is made for political purposes. It is true that my hon. friend from Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) is a Conservative and supports the Government, but I do not think Mr. Bernier supports the Government, though it adds to his constituency, or rather leaves his constituency exactly as it was before.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I now move the amendment which I read, with regard to farmers' sons.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) called my attention to the need of making the same provision with respect to tenants for counties as in cities and towns; I therefore move the amendment which I read to the House before the Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. The point was, whether it would not be just as well as to allow the tenant to vote in both cases—first, if he has the rental that is required of him here, or if his property is worth that amount. If he has property valued at \$150, let him vote on it; it will save a good deal of trouble in enquiring into deeds, etc.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That offends the principle of the Act, which is that the tenant, in order to have a vote, must pay a certain rental. In order to expedite matters, the clause says, that even in a county, the fact that he is assessed for \$150 shall be *prima facie* evidence, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that he pays the requisite rent.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

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

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, in order to amend the same, by adding a new clause, as follows:—

That any person being an agent within the meaning of the Indian Act, 1880, and who, either directly or indirectly, seeks to induce or compel any person, being an Indian or of part Indian blood and qualified to vote only in respect of property forming part of a reserve, as defined by said Act, to cause his name to be registered as a voter or to vote or refrain from voting at any election of a member of the House of Commons, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and if found guilty thereof, shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$200 or by imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, or by both, and shall not be entitled to hold any office or place of emolument in the appointment of the Governor or Superintendent General of Indian Affairs for a period of two years from the date of his conviction."

Bill re-committed and amendment agreed to.

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

Mr. MILLS moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House, in order to amend the same, so as to provide that a judge may be the revising officer for the whole of his judicial district; and also to amend sections 15, 28 and 58.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amendment is certainly not necessary. It is now provided that the judge may be the revising officer for the whole of the electoral district, or a portion of the electoral district, which is what the hon. gentleman wants. If the judge has a certain judi-

cial district, a portion of which belongs to another electoral district, the Government may appoint the judge as revising officer for that portion of the judicial district which belongs to another electoral district. That is in the discretion of the Government in either case, so that I do not think that there is any object in that part of the amendment. Then, as to the latter part of the amendment, the hon. gentleman does not say how he proposes to amend these clauses.

Mr. MILLS. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that as the Bill now stands the revising officer for an electoral district must be the revising officer of the whole district. Of course, if the hon. gentleman chooses to leave the Bill in a position which makes it impossible to appoint a judge for his entire judicial district, he is taking a position contrary to the promises which he made in Committee of the Whole.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I promised to adopt amendments which would make the Bill more workable.

Mr. MILLS. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 18.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MILLS. According to section 14, wherever the revising officer is referred to, it is provided that he shall be the revising officer for the whole district. The whole plan of the Bill is such that unless it is amended a judge cannot be the revising officer for his judicial district.

Bill re-committed and amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Bill as amended be now taken into consideration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to place a motion in your hands, which I shall do without any remarks, as the question has already been fully discussed. I move:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide for leaving with the people the control of the voters' lists by officers of their own selection; and for avoiding the useless expense of double machinery for preparing voters' lists, the extra expense contingent upon a Dominion Franchise Bill, and the confusion and annoyance to the people resulting from two distinct methods of preparing and revising voters' lists: by providing that each Province shall be allowed to judge of the proper requirements for the exercise of the franchise within its own limits (inasmuch as the diversities of conditions in different Provinces render it difficult, if not impossible, to fix a uniform franchise for the entire Dominion that will fully meet the conditions and wants of each separate Province); and that a uniform franchise for each Province, for both provincial and Dominion elections, shall be secured, by providing that the voters' lists used in each Province, in the election of members of the Dominion House of Commons, shall be voters' lists in each Province prepared under the laws of such Province, and in use for the election of members of the House of Assembly of each such Province.

House divided on amendment:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,  
Auger,  
Bernier,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casgrau,  
Catudal,  
Charlton,  
De St. Georges,  
Dupont,  
Edgar,  
Fairbank,

Fisher,  
Forbes,  
Geoffrion,  
Gigault,  
Gillmor,  
Guay,  
Gunn,  
Holton,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
Kirk,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingston,  
McCraney,  
McIntyre,

McIsaac,  
Mills,  
Mulock,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,  
Rinfret,  
Scrifer,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wells.—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,  
Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Billy,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Chapleau,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Curran,  
Daly,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (Maski'gé),  
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Farrow,  
Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.),

Fortin,  
Foster,  
Gagné,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guilbault,  
Hackett,  
Haggart,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Homer,  
Jamieson,  
Jenkins,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Landry (Montmagny),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Mackintosh,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Pictou),  
McDougall (C. Breton),  
McLellan,  
McNeill,  
Massue,  
Moffat,

Orton,  
Paint,  
Patterson (Essex),  
Pinsonneault,  
Pope,  
Pruyn,  
Riopel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Townshend,  
Tupper,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Oardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
White (Kenfrew),  
Wigle,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westm'ld),  
Woodworth,  
Wright—96.

Amendment negatived.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company—(Mr. Haggart.)

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

The House resumed the consideration of Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. JENKINS. I beg to move:

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same as follows:—By inserting after clause 8, the following clause:—In the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island besides the persons entitled to be registered as voters, and to vote under the foregoing provisions of this Act, every person who at the time of the passing of the same:—

1. Is of the age of 21 years and is not by this Act or by any law of the Dominion of Canada disqualified or prevented from voting, and
2. Is a British subject by birth or naturalization and resident of this Province, and is entitled to vote in the said Provinces respectively by the laws now severally existing in the same, shall have a right to be registered as a voter and to vote so long as he shall continue to be qualified to vote under the provisions of the said last mentioned laws and no longer.

He said: In 1854, the Legislature of Prince Edward Island passed a Bill conferring manhood suffrage on the people of that Province. At that time many were opposed to the measure. It was looked upon as an infringement of the rights of property; a measure fraught with great danger to the State, and it was thought that mob rule; with all its concomitant evils would be the result. The experience of 30 years had proved the failure of those predictions. No evil consequences followed the extension of the franchise; on the contrary, the results have been in every way advantageous, and those most hostile to manhood suffrage at that time are now desirous of having it retained. It was supposed that the electors admitted to the privilege of the franchise by that Bill would attach themselves *en masse* to the Radical element. The contrary has been the case, and it is well known that a majority of that class of electors support the Liberal Conservative party. The knowledge of this fact

induced the Hon. David Laird, Minister of the Interior in the late Government, to introduce a Bill into this House, intended to wipe out as voters all those who voted on manhood suffrage. That Bill passed the House, and was supported by hon. members who now look upon the very slight restriction of the franchise which will result from the Bill before the House with righteous indignation; and the young men of Prince Edward Island have to thank their friends in the Senate that they have not been deprived of a voice in the election of their representatives. Efforts of various kinds have been made to palliate this attempt to rob our young men of the franchise; it has been said that it was only intended as a temporary measure, to be in force until the Local Government should pass a registration Bill. Now, Sir, while I fully admit the right of this House to fix the franchise and control the machinery by which its members are to be elected, I deny its right to coerce a Provincial Government into passing a registration Bill, or to compel it to assume any part of the expense of Dominion elections, or to disfranchise any body of electors till it had done so. The case is clear; it was a deliberate and most unjustifiable attempt on the part of the late Minister of the Interior to get rid of a class of voters that were obnoxious to him, and no amount of special pleading can deprive it of that character. My hon. colleague seems to be imbued with much the same spirit; he is very anxious to have the names of franchise voters struck off the list; he considers it arbitrary, unjust and outrageous that the present list should be taken as *prima facie* evidence of the right to vote. Sir, I do not share with my hon. colleague this extreme anxiety to have names struck off the voters' list; on the contrary, Sir, it would be to me a matter of regret if even one voter should be struck off, and I hope the House will see the injustice of depriving any class of the franchise who have once exercised that privilege. The Bill before the House is a very liberal one, verging closely upon manhood suffrage; in most of the Provinces it will enlarge the franchise, but in Prince Edward Island it will, to some extent, restrict it. Now Sir, while I admit that it may be advisable to have a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion, I contend that it would be impolitic and unjust to make the provisions of this Bill retroactive; it would be contrary to the spirit of the age, contrary to the spirit and intention of this Bill, to deprive any man who has once enjoyed it of the right to vote. My experience of manhood suffrage is, that those who vote under it are as intelligent and independent as any other class of electors, and they have invariably exercised their privilege in a manner becoming to themselves and reflecting credit on the Province to which they belong. Sir, this amendment is intended to secure the franchise to all who have ever voted under manhood suffrage or who would have been entitled to vote under the old law at the next general election, and I trust that the good results which I feel sure will follow the extension of the franchise, effected by this Bill, will remove the doubts and scruples of those who are now opposed to manhood suffrage, and that before a second general election shall take place that system of voting will be adopted, and every educated honest citizen of this Dominion, will be entitled to record his vote for the representatives who are to make the laws under which he lives.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.). Since we have failed in retaining to the people of Prince Edward Island the full privilege they have hitherto enjoyed, I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's. I should be sorry to be a party to depriving voters of any privilege which they now enjoy. There is no doubt that although uniformity is not actually necessary to the Bill, it is highly desirable. As Prince Edward Island and British Columbia are the only Provinces in which the franchise has been restricted to any extent,

Mr. JENKINS.

I hope the House will accept the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Jenkins). The people of Prince Edward Island have every confidence that the leader of the Government will not be a party to disfranchising any of the electors of that Province, and I hope the House will see proper to adopt the amendment. No doubt this House has a perfect right to pass a Franchise Bill, making arrangements for carrying out its own elections, and I hope that, under the circumstances, it will not be deemed necessary to disfranchise any of the electors of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. I congratulate hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island on their change of views with respect to this question. A few moments ago they voted down the principle of conferring on the various Provinces the same qualifications for voters for members of this House as for the local elections in those Provinces. The hon. gentleman is quite willing to disfranchise a large number of voters in every other Province, but he protests against any voters in his own Province being disqualified under the Bill. I do not know why hon. gentlemen should deny to other Provinces the rights which they claim for their own; but it is evident that the hon. gentleman has not looked at the qualifications of voters in the other Provinces, or he would hardly agree to the restriction of the franchise at the expense of the other Provinces. I do not know a Province in which the Bill extends the franchise, because in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, many thousands of those who are now entitled to the exercise of the franchise will be denied that privilege.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the members from Prince Edward Island are very inconsistent. The privileges enjoyed with regard to the election of members for the Dominion Parliament in the last Dominion election are to be continued, and the hon. gentleman said, a few moments ago, that we voted against a resolution giving the same privilege to the other Provinces. I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct. The last resolution simply referred to the fact that the voters' lists should be taken in each Province for the Dominion elections; and in Prince Edward Island we have no voters' list, and if the resolution had carried, it would have been necessary to change the whole Bill and to disqualify a large number of people in that Province. But the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Jenkins) does not at all break upon the uniformity of the Bill. If passed by this House, as I hope it will be, it will only confer the right to vote on the electors of Prince Edward Island who voted at the last election, so long as they continue in the possession of the franchise that entitled them to vote at that election; and the young men coming of age shall have to conform to the law, the same as people in other parts of the Dominion. I look upon the amendment as very important to the electorate of Prince Edward Island—to those who have exercised the privilege of voting there for twenty-five years or more. The hon. mover of the amendment stated that twenty-five years ago, or upwards, when manhood suffrage was introduced into the Province, a great deal of uneasiness was felt by the property holders, that it was too radical a change, and they very much feared that the men enjoying the right of suffrage would deprive them of the rights and privileges they formerly enjoyed. But such has not been the case. After an experience of twenty-five or thirty years of manhood suffrage, the most tenacious to uphold that privilege are the property holders of the Province, and the people of that Province look upon that privilege as one of their dearest and most cherished rights. Although the Bill before the House is a very liberal and progressive measure, and very comprehensive in its details, almost amounting to manhood suffrage, yet, in the Province of Prince Edward

Island, it will, in a small degree, restrict the vote, and a few young men and perhaps a few old men who enjoyed that privilege before will be deprived of it by the Bill. I therefore trust that this amendment will pass and that the privilege those people have enjoyed so long will be retained to them. We laid the foundation of this amendment a few weeks ago, when this House adopted the provision that the poll books should be taken as the basis upon which the revising officer should make up his list, in places where no voters' list is in existence. The revising officer will have no difficulty at all. The poll book will be *prima facie* evidence of the right of the elector to vote. I was surprised to observe in the Votes and Proceedings that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who, I regret to see, is absent from his seat in the House, gave notice of an amendment, that all those who are not possessed of certain qualifications in Prince Edward Island should be struck off the list. His amendment is as follows:—

"That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same by striking out the provision making the poll books at the last election, in each electoral district in Prince Edward Island, *prima facie* evidence of the right to vote of the persons whose names are in such poll books as voters, and by providing, in lieu thereof, that in Prince Edward Island the revising officer for each district shall, as soon as possible after taking the oath of office, obtain certified copies of the assessment lists in the cities and towns where there are such lists, and, in the counties outside of the cities and towns, certified copies of the last revised assessment rolls of each school district, and that such lists shall be taken as *prima facie* evidence of the value of the lands therein mentioned."

The hon. gentleman pretended to be very much in favor of manhood suffrage in his speeches in this House; he seemed to be very desirous that the privilege enjoyed by the people of Prince Edward Island so long should be continued to them; but he was very much afraid that the poll books should be taken as the basis for the voters' list, and he gave notice of this amendment to strike off all the names of those on the poll books, and in lieu thereof to take the assessment lists of school districts throughout the Province. I am very much surprised that the hon. gentleman should go that far. If you do not take the poll books in the Province of Prince Edward Island as a basis, you cannot have a voters' list at all. We know that it is a very easy matter to strike a name off the list while it is very difficult to get an elector, particularly during the busy season, to come forward to get his name put on the list. The salaries of the school teachers are paid by the Provincial Government; the school district may vote a supplement to the salary or not, and it may have an assessment list or not, just as it chooses, or the people may voluntarily subscribe an amount for the running of the school. So that a list could not be framed at all in that way, and I am glad the right hon. First Minister adhered to his proposition to retain the poll book as the basis on which the revising officer would make his list in the Province of Prince Edward Island. We had at one time a registration of voters in that Province. It was the intention of the late Government to disfranchise a large proportion of the population, or otherwise to coerce the Province into the expense of preparing the voters' list. The people of the island were very indignant at that proposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite now speak of uniformity, but this was a great breach of uniformity. While in all the other Provinces the same franchise that qualified an elector to vote for a member of the Provincial Legislature qualified him to vote for a member of this House, Prince Edward Island was made an exception. We had two sets of qualifications there; one was manhood suffrage, on which members of the House of Assembly or the Lower House were elected; the other was a higher qualification, based on the ownership of £100 worth of property, on which legislative councillors were elected. In the Bill introduced into this House in 1874 that qualification was adopted for the election of members to this House. It is true, that provision was rejected in the Senate, and the rights and privilege

enjoyed by the people of Prince Edward Island were continued to them by the action of the Senate at that time. Now, the hon. member for King's (Mr. McIntyre), who was in the House at that time, and who, I am glad to see, is in the House this evening, in addressing this House a few days ago on this question, stated that it made little or no difference to the people of Prince Edward Island whether the Senate adopted that amendment to the Bill or not. As the hon. gentleman on that occasion referred to myself, I will take the liberty of reading an extract from his speech, and correcting him in a few particulars. Referring to the clause in the Bill as it went from this House, he said:

"This clause was of a merely temporary character, and was inserted only to make provision until the Local Legislature passed a registration Act, which they did the very next Session. So whatever difficulty was caused by inserting this clause was completely removed by the Act of the Local Legislature. This clause would never have been inserted had it not been known that the Local Legislature was about to pass a registration Act. This was merely a temporary clause, and whether it was thrown out by the Senate or not, made no difference in regard to the island."

Now, the hon. gentleman is not quite correct in that statement. It may have been intended as a temporary clause, but it would be a permanent matter, unless the island Legislature went to the expense of providing a voters' list. But the hon. gentleman says the island Legislature did do so at the very next Session of the Legislature. Now, the hon. gentleman is not correct in that regard. The island Legislature did not pass a Registration of Voters' Act until 1877, three years after the Act of 1874 was passed. If the Senate had not amended the Bill, and an election had taken place in Prince Edward Island in the interim between 1874 and 1877, at least three-fourths of the electors of Prince Edward Island would have been disfranchised. The hon. gentleman complained very loudly of the measure now before the House, and said it would disfranchise a great many of the young men and the old men in that Province, but the Act passed at that time would have disfranchised three-fourths of the electors of Prince Edward Island. This Bill, while it is not as liberal as we would desire, is still a very liberal measure. A man owning \$150 worth of property has the right to vote; the tenant, the occupant, the farmer's son, the mechanic's son, the fisherman, have the right to vote, while, under the Bill of 1874, as it went from this House to the Senate, no man in Prince Edward Island would have had a vote unless he had \$325 worth of real estate. I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman who tacitly assented to the disfranchisement of so many under that Bill can say that this Bill is a gross infringement of the rights of the people of that Province. It may be said that I go too far when I say that three-fourths would be disfranchised by that Bill; but on looking over the election lists in the Province, I find that at the last election for legislative councillors in Queen's county, the metropolitan county, the vote polled was 1,491, while the vote polled at the last partial election for the House of Commons was 6,816; so that under the Laird Bill more than three-fourths of the people would have been disfranchised. In 1876, one year before the Registration of voters' Act was passed in the Province, the Hon. David Laird, Minister of Interior in the late Government, resigned, and was appointed Governor of the North-West Territory. An election was held in the county of Queen's, in October, 1876, for a representative in the place of Mr. Laird. If that Bill had not been amended by the Senate three-fourths of the electors of Queen's would have been disfranchised at that time, so that it made a very important difference to the people of Prince Edward Island whether that Bill was allowed to pass as it went from this House or was amended by the Senate. The hon. gentleman says it would make very little difference. I have an authority which he will not dispute, the high authority of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who is not only the hon. gentleman's

leader but is, I believe, the recognised leader of the Opposition members from the Maritime Provinces, and that hon. gentleman stated that the temporary provision in the Laird Bill evoked a storm from one end of Prince Edward Island to the other, a justifiable storm, because, as a temporary provision, I say it was unjustifiable. I need not deal with the merits of this question at any greater length. The subject is well known to hon. members. I trust we have their sympathy, and I hope we shall have their support. Hon. members from all parts of the country do not desire to deprive any person who once exercised the right of the franchise of that high privilege, and although the Bill is of a very liberal nature, and I have supported it for many reasons all through, it does not go as far as I would wish, and I would like to have continued to the free and independent and intelligent people of Prince Edward Island, who have exercised the franchise before, the right which they have hitherto possessed.

Mr. McINTYRE. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island who have preceded me have occupied a very peculiar position in regard to this Bill. They conveniently forget that their names are on record as voting for the second reading, which included the adoption of the whole Bill. Now they pretend to be very anxious to mitigate the evil they have already committed, by reading amendments, which they know very well will not be accepted by the Government of which they are prominent supporters. It is a foregone conclusion that they will not be accepted, but those gentlemen must have their names on record against depriving the men who sent them here of their votes. The hon. gentleman says this is a very liberal Bill; but, instead of sticking to the Bill, he talks about a Bill passed here some ten years ago, with which we have nothing in the world to do at present. His speech was intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people of Prince Edward Island and to draw their attention away from this Bill to one passed ten years ago. I will show how liberal this Bill is, and what the hon. gentleman understands by liberality. In Prince Edward Island manhood suffrage prevailed for those who had no property qualification, and after performing their statute labor or paying \$1, which was its equivalent, they could vote. How are they going to vote to-day? On the qualification of \$1 they formerly had a vote, and to-day that qualification is raised to \$300 for income. Again, as far as property is concerned, any person having property of the value of 40 shillings a year, or \$6.40, had the privilege of voting, and the lowest qualification under this Bill is \$20 a year rental. There is a great difference between voting on a qualification of \$6.40 and \$20 a year. This is some of the liberality the hon. gentleman thinks is attached to this Bill. Of course, if a person has property he has a vote on all occasions, but it is the young men who have no property who are favored by the manhood suffrage qualification. I look upon this Bill as a step in the wrong direction—at least, so far as Prince Edward Island and British Columbia are concerned. We are going back to a state of affairs which prevailed 30 or 40 years ago. According to this Bill the poll books used at the last election are to be taken as *prima facie* evidence of those whose names appear thereon having a right to vote. But there are hundreds of persons whose names appear on the poll books who will have no vote, because they voted at the last election on the manhood suffrage qualification. Then there is that class of young men who have since become of age, and they have as good a right to be put upon the list as those who are now on, yet they cannot vote, because they have no qualification. If these men who really have no qualification are left on the poll book, it will be due altogether to the goodwill of persons on both sides of politics in refraining to take objection

Mr. HACKETT.

to them; because, if any person desires to have their names struck off, it can be done. The hon. gentleman who spoke before me referred to the Bill of 1874, and had a good deal to say about its disfranchising tendency. On a former occasion I stated that this clause which referred to Prince Edward Island was for the purpose of affording a sort of registration of voters until the Local Legislature should pass a registration Act, which, the hon. gentleman says, they did about two years after that. I think it was passed previous to 1877, but I am not sure about that. I shall close my remarks by moving an amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Queen's county (Mr. Jenkins):

That all the words after "that" be left out, and the following be inserted: to amend the same, so as to provide that the provincial qualification of voters in Prince Edward Island shall continue to be the qualification of voters for the election of members to the House of Commons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is much chance of that amendment to the amendment carrying, as on a previous occasion the House has declared, in unmistakable terms, against it; therefore, I fancy there is not much use in discussing that point. The question really before the House is the amendment moved by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Jenkins), and I shall say at once that I accept that amendment. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) declared that as, a short time ago, we had voted against the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), it would be quite inconsistent for us to support this. I do not see that at all. The motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk was against the principle of this Bill, namely, that the Dominion Parliament should fix the franchise for the election of members to this Parliament, instead of leaving it to the Local Legislatures. That is the principle of this Bill; therefore, those hon. gentlemen who voted against that, and at the same time support this amendment, are in no way guilty of inconsistency. I think, however, that this amendment is practically of very little importance. I agree with the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett) that under the present Bill almost every man can vote. I heard a Liberal say that any man in Canada who could not vote under one or other of the franchises provided in this Bill deserves to be in the poor house, and will find his way there. Whether it be as a property owner, real or personal, or under the income clause, or as a wage-earner—by some means or other, every independent man in this country—such is the happy condition of the country—that the people earn enough and ought to own enough property to have a vote. So I think that the number of men who will be added to the list in Prince Edward Island by adopting this amendment will be exceedingly small—so small as not to really affect the election in any constituency on the island. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a sentiment about it, and the hon. gentlemen contend that no man who now has a vote in Prince Edward Island or British Columbia ought to be disfranchised. Now, this Bill is not a disfranchising Bill in any way whatever. The hon. member for Bothwell said that people were disfranchised by it. I say they are not. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, alludes to the Bill that is to come into force in Ontario in January next. But that is a matter in the future. The present Bill, which has been introduced before, and is introduced this Session, is an enfranchising Bill, and very many men, a large number of men, who hitherto have had no vote in Dominion elections, will come in under this Bill—there is no doubt about that. It is an enfranchising Bill. Those who hitherto have had votes in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia might feel aggrieved if any few of them were cut off by this Bill, and as it will not affect the principle of the Bill substantially, and will only affect the men who now have a vote, and will have no effect in the future, I accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jenkins).

Mr. MILLS. What about Manitoba ?

Mr. EDGAR. The First Minister has just stated that this is not a disfranchising Bill. Now, to-day I took the trouble to see how the case stood in a couple of wards in the city of Ottawa, to see whether this was a disfranchising Bill or not. We know that under the new Act of Ontario, voters who are entitled to vote for members of the Ontario Legislature are at present entitled to vote for members of the House of Commons. Now, in the Act passed by the Ontario Legislature the qualification of owners, tenants or occupants of real estate in cities is \$200; the qualification adopted by this Bill for cities is \$300 in respect of real property. Now, in this city, the last assessment rolls printed were made in 1879. I ascertained that in By ward, in this city, there were 82 persons assessed in respect of real property valued between \$200 and \$300. These men will have the right to vote under the Ontario Act, but if this Bill is passed they will be disfranchised. I take another ward. I take Ottawa ward, in this city, and I find there are 181 persons in that ward alone who will be disfranchised by this Bill. In those two wards there are 263 names on the assessment roll for 1879, the last printed, who will be disfranchised by the operation of this Bill, because the Ontario Act is the law to-day. It is not a speculative matter; it is not what may be the law—it is what is the law to-day. It was passed and came into operation on 1st July for a great many purposes. For all purposes connected with assessment, for instance, it is the law to-day, and after 1st January it will be the law in all respects, and we do not expect elections before that date. That does not include another class who will be disfranchised by this Bill, that is the class of wage-earners and income voters, who, if they have an income of \$250, have a vote to-day under the Ontario Act, whereas by this law such persons will not have a vote, unless possessed of an income of \$300. There will be a very considerable class who will come between \$250 and \$300 in regard to income, who will be positively and absolutely disfranchised by this Bill when passed. I dare say, in each constituency of this Dominion—and Ottawa sends two members—there will be as many disfranchised by this Bill as in these two wards of Ottawa city. If that is correct, then by this clause there will be over 25,000 disfranchised through the Province of Ontario alone by the operation of this Bill; and yet the right hon. the First Minister tells the House that this is not a Bill to disfranchise.

Mr. STAIRS. I should like to direct the attention of the House to the effect this Bill will have upon the Province of Nova Scotia. I understood the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say that this Bill will disfranchise large numbers in all the Provinces of the Dominion. Having taken the trouble to ascertain what the effect will be in the county of Halifax, I beg to state that I have received from Halifax the assessment roll for five polling sections, which can be taken as representative districts. They include fishing, farming and mining, and a careful analysis of the figures shows that in those five polling sections there were 944 resident ratepayers at the last assessment. Under the old Nova Scotia Act—the House will recollect that it was stated there was a new Act passed during the last Session of the Local Legislature—652 of those ratepayers would be qualified to vote under the real estate qualification. The only class that could possibly be disfranchised under the present Dominion Bill would be those who were entered under the real and personal property qualification. Out of 659 qualified voters there would be only 7 who would be disqualified and not have the right to vote under the Dominion Bill, which does not include a real and personal property qualification. So, if there was nothing else in the Dominion Bill, the House will see that there was an insignificant number of persons disqualified in the five sections for want of real and personal property qualification as under this Bill.

383

Under the Dominion Bill there will be the same number of persons qualified out of those 944 as there would be under the local Act, as far as the real estate qualification is concerned, as owners, that is, 652. Then, there will be a very large number, indeed, of persons qualified under this Bill on account of the different way in which the qualification is arrived at, the one being by assessment and the other actual value. Anyone who will take the trouble to look over the lists will perceive that there are a very large number of persons on the list in those polling sections, and, of course, this will cover very many persons who come within a few dollars of having the amount necessary to qualify. In running my eye down the list, I saw several amounts, such as \$145, \$140 and \$130. Under the present local Act those would not be qualified to vote; but under the Dominion Bill it is certain they will be qualified to vote. There is not the slightest doubt but that there will be 200, at least, qualified as real estate owners under the Dominion Bill who are not qualified under the local Acts, either past or present. Besides, I find there are 37 persons whose names are not on the list who will probably be qualified to vote under the qualification for fishermen, namely, owning \$150 worth of real estate, fishing tackle, etc. They are not qualified to vote under the local Act, because they have not the fishing qualification; for under the local Act they must have personal property to the value of \$300, whereas the amount is only \$150 to qualify as fishermen under the Dominion Bill. On looking over the assessment rolls it appears that very few, not more than one or two out of the seven, were qualified under the real and personal property qualification. Besides, on looking over the assessment lists, I noticed there are 219 ratepayers whose names appear on those rolls who have property sufficient to qualify one or more sons under the Dominion Bill. Those parties did not vote under the Nova Scotia Act, and therefore, strictly speaking, they cannot be said to be disfranchised, but there has been an enlargement of the franchise. I do not want to deceive the House, and I have great pleasure in explaining that the Act passed last year will give those persons qualifications the same as they will have it under the Dominion Bill. I have added also the fishermen, and there are a very large number who will be qualified, because they own sufficient real estate and nets to give them the vote under this Bill, which they do not possess under the local Act. Instead of their being disfranchised, there will be really an enlargement of the franchise, to the extent of 700 votes, at least.

Mr. LAURIER. I am one of those who do not believe in universal suffrage. I do not believe it is right in principle, for I believe that the primary principle which ought to govern this matter is that the regulation of the franchise should belong to each Province, and if you have in Prince Edward Island universal suffrage, and if the people there are satisfied with it, I would not be a party to depriving them of it, any more than I would be a party to the majority in this House imposing on us in the Province of Quebec a more extended suffrage than prevails in that Province. The Prime Minister has stated that he would not deprive any voter in Prince Edward Island of the suffrage. I say that the same principle of justice requires that votes should not be given to any man in the Province of Quebec, or any other Province, to whom the Legislature of that Province has not thought proper to give the vote. For this reason, I am prepared to vote for the amendment and the sub-amendment.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. McIntyre to the amendment.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,  
Auger,

Gillmor,  
Guay,

McIsaac,  
Mills,

Bernier,	Gunn,	Mulock,
Blake,	Hackett,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jenkins,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Langelier,	Springer,
Catudal,	Laurier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Trow,
Edgar,	Livingston,	Vail,
Fairbank,	Macdonald (King's),	Watson,
Fisher,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Forbes,	McCraney,	Wells.—50.
Geoffrion,	McIntyre,	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	Montplaisir,
Allison,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Orton,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Pinsonneault,
Barnard,	Gagné,	Pope,
Beaty,	Girouard,	Pruyn,
Bell,	Gordon,	Riopel,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bergin,	Guillet,	Ross,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Smyth,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John)	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Daoust,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dawson,	McDougall (Pictou),	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers (Maskingé)	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wigle,
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	McLellan,	Wood (Brookville),
Dickinson,	McNeill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dodd,	Massue,	Woodworth.—95.
Dugas,	Moffat,	

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. WELDON. So far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned, some material alterations in the franchise have been made, and some of my hon. friends have indicated the changes which will take place in some of the constituencies under the operation of this Bill. I have in previous speeches referred to the effect of the Bill upon the voters of the city of St. John, and I regret that many voters in that city, who have been exercising the franchise for years, will be deprived of that privilege. I think if the people of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia are to be regarded in this matter, it is right that the claims of the classes to which I have referred in the Province of New Brunswick, who will be disfranchised if this Bill passes in its present shape, should also be considered. There are a number of people who are in possession of large and valuable properties in the cities of St. John and Portland who will be disfranchised under the provisions of this Bill, and others who now enjoy the franchise by virtue of their being freemen of the city. I venture to think that if the Minister of Finance were present he would agree with me that these men should not be deprived of the franchise, for I believe the Minister of Finance owes many a vote in the city of St. John to the very class whom this Bill will disfranchise. Holding these views, I would move an amendment to the amendment:

To insert the words "New Brunswick" after the words "British Columbia," and to strike out the words "in the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island," and insert the following: In order to enable persons now entitled to vote in the Provinces of British Columbia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward, to vote at future elections of the members of the House of Commons in the said Provinces.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I regret very much indeed that the First Minister has accepted the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, if I understand that amendment. I have listened patiently and with interest to the discussion, and I have endeavored to understand the amendment. I am not sure that I understand it fully; but if I do understand it, I regret very much that it has been accepted, inasmuch as I should feel constrained to vote against it. A few moments ago I sent for the amendment to read it for myself, but was not able to get it, as it was in the hands of some other hon. member, and as there was no notice given of it, I may not be familiar with its details; but if I understand it, it proposes to give Prince Edward Island the right, for the first electoral list that will be made under this law, to act on the law of Prince Edward Island as it exists to-day: that is, to take the present qualification as the basis of the lists for the federal elections, and that is to continue for all the voters who will then be found entitled to vote, so long as they live; but if new voters come forward they must qualify under the law that applies to other parts of the Dominion. The result of that, according to my interpretation, is that a young man who is to-day 21 years of age, and otherwise qualified under the island law, will, if he lives to be 81 years of age, be entitled to vote for 60 years longer without the necessity of acquiring any other qualification; whereas, a young man who is only 20 years of age, just one year younger, will come in next year, and if he should not happen to have the necessary qualification under the present Bill, will not be entitled to vote at all during the same length of time. Moreover, that exception destroys the uniformity of the Bill. I feel that I could not vote against the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) if I did not vote against the other; I feel that I should vote against both. I shall therefore vote against the amendment of the hon. member for St. John and also that of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Jenkins), if my explanation of it is correct.

Mr. BURPEE. I differ from the conclusions of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry). It is an old saying that half a loaf is better than no bread. I would prefer universal suffrage all over the Dominion, as they have it in Prince Edward Island, to the franchise of this Bill; but it is clear, from the last division, that we cannot get universal suffrage for Prince Edward Island, or for any of the other Provinces. Now, I am willing to accept for New Brunswick what has been conceded by the Premier to Prince Edward Island; that is, I am willing to take the lists of New Brunswick as they stand now, and allow those whose names are now on the voters' lists to continue there as long as they live, and accept for those who will come in after this year the franchise which is adopted for the whole Dominion, rather than these electors should be disfranchised whose names are now on the lists. Now, I think New Brunswick has a good case in this matter, and I cannot for the life of me understand on what principle this concession can be denied to us if it is granted to Prince Edward Island. The real estate qualification in New Brunswick is based on \$100 worth of property. By this Bill it is made \$150, and we have official accounts from the officers of five counties showing the number of persons who have not property to the value of \$140, and whose names will be struck off the list. In the county of York there will be 804; in Queen's, 527; in Sunbury, 394; Charlotte 550; and Carleton over 300. Now, what we ask by the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is that these people should be put upon the same footing as those who are enfranchised in Prince Edward Island. If the hon. gentleman can give a good reason why this should not be conceded to New Brunswick as well as to Prince Edward Island, I should like to hear it. This is uniformity with a vengeance; it is mak-

ing fish of one and flesh of another in earnest. I do ask the consideration of the House for this amendment, which is based on the principle that the different Provinces should be placed on the same footing in this respect.

Mr. BLAKE. Surely the people of New Brunswick have the same right to consideration as the people of British Columbia and the people of Prince Edward Island. If the prejudices and the passions and the sentiments of the people of one Province be considered, are not those of the people of another Province to be considered? The hon. First Minister says he does not think it will make much difference in the island of Prince Edward—that he believes there will be very few persons enfranchised under the amendment he has accepted who would be disfranchised if the amendment were rejected, but he believes it is a proper concession to make to those gentlemen, who propose that no man should be disfranchised who has the franchise now in these Provinces. It has been pointed out to him repeatedly, in the course of these discussions, that large numbers of persons would be disfranchised under the operation of this Bill in the Province of New Brunswick, and surely the same rule should apply to them. If the hon. gentleman denies the statistics which have been given, and says there would be very few disfranchised in New Brunswick, can any more be said with regard to Prince Edward Island? But apparently a very large number will be disfranchised in New Brunswick, not merely with reference to the property qualification, but also, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. McIntyre) pointed out, with reference to the personal property qualification, under which a very large proportion of his constituents voted—a qualification which is not recognised by this Bill at all. Now, what is justice for one Province is justice for another. Hath not a Jew eyes, affections, passions? Is not a New Brunswicker as much to be considered as a Prince Edward Islander on the Atlantic coast or a British Columbian on the Pacific coast? As my hon. friend has said, are fish to be made of one and flesh of another? Is an exception to be made of one and no exception to be made of the other? What sort of justice is this? It is the deformity of uniformity, Sir.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is all very brave talking, Mr. Speaker, but there is an important difference between the two cases. In Prince Edward Island and British Columbia everybody has the right to vote, and therefore the operation of this Act is alleged, in some degree, to cause the disfranchisement of some men; but there is a property qualification in New Brunswick, not identical with that provided by this Bill; but one of the most experienced men in elections in that Province is my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who is not here, and he says this Bill will, on the whole, largely increase the votes in the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BURPEE. It will disfranchise a good many.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The two franchises do not run on all fours; every qualification is not nominally the same; but in the various franchises given by this Bill the number of voters in the Province of New Brunswick, from the best information I have got, will be largely increased. Therefore, there is no similarity between the two cases.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has told us that, on the whole, the Bill that he has submitted will give to New Brunswick as liberal a franchise as it now has.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Larger.

Mr. MILLS. But he forgets that his Bill will disfranchise many persons in New Brunswick. It is all very well to deal in generalities, but the hon. members for King's (Mr. McIntyre) and Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) have gone into this

matter with care, and have obtained the necessary information, and have stated that, in one constituency, upwards of 400, and in another upwards of 800, will be disfranchised. The hon. gentleman says that in Prince Edward Island a considerable number of people will be enfranchised; but is it any compensation to one man that another has received the franchise when he is disfranchised? The hon. gentleman may confer the franchise upon a few who do not now possess it. I do not object to his conferring the franchise, but I do object to his disfranchising those who are possessed of the elective franchise now. I pointed out, when this Bill was under discussion, that except for some offence, no one who has enjoyed the franchise in England is disfranchised when there is a change made in the qualification of voters; but the hon. gentleman has undertaken to disfranchise a large number of the people of this country. One of my hon. friends went into a calculation, and showed that he had disfranchised upwards of 130,000 in the Dominion of Canada; and I say it is monstrous to deprive those who have enjoyed the elective franchise of that inestimable privilege, when nothing has been done to show that they are unworthy of the trust committed to them. That is what he does. My hon. friend from Sunbury pointed out that, in his constituency, several hundred persons would be disfranchised; and he asks that the Bill be so amended that those persons who now possess the elective franchise shall continue to enjoy the right they now have. The First Minister says that there are no parties in New Brunswick who will be disfranchised. If he is right—I do not admit that he is, but if so—this amendment could do no harm; it would leave the parties just as they are now. There would be no semblance of injustice, although no more would have the franchise than those to whom he proposes to give it. What harm is done by this double security against disfranchisement? The hon. gentleman gives the franchise now to those whom he proposed a few days ago to disfranchise in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. What right have these people to the elective franchise that the people in New Brunswick, who have had it up to this moment, cannot assert? The proposition is a monstrous one, one that this House ought not to entertain. This House has humiliated itself on more than one occasion during this Session at the instance of the First Minister. It has said and unsaid the same thing many times this Session. The hon. gentleman is asking hon. members to-night to unsay what they have said with regard to Prince Edward Island. I do not object to that. He was wrong before; he is more nearly right now. But let him do the justice to the people of New Brunswick that he says he can do to the people of Prince Edward Island; let him deal out the same measure of justice to the people in one Province that he proposes to allow to the people in another. In this Dominion we suppose that we stand upon a footing of equality. I am not willing to refuse to the smallest Province what I would claim for the largest and most populous Province in the Dominion. Let us respect the rights the people have hitherto enjoyed, and, to do that, let us vote for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from New Brunswick.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was somewhat surprised when my hon. friend behind me stated to me that some 400 would be disfranchised in Queen's county, N.B. I could hardly believe it, but I took the trouble to send home and have the list examined in my own county of Charlotte, and I learned, though there were two voting places in which the lists were not then available, that there were 530 disfranchised under this Bill. As to who can vote under this Bill, it is a mere matter of speculation. I know as much about it as the Finance Minister, and he knows no more about it than any one else. We cannot tell how many will be enfranchised until the new list is made up, but in the meantime I am satisfied that some will be disfranchised. It is a mere mat-

ter of speculation how many, and I cannot say how many, but some will be, and who knows how many will be qualified under it? They may qualify under the wage-earners' qualification, or they may prevail upon somebody to value their property at \$150 when it has been valued heretofore at \$100. I do not see how the Government can give the right to two Provinces and refuse it to others. I cannot go to all these 500 or 600 men who are disfranchised, to all appearance, and tell whether they will be able to vote under some other qualification or not. The same thing may be said also as to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. My hon. friend from Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry) says he is going to vote against both amendments. No doubt there will be some disfranchised in his county. He does not want that. They voted to send him here. Why should he not claim for them the same privilege that the Government is willing to concede to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia? I cannot see on what principle it can be refused. My opinion is, that there will be 10,000 disfranchised in New Brunswick, and how many of these will be enfranchised under this Bill who can tell? It will do no harm, however, to let those who have been enfranchised remain so. If the amendment is not adopted, it will be inconsistent, and will not be dealing fairly with all the Provinces.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The fact is, that the conduct of the First Minister in this matter is wholly unjustifiable, and no one knows it better than the First Minister himself. He proposes to allow every man in the island of Prince Edward and in British Columbia, who is now entitled to a vote, to retain that right as long as he lives, and when my hon. friend from St John (Mr. Weldon) submits a similar proposition, the hon. gentleman refuses it to the Province of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman says the cases are different, and I agree with him. Wherein does the difference lie? In Prince Edward Island and British Columbia they have universal suffrage; every man is entitled to vote. A man may be here to-day and he may be somewhere else to-morrow; he has no ties in the country that will justify the Government in allowing him to retain the right to exercise the franchise. In the Province of New Brunswick no man can vote unless he has a property qualification, unless he has a house and land, unless he has a home; and unless he has property to the amount that the hon. gentleman exacts by this Bill to qualify him he is not entitled to vote. But in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia no such qualification exists. In New Brunswick the very men who have a claim upon the consideration of this House, the very men whose homes are in the Province, are deprived of a vote by this Bill. I ask what justification there can be for this proposition? The hon. gentleman tells us that he has largely extended the franchise. How has he extended it? He has given the Micmac Indians of New Brunswick a vote, and he proposes to cut off the freemen of the city of St. John, who are now entitled to exercise the franchise. Yet the hon. gentleman pretends to say there is some distinction between the two cases. There is no distinction that would give the voters in the island a right to vote, and he knows it. The hon. gentleman knows that his followers in this House from Prince Edward Island have notified him that they dare not go back to their constituents unless he makes this change. The hon. gentleman knows full well that unless he makes this change in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, instead of having nine supporters from those Provinces he would not have one. The hon. gentleman is guided by no principle. With him, it is a pure question of expediency. He is willing to sacrifice every principle for the sake of political exigencies. The hon. gentleman thinks, no doubt, that he can secure the support of three members from Prince Edward Island and six from British Columbia by

Mr. GILLMOR.

doing them the full measure of justice that he is not willing to do to any other Province, and he calls that fair play and justice to all. Sir, my hon. friend has said that the First Minister has dragged his supporters through an amount of filth and dirt during this whole contest that is not creditable to himself or to them, and he will have to drag them through a good deal more filth and dirt before he gets this Bill through in the shape it is now.

Mr. IRVINE. When I spoke upon the second reading of this Bill, I gave it as my opinion that none of my constituents would be disfranchised by it. Since then some of my colleagues, in conversation with me, have assured me that I was not correct, and so I took the trouble to write home to the secretary-treasurer of my county to look over the new assessment rolls of this year and to send me the result. I asked him to see if there were any persons assessed between \$100 and \$150 in real estate and in personal property. I received a letter, which I am willing to show to the First Minister, and this letter states that in my county there are some 300 names on the assessment roll who will be disfranchised under this Bill, as not having the qualification required by it. Now, Sir, the First Minister stated that the Finance Minister, his colleague from New Brunswick, was a good authority on this subject. He may be, but I think I am justified in saying that the assessors appointed under the law of New Brunswick are equally as good authority, if not better. They are required to take an oath to value the property of the inhabitants for assessment purposes as correctly as they would the property of a deceased person. They go from door to door to assess the real and personal property of every person, and I think it must conceded that they are better authority than either the First Minister or the Finance Minister.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Weldon to the amendment.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Auger,	Guay,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant).
Blake,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Soriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Springer,
Catudal,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Trow,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Vail,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Watson,
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Forbes,	Melsaac,	Wells.—46.
Geoffrion,		

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	Massue,
Allison,	Fortin,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gagné,	Orton,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Billy,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Royal,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Small,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Curran,	Lesage,	Vanasse,

Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCallum,	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McDougald (Pietou),	Wigle,
Dickinson,	McDougald (O. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	McNeill,	Woodworth.—96.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. WATSON. In the Province of Manitoba, at present, the qualification for voters is \$100 in cities, towns and villages, as well as in country municipalities. I feel satisfied that under this Bill, as it stands at present, a great number of the electors of Manitoba will be disfranchised; therefore, I hope the First Minister will consent to attach Manitoba to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, and give them the same rights. If he does not do so, he will be doing a great injustice to many people in Manitoba. Therefore, I beg leave to move, in amendment to the amendment:

To leave out the words "the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island," and to insert the following: "in order to enable persons now entitled to vote in the Provinces of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba at future elections for members of the House of Commons in the said Provinces."

House divided on amendment of Mr. Watson to the amendment.

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Auger,	Guay,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant).
Blake,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant).
Camobell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce).
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Springer,
Catudal,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford).
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Trow,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Vail,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Watson,
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Forbes,	McIsaac,	Wells.—46.
Geoffrion,		

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	Massue,
Allison,	Fortin,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gagné,	Orton,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Billy,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Royal,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Small,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Curran,	Lesage,	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCallum,	White (Renfrew).
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
Dickinson,	McDougald (O. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	McNeill,	Woodworth.—96.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the First Minister will make a mistake if he departs from the principle on which this measure is founded. He has, during the discussions on the Bill,

steadily endeavored to impress on the House the necessity of uniformity, that whatever law may be made for one Province shall be applicable to another Province. Only this afternoon, when a suggestion was made as to a proposed change, the First Minister replied that it would interfere with the principle of uniformity—that was in regard to tenants' right to vote. This evening the First Minister has announced that the franchise enjoyed in the two extreme Provinces should not be interfered with. He has affirmed as a principle that because men enjoy manhood suffrage the vote should not be taken away from them. If that is a sound principle, it is applicable generally; and the same right must be extended to every citizen of the Dominion. If he thinks it is an unsound principle to disfranchise any citizen in British Columbia or Prince Edward Island, I ask him to extend that principle to every other Province. On what principle is he proposing to disfranchise the electors in Ontario and Quebec or Manitoba? If you take the old law in Ontario, and compare the rights of tenants, it will be found that they are restricted by this Bill. Under the local law the tenant was not obliged to be in possession of the property demised, in order to have a vote. Under this Bill he will require to be in possession. If you compare this measure with the enlarged Bill recently passed by the Ontario Legislature, it is evident that a large number of people will be disfranchised. In Algoma manhood suffrage is in force to-day. Is it fair, then, that the voters in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, who, but for this amendment, would not be entitled to vote on that qualification, should have the franchise, while many of the citizens of Algoma would be disfranchised. For those reasons I propose the following amendment, which follows exactly the language of the amendment respecting Prince Edward Island:

That the following words be added: In the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, besides the persons entitled to be registered as voters under the foregoing provisions of this Act, every person who, at the time of the passing of the same, first, is of the age of 21 years, and is not by this Act or by any law of the Dominion of Canada disqualified or prevented from voting; and second, is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and a resident in the Province, and is entitled to vote in the said Provinces respectively by the laws now severally existing in the same, shall have a right to be registered as a voter, and vote, so long as he shall continue to be qualified to vote under the provisions of the said last mentioned laws, and no longer."

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mulock to the amendment.

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Auger,	Guay,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant).
Blake,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant).
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce).
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Springer,
Catudal,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Trow,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Vail,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Watson,
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Forbes,	McIsaac,	Wells.—46.
Geoffrion,		

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	Massue,
Allison,	Fortin,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gagné,	Orton,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Riopel,

Billy, Hall, Robertson (Hamilton),  
 Blondeau, Hesson, Robertson (Hastings),  
 Bowell, Hickey, Ross,  
 Cameron (Inverness), Homer, Royal,  
 Campbell (Victoria), Jamieson, Small,  
 Carling, Jenkins, Sproule,  
 Caron, Kaulbach, Stairs,  
 Chapleau, Kilvert, Taschereau,  
 Cimon, Kranz, Tassé,  
 Cochrane, Labrosse, Taylor,  
 Colby, Landry (Kent), Temple,  
 Costigan, Landry (Montmagny), Townshend,  
 Coughlin, Langevin, Tupper,  
 Curran, Lesage, Vanasse,  
 Cuthbert, Macdonald (King's), Wallace (Albert),  
 Daly, Macdonald (Sir John), Wallace (York),  
 Daoust, Mackintosh, White (Cardwell),  
 Dawson, McMillan (Vaudreuil), White (Hastings),  
 Desaulniers (Mask'ngé), McDougald (Pictou), White (Renfrew),  
 Desaulniers (St. M'rice), McCallum, Wigle,  
 Dickinson, McDougall (C. Breton), Wood (Brockville),  
 Dodd, McLelan, Wood (Westmoreland),  
 Dugas, McNeill, Woodworth.—96.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. LANGELIER. It was expected that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Jenkins) would be accepted by the Government. Almost immediately the First Minister said he would not accept the amendment. Now that amendment is accepted, or something to the same effect, and I think that the members from the Province of Quebec should see that their Province is as well treated as the other Provinces, and therefore I move:

That the Bill be not now considered, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of inserting therein another clause, as follows: In the Province of Quebec, besides the persons who are entitled to be registered as voters, and to vote, under the provisions of this Act, every person who, at the time of the passing of the same, is of the age of 21 years, and is not disqualified by this Act, or by any law of the Dominion; who is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and is entitled to vote in such Province, under the laws now existing in the same, shall have the right to be registered as a voter, and to vote, as long as he shall be qualified to vote under the provisions of the last mentioned laws, and no longer."

House divided on amendment of Mr. Langelier to the amendment.

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Armstrong, Gillmor,  
 Anger, Guay,  
 Bernier, Gunn,  
 Bourassa, Holton,  
 Burpee, Innes,  
 Cameron (Middlesex), Irvine,  
 Campbell (Renfrew), Kirk,  
 Cartwright, Langelier,  
 Casgrain, Laurier,  
 Catudal, Livingston,  
 De St. Georges, Mackenzie,  
 Fairbank, McCraney,  
 Fisher, McIntyre,  
 Forbes, McIsaac,  
 Geoffrion, Mills,

Mulock, Paterson (Brant),  
 Ray, Rinfret,  
 Scrivier, Somerville (Brant),  
 Somerville (Bruce),  
 Springer, Sutherland (Oxford),  
 Trow, Watson,  
 Vail, Weldon,  
 Wells.—44.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott, Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),  
 Allison, Fortin,  
 Bain (Soulanges), Foster,  
 Baker (Victoria), Gagné,  
 Barnard, Girouard,  
 Beaty, Gordon,  
 Bell, Grandbois,  
 Benoit, Guibault,  
 Bergeron, Guillet,  
 Bergin, Hackett,  
 Billy, Hesson,  
 Blondeau, Hickey,  
 Bowell, Homer,  
 Cameron (Inverness), Jamieson,  
 Campbell (Victoria), Jenkins,  
 Carling, Kaulbach,  
 Caron, Kilvert,  
 Chapleau, Labrosse,  
 Cimon, Landry (Kent),  
 Colby, Landry (Montmagny),  
 Costigan, Langevin,

Moffat, Montplaisir,  
 Orton, Paint,  
 Pinsonneault, Prun,  
 Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton),  
 Robertson (Hastings),  
 Ross, Royal,  
 Small, Smyth,  
 Sproule, Stairs,  
 Taschereau, Tassé,  
 Taylor, Temple,  
 Townshend, Tupper,

Mr. MULOCK.

Coughlin, Lesage,  
 Curran, Macdonald (King's),  
 Cuthbert, Macdonald (Sir John),  
 Daly, Mackintosh,  
 Daoust, McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
 Dawson, McCallum,  
 Desaulniers (Mask'ngé), McDougald (Pictou),  
 Desaulniers (St. M'rice), McDougall (C. Breton),  
 Dickinson, McLelan,  
 Dodd, McNeill,  
 Dugas, Massue,

Vanasse, Wallace (Albert),  
 Wallace (York),  
 White (Cardwell),  
 White (Hastings),  
 White (Renfrew),  
 Wigle,  
 Wood (Brockville),  
 Wood (Westmoreland),  
 Woodworth.—95.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the motion is carried, I wish to give a few words of explanation of the vote I have already given on this question. I have always held that this Act is wide enough; that it would be unlikely that any person of 21 years of age, in the enjoyment of health and able to earn a livelihood, would not be able to vote under this Act. With regard to the amendment, however, if there is a necessity for it for British Columbia or Prince Edward Island, then I say it should apply to all the other Provinces. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Kent on this question, and if a vote were taken upon it, I should record my opinion in favor of the views I have expressed.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Jenkins.

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Abbott, Fisher,  
 Allison, Forbes,  
 Armstrong, Fortin,  
 Bain (Soulanges), Foster,  
 Baker (Victoria), Gagné,  
 Barnard, Geoffrion,  
 Beaty, Gillmor,  
 Benoit, Gordon,  
 Bergeron, Grandbois,  
 Bergin, Guillet,  
 Bernier, Gunn,  
 Billy, Hackett,  
 Blondeau, Hesson,  
 Bowell, Hickey,  
 Burpee, Holton,  
 Cameron (Inverness), Homer,  
 Cameron (Middlesex), Innes,  
 Campbell (Renfrew), Irvine,  
 Carling, Jamieson,  
 Caron, Jenkins,  
 Cartwright, Kaulbach,  
 Casgrain, Casgrain,  
 Cimon, Kilvert,  
 Coughlin, Labrosse,  
 Cuthbert, Langelier,  
 Daly, Langevin,  
 Daoust, Laurier,  
 Dawson, Curran,  
 De St. Georges, McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
 Desaulniers (Mask'ngé), McCraney,  
 Desaulniers (St. M'rice), McDougald (Pictou),  
 Dickinson, McDougall (C. Breton),  
 Dodd, McLelan,  
 Dugas, McIntyre,  
 Fairbank, McIsaac,

McLelan, McNeill,  
 Massue, Mills,  
 Montplaisir, Orton,  
 Paint, Paterson (Brant),  
 Pinsonneault, Prun,  
 Ray, Rinfret,  
 Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton),  
 Robertson (Hastings),  
 Royal, Scrivier,  
 Small, Smyth,  
 Somerville (Brant),  
 Springer, Stairs,  
 Taschereau, Tassé,  
 Taylor, Trow,  
 Tupper, Vail,  
 Wallace (Albert),  
 Wallace (York),  
 Watson, Weldon,  
 Wells, White (Cardwell),  
 White (Hastings),  
 Wigle, Wood (Brockville),  
 Wood (Westm'land)—114

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Auger, Landry (Kent),  
 Bourassa, Landry (Montmagny),  
 Catudal, Lesage,  
 Girouard, Mulock,  
 Guibault, Ross,  
 Kirk, Somerville (Bruce),

Sproule, Sutherland (Oxford),  
 Temple, Vanasse,  
 White (Renfrew).—17.

Amendment agreed to and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. MILLS. Supposing one of the parties living on the island should leave, and should take up his residence elsewhere, he will cease to be a voter for the time being, but if he returns to the island, does he stand on the same footing

as any other person without property? I understand that a large number of those persons on Prince Edward Island, who have hitherto voted on property, are fishermen, who sometimes reside on the island but occasionally reside elsewhere. The hon. gentleman is carrying through a Bill undertaking to qualify a number of parties to vote; he is introducing what is a serious disintegrating element, for he cannot suppose that the Bill will remain in its present form for any length of time, and therefore he should explain what he intends by the clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill speaks for itself.

Mr. MILLS. No, it does not. What is the legal effect of it? The hon. gentleman has some intention with regard to those to whom he purposes to give a vote, and I ask him what is his intention?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to know the purport of an amendment which is distinctly contrary to what was declared to be the object of the Bill. No doubt the object was to save the hon. gentleman's friends in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MILLS. It is currently rumored in this Chamber that the hon. gentleman himself is the revered parent of this clause, and that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island is only its foster parent. The hon. gentleman having drawn it up, ought to know and ought to tell the House its exact purport.

Bill reported with amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Bill as amended be now taken into consideration.

Mr. LANGELIER. I beg to move:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend it, so as to provide that every person having the right to vote at the elections for the Legislative Assembly of any Province shall have the right to vote at elections for the House of Commons.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Langelier.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Bernier,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Trow,
Catudel,	Lister,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Watson,
Dupont,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wells.—41.
Fisher,	Mills,	
Geoffrion,	Mulock,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Forbes,	Massue,
Allison,	Fortin,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Orton,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Paint,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pruyn,
Bell,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Benoit,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Ross,
Billy,	Hesson,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Hickey,	Small,
Bowell,	Homer,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Colby,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Duthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),

Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (Cape Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—92.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McNeill,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BURPEE. I move:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, for the purpose of amending the 3rd sub-section of the 4th section, by omitting the words "and 50," in the second line of the said sub-section.

This is to make the property qualification \$100 instead of \$150.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Burpee.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Auger,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Landry (Kent),	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Lister,	Temple,
Casgrain,	Livingston,	Trow,
Catudel,	McCraney,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Mills,	Watson,
Fairbank,	Mulock,	Weldon,
Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),	Wells.—37.
Forbes,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fortin,	Massue,
Allison,	Foster,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Geoffrion,	Orton,
Baker (Victoria),	Gigault,	Paint,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Pinsonneault,
Beaty,	Gordon,	Pruyn,
Bell,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Benoit,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Ross,
Billy,	Hesson,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Hickey,	Small,
Bowell,	Homer,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Duthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dugas,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dupont,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—89.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McNeill,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW moved:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same so as to provide that the qualifications of voters for the Province of Ontario for the election of members of the House of Commons shall be the same as that which may be fixed as the qualifications of voters for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Trow.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Bernier,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langlier,	Springer,

Cartwright,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
De St Georges,  
Fairbank,  
Fisher,

Laurier,  
Livingston,  
McCraney,  
Mills,  
Mulock,

Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wells.—36.

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Abbott,  
Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Barnard,  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Billy,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),  
Desaulniers (St. Mau'ce),  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Farrow,  
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)

Forbes,  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guillet,  
Hackett,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Homer,  
Jamieson,  
Jenkins,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Landry (Montmaguy),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Pieton),  
McDougall (C. Breton),  
McLelan,

McNeill,  
Massue,  
Moffat,  
Orton,  
Paint,  
Pinsonneault,  
Pruyn,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Royal,  
Small,  
Smyth,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Townshend,  
Tupper,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wigle,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth.—88.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I rise to move an amendment to the tenant clause of the Bill, and I wish to call the First Minister's attention to that clause for a few moments. I find there is an invidious distinction made between the tenant and the other two classes who vote on property qualifications. As regards the owner of property, there is nothing required with regard to the amount of interest he has in the property; he is simply required to be nominally the owner of it. The property may be mortgaged for all it is worth, and he may be in debt besides, but still he is allowed to vote on the property. Then, again, as regards the occupant, it is not necessary he shall have any monetary interest in the property at all. He may be simply a squatter, but still he has a right to vote. It is entirely different when we come to the tenant clause. There the distinction is made, that he must pay a certain amount of rent, no matter what the intrinsic value of the property may be. Not only that, but a certain portion of that rent, up to \$20, shall be paid before he will be allowed to vote. I say, again, that is an invidious distinction. Then I find there is one class of tenants entirely debarred from the franchise. The section only provides for two classes of tenants: first, the class that pays the rent in money; and next, the class that pays, instead, in kind, or a part of the produce of the land. But in Ontario, and I suppose in the other Provinces as well, there is a large class of tenants not included under either of these heads. We have often tenants who, instead of paying money or produce, remunerate the owner by making improvements, by making, for instance, fences, or clearing a portion of the land, or draining a portion of the land; or erecting buildings, or in some way or other not included in either of these classes. This I take to be a great hardship. A tenant of this class may be paying a large consideration. The property he is holding may be worth \$1,000 or \$10,000, and the consideration he is giving for the use of it may amount to hundreds of dollars; yet, under this Bill, he will have no right to vote. The clause, as it stands now, requiring that this rent shall be paid, will also be troublesome in finding out the correct amount of rent, and, in many cases, will cause a good deal of annoyance. That annoyance may be very much inten-

Mr. TROW.

sified. Poverty is no disgrace, if a man has not brought it on himself through his own misconduct, but there is no man, no matter how poor he is, who wishes to have that poverty flaunted in the face of the public. Under the Bill, as it is, when a tenant goes to vote, the first question asked is whether he has paid his rent or not; and it has always been open to the landlord, if he is on the opposite side of politics, to trump up a bill against him and dispute whether he has paid the amount of rent required or not. Not only that, but we can easily conceive a poor tenant may often be subjected to another species of annoyance. We know that not only candidates, but agents, are in the habit of canvassing a party who is supposed to have a vote. A tenant who is unable to pay his rent may be from day to day annoyed by these parties coming to solicit his vote, and at last, in order to get rid of them, he will have to acknowledge that he has not and is not able to pay his rent. I say, again, an invidious distinction is made against the tenant. It may be said the principle of the Bill is that not the value of the property, as regards the tenant, but the rent paid, is to be the qualification. But why should a principle of that kind be adhered to when it is not only going to debar a large number of voters from the franchise, but is going to make an invidious distinction, not productive of any good or not answering any useful purpose? I beg to move, in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that the qualification of a tenant shall be determined by the actual value of the property of which he is tenant, the same as in the case of occupant or owner in all the Provinces in which the actual value appears on the assessment roll.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Armstrong.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,  
Auger,  
Bernier,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casgrain,  
Catudal,  
De St. Georges,  
Fairbank,  
Fisher,  
Forbes,

Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Holton,  
Innis,  
Irvine,  
Langelier,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingston,  
McCraney,  
Mills,  
Mulock,

Paterson (Brant),  
Ray,  
Rinfret,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wells.—37.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,  
Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Barnard,  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Bergeron,  
Billy,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),  
Desaulniers (St. Mau'ce),  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Farrow,

Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guillet,  
Hackett,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Homer,  
Jamieson,  
Jenkins,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Landry (Montmaguy),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Mackintosh,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Pieton),  
McDougall (C. Breton),  
McLelan,

McNeill,  
Massue,  
Moffat,  
Orton,  
Paint,  
Pinsonneault,  
Pruyn,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Royal,  
Small,  
Smyth,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Townshend,  
Tupper,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wigle,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth.—87.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant) moved in amendment :

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that the sons of owners, occupants and tenants, in the Province of Ontario, who are natural-borne or naturalised British subjects of twenty-one years of age, and whose fathers are upon the revised assessment roll for real property, in cities and towns, of the actual value of \$400, and in incorporated villages and townships for \$200, shall be entitled to have their names entered upon the voters' list and to vote for the election of members to the House of Commons.

Amendment negatived on the following division :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McOraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :  
Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—87.

Mr. McCRAVEY moved, in amendment :

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that any male person, in the Province of Ontario, who is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, who is twenty-one years of age, and who is entered upon the revised assessment roll as tenant for real property of the actual value, in cities and towns, of \$200, and in incorporated villages and townships, of \$100, shall be entitled to have his name entered upon the voters' list for such city, town, incorporated village or township, as the case may be, and to vote at the election of a member for the House of Commons.

Amendment negatived on the following division :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McOraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—87.

Mr. INNES moved in amendment :

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that in the Province of Ontario every male person, being a British subject of twenty-one years of age, and being entered upon the last revised assessment roll as owner or occupant of real property of the value, in cities and towns, of \$200, and in incorporated villages and townships for \$100, shall be entitled to have his name placed on the voters' list and to vote for the election of a member to the House of Commons.

Amendment negatived on the following division :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McOraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :  
Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—87.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to move an amendment in the direction that I favored when the different clauses of the Bill were discussed in committee. I strongly favored the proposition which was then made, that those in charge of the preparation of the local electoral lists, in other words, the clerks of the different municipalities, should have the preparation of the primary lists under this Bill. The men who have had the preparation of those lists in their hands throughout the Province of Ontario have done their work satisfactorily; they are men of all political parties, and they have been actively supervised by the municipal councils of their own municipalities, while there has been an appeal to the judge. Under this Bill, the preparation of the lists is left in the hands of one individual, who has not such supervision exercised over him. While I take exception to the change proposed for these reasons, I also take exception to the course pursued in this matter in the Bill now under discussion, because I believe we are passing over an efficient, a reliable, a thoroughly responsible body of men, who have had these duties to discharge for a number of years, and have, in much the greater number of instances, discharged them with a credit which certainly should not be reflected upon by the course proposed by this Bill. Independent of political reasons, these men are able to discharge the duties of the preparation of the voters' lists throughout the Province of Ontario with care, and so as to secure to us what is the main purpose of any electoral system, the success of the party that is in the majority. I deny that the same purpose can be as efficiently secured by this Bill. This Bill proposes to remove the control of the voters' lists from the people themselves to an appointee of the Government of the day, a course which, I think, will result in great dissatisfaction among the people. Independent of these reasons there is that of expense. In the present case we are assuming a responsibility which can be avoided by the adoption of the proposition I desire to make. For all these reasons, I beg to move, in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that the preparation of the voters' lists in the Province of Ontario shall be in the hands of those who now prepare the voters' lists for the election of members to the Provincial Legislature.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

<b>YEAS :</b>		
<b>Messieurs</b>		
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

<b>NAYS :</b>		
<b>Messieurs.</b>		
Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,

Mr. INNES.

Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth—87.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. I have an amendment of a somewhat similar nature to that which has been negatived, which applied only to the Province of Ontario. My amendment will apply to the whole Dominion. It is this:

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that the lists of the electors qualified under this Act shall be prepared by the same officers and in the same manner as those of the electors qualified to vote at elections for the Legislative Assemblies in the several Provinces.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

<b>YEAS :</b>		
<b>Messieurs</b>		
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

<b>NAYS :</b>		
<b>Messieurs.</b>		
Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth—87.

Mr. LISTER. I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that in case of an appeal upon the claim of any person to be put upon the voters' list or the right to remain upon such list, such person may vote, but his ballot shall not be counted, but shall be sealed up by the deputy returning officer in an envelope endorsed with the polling division, the election and the number opposite the voter's name upon the poll book, and such ballots shall be forwarded to the court in which such appeal is pending, and when the appeal is decided the court shall certify to the returning officer the votes to be added, if any, to the number counted for each candidate, and the return shall be corrected accordingly, and the court shall also certify the result of the appeal to the revising officer, who shall amend the voters' lists, so far as may be necessary, in accordance with such certificate.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEA'S :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant)
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford).
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Grouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Krauz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Guthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougall (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLellan,	Woodworth.—87.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to move an amendment which I discussed in Committee of the Whole. It is permitting an appeal from the adjudication of the revising officer, and is substantially the proposition which the First Minister submitted in the Bill as originally introduced into the House. Under this Bill, where the revising officer is not a judge there is an appeal to the county court judge, but there is no appeal beyond that. I propose, by this amendment, that there shall be an appeal from the adjudication of the judge of the county court, or the judge of the Superior Court, as the case may be, when he is the revising officer or the judge in appeal. I think the amendment is of the first possible importance. It is the law in England, and I think it ought to be the law here. The proposition that the First Minister has submitted to Parliament in this Bill is that where the revising officer is not the judge there shall be an appeal to the judge, but where the revising officer is the judge there shall be no appeal from his decision. We know that under this Bill important and difficult questions of law are likely to arise, and I think it is of the first consequence that we should have the law properly settled. In my amendment, I propose that there shall be an appeal from the adjudication of the judge to a Superior Court. The amendment covers the whole propositions contained in the original Bill introduced by the First Minister, together with the necessary machinery for working it out. I beg leave to move, in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of adding to section 47 the following sub-sections:—

(a.) Any person or persons who, under the foregoing sections, shall have made complaint, according to the practice therein provided for in respect of the list of voters in any polling district, with respect to the final revision thereof, whether such list be the first or any subsequent voters' list for the polling district, prepared under this Act, or any person or persons, with reference to whom such complaint was made, who

shall be dissatisfied with the decision on any point of law of the revising officer or the judge in appeal, in respect of such complaint, may give to the revising officer or such judge, within seven days after the day of such decision, notice in writing of his desire to appeal to a superior court from such decision, stating shortly in such notice the decision complained of and his reasons for appealing against it; and the revising officer or such judge shall, as soon as he conveniently can do so, state, in the form of a special case, the facts established according to his opinion by the evidence, and necessary to be laid before the court above in order to determine the said point of law; also his own decision on the same, as nearly as may be, according to the form and practice provided for the stating and hearing of a special case in the court intended to be appealed to, and he shall then sign the same as revising officer or such judge, and shall require the appellant, or his counsel or agent, after reading the same to him, to sign a declaration at the end of such special case in the words: 'I appeal from the above decision;' after which the revising officer or judge shall endorse the said case with the names of the parties, appellant and respondent, if there be a respondent or party desiring to maintain the decision appealed from, and the number of the polling district, and the name of the electoral district thereby affected, and shall deliver to such appellant, or his counsel or agent, a certified copy of such case, and, also, if required, to the respondent, or his counsel or agent.

(b) No such appeal shall be allowed or entertained against any decision of the revising officer or judge upon any matter of fact, or the admission or rejection of evidence adduced or offered on any matter of fact, but the appeal shall be allowed only on some point or points of law, as before mentioned. With the consent of the revising officer or judge, any number of persons desiring to appeal on the same point or points of law may be joined in the same statement of case, making it one appeal.

(c) The appeal shall be in the form of a petition to the court, accompanying the statement of the case, certified by the revising officer or judge, and praying that the voters' list in question may be amended by the insertion or omission of the name or names alleged to be wrongfully omitted or inserted, or otherwise, as the case may be, and shall be presented on behalf of the appellant, at the next sitting of the court appealed to, after the expiration of the said notice of appeal, by any barrister or advocate practising therein.

(d) A copy of the petition must, at least four days before such presentation, have been served upon the revising officer or judge, and upon the party in whose favor the decision appealed from was given, with a notice of the time and place at which the petition will be presented, such service being made in the manner prescribed in any ordinary case of summons to appear before such court in civil cases or in any other manner prescribed by any rule made by any court in that behalf under this Act. The revising officer or judge, and the opposing party (if any) may appear by any barrister or advocate practising in the court, upon whom any order made by the court in the case, or any notice or other proceeding therein, may be validly served.

(e) If the petitioner or petitioners does not or do not appear on the day on which the petition is to be presented, or, appearing, withdraws or withdraw his or their petition, the case shall, on the application of the revising officer or judge, or any other party on whom the petition has been served, as aforesaid, be dismissed as respects such petitioner or petitioners, and the polling list shall, as to him or them, remain unaltered:

If the petitioner or petitioners appear, and neither the revising officer nor any other party aforesaid does so, or appearing, does not oppose the petition, the court shall order the polling list to be amended, as prayed for, and the revising officer shall amend it accordingly.

But if the petition be opposed by the revising officer or other party aforesaid (if any), then appearing, the court shall appoint a convenient time and place at which the case shall be heard by some judge of the court, who shall hear and decide the same summarily, and without being bound by any technical rules of proceeding; such decision shall be subject to no appeal, and shall be notified in such manner as the court may direct to the revising officer, who shall obey the same and shall amend the polling list or leave it unaltered accordingly.

Provided always, that the court may, if it be of opinion that the case submitted is not sufficient to enable it to give judgment in law, remit the case to the revising officer to be more fully stated.

The court may award costs to or against any party in the case.

The court, or the judges thereof having by law power to make rules of practice for proceedings therein, shall (subject to the provision hereinafter made as to the Province of Quebec) have power to make rules of practice for appeals under this Act, and a tariff of costs and fees on such proceedings respectively, and to alter the same; but if and so long as no such special rule or tariff shall be in force and applicable to any appeal under this Act, the court or judges shall cause the proceedings for which no such special provision is made to be conducted in such manner as they may deem best adapted for doing substantial justice to all parties, and shall allow such costs as they may deem reasonable; and the court deciding the case in appeal shall, in its order on that behalf, direct by what party the costs on any or all the proceedings shall be paid, and they shall be subject to taxation, as in other cases in the court, and recoverable in like manner.

(f) The appeal, in the Province of Ontario, shall be to any of the divisional courts of the High Court of Justice for that Province, or to any one or more of the judges thereof, sitting at such court,—in the Province of Manitoba to the Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba,—in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to the Supreme Court of each of such Provinces respectively,—and in the Province of Quebec to the Superior Court at the city of Quebec, if the polling district in question be in any of the districts of Quebec, Three Rivers, Saguenay, Chicoutimi, Gaspé, Rimouski, Kamou

raska, Montmagny, Beauce or Arthabaska,—and to the Superior Court at the city of Montreal, if such polling sub-division be in any one of the districts of Montreal, Ottawa, Terrebonne, Joliette, Richelieu, St. Francis, Bedford, St. Hyacinthe, Iberville or Beauharnois; and any three judges of the said Superior Court residing at the city at which the petition is presented shall have and exercise, with respect to such petition, all the powers by this Act vested in the court, except only that any rules of practice or tariff made under this Act shall be made or altered only by the judges of the court resident in the said cities, or a majority of them.

Amendment negated on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McCallum,	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,		Woodworth.—37.

Mr. WELDON moved, in amendment :

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of adding to the third clause the following sub-section : And in the electoral district of the city of St. John, any free man of the said city, resident therein, and assessed upon one hundred dollars and upwards.

Amendment negated on the following division :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—37.

Mr. FAIRBANK moved in amendment :

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that no Indians, except those who have been enfranchised and have had conferred upon them the same civil capacities and responsibilities, and who possess the same qualifications as other persons entitled to vote under this Act, shall possess the electoral franchise.

Amendment negated on the following division :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—37.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved in amendment :

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, by adding the following words at the end of section 14 : Provided, also, that the name of any Indian or person of part Indian blood living on a reservation, and who has not been enfranchised under the Indian Act, shall not be entered upon any list of persons entitled to vote in any electoral district, without the consent of such Indian.

He said : An amendment was offered in committee, providing that under the peculiar circumstances of the Indians

living on reservation, where there are no assessment rolls, and nothing to guide the revising officer, the Indians should make personal application to the revising officer and give a description of the property, the post office address, and so forth. Some little exception was taken to this, because it was thought it would be placing Indians in a different position from anyone else. That has been abandoned; and I simply provide that an Indian's name shall not be entered on the voters' list without his consent. It is an amendment which all who have the welfare of the Indians at heart should support. I would be failing in my duty to the Indians who live in my district if I did not present this amendment. I have already explained that some of the Indians claim that they came here under a treaty made with Great Britain; that they are not subjects, but allies, of the British Crown. And that affords one of the great reasons why they have not availed themselves more largely of the enfranchisement clauses of the Indian Act. From indications I have had, I believe this measure is not sought by many of those Indians, although it has been intimated that the Indians desire to have votes. I know that well educated and intelligent Indians, for whose opinions I am willing to give every consideration, have, in the public prints, and one in a letter to the First Minister, declared that the Indians wanted votes; but I believe they did not speak on behalf of their people. It is but right and proper that we should determine that their names shall not be placed on the list except with their consent.

Mr. McCALLUM. They are not obliged to vote, even if their names are on the list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has given that reason before. But the moment Indians are placed on the voters' list you give them a certain right, and you are telling them that they must work like the others. I think the First Minister adopted an amendment this afternoon, one of the provisions of which was that the Indian agent should not—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Induce or compel them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And also that the Indian agent shall not put their names on the roll. I supposed that the Indian agent would have to go there, and that being the case, any Indian desiring to have his name entered on the list, it would simply be enough for him to give his consent. But as to those who do not desire to have their names entered upon the list, it will be respecting their prejudices and feelings, and I feel confident that in my own riding there are some Indians who will desire to be in that position, and I think in such a case it would be unwise to compel them. I think the amendment is a reasonable one and a proper one, and one which will be accepted by those who desire the well-being of the Indian, and I present it to the House in the confident expectation that it will be adopted.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :		
Messieurs.		
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McOraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :		
Messieurs.		
Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tasé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—37.

Mr. GILLMOR moved, in amendment :

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, by providing that the voters' lists shall be prepared each year by the municipal officer or officers, who, under the law of each Province, is or are required to prepare the voters' lists for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly; and that in the Province of Prince Edward Island, where there are no voters' lists for the provincial elections, the voters' lists shall be prepared annually by the county court judge in which the electoral district is situate, and that every such officer shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath of office before any judge of the Superior Court or Court of Record of the Province in which he is to act, in the form contained in the schedule to this Act, for such purpose, which he shall forthwith thereafter cause to be filed with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa.

Amendment negatived in the following division:—

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

  

NAYS :		
Messieurs.		
Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tasé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),

Desaulniers (Maski'ngé), Mackintosh,  
Desaulniers (St. M'rice), McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
Dickinson, McCallum,  
Dodd, McDougald (Picton),  
Dugas, McDougall (U. Breton),  
Farrow, McLelan,  
White (Hastings),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wigle,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth.—87.

Mr. HOLTON moved in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the committee, for the purpose of amending the same, by providing that the county court judge, in each county where there is such judge, shall be the revising officer for the electoral district or districts, or parts of an electoral district, within such county, and in the Province of Quebec the Superior Court judge of the judicial district, in each electoral district or part of an electoral district, shall be the revising officer for such district or part of a district; and that in any case where a judge, who is a revising officer under the Act, shall be unable to discharge the duties of revising officer for his entire county, or for any part thereof, he shall forthwith signify such his inability to the Chief Justice of the highest court of his Province, and if his inability extends only to a part of his county, he shall specify particularly which part, and such Chief Justice shall thereupon forthwith appoint another county judge or a barrister of at least five years' standing as revising officer in the place of the judge so signifying his inability to act for the county or part of the county, as the case may be, and the person so appointed shall have all the powers conferred upon a county judge acting as a revising officer under this Act.

Mr. MILLS. I trust the hon. gentleman will accept this amendment. I think he expressed his intention to appoint county court judges as revising barristers. I understood him to say, since that announcement was made to the House, that he had communication with many of them, and that they have all expressed their willingness to serve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not all, but many of them.

Mr. MILLS. I think, in a matter of this kind, it should be made a matter of duty, and not of choice, on the part of the judges, and it would remove a serious objection to the Bill if Parliament should indicate in it the party who is to be the revising officer. I think the hon. gentleman should accept the amendment. He says he is anxious to make the Bill perfect, and we have certainly made great efforts—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To destroy it?

Mr. MILLS. No; for the hon. gentlemen must admit that a great many important changes have been made to the Bill. Our efforts remind me of a story which is told of Bismarck.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. MILLS. He said there was great difficulty in getting His Majesty to come to the ditch; but if he got there, he would have no difficulty in getting him to jump. We have had great difficulty in getting the hon. gentleman to consent to the appointment of county court judges, and now I think he should at least go as far as the amendment proposes.

Amendment negatived on the following division:

YEAS.		
Messieurs		
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant).
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Kinret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCrane,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS:		
Messieurs.		
Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Poster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,

Mr. GILLMOR.

Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Picton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—87.

Mr. FISHER. I believe, in the Province of Quebec, the people have been well satisfied with the manner in which the work has been done by the municipal officers. The voters' lists are prepared free of cost, and I believe the electors will feel it to be a grievance to have Government officials going through the country doing this work for pay. In that view, I move the following amendment:

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, so that the voters' lists in the Province of Quebec may be prepared by the municipal officials, in the same manner as are now the voters' lists for the election of members of the Provincial Legislative Assembly of that Province.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members on this side are perfectly right in moving these amendments. I know that several municipal councils in the Province of Quebec have passed resolutions for the same purposes, amongst others, the council of Beauharnois, who adopted, at their last meeting, the following resolutions, which I will read to the House:—

"MEETING OF THE 10TH JUNE, 1885.

"PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

"At a general sitting of the municipal council of the county of Beauharnois, held in the Market Hall, in the town and county of Beauharnois, Wednesday, the tenth day of the month of June, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five, at one o'clock, p.m., according to the provisions of the municipal code of the Province of Quebec;

"Present: Jean Baptiste Myre, Esq., warden of the county; I idore Pilon, Esq., mayor of the parish of St. Timothée; Jean Baptiste Desgroselliers, Esq., mayor of the parish of St. Etienne; Henri Sauvé, Esq., mayor of the parish of St. Stanislas de Kostka; and Théophile Trudel, Esq., mayor of the parish of St. Clément; being a quorum of the municipal council of the county of Beauharnois; his honor the warden being president.

"The mayor of the parish of St. Timothée, seconded by the mayor of the parish of St. Stanislas de Kostka, moves:—

"That, whereas the mode followed heretofore for the drawing up and revision of the electoral lists gives more security than the mode proposed in the Franchise Bill now discussed in the House of Commons, under which a revising officer shall have the absolute control of that work;

"Whereas, the council in each municipality are the most competent authority for the drawing up of those lists and that by leaving that right with the municipalities, the Government or corporations will spare a great deal of money, it be resolved: that for those reasons, and many others, the said council are expressly opposed to the adoption of such a Bill; that the council declare, without hesitation, that they give, at the present moment, the true expression of the general dissatisfaction which exists in their division;

"That, in consequence, the council of the county of Beauharnois do protest energetically against the adoption of such a measure, and do respectfully pray the Parliament of Canada to not adopt it, especially the provisions tending to deprive the municipalities of the right to make up and revise the voters' lists;

"Finally, that the secretary-treasurer be authorised to send the member for this county, a copy of the present resolution, requesting him earnestly to oppose all measures contrary to those wishes.

"(Signed), J. BIE MYRE, Warden.

"(Signed), E. H. BISSON, Secretary-Treasurer.

"Certified a true extract from the Minutes Book.

"E. H. BISSON, Secretary-Treasurer.

Amendment negatived on the following division :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Anger,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex)	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Wells.—38.
Fisher,	Mulock,	

NAYS :  
Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.),	McNeill,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Billy,	Hickey,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Homer,	Small,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maskingó),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McLellan,	Woodworth—87.

Amendments made in Committee of the Whole read the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said amendments be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to ask the First Minister how he proposes to get a list of the Indian voters. I have pointed out to him, at different times, that they are not in the same position as other voters. The Bill provides that the revising officer shall take the assessment roll, and that where there is no assessment roll, as in Prince Edward Island, he shall take the last list of voters; but the Indians have no assessment roll and no last list of voters. The agent is not permitted to tell who are entitled to vote, and by what means is the list to be made up? It seems to me the First Minister ought to have given the matter some consideration. The Indians occupy an exceptional position altogether, and that is what led me to make the motion I did. But how are the Indian names to be got, and got fairly.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What will prevent the agent giving the names?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The fact that an Indian is a red man does not prevent his going and having his name put on by himself or by his agent, just the same as a white man. The revising officer will go to a municipality and will hold his little court, and the Indians will themselves call personally or by an agent.

Mr. MILLS. How can an unenfranchised Indian appoint an agent? He has no legal capacity.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FISHER. I spoke a few moments ago to the right hon. leader of the Government about a very slight amendment which I think is necessary in the 18th section of the Bill. It was arranged by that section that anyone objecting to a name on the list should notify the revising officer by a registered letter, and also that the person objecting must notify the person objected to; but it does not say by registered letter, and I simply propose that those words should be added. The right hon. gentleman, in conversation, a few minutes ago, said he was quite willing to accept this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mentioned to the hon. gentleman that as those words had been omitted by general consent they could be added at this stage.

Amendment agreed to.

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

Mr. MILLS moved :

That the Bill be not now read the third, but that it be read the third time this day three months.

He said: I will make a very few observations on the motion which I have put into your hands. This is a very important measure, and one upon which there is a very wide difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen on that side and those on this side of the House. We regard the measure as less objectionable than it was when it was introduced, but we still think it is a very objectionable measure—one not in the public interest, one not calculated to secure a fair expression of opinion in the country, and one which gives to the Government of the day a power they ought not to possess. In my opinion, the Administration stand before the country as an interested party, precisely the same as do hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; and the policy of the law, hitherto, has been, not to put the preparation of the voters' lists into the hands of either the Ministers or their opponents, but to leave it in the hands of the electorate, those who are the masters of Parliament, with whom the supreme power is vested, and who are to decide by whom the government of the country shall be carried on. Now, this measure, it seems to me, violates that important principle, in putting into the hands of the Government, for the time being, the appointment of those parties by whom the lists are to be prepared. Besides that, there is a very wide departure from what hitherto has been the well recognised rule in introducing and carrying through Parliament an important measure of this kind, without first having had the opinion of the country expressed upon it. I have called the attention of the House, during the discussion of this Bill, to the rule which has been observed in England since the period of the Revolution in every case, with the single exception of the changing of a triennial into a septennial Parliament, which has been justified by those who were parties to it only on the ground that it was to prevent revolution—that it was to prevent conspiracies for bringing back the Stuart dynasty to the throne of England. Now, we have called the attention of the House to the fact that every change of the electorate is regarded, not as an ordinary act of legislation, but as a change of the constitution, and that the nation undertakes to protect itself against the improper conduct of a majority in Parliament for the time being, by requiring that there shall be an expression of the opinion of the country on the subject before it shall be dealt with. This was so in 1831, in the case of the Reform Bill; it was so in the case of Catholic emancipation; it was so in the case of the Bills of 1866 and 1867; it was so in the case of the abolition of Church and State in Ireland; and it was so in the case of the last election, when the proposal to confer the elective franchise on householders in rural districts was submitted to the country. Now, that has not been done in this case. Besides, ther,

has been no pressing necessity for this measure. The hon. gentleman does not say that the law we now have has worked unsatisfactorily; he has not shown that it unduly restricts the influence or power of Parliament, or that it has prevented a proper expression of the opinion of the country in the election of Parliament. This Bill ought to have been introduced earlier than the third Session of Parliament; and the hon. gentleman, the moment he brought it into operation, should have appealed to the country, and obtained from the electors an expression of opinion. If the hon. gentlemen were to argue that this Parliament does not fairly represent the country, that it was not properly elected, that the machinery for the election was so imperfect that a proper expression of the opinion of the country could not be had, then it was important that this measure should have been introduced earlier, and that a discredited Parliament should not have continued to legislate for the general welfare of the country. We have had the present law in operation for eighteen years; no complaint has been made, and no abuse has been shown to have grown up under it; in no case has it been shown that a member returned for a constituency did not fairly represent the opinion of that constituency; so that there was really no abuse to correct. Then the hon. gentleman has proposed to confer the elective franchise upon a class on whom no one proposed to confer it at the last elections. I will venture to say there is not a single hon. gentleman sitting on that side who, at the last election, appealed to the people to return him on the ground that he would vote to confer the elective franchise upon the unfranchised Indians, or promised, if they did return him, that he would do so. The hon. gentleman himself has said that these men were not competent to exercise the elective franchise, or administer the simplest municipal matters. We know that under our system the Indians are not recognised as ordinary subjects. For instance, the tribal Indian is never punished for taking up arms against the Crown, capitally, as guilty of treason. He is not dealt with as an ordinary criminal, and there have been decisions, over and over again, during the existence of the old 13 colonies, and which have since been followed by the courts of the United States and in this country, recognising the fact that the Indian is not an ordinary citizen. I would like to know why it is we have had 150,000 of people or more disfranchised by this Bill, white men, men who have not shown themselves incompetent to exercise the elective franchise, and have had the elective franchise conferred upon men who can neither read nor write, who are not possessed of property in their own right, who pay no taxes, who are under no obligations to serve the State—men who are without public spirit, and, in many instances, are subsisting by the charities of those who are denied the right to vote under the Bill before us. That being the case, I am opposed to this Bill, and have made the motion which is in your hands. In making that motion, I have voiced the opinions of hon. gentlemen, not only on this side but also on that side. I believe that the great majority of the people who have returned the hon. gentlemen, or those who support them in this House, are not in favor of conferring the elective franchise upon men who are not possessed of the ordinary powers, capacities and responsibilities of citizens. Holding that view, Sir, I put this motion into your hands. I have not sought to delay the House in proposing this amendment; I have sought to give the country an opportunity of understanding the question. I believe it is understood, and we are ready to allow the hon. gentleman, if a majority continues to support him on the third reading, to assume the responsibility and the discredit of having put a measure of this sort on the Statute Book.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.  
Mr. MILLS.

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Auger,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Livingston,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Vail,
Dupont,	Mills,	Watson,
Fisher,	Mulock,	Weidon,
Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),	Wells.—37.
Gigault,		
NAYS :		
Messieurs		
Abbott,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gordon,	Orton,
Baker (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Paint,
Beaty,	Guillet,	Patterson (Essex),
Bell,	Hackett,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Ross,
Billy,	Homer,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Jenkins,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Smyth,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Sproule,
Caron,	Kranz,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Tassé,
Colby,	Landry (Montmagny),	Taylor,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Townshend,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCallum,	White (Gardwell),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	McDougald (Picton),	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	McDougall (Cape Bret'n),	White (Renfrew),
Dugas,	McLellan,	Wigle,
Farrow,	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Massue,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Foster,	Moffat,	Woodworth.—88.
Gault,		

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the 4th of July, a fitting day to disfranchise your own countrymen.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:10 a.m., Saturday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SOUTH GRENVILLE ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that the Clerk had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Walter Shanly, Esq., to represent the electoral district of the south riding of the county of Grenville, in the room of the late William Thomas Benson, Esq., deceased.

### DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. TROW (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What sum has been received up to date on account of sales of Dominion lands, for fiscal year 1884-85? What sum has been expended up to date and charged to capital account,

for surveys of lands in the North-West, during the present fiscal year?

Mr. McLELAN. The amount received up to the 20th June, 1885, on account of sales of Dominion lands, was \$374,057.63; and the expenditure charged to capital account was \$269,546.

#### CUSTOMS AND EXCISE RECEIPTS.

Mr. TROW (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What amount has been received for Customs, and what for Excise, during the month ending 30th June?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount received for Customs is \$1,361,387, and for Excise \$444,031.

#### RODGERS' FISH-LADDERS.

Mr. FORBES asked, Has the Government, through the Department of Marine and Fisheries, bought Rodgers' interest in his fish-ladders? If so, when was the purchase made, and what was paid for the same?

Mr. McLELAN. No; it has not bought it.

Mr. FORBES asked, Does the Government or the Department of Marine and Fisheries intend using the Rodgers' fish-ladders in Davison's dams during the coming summer, or what means are intended to be used for getting fish up the Lahave, if these ladders are not?

Mr. McLELAN. An engineer is now engaged in making an inspection of the dams on the river, with a view to ascertaining the most desirable means of providing the required passage for fish.

#### FISHING IN LAKE SIMCOE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, Is it the intention of the Government, at the present Session, to introduce such legislation as may be necessary in order that Government agents may be empowered to issue valid permits to fish in the waters of Lake Simcoe?

Mr. McLELAN. Lake Simcoe being set apart, under the Fisheries Act, for the propagation of fish it is not proposed to introduce any legislation the present Session in order that Government agents may issue valid permits to fish.

#### COUNTY COURT JUDGES' SALARIES.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a measure during the present Session providing for the increase of the salaries of county court judges throughout the Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not.

#### DEEP WATER FISHERIES ON THE COAST OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, What steps, if any, have been taken by the Dominion Government concerning the protection and promotion of the deep-water fisheries on the coast of British Columbia? Is it the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps for ascertaining their nature and probable value during the ensuing fiscal year? If so, by what method and to what extent of expenditure will such fisheries be encouraged?

Mr. McLELAN. No steps have been taken in connection with the deep sea fisheries. The Inspector of Fisheries has been instructed to take such steps as may be necessary to obtain accurate statistics as to the value of the British Columbia fisheries.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What are the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the eleven months ending 31st May, 1885?

Mr. POPE. As far as I can understand, the working expenses were \$2,304,019, and the earnings \$2,173,214.

#### SALARIES OF MINISTERS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant) asked, Is it the practice of the members of the Government to draw their salaries monthly in advance? If so, when was the practice established, and why?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This question has been overlooked, but the members of the Government and the Inside Civil Service do draw their salaries monthly in advance. The date, and the reason why, I shall give to-morrow.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to bring to the attention of the House, under the rule of privilege, a matter which was brought to the notice of the House on Thursday by the hon. member for Centre Wellington, in answer to a charge made that he had shirked the vote on the amendment from the Senate to the Scott Act. I would have answered on that day the remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) had I been in the House, but I was absent in the Library at the time, and I had no knowledge of his intention to bring the matter to the notice of the House. In order that I may not be misinterpreted by the House, and be considered as having acted unfairly, I am desirous of making this explanation. The hon. member for Centre Wellington came to me on the evening of the debate on the Senate amendments to the Scott Act, saying that he was desirous of taking the evening train to Toronto, and asked me if I would pair with him, saying that he intended to vote in favor of the amendment, and he knew that I was going to vote against it. I said to him: "I cannot pair with you. I am desirous of giving an open vote." He said: "I wish you would pair with me, because I want to go away on important business." I was very desirous of accommodating him, but I said that I feared my pairing with him would be misinterpreted. He urged me again, and said he was very anxious for me to pair with him. Finally I consented; but before I consented he told me that there would be no difficulty if I would be present in the House and not vote; that my vote would be challenged, and then I could say that I had paired with him, and my vote would be recorded in the ordinary way and would appear in the *Hansard*. I told him I did not think that was correct; and he said: "Well, it is understood that we pair; we will pair in that way." I said: "Very well," and we parted with that understanding. A few moments after he had left I went to the Assistant Speaker and informed him of the position, and asked him if the hon. member for Centre Wellington was correct, saying that I had my doubts about it; and he said: "He is not correct. Your name will not appear in the list of the yeas and nays, but if you state that you paired with him, it will appear in the *Hansard*." I felt then that I was not bound by that pair, and consequently I gave an open vote against the amendment. I make this statement in order that I may not be considered by the House as having acted dishonorably.

Mr. ORTON. I am sorry I cannot entirely endorse the account of the pair which has been given by my hon. friend. When I asked him to pair it was not until after he made some remark as to his being desirous to have it known how he

voted, and I told him that by getting somebody to challenge him he could have it recorded in the *Hansard*, and that would be a sufficient reply to parties who might imagine that he had shirked the vote; and the pair was agreed to on those terms.

#### THE DEATH OF LIEUT.-COL. WILLIAMS.

Mr. CARON. It is with the deepest pain and sorrow that I have to-day to make an announcement to Parliament which I know will cause as much mourning and affliction among hon. members on both sides of the House as any announcement which has ever been made to Parliament, conveying the information of the death of one of the members of this House. Sir, I have to announce the death of Lieut.-Col. Arthur Williams, in command of the Midland Battalion. I can say that during all the troubles which are now very nearly ended in the North-West, Col. Williams has shown himself to be a brave and gallant officer, honoring his profession, and possessing those qualities which would make any arm of the service proud of possessing him as an officer. I can state, Sir, that it is only a few days ago that I received from him a despatch giving me minute details of the battle of Batoche. It will be remembered by every hon. gentleman that on that memorable occasion, which practically broke the backbone of the rebellion, Col. Arthur Williams was the hero of that day. At the head of his men he gallantly forced the rifle pits and made that charge which is one of the most brilliant actions of a campaign which has distinguished so many of our brave volunteers. He led the men on that day, and the result of that brilliant charge secured the success of the day, and the practical ending of the armed insurrection. In a despatch which was sent to me by the Major General, and which will be read with interest by the hon. members of this House, he mentioned the name of Lieut.-Col. Williams as being one of those who distinguished himself, and to whom was due the honors of that day. I can only tell you, Mr. Speaker, how shocked I was when I received the first sad tidings of his illness, and shortly afterwards of his death. The shock was greater still from the fact that from the recent despatches he had sent me I had little reason to suppose that in the very hour of victory, when he was on the eve of coming home to receive the honors to which he was entitled for having fought so valiantly the battles of his country, I had little reason to suppose that he would never return with his companions in arms to receive the congratulations of their grateful countrymen, and the admiration which every good citizen of Canada must feel for the brave volunteers. Sir, last night I received from the Major General, from the camp at Fort Pitt, the following telegram, dated July 5th:—

"I deeply regret to have to say that Col. Arthur Williams is dangerously suffering from inflammation of the brain. He is on board the *North-West* steamer, and the doctors say he must be left at Prince Albert.

"(Signed), FRDK. MIDDLETON,  
"Major General."

Shortly afterwards I received the following telegram.—

"Steamer *Marquis*, *via* STRAUBENZIE, N. W. T.

"It is with the deepest regret that I have to say that Col. Williams is sinking, and that the doctors have little or no hopes. They now say that besides the affection of the brain, he has pneumonia and symptoms of typhoid fever. He has been quite unconscious since this morning.

"(Signed), FRDK. MIDDLETON,  
"Major General."

This morning I received another telegram, stating that he was dead. Sir, I have spoken of him as a soldier. Those who know him as an intimate friend feel more deeply the loss which is suffered by a large circle of devoted friends. As a friend we always found him generous and true. I can speak of him as such, because it has been my privilege, ever

Mr. ORTON.

since I have been in Parliament, to count Lieut.-Col. Williams among my friends. We all remember his geniality and his unselfishness. Whenever it became a question of meeting the views of his friends he was always ready to make the sacrifice of his own personal feelings. He was one of those whose loss will always be remembered. As a public man, he has always been true to the party to which he belonged, and those whose privilege it has been to act with him in politics know how true he has always been to the principles which he considered best, and to the leaders whom he loved and followed so faithfully. I only regret that, on this occasion, some one who would, better than myself, have spoken of the qualities and virtues of the man whose loss we deeply regret, should not have been entrusted with the task which it has been my duty to fulfil to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure we all heartily concur in the observations just made, expressive of the deep regret with which both sides of the House have heard, as we did hear some hours ago, the sad news, and which has now been officially communicated to us. The friend whom we have lost was, as the hon. gentleman has said, well known to all of us. He had been for many years in Parliament, and his unswerving fidelity to his party was entirely consistent with the exhibition of kindness and most friendly feeling towards those of his colleagues who did not share his political views, and in the discharge of the not unimportant duties which he performed on behalf of his party, we always had to recognise the courtesy and kindness with which he met the views of hon. gentlemen on this side, and he exhibited, in the delicate arrangements which have to be made, that sense of high honor which was a peculiar characteristic of him. For myself, I speak with unfeigned personal sorrow, when I recollect the loss which we have sustained. Col. Williams was an old schoolfellow of mine; he was an old and attached personal friend of mine; he was my colleague in the representation of the county of Durham. We met first in political life in the Local Legislature, to which he was elected a short time after my own election; and we have met since that time for many years, never harmonising, unfortunately, in our political views, but maintaining uninterruptedly our personal friendship. We know his devotion to military duties. He was no holiday soldier, but he exhibited for many years an earnest devotion and an intelligent interest in that important branch of the public service; and I know for myself how eager he had been, if it were at all possible, to exhibit his devotion to the cause of the Empire in the Egyptian campaign, and how anxious he was and how rejoiced he was when the prospect opened of serving his country in the campaign which is now ended. I know for myself of those anxieties, and it strikes one painfully to remember how cheerfully and joyfully he went out; how warmly he shook our hands with that hand which is now cold in death. I regret the event the more because of the incidents to which the hon. gentleman has referred, because of the brilliant part which, from all accounts we have received, our late friend played in the battle of Batoche; and we can only say of him that, though it was not his fortune to fall in that struggle, yet he none the less fairly *mort sur le champ d'honneur*.

#### FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS.

Mr. VAILL. May I ask the First Minister when he will lay on the Table further papers in connection with the fisheries matter. We are drawing very near the close of the Session, and it is very important we should obtain them as soon as possible. I may, at the same time, ask the First Minister if his attention has been drawn to a paragraph which appeared in the papers on Saturday, with respect to some order passed at Washington relating to goods passing free through Canada. Will the hon. gentleman state what

the effect of that will be upon the trade of the Dominion. The paragraph is somewhat difficult to understand, unless we are in possession of information from the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I have mentioned before, I have ready to lay on the Table of the House a number of papers connected with fisheries negotiations. I have not them all, as many of them were private communications. The assent has been obtained from the British Ambassador, and on the return of His Excellency, which will be on Wednesday, I will be in a position to lay the papers before the House. With respect to the other question asked: I saw the notice in the newspapers. There has been no communication at all on that point between Washington and Ottawa. It does not refer to the bonding system, but to the privilege given in 1871, principally in the interest of the Welland Railway. The American coasting laws are very rigid, and American vessels starting from Chicago for Oswego or Ogdensburg were not allowed to touch our coast. They could go through the Welland Canal as being a portion of the navigation, without being supposed to touch at a Canadian port; but many of those vessels draw too much water when laden to get through the Welland Canal, and so they are in the habit of stopping at the Erie terminus of the Welland Railway, landing their cargoes, going through the canal light, and resuming cargo at the Ontario terminus, the cargo having been carried over the Welland Railway. It appears this notice is to do away with that privilege.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask if that is the only effect of it. It is exceedingly ambiguous, and there is a good deal of uncertainty felt in regard to it by merchants.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no uncertainty. If the hon. gentleman will look at the treaty he will see how the matter stands. It has nothing to do with the bonding system whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. It is an exhibition of good will on the part of the Americans to lead us to agree to the other arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be so.

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the correspondence with Newfoundland with respect to duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The telegraphic despatches will be brought down.

### THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 154) further to amend the Act relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Bill (No. 152) to amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883.—(Mr. Caron.) (On a division.)

### SETTLEMENT OF MANITOBA CLAIMS.

Mr. BOWELL moved third reading of Bill (No. 155) for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister whether he has received any information from the Department of the Interior as to the quantity of land which would be transferred to Manitoba under this arrangement.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks. I have not been able to obtain it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 156) to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada be discharged; and that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill for the further consideration of the last clause. He said: I wish to make a slight amendment in the last clause of the Bill, namely, to insert the words "other matters" after the word "vessel," in the 23rd clause.

Motion agreed to, and Bill recommitted, amended, reported as amended, and read the third time, and passed.

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire, before this motion is carried, to bring before the House, a question of which I gave notice at the earliest possible moment. I gave notice, through my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), of my intention of bringing up the question of the North-West on the same evening on which the First Minister brought down the last papers which he said he intended to bring down this Session, and since that time I have been awaiting the opportunity which now, perhaps a little unexpectedly, has arisen. I rise to charge upon the Government, in their administration of affairs in the North-West, grave instances of neglect, delay and mismanagement, prior to the recent outbreak, in matters deeply affecting the peace, welfare and good government of this country. I do not intend to touch upon many questions connected with the administration of affairs in the North-West, which yet prove, in my judgment, the truth of that accusation, but which, for all that, are more remotely connected with the particular events which will form, so far as I am concerned, the subject of the present discussion. For example, the general railway policy, the general tariff policy, the general policy of inflation, the general land policy, the general use that has been made of the domain, and of the power to appoint to offices by the Government—that conduct, generally speaking, which, without special reference to this matter, led an eminent publicist, not devoted to either party, after a visit to that country during the late summer, in which, indeed, he did not touch the regions which are particularly affected by the present disturbances, but in which he saw what was to be seen and heard what was to be heard along the great line of railway communication—I say which led that eminent publicist, Mr. Goldwin Smith, in a review of his visit, to use these words:

"Nobody doubts that the intentions of the Ottawa Government towards the North-West, are good. But it is a distant Government; its all powerful chief has never himself been in the North-West; and references or appeals to it are tedious and precarious. It is a party Government, and it cannot resist the importunities of hungry partisans, who mark the new and defenceless territory as their perquisite, though the consequence of yielding has inevitably been injurious to the political morality of a young community, the foundation of whose character ought to have been laid in honor. The parliamentary system, though the best for those who are represented, is, for those who are unrepresented, or inadequately represented, the worst."

And again:

"Old politicians think only of voting power; but there is a power besides that of voters, which, if a deaf ear is turned to the remonstrances of the North-West, will probably soon be encountered. Not that there exists the thought of violence. Nowhere is the reign of law more perfect than among these Canadian pioneers. What they contemplate in the last resort, is an appeal to England for release from the Confederation, and for the establishment of the North-West as an independent British colony."

Now, Sir, the matters to which I have referred we have, from time to time, pressed upon the consideration of the Government, and with proofs, though I do not speak of them

to-day, because the discussion of the conduct of the Government will—the papers being yet unprinted, and it being necessary, therefore, to make a more exhaustive review than if they had been printed, as they ought to have been, and the course of events over a period of eight years being necessarily to be traced—over-tax one's strength, and for the same reason I propose to summarise only a large number of the more nearly related matters. I am relieved from the necessity of engaging now in any discussion of some important topics. I have already taken occasion to point out to the House the events of the year 1869-70, and their bearing upon the more recent transactions. I have already stated my view of the nature and extent of the responsibility of the Government in connection with North-West affairs. I have already pointed out that the Government, in view of the late events, is really on the defensive, and is bound to vindicate itself, being *primò facie* responsible for such occurrences as have taken place in a self-governing community. The Government has declined that challenge, but it has courted enquiry, it has challenged attack, and it has denied all fault and blame. One question, which is very material to be discussed, I have already treated in part—the question of local defence—the course of the Government with reference to the local corps of the North-West; and I have also taken the opportunity to refer to another very important point, the lack of those representative institutions, which, had they been granted earlier and been as effective as we might expect, would have proved the safety valve which would have prevented the recent affair. I may say at once that there has been, in my view, a scandalous breach of duty on the part of the Government, with reference to bringing down the papers. From the earliest period at which we had news of the revolt, I have been appealing for those papers. They have come down reluctantly, at long intervals, with pretence of a difficulty in copying, and, when produced, those which have been produced have borne upon their face marks that they had been ready for production for many days before it was thought fit to lay them on the Table. From time to time essential papers have been declined, and even to-day papers which as I shall show are extremely important, in order to reach the full extent of the culpability of the Government, are retained—papers which it is essential should be produced, and which, if they be not produced, must be elicited at some future day through the medium of a select committee. But, although gravely compromising papers, as I believe I shall be able to show, have been withheld, yet enough has come to light in my judgment to enable us to decide in the affirmative on the motion which I shall place in your hands. Now, Sir, to deal with events and a course of administration which runs over so many years at all effectively, it is necessary to grapple with the state of the facts as to each important question separately, and I propose to take that course; but it must never be forgotten that the combined operation of the different series of facts, and of several grievances, concurrently acting upon the mind of a population, is much greater than that of simple addition—that the operation is intensified, and that the difficulties are infinitely greater than if the same sets of grievances were operating at different times. There are questions which arise concerning the half-breeds, questions concerning the Indians, and questions common to whites and half-breeds alike. As to Indian affairs, I have already shown the great importance of the Indian question. I do not propose to embarrass this discussion—as I might by the multiplicity of proofs which I should have to bring forward—by dealing at length with the Indian question, for the sufficient reason that the proofs upon that subject are more easily accessible to hon. members and to the country than the unprinted proofs to which I shall have to refer upon other questions. They are to be found in the Blue Books, and in the reports, and

Mr. BLAKE.

they show, in my judgment, neglects, delays, incompetence, bad appointments, mistaken policy, and breaches of promise, resulting in the fact that many of the Indians had got into a highly discontented and excited state, and were ripe for trouble in 1884-85. But this fact is undeniable that, to whatever cause it was due, such was the condition of many of the Indians at that time. Now, Sir, with reference to the half-breeds, I propose to examine the facts in connection with the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories to recognition in respect of the extinguishment of the Indian title; the facts in connection with the claims of the unenumerated half-breeds of the Province of Manitoba in respect of the extinguishment of the Indian title; the claims of the land holding half-breeds for grants and for surveys, particularly in connection with river lots. And as to the whites and the half-breeds in matters of common concern, I shall touch, though only touch, on the claims of the land holders for grants and surveys; the claims as to the reserves of various kinds; the claims in connection with wood regulations and local improvements; and claims as to representative institutions. But on these questions I shall only repeat the expression of my opinion as to their importance, and their felt importance, to the people. I do not propose, Sir, to engage in the discussion of the actual outbreak or the events of the campaign. I think, as I have more than once said, that it would be entirely premature to do so, and with the exception of perhaps one slight incident I shall disembarass the present discussion from the question of the immediate preparations for and the actual conduct of the campaign. And before I engage upon the enquiry to which I have just pledged myself, I may say, that having passed a good many years of my life in this House and elsewhere, in the investigation of evidence and the analysis of facts, I never rose to state a case which was based upon facts, with a more absolute conviction of the overwhelming character of that case and the inexorable conclusion which is to be drawn from those facts, than I do upon the present occasion. My task is therefore, in this respect, easy. It is rendered difficult only by the number and range of the events, and the multiplicity of the proofs which I shall have to endeavor to adduce, and which I shall submit to all candid persons inside and outside of this House, in the conviction that but one conclusion can be reached as to the result. Now, Sir, with reference to the claim of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories for consideration in respect to the extinguishment of the Indian title, I call attention to the fact that that claim was recognised, in so far as the half-breeds of the original Province of Manitoba were concerned, in the course of the events of 1869-70. By the bargain that was made, incorporated in the Act of 1870, 1,400,000 acres of land were set apart to be divided amongst the half-breed minors in respect of the extinguishment of their claims to the Indian title. By subsequent legislation, it was provided that the half-breeds, heads of families, should get a 160-acre grant. I maintain that the claim of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories to consideration in respect of the extinguishment of the Indian title was then settled in principle. Justice is the same on the banks of the Saskatchewan or the Qu'Appelle as on the banks of the Red River or the Assiniboine. It was impossible to find a different rule to be prescribed for different parallels of latitude, and it was absolutely impossible to say that that which had been granted in the one case should be declined in the other. Now, I rejoice that it happens to me, who am not of the same race or of the same creed with these French half-breeds, to point out these circumstances, because it cannot be said of me that I am moved by those prejudices or predilections which might be charged against one of their own race or creed. It is not on any such grounds that this question is to be handled, it is to be handled as a question of justice, of policy,

of statesmanship. Of the half-breeds, I only\* say as I have said before, that I recognise them as fellow Canadians, misled and deeply wrong, but we are not to try them here; their trial is appointed elsewhere. It is here, and here alone, in the first instance, that the Government of this country can be tried for its conduct in respect of these transactions; and that trial, and the ascertainment of their responsibility, is a task which fitly falls upon our shoulders. I ask whether the Government has done its duty in respect of this portion of the population of Canada, and I answer that question, as I think you will answer it, after you have heard the evidence, by an emphatic negative. I believe there never was a grosser case of neglect, of delay, and of mismanagement than that which I am about to develop with reference to this particular claim. The question did not become urgent in the North-West Territories very early, because there was but little interference with the half-breeds of the North-West Territories for some years. There was comparatively little settlement in the country; there were but few surveys; there were but few authorities of any kind to interfere; things went on for a while pretty much in the old groove. But by degrees settlement increased; by degrees new arrangements were being made; by degrees a new order of things pressed itself upon attention, and concurrently with that gradual change, there came the rapid disappearance of the buffalo which, about the years 1877, 1878, 1879, indicated the imminent, urgent necessity of some other livelihood than that which many of these half-breeds had wholly depended on, and most of them had in large part depended on in prior years. It was in the early part of 1878 that the regular, formal agitation on this subject took shape. And here, Sir, I may pause to notice with amazement a letter which I have seen published, emanating from a member of the Government, dated so far late as the 6th June last—a letter from the Secretary of State—in which he says:

"If the half-breeds had serious complaints against the Canadian Government, the ordinary method of petition was open to them as to every free citizen. They have not availed themselves of it."

Can it be that on the 8th June, 1885, a member of the Government of Canada should yet have been in such dense ignorance of the facts with reference to this case as to make that public statement? And can it be that that member should be the Secretary of State of Canada? Why, the record is one long cry for redress; but it never reached his ears. About the beginning of June, 1878, a petition was presented from Prince Albert and forwarded to the Government by Captain Moore—that gentleman who is amongst the volunteers who joined the police at the Duck Lake fight—signed by 151 persons; it contained allusion to certain topics, and it contained, amongst others, this paragraph:

"Lastly, your petitioners would humbly represent that whereas a census of the half-breeds and old settlers was taken in the Province of Manitoba shortly after the organisation of that Province, with a view to the distribution of scrip, said scrip having since issued to the parties interested, and whereas at the time this census was taken many half-breeds, both minors and heads of families, resided in the territories and were not included in the said census, your petitioners would humbly represent their rights to participation in the issue of half-breed or old settlers scrip, are as valid and binding as those of the half-breeds and old settlers of Manitoba, and are expected by them to be regarded by the Canadian Government as scrupulously as in that Province; and with a view to the adjustment of the same, your petitioners would humbly request that a census of the said half-breeds and old settlers be taken at as early a date as may be conveniently determined upon, with a view to apportioning to those of them who have not been already included in the census of Manitoba their just allotment of land and scrip."

To that petition no acknowledgment or, at any rate, no answer is on record amongst the papers brought down. On the 1st February, 1878, the half-breeds of St. Laurent had a public meeting, at which Gabriel Dumont was president and Alexander Fisher secretary, both prime movers in the

recent affair, and they determined upon several requests. Amongst them was this:

"That there be granted to all half-breeds who have not participated in the distribution of scrip and lands in the Province of Manitoba like scrip and grants of lands as in that Province."

About March, 1878, there was a petition of French Canadians and half-breeds of St. Albert on various subjects. It refers to the petition of St. Laurent, to which I have just referred, and it contains this paragraph:

"That all the heads of families of half-breeds and their children who have not participated in the distribution of scrip and land in the Province of Manitoba be allowed such like scrip and grants of land as were allowed in the said Province (at least that bush lands should be granted to them)."

Both these petitions were transmitted by Lieutenant Governor Laird, in February and in April, to the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What year?

Mr. BLAKE. In 1878, during the time of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). In 1878 there was a petition of the half-breeds of Cypress Mountains, which contains 269 signatures. It contains a number of statements as to their distressed condition, due principally to the disappearance of the buffalo, and makes this declaration:

"That the majority of us, upon the cession of the Province to the Local Government, were temporarily absent, and were thereby deprived of the benefit of the scrip given to those half-breeds, who were at that time present in the Province."

It prays for several advantages, amongst others seed, grain, agricultural implements, and for a large reserve in a particular locality. And here comes, following on that petition, a resolution passed by the North-West Council. On the 2nd August, 1878, the council of the North-West Territory, in its legislative session, passed the following resolution:—

"Whereas this council has had under consideration a petition of certain half-breeds who usually frequent the neighborhood of Cypress Hills'

And they proceed to describe the substance of the petition:

"And whereas it is not in the power of this council to grant lands, assistance to procure such, or any such like advantages, resolved therefore that the Lieutenant Governor be requested to forward a petition to the Dominion Government together with the following suggestions which they respectfully and strongly urge may receive the early and earnest attention of His Excellency the Governor General:

"1st. That it would be injudicious to set apart reserves of land for the half-breeds of the North-West Territory or give them negotiable scrip;

"2nd. That in view, however, of the fact that grants of land or issues of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands of that Province, there will undoubtedly be general dissatisfaction among the half-breeds of the said territories unless they receive some like consideration.

"3. That this consideration would most tend to the advantage of the half-breeds were it given in the form of a non-transferable location ticket, for say, 160 acres for each half-breed head of a family, and each half-breed child of parents resident in the said territories at the time of the transfer thereof to Canada, the ticket to be issued immediately to any half-breed eighteen years of age or over, on furnishing evidence of claim, and to every child on arriving at that age and furnishing the necessary evidence.

"4. That each half-breed holding such a location ticket, should be allowed to locate it upon any unoccupied Dominion lands, but the title of the land so entered should remain in the Crown for ten years; and if, at the expiration of three years after such entry, the half-breed locatee has made no improvements on the land, his claim thereto shall be subject to forfeiture.

"5. To induce those half-breeds who now procure their livelihood by hunting on the plains to abandon their present mode of life and settle on their locations, by which course it alone appears possible to avert the great destitution with which they are threatened owing to the imminent early extinction of the buffalo, that aid in agricultural implements and seeds be allowed them for three years, but only once for each family that may settle within that time.

"6. That half-breeds who have shared in the Manitoba distribution of lands and scrip should not be entitled to receive location tickets in the territories though now resident therein."

On the 30th September, 1878, Lieutenant, Governor Laird transmitted the Cypress Hills petition, and the resolution of

the North-West Council which I have read, in a despatch which contains these words:

"I feel it my duty to ask you to urge upon the Dominion Government the necessity of taking early action with respect to the claims set forth by the half-breeds of the Territories, either in the direction indicated by the resolutions of the North-West Council, or in such other manner as the Government may deem meet. The half-breeds of Manitoba—the heads, of families as well as the children—having received either script or land, I may remark that from what information is within my reach, I have no doubt the half-breeds of the Territories who think they have as good a claim to consideration as their compatriots in Manitoba, will be very much dissatisfied unless they are treated in a somewhat similar manner."

By the time that reached Ottawa the Government had changed, the hon. gentleman had assumed the reins of office, and, with the reins of office, he had accepted the Department of the Interior and the Superintendency General of Indian Affairs, thus identifying himself in both those aspects with the questions which are involved in this controversy. On the 20th November, 1878, his Deputy Minister acknowledged the despatch of Governor Laird, the resolution and the petition, and stated that that despatch, with its enclosures, would be brought under the consideration of the Minister on his return to the seat of Government. About the same time at which that despatch was written, the Lieutenant Governor visited this section of the country, and I quote from the newspaper the account of his visit:

"While the Lieutenant Governor was at Duck Lake, a deputation of half-breeds from the St. Laurent waited on his honor, and, in most respectful terms, urged him not to allow Chief Beardy's reserve to surround their claims or encroach upon the lands where they had been accustomed to cut hay. They also desired to be informed if any reply has been received to the petition forwarded, through his honor, to Ottawa, respecting the half-breeds in the territories. The Lieutenant Governor thereupon explained matters to them as fully as was in his power. When he had concluded Norbert Laurance, Esq., cordially thanked him for the obliging manner in which he had replied to their enquiries."

I have now shown you as clearly as I could what the position of this question was at the time when hon. gentlemen opposite commenced their dealing with it, in the fall of the year 1878. I have read you the petitions which had already been presented from the locality, the resolution of the council, the despatch of the Lieutenant Governor, all indicating that the question was one for early solution, the North-West Council being of opinion that modified compensation ought to be given in a different form from that which had obtained in the Province of Manitoba, for reasons which were sufficiently obvious; and the case being presented to the Government by the Lieutenant Governor as one for early action, either in the method devised by the council, or in some other method, at the peril of dissatisfaction. I have no complaint to make of the expedition with which the then Deputy Minister of the Interior, Mr. Dennis, grappled with the question. On the 20th December, 1878, Mr. Dennis presented to his Minister a very long memorandum dealing with the case of those claims, and from it I extract some passages. He submits to the Minister "that it is expedient with as little delay as possible to deal with the claims to consideration preferred by the half-breeds of the North-West Territories." He describes the half-breeds as of two classes, those of the plains, and those who, while spending part of the year in hunting the buffalo, possess settled homes. He says:

"The second-class may be illustrated by reference to those half breeds who are found at Edmonton, St. Albert, St. Laurent, St. Anne's, Victoria, etc., who have habitable and in some cases, good houses, where they reside and cultivate the soil to a greater or less extent, but still mainly depend for their means of living upon the buffalo."

He adds:

"Some uneasiness is felt by the half-breed element in the Territories in consequence of no steps having yet been taken towards the recognition of the demands put forward on their behalf. It must be freely admitted they have a claim to favorable consideration, and the question is, how is that claim to be satisfied so as to benefit the half-breeds, and at the same time benefit the country?"

MR. BLAKE.

He discountenances the absolute grant of lands, or treating them as wards and making Indian treaty with them. He proposes to offer them certain inducements to settle on land, and to learn to farm, especially to raise cattle, and of this plan he says:

"The immediate effect would be, assuming that the half-breeds themselves are willing to give it a trial, that we should have the whole of this element in sympathy with the Government in dealing with the plain tribes of Indians. In this way we should attract to our side a moral power which in the present critical relations of the various tribes of Indians towards each other and towards the Government, would prove of the greatest value to the Dominion."

He refers to the petition of the Cypress Hills half-breeds and the resolution of the North-West Council, and says he "is of opinion that encouragement additional to that recommended by the council would be required to induce the half-breeds to become settlers, and he fully believes that it would be in the interest of good government in the North-West to grant the same." He suggests "that the half-breeds, where wished for, should be permitted to take up their lands in such a way as to enable them to settle together in bands, and, wherever a band of 50 or more families form themselves into one community or settlement, they should be provided with a school or teachers for a term of years, such teachers to be selected with a view to being able to instruct them in the raising and care of stock, also in practical agriculture, including the use and care of implements." He adds:

"The undersigned regards the state of affairs in the Territories in relation to the Indians and half-breeds as calling for the serious consideration of the Government, in view of additional complications which are not unlikely to arise owing to the presence on our soil of large numbers of armed Indians, refugees for the time being from the seat of war in the adjoining territory. He is of opinion that further means should be adopted to cultivate and maintain relations with Indians and half-breed populations calculated to attach them to us and to convince them that the Government is desirous of fulfilling its obligations to them in the utmost good faith."

He suggests a scheme of industrial schools, and he closes thus:

"The undersigned respectfully requests for the whole question discussed in this memorandum the early consideration of the Minister of the Interior, in order, if thought desirable, that a measure may be prepared embodying such policy as may be decided upon in good time for the ensuing Session of Parliament."

The action which appears to have been taken on that memorandum was, first, the appointment of Mr. N. F. Davin as a commissioner to enquire into the industrial school question, both in the Territories and in the United States, upon which, so far as I can apprehend, no final report has been brought down; secondly, to send the memorandum for the consideration and advice of Archbishop Taché, Bishop McLean, Bishop Macrae and Governor Laird. On the 23rd of December, 1878, three days after the date of the memorandum, Colonel Dennis writes to Archbishop Taché, transmitting the paper, in this language:

"As you will see by the tenor of the paper, I am fully impressed with the justice as well as the expediency of disposing of the question at the earliest possible period."

On the 29th January, 1879, Archbishop Taché replied in a very long letter to Col. Dennis' communication, and from that I shall make some extracts. Amongst the headings which the Archbishop treats is one "Importance of the Half Breed Question."

"It must be freely admitted that the half-breeds of the North-West have a claim to favorable consideration. Great uneasiness is felt by them in consequence of no steps having yet been taken in their behalf. A liberal policy on the part of the Government would attract to its side a moral and physical power which in the present critical relations of the various tribes of Indians towards each other and towards the Government, would prove of the greatest value to the Dominion. On the other hand the half-breed element dissatisfied would form a standing menace to the peace and prosperity of the Territories. There is no doubt that the state of affairs in the Territories in relation to the Indians and half-

breeds, is calling for the serious consideration of the Government, and measures should be adopted to cultivate and maintain relations with the half-breed population calculated to attract them to us."

"The formidable Indian question has not yet arisen in our midst, owing largely to the influence of the half-breed element. The disappearance of the buffalo, and especially the extension of the settlers in the Indian country, are preparing difficulties which may be avoided, I hope, but which would otherwise involve such terrible and expensive results that it is the duty of all the friends of the Government and of the country to do all in their power to prevent such misfortune.

"The result depends in a great measure on the way the half-breeds would be treated. Friendly disposed, they will mightily contribute to the maintenance of peace; dissatisfied, they would not only add to the difficulty, but render the establishment of the country the next thing to an impossibility.

"2. What ought to be avoided when alluding to HALF-BREEDS—It is important in public documents to avoid comparing the half-breeds with the Indians; and it is not just to say that a certain class of them differ but little except in name from the Indians. They have not the tastes, habits and instincts of the Indians. They are hunters, traders or settlers, but no portion of them can be classified with the savages of the plains."

He proceeds to point out on what the settlements at Edmonton, St. Albert, St. Anne's, St. Laurent and Victoria, depend, and how those at Wood Mountain and Cypress Hills also live. He then adds:

"The half-breeds are a highly sensitive race; they keenly resent injury or insult, and daily complain on that point. In fact they are daily humiliated with regard to their origin by the way they are spoken of, not only in newspapers but also in official and semi-official documents.

"3. GRANT OF LAND—Every one acknowledges the desirability for the half-breeds to settle definitely on lands to cultivate them. Here is a scheme which I take the liberty to propose:

"(a.) I estimate the half-breeds actually in the North-West to number about 1,200 families. Let the Government make 12 reserves for them in the very places the half-breeds themselves will like to have them.

"(b.) Each reserve should be for 100 families at least, and contain an area of 12 square miles of available land, that is to say, the extent of four townships.

"c. All the half-breeds, men, women and children, residing in the North-West on the 1st January, 1879, ought to receive two non-negotiable scrips for 80 acres of land each, to be located by them in one of the above mentioned reserves."

He proceeds to point out that this property should be inalienable for at least three generations, save exchanges of entire lots between half-breeds, which might be allowed.

"In the settlements already formed the half-breeds ought to be confirmed in the possession of the lot or lots they claim, and on which there are improvements, even which is very rare, when they claim more than 160 acres. When the lots claimed are less than 160 acres, scrips for the balance ought to be given."

Then, after entering into further details, he concludes by pressing once again, the importance of an early settlement of the question.

"SPEDDY SETTLEMENT OF THE WHOLE MATTER—It is desirable that the half-breed question should be decided without any further delay. The requisite legislation ought to be passed in the coming Session of the Legislature. Immediately after inspectors ought to be appointed, and I would particularly recommend Mr. Angus McKay as one of the inspectors. Surveyors will have to be sent to the Territories next summer, to mark immediately, at least, the outside lines of the reserves, with one or two rows of lots. Other details may come afterwards, provided they be not delayed unnecessarily. There is no doubt the difficulties increase with delay."

On the 18th January, 1879, Bishop McLean wrote in answer to the letter of Colonel Dennis:

"I thoroughly sympathise with you in the anxiety you show to conciliate the half-breeds of the North-West Territories. The plain Crees and the Blackfeet have been but recently reclaimed from a state of constant warfare between themselves by the introduction of the Mounted Police force; and the presence of large bands of Sioux, renowned for their warlike habits, might at any moment, without any administrative skill on the part of the Government, lead to dangerous outbreaks that would not only be deplorable in their immediate results, but tend to damage the prospects of the country in regard to settlement. In bringing so prominently into the foreground the value of the half-breed element being in sympathy with the Government in dealing with the Indians, I think you have grasped the main point of the whole question. The experience of all the years I have lived in the North-West points to

the conclusion that the Indian has a tendency, in all his dealings with the white man, to consult and largely to be guided by the opinion of the half-breeds. Therefore you have the whole half-breed element in sympathy with the Government in dealing with the plain tribe of Indians. I would express a very hearty conviction in the conclusion that you draw, namely: that we should attract to our side a moral power which, in the present critical relation of the various tribes of Indians towards each other and towards the Government, would prove of the greatest value to the Dominion."

I should have added that another question is touched on by the Archbishop, which is, that in existing settlements all the properties in the reserves should be sub-divided into lots of 10 chains broad by 80 in depth, in accordance with what was the ancient custom of the country. Bishop Macrae's statement is, perhaps, not material to be read; he declares that he has had but very little acquaintance with the subject. Governor Laird, on the 13th March, 1879, says:

If the half-breeds desire to settle down together I most certainly think that land should be for a short time reserved for them; but I believe it would be a mistake to lock up the land for a longer period than two or three years."

He discusses the question of teachers, and also of industrial schools, arguing rather against the practical availability of that proposition in the emergency, and adding these words:

"The wants of the Indians and half-breeds are pressing, and it appears to me that the same money that would support industrial schools could in the meantime be better employed in hiring a few practical men to go at once on the reserves and teach them how to plough, sow and save their crops, in order that, if possible, starvation in its worst form may be averted."

Just about the same time at which these various despatches were being written, there came the rumor that Louis Riel was going to the Saskatchewan—even at that early date. The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 24th March, 1879, contains this paragraph:

"The *Emerson International* gives currency to the rumor that Louis Riel intends going to the Saskatchewan next summer with a large French half-breed emigration to take place from settlements on the Red and Pembina Rivers. It is rumored that an agitation is on foot to obtain a reduction of the terms of his banishment, the Hon. Jos. Dubuc being understood to have promised to use his influence at Ottawa with the French Canadian members in support of the application."

On 15th May, 1879, by the Dominion Lands Act brought in during that Session, power is delegated to the Governor in Council:

"To satisfy any claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title preferred by half-breeds resident in the North-West Territories outside the limits of Manitoba, on the 15th day of July, 1870, by granting land to such persons, to such extent, and on such terms and conditions, as may be deemed expedient."

So that not having decided upon the precise form of their policy they decided upon a quasi-recognition of the claim, and they asked Parliament to hand over to them absolute power and discretion to deal with it as they pleased, on what terms they pleased and when they pleased; and that power was granted. A question for our consideration from the time of the passing of that Act is, how they used the power which they so asked and so obtained? I will show that from that time up to 1885 they did nothing whatever. I will show they did nothing whatever with a question which had been declared by the Deputy head of the Department, by all persons who had been consulted under the advice of the Minister, to be a present question, a pressing question, a question which had already assumed the form of agitation, namely, public meetings and petitions, a question whose difficulty would be enhanced by time—I will show that having taken from Parliament *carte blanche* they never used their power from that day until the year in which we now are. The difficulties unquestionably were to be enhanced by time. No grievance grows less by time; no just demand diminishes in its intensity by time. The feeling of soreness, of irritation and neglect increases

by time. The demands are apt to be exaggerated by time. The situation grows complicated by time, and in this case it was perfectly clear it was to become more complicated by time, because we were dealing at that moment with a state of things in which but comparatively few of the half breed population had taken up land. There were very considerable numbers at certain points to which I have referred; but taking the whole population of the Territories a large number of them had not taken up and improved lands at that time, and therefore there arose no question on the two titles as to the bulk of the half-breed population, as to at all events the majority of the half-breed population—I mean the right to the extinguishment of the Indian title and their rights as settlers. That arose only as to those who had settled; but it was clear it was going to arise with a much larger proportion of the half-breeds from year to year because it was inevitable they must starve or settle. Those who had not settled lived entirely by the chase of the buffalo and by freighting, and the buffalo having disappeared, they must either starve or settle; and settling, of course, the question of their title as settlers as well as the Indian title would arise. Was it because there was no pressure upon the Government that this matter slipped by neglected? Not so. As I have said, their Deputy Minister had warned them; the North-West Council had warned them; the Governor had warned them; and the three advisors whom they called into council had warned them that it was a question which ought to be settled at once, delay in the settlement of which would enhance the difficulty, and which therefore merited and demanded the early attention of the Government. They did nothing during those six years; they formed no ministerial plan; they enunciated no ministerial policy; they passed no Order in Council; they did not even take the preliminary steps of having an enumeration; they waited until the outbreak was on foot, and then they acted as I will show you after a while. During 1879, after having obtained the parliamentary authority to which I have referred, nothing was done. But on 1st December of that year Colonel Richardson, who had been for many years as a stipendary magistrate and a member of the council in the Territories, being in Ottawa, gave a memorandum, no doubt at the request of the Government, to Colonel Dennis, and in that memorandum he says:

“As soon as steps are taken to ascertain the number of half-breeds in the Territory who have not already shared in the Manitoba grant the scheme suggested by Colonel Dennis in the conclusion of his memorandum would I think give satisfaction generally.”

He differs, however from him on two points: First, he thinks there should be no special educational facilities; and second, there is no need to teach the half-breeds to raise and care for stock, because they know all about it, and in fact they teach the whites the proper way of raising and caring for stock in that country. He adds that some half-breeds would prefer settling near white settlements. It seems to be very clear that the First Minister in charge of this matter was reluctant to recognise this claim. And that seems to be apparent from another letter by Colonel Richardson to Colonel Dennis, written on 13th January, 1880. That letter runs as follows:—

“DEAR COLONEL DENNIS,—Having passed three years in the North-West and during that period seen a good deal of the half-breed population, the following induced by the remarks of the right hon. the Premier in my presence last Saturday, may not be out of place, the subject of dealing with the half-breed element of the North-West being, as I then gathered, intended for early discussion.

“1. These half-breeds claim and insist that as a distinct class they have a share in the Indian title to the land outside of Manitoba which has not been extinguished, and as such distinct class entitled equally with the half-breeds of Manitoba to special consideration. That grounds exist for such contention appear by reference to statutes of Canada, 1870, Cap. 3, sec. 21.

“2. Admitting these half-breeds might (as some few have, but now regret) joined in the Indian treaties, I am convinced such a contingency is not only not probable, but that if they requested they would reject

Mr. BLAKE.

the offer; besides I do not think their joining in the Indian treaties would be in the public interest, but decidedly the opposite.

“How best to deal with the element has, as you are aware, been considered and you already hold my views on the subject.

“I may however be permitted to express the opinion that opportunities now present themselves for removing the dissatisfaction existing among these people, and securing their good will towards the Government, because: 1. Their former occupation as hunters is gone. 2. They are as a class destitute. A further reason for urging as I respectfully do, early action is that they are scattered among the Indians and lately subjected to the evil influences of leading spirits of the Manitoba troubles of 1870, who during the past season have been traversing the country doing at least ‘no good.’”

Again you see, Mr. Speaker, the importance, in the view of a magistrate from the Territories, of early action, the danger of delay, the favorable character of the conjuncture of circumstances which then presented themselves for a settlement in a form which would be permanently beneficial to the half-breeds and at the same time to the country, and the efforts to remove the difficulty which he saw stood in the way from conversations he had with the Minister who seems to have held that the half-breeds had no well founded claim, and to have suggested that the Indian treaty was a good solution for any such claim. Nothing was done in 1880, although the year opened, as I have said, by this further communication from Colonel Richardson. In that year once again there was reference to danger, for amongst the papers brought down is a letter from W. L. Orde, Indian agent and clerk, North-West Indian Superintendency, Battleford, dated 3rd April, as follows:—

“I have the honor to inform you that an authentic report has reached here from the south, that Louis Riel is now agitating amongst the half-breeds, and the Sioux, and Crow Indians, it is said with a view of an attack upon the Blackfeet and Blood Indians, the ostensible object being to wrest from the latter, a large number of stolen ponies. He may have other evil designs, and I think it well to let you know.”

But although nothing was done at Ottawa, pressure was applied to Ottawa. In the spring of 1880, the half-breed inhabitants of Manitoba Village, Lake Manitoba, North-West Territories, signed a petition which contains these words:

“And whereas the half-breed heads of families, and the children of the same, born in or resident in the Territories, previously to 15th July, 1870, have not yet had their claims to equal rights and privileges with their brethren in the Province of Manitoba, investigated as is provided for by sub-section ‘E’ of clause 125, 42 Vic., Chap. 31; and whereas the continued delay in ascertaining and investigating said claims, is creating great and general dissatisfaction throughout the Territories, we your petitioners do humbly pray that you will cause a commission to be issued at an early date to enquire into and confirm the said claims, not only with regard to scrip and allotments of lands as provided for in Manitoba, but moreover to confirm the titles of lands occupied by or purchased by parties from occupants of claims taken previously to the transfer of the Territories to the Dominion of Canada.”

On the 10th of May, 1880, the Deputy Superintendent General acknowledges that petition, and states that it will be duly laid before the Minister for consideration. It was under consideration until 1885. On the 23rd of February, 1880, there was a meeting at Duck Lake to which I adverted a few days ago, called by Father André to protest against the notion of abolishing the territorial government; and in his speech, as reported in the newspapers, Father André said:

“Before long this together with several other settlements, would be entitled to representation in the council at Battleford. Then the council would be in a better position to speak in the name of the people, to press their wants and remedy their grievances at Ottawa.”

Showing that they had even then wants and grievances, in the opinion of the speaker, which required pressing, and in respect of which they valued even that imperfect and rudimentary system of representation, under which they hoped soon to have a member in that district. On the same occasion, another of the speakers, Mr. Abraham Montour, said:

“Several other petitions had already been forwarded to Ottawa, setting forth the rights and certain wants of the half-breed element throughout the territory, and the action of the Government was still to be learned. He feared the present petition would receive similar treatment.”

So that there was even then complaint of the neglect of petitions which were forwarded to Ottawa. On the 19th of May, 1880, Mr. Thomas McKay, I believe a very respected resident of Prince Albert, transmitted to the Minister of the Interior a petition in this letter:

"I herewith forward you petition from the half-breeds of Edmonton and Prince Albert, North-West Territories. As we have no representative for the North-West Territories through whom we could make our wants known, the petition is forwarded to you, trusting it shall receive your early and special attention."

The petition is signed by 102 names, and, amongst other things, it contains these statements:

"And whereas the half-breed heads of families, and the children of the same, born or resident in the Territories previously to July 15th, 1870, have not yet had their claims to equal rights and privileges with their brethren in the Province of Manitoba, investigated, as is justly due to them, and as is provided for by sub-section 'E' of clause 125, 42 Victoria, Chapter 31; and whereas the continued delay in ascertaining and investigating said claims, is creating great and general dissatisfaction throughout the Territories; we your petitioners do humbly pray that you will cause a commission to be issued at an early date to enquire into and confirm the said claims, not only with regard to scrip, and allotments of land as provided for in Manitoba, but, moreover, to confirm the titles to land occupied by or purchased by parties from occupants of claims taken previously to the transfer of the Territories to the Dominion of Canada."

On the 10th of July, 1880, Mr. McKay's letter was acknowledged, and he was informed that it would receive due consideration on the return of the Minister from England. It was under consideration till 1885. I come to the year 1881; nothing was done in the year 1881, but the pressure went on. In the summer of 1881, there was a petition to the Governor General from the half-breeds of Qu'Appelle, with 112 signatures containing these statements:

"That owing to their being temporarily absent from the now Province of Manitoba, at the time of the transfer of the said Province and the North-West Territories to the Dominion of Canada, they have been deprived of, and debarred from, several advantages which were accorded to their confères who were residents in the Province of Manitoba at the time of the aforesaid transfer, and that your petitioners are of opinion that they have been unjustly treated, as their conduct and actions at the time referred to deserve the kind consideration of the Government. Therefore your petitioners humbly pray that they be dealt with and treated similar to the half-breeds of Manitoba, and the Government will grant scrip to the heads of families and grants of land to the children of the heads of families in the North-West Territories, in like proportion as was granted to half-breeds and old settlers in the Province of Manitoba."

That petition was acknowledged on the 20th of September, 1881, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, and the parties were informed that the petition would be duly considered. It was considered up to 1885. On the 7th of June, 1881, the district of Lorne having in the meantime acquired representation in the North-West Council, a memorial was presented to that council by Mr. Lawrence Clarke, member for Lorne, in these words:

"The undersigned has the honor to represent—

"That a feeling of dissatisfaction and discontent exists among the half-breed element of the North-West Territories.

"That such feeling has arisen from what these half-breeds consider a disregard of their rights, and in the opinion of many whose standing in the country gives such an opinion weight, has, to some extent at least, increased the difficulties encountered by the Dominion Government in their dealings with the Indians, between whom and the whites the half-breeds form a distinct class, possessing, as a rule, great influence over the Indians.

"That the half-breeds have always been recognised as possessing rights in the same soil, subject to which the Dominion accepted the transfer of the Territories, and while ample provision has been made for those resident in Manitoba, on the 15th July, 1870, nothing has been done towards extinguishing that portion of the Indian title to lands and territories outside the Province of Manitoba, as originally formed by the Act of 1870.

"The undersigned further draws attention to the fact, that, by law, the half-breeds are excluded from the benefit conferred upon the Indians.

"That the undersigned has been given to understand several petitions from various quarters have been presented to the Dominion Government on the subject of the half-breeds, particularly referred to, but no notice taken thereof.

"That the undersigned knows that a considerable portion of these half-breeds were and are still residents of the electoral districts of Lorne, and feels it his duty as the electoral representative of that district, to bring under notice, their grievances, in the hope that some action may

be taken at an early day, towards removing what seems to be just cause or complaint.

"The undersigned recommends that through your honor in council the attention of His Excellency be respectfully drawn to the subject, and he be memorialised to direct the attention of his Ministers to the position of the half-breeds who at the transfer to Canada, were and still are residents of the North-West Territories, and have not become parties to Indian treaties, and the taking of such steps as may lead to a speedy adjustment of the grievances they labor under."

On the 14th of June, 1881, the Lieutenant Governor transmitted a copy of this memorial to the Government, adding:

"I was requested by a resolution in council, passed on the 10th inst., to transmit copies thereof to be laid before His Excellency the Governor General, and to express the hope that His Excellency may be pleased to draw the attention of his Ministers to the grievances complained of.

"I trust you will have the goodness, at an early day, to bring these subjects to which these memorials refer, under the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General."

On receipt of these papers, it seems from the papers which were brought down, that the Deputy Minister felt it needful to make another effort, and he made up a file which contained his memorandum of December, 1878, the letter of Archbishop Taché, the letter of Bishop McLean, the letter of Bishop Macrae, the letter of Governor Laird, the letters of Colonel Richardson, the memorial of Mr. Clarke, and the letter of Governor Laird, which I have just read, and he laid it before Sir David Macpherson, then Acting Minister of Interior, with this memorandum:

"The undersigned submits for the information of the Acting Minister the file herewith on the subject of the claims preferred by the half-breeds of the North-West Territories to lands or scrip following upon the grants in this behalf made to the half-breeds of Manitoba."

It is clear, even from that memorandum and its submission at that date, that up to that time no progress had been made in the solution of the question since the period of the passage of the Act, and it was then laid before the Minister for further consideration. It remained under consideration until the year 1885. On the 4th of September, 1881, the Governor General, Lord Lorne, visited the North-West Territories and those regions. A joint address was presented to him by the Hudson Bay Company, the settlers, and the Indians, on the Saskatchewan, and in reply he used this language:

"In cementing the friendship which, thank God, has reigned between the white and the red man, the Metis has been the valued confidant as he is the brother of both. He has aided in the perfect understanding which exists."

Thus was evidenced the opinion of the executive of the country, as to the importance of the half-breed element, in confirmation of the correspondence I have already read, as to the need of preserving a good understanding between the white and the half-breed with a view to the maintenance of good relations with the Indians. But instead of those good terms being maintained, the half-breeds' petitions were disregarded, he was not vouchsafed a reply, he was despised, and neglected, and he became, as Archbishop Taché indicated in his letter he might become, a scourge instead of a help. On the 8th of October, 1881, there was a meeting at Prince Albert, largely attended by persons representing the entire district of Lorne, who passed a series of resolutions, of which the third is as follows:—

"Whereas the Indian title in this district or territory has not become extinct, and the old settlers and half-breed population of Manitoba were granted scrip in commutation of such title, and such allowances has not been made to those resident in this territory, resolved that the Minister of the Interior be requested to grant such scrip to such settlers, thus placing them on an equal footing with their confères in Manitoba."

These resolutions were ordered to be presented by Mr. Lawrence Clarke, the member for the district, and he was directed to obtain a reply. From the correspondence it appears that he visited Ottawa, and he received a letter after that visit, dated the 22nd of November, 1881, in which, by the direction of the Minister, the Deputy acknowledges the receipt of the memorial and resolutions of the Prince Albert meeting, and says:

"Resolution No. 3.—As by treaty with the Indians their title to any portion of the territory included within the district of Lorne has been extinguished, this resolution would need explanation."

It is a very extraordinary thing that this subject should have so little penetrated the brains of the Department up to that time that they were able to seize on the suggestion that the Indian title had been extinguished as an excuse, when it was perfectly clear to the most ordinary mind that it was the share of the half-breeds in the Indian title that had not been extinguished which formed the basis of the resolution.

"In closing, I am to say that the Minister will cause enquiry to be made through his own officers with reference to the several subjects of these resolutions, and will on their report have such action taken in the premises as may be in accordance with law and necessary."

On the 25th of January, 1882, Mr. Clarke, acknowledged the receipt of this letter, and dealing with resolution No. 3 he answers as follows:—

"I would respectfully submit that the Indian title no doubt has been extinguished, but evidently not that of the half-breed residents of the North-West Territories. The Government of the Dominion of Canada have repeatedly acknowledged the right in the soil of the half-breed inhabitants as is proved."

He then proceeds to cite in detail the Act of 1870, to which I have referred, the Act of 1874, the Act of 1876, the Act of 1877, and the Act of 1879, citing the appropriate clauses in each case to prove his contention; and he adds:

"It will be seen therefore that from the first enactment in 1870 to the last in 1879, the rights in the soil of the half-breed have been recognised by the Government, and provision made for the extinguishment of their title. A very strong memorial on this subject was laid before the North-West Council at its last meeting in June, 1881, and a resolution adopted by that body that the memorial should be remitted to the Governor General of Canada, with a recommendation that His Excellency would be pleased to draw the attention of his Ministers to grievance complained of."

On the 14th of April, 1882, the Deputy Minister acknowledges the receipt of the letter of Mr. Clarke, and says:

"The other points raised in your letter"—

Which are the points relating to half-breeds—

"are reserved for the Minister's special consideration."

They received that consideration in 1885. Now, I come to the year 1882. The report of the Minister of the Interior was presented on the 15th February, 1882, and it is the only document which indicates that any step had been taken in the matter:

"The condition of the half-breed population of the Territories, and the claims which have been preferred on their behalf to be dealt with somewhat similarly to those of the half-breeds of the Red River, have been receiving careful consideration, with a view to meeting them reasonably."

But nothing appears to have been done; the consideration appears to have been fruitless. If there were any notions formed, they did not refer to the matured condition of plans or schemes; no report was made by the Minister to Council; no action was taken whatever. In the month of October, 1882, and for several months afterwards, Bishop Grandin, who is the Bishop within whose diocese these parts are, was at Ottawa, on various matters relating to his diocese. I have little doubt, from what I have read and seen, that with reference to that protracted mission of Bishop Grandin there are papers; but I have not had access to those papers, and no papers whatever have been brought down by the Government relative to Bishop Grandin's mission, his petitions, or the results. But besides attending to his own special business, as to which the Government has left us wholly in the dark—if indeed there be, as I believe there to be, papers which would throw light upon it—Bishop Grandin, who certainly got some concessions, who certainly was promised a written reply, which written reply I am not sure he ever received, gave, I believe, warnings to the Government as to the impending trouble in consequence of the delays, and I charge that either then or

Mr. BLAKE.

earlier or later, Bishop Grandin made applications and representations, and received promises: and I will give the proof of that now. In an address which he made to a large assemblage of half-breeds at St. Laurent on the 5th of February, 1884, as reported in *Le Manitoba*, he used these words:

"As to the other propositions, I have busied myself already for a long time with these in your special interest. I have put upon the Federal Government all possible pressure to obtain justice; I have even obtained promises which I believed official, but which I have the pain of seeing to-day forgotten. I have felt the same discontent that you also have felt, and I have not failed to complain upon the subject in high quarters."

Where are the papers? In the month of October, 1882, the surveyors of the Dominion Government were at St. Albert, which, I believe, is the headquarters of the diocese. They were about to engage in a survey on the ordinary general principle of the lands in that neighborhood. They gave satisfactory explanations to Father Leduc as to the purpose of that survey, and as to its being followed in the course of a few days by a special survey of the recognised holdings on the river lot system. But later on fresh orders from Ottawa came, under which those special surveyors who had commenced their work were stopped. Excitement ensued; a public meeting was held, and Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney were appointed delegates to Ottawa. That poor population raised \$600 in cash to pay their expenses; \$100 more was raised on their way down to Fort Saskatchewan. Their demands were reduced to writing, and among those demands was one for the settlement of these Indian title claims. That demand was presented by the delegates to the Government at Ottawa, but it has not been brought down; it is not among the papers. They started on their journey; they were 24 days travelling to Qu'Appelle Station; they reached Ottawa; there were long communications, in which intervened the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), Sir David Macpherson, the hon. Minister of Public Works, and the First Minister himself. Promises were made; they asked for writings; the Minister replied to them: "Give a written memorandum and you shall have a written response." They gave written papers into the hands of the Minister, but they are not brought down. Amongst them, in March, 1883, was a memorandum signed by Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney, and it contains this paragraph:

"The inhabitants of St. Albert are for the most part French or English half-breeds, born in the North-West Territories or Manitoba. Before the transfer they were the natural joint possessors of the soil with the Indians. A treaty has been concluded with the latter for the extinction of their rights, but the half-breeds of the Territories have not yet received any compensation, notwithstanding they are on the same footing of right, in fact, with those of Manitoba. They demand then, by the intervention of their delegates to Ottawa, that the Act of Manitoba relative to the rights of the half-breeds and their children born before the transfer be extended to the North-West Territories."

They have received answers, but the answers are not brought down. I believe the answer with reference to this particular claim, which was not the special claim, which was the foundation of their mission, was that the question of this particular right of the half-breeds at that very moment occupied the attention of Parliament. It is true there were two ways in which it might be said to have occupied the attention of Parliament. One was because there was a motion before the House during the Session, made by myself, for the petitions of the people of St. Albert, which embraced this question; the other was that on that occasion a Consolidated Dominion Lands Act was passed, although no change was made in the Act of 1879 authorising the Government to deal with the question. I know of no other way in no extent to which it could be said that particular question was engaging the attention of Parliament than what I have said. But, notwithstanding these delegations, nothing was done in 1882, and the same observation applies to 1883. Early in the year 1883, in fact

during the beginning of 1882-83, a petition was circulated among the citizens of Prince Albert to the House of Commons, and it was presented on the 20th March of that year, bearing the signatures of 394 settlers. It contains this paragraph :

"Whereas there are many half-breeds in this locality and other parts of the North-West Territory who have never taken the treaty, and who were not in Manitoba at the time the census in 1870 was taken, in consequence thereof have not participated in the scrip issued to the half-breeds in that Province."

And this prayer :

"That those half-breeds in the North-West Territory, who have not participated in the scrip issues to the half-breeds in Manitoba may have the same issued to them, thus placing them on the same basis as their brethren in that Province."

In 1883, it seems, Louis Riel visited his old haunts in Manitoba, and became the subject of newspaper comments. On the 9th October, 1883, the North-West Council renewed its application to the Government in this regard. It had done it in 1878; it had done it in 1881; and it did it in 1883:

"Your memorialists further pray that those half-breeds in the Territories who have not participated in the arrangement to extinguish the half-breed claim in Manitoba should enjoy the same rights as accorded half-breeds in that Province."

You will observe that the council had recognised that the time for any other arrangement had now passed; that whatever might have been done to make different arrangements with the half-breeds in the earlier days, when their condition was different, before so much delay and neglect had taken place, could be done no longer; and their suggestion to the authorities, based upon the suggestion of the people there, was that the half-breeds in the North-West Territories should be given the same rights as those in Manitoba had been given. It had come to that at last, after three or four years of suggestion and unavailing pressure. On the 18th October, 1883, the Privy Council referred that memorial to the President of the Council and the Minister of the Interior for action; they had it under consideration until 1885. By that time, the agitation had got high on various questions. There was a mass meeting, on the 17th October, at Prince Albert, of the inhabitants of Prince Albert and the neighborhood. There were resolutions passed and speeches delivered, and these resolutions were ordered to be transmitted by the secretary of the meeting to the Minister, but they have not been brought down. Amongst these was a resolution endorsing the petition of the council of the North-West Territories for a recognition of the right of the half-breeds in respect of the Indian title as in Manitoba. On the 21st of January, 1884, a meeting was held of the settlers of St. Catharines parish to discuss some of their grievances. A committee consisting of W. Kennedy, J. Isbister and W. Swain was appointed to draw up a petition to the Government, setting forth the grievances the people were laboring under in regard to land matters, and praying for redress, and to cooperate with other committees which might be formed, and to wait on Inspector Pearce and ask him to forward the petition to the Government. That petition has not been brought down. It embraced other matters with reference to this matter; and my reason for thinking so is because there was a series of meetings held on the same lines, and I find it expressly stated in the resolutions adopted at another meeting. At a meeting in the parish of St. Catharines, held the 21st of January, 1884, Mr. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. J. Anderson, and it was resolved:

"That the half-breed people of the North-West Territories are unjustly treated in not having the same privileges as regards land grants and scrip extended to them, which have been enjoyed by their brethren in Manitoba, and pledging the meeting to make its best endeavors to have the injustice redressed."

But no petition founded on that resolution has been brought down. At Lindsay school-house, Red Deer Hill, in the same month a meeting was held and the resolution, passed at St.

Catharines, was endorsed and a committee appointed to draw up a petition; but no indication of the existence of that paper is brought down. On the 28th of January, 1884, a meeting of settlers was held at Haloro settlement on the South Branch, at which the resolutions of St. Catharines and Lindsay were read and adopted. Mr. A. Spence and Mr. M. Crestine were appointed a committee to draw up a memorial to the Government, but no such memorial appears in the papers brought down. Mr. J. Jackson was appointed to obtain the co-operation of the French settlement in carrying out the resolutions passed at the various meetings, and hopes were expressed that the agitation would increase. The same winter there was a meeting at the Hudson Bay store, South Branch, which was attended by Mr. Macdowall, who was the member for that district, having succeeded Mr. Clark. The grievances were discussed, and much was expected of the coming Session of Parliament. On the 26th of February, 1884, a public meeting was held at Colleston school house. Mr. Macdowall, member for Lorne, spoke; he took up the memorandum of North-West Council in reference to settlers grievances and expressed his confidence in the Minister of the Interior, and thought that the grievances stated in the memorial would be redressed. A series of resolutions were adopted including this one:

"That the half-breeds and natives of the Territories are entitled to the same treatment as their more favored brethren in Manitoba receive."

No indication of that is brought down. On the 27th March, 1884, in this House, the special allusion to the affairs of the North-West which took place for the purpose of debate at any rate, was made. I had discussed in general terms the discontent existing in that region on the Address, and on the 27th of March my hon. friend the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, made a motion in amendment, and made a speech which contains this language:

"I have spoken to you of the Province of Manitoba and the farmers of that Province, but we must recollect that there is another representative body in the North-West, a body of equal, perhaps of greater importance—a body that rules over an area of 20,000 square miles, with a population estimated at from 20,000 to 150,000 people, a body which has sovereign power in the limits given to it by the constitution under which it has its existence. I refer to the North-West Council. They, too, in solemn council assembled, drew up a list of the grievances of which the North-West Territories had to complain. These grievances were sixteen in number—sixteen different grounds of complaint—and all these grounds of complaint have an importance and a significance well worthy the consideration of those who are now at the head of the affairs in this country. I do not propose dealing with those grievances at any considerable length; I propose only referring to one or two of them; but in dealing with any of these grievances we ought to bear in mind that the importance to be attached to a protest of misgovernment, of bad policy, depends very largely on the source whence the protest comes. The first question that naturally arises is: Do the people who complain know whereof they speak? Are they conversant with the position and the circumstances of the country? Do they appreciate thoroughly the trials and the difficulties connected with pioneer settlement? And can they fully appreciate the errors of judgment or policy committed by the Administration in the great North-West? Are they free to give an honest and an unbiassed judgment on the question on which they undertook to pronounce? If they are the friends of the Government, they surely cannot desire to embarrass the Government, and one cannot help coming to the conclusion that there must be some foundation for their complaints. We all know perfectly well that at least four-fifths of the North-West Council are the friends of the Government. Now, let us see what those friends of the Government in the North-West complain of."

And he read their complaint, which contains this clause:

"Your memorialists further pray that those half-breeds in the Territories who have not participated in the arrangement to extinguish the half-breed claims in Manitoba should enjoy the same rights as accorded half-breeds in that Province."

And then a claim for further surveys and river lot surveys. He adds:

"The demands to which I have referred, made by Manitoba and the North-West Council, are of a not unimportant character. They involve very grave consideration. Hon. members acquainted with the country will admit that they affect the growth and prosperity of the whole of

our western region. Their admission will to a large extent inspire hope and confidence in the minds of the settlers who have gone to make homes in the North-West, and the refusal of those demands—reasonable demands, at any rate—will, in my judgment, imperil the very existence of the Province and of the Territory; and I claim, also, that the refusal will at least check the growth and prosperity of the Territory, and to some extent, I believe, it will weaken the ties which bind Manitoba and the Territories to the Dominion of Canada. I do not say that all the demands made by the Province or by the Territories are all fair and reasonable, I do not pretend to say that the claims made are all fair and reasonable; but I say that every claim advanced by the Province of Manitoba, and every ground of complaint against the policy of the Dominion Government made by the North-West Territories, deserve at the very least, at the hands of the Government, a fair consideration. If those claims are fair and reasonable they should be met promptly, they should be discussed promptly, they should be considered promptly, and if fair and honest claims they should be considered by the Government promptly."

And he moved:

"This House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of the condition, complaints and demands of Manitoba and the North-West Territories with a view to devise means for remedying any well-founded grievances and complying with any reasonable demands."

But unhappily his motion was rejected. In the spring of 1884 the agitation went on, and grievances and complaints were the talk of the people of all this district. In May, 1884, it is reported in the local paper:

"Meetings of the settlers have been held in different places lately, in fact since last winter, discussing their grievances. Last Tuesday a meeting of delegates was held in the Pocha school-house. It was a very large one, all parts being represented. They seem to be fully alive to the fact that farmers' interests are all alike and that union is strength. A working committee has been formed and a list of their grievances drawn out, among which may be mentioned—just representation, the half-breeds of the North-West to receive the same as those of Manitoba, no 80 acres homesteads, and no timber dues. A good deal of feeling exists on account of all officers in the North-West being filled with people from the eastern Provinces, notably Indian instructors. The natives here know the Indian nature much better than strangers can do; besides, the instructors they have sent know nothing about farming and need instruction themselves. Such is the feeling prevalent here."

Then in the same month of May:

"A meeting composed of French and English half-breeds was held at Lindsay school house on Tuesday last; the object seems to be for both parties to agree on a set of resolutions which have been passed at previous meetings, said resolutions embodying grievances complained of by said French and English half-breeds. The substance of the resolutions being the same as was agitated last winter with the addition of two, namely, one protesting against the participation of the Hudson Bay Company in any land in the country and the other in regard to sending a deputation to Louis Riel. Objection was made by the English half-breeds, and, after some sharp discussion in which the Chairman, Mr. Andrew Spence, criticised the English side, in which he said it was his opinion that some of them thought themselves too wise, ergo, a set of fools, the whole thing was left to a committee, who after some time adopted all the resolutions as presented by the French. It seems to be the mind of the meeting to invite Louis Riel into the country instead of having to send out of it to consult him *re* matters concerning the negotiating for the transfer of Manitoba and the North West Territories into the Union. What the aim of all these meetings is very few seem to know, if any do, but, as far as stated in the resolutions, it is all well enough to set forth grievances of which not only the half-breeds but Canadians from Ontario as well join, one of the latter taking the lead in opening his purse when subscriptions were called for, for defraying the expense of the delegation to Riel. The delegation is composed of four members of the committee—Messrs James Isbister and M. Dumas for the English, the French members have escaped the memory of your correspondent."

In the same month the same newspapers, speaking generally of the rights of the Territories, spoke editorially as follows:—

"We have every reason to believe that the half-breeds have only been restrained hitherto from very active measures to enforce redress of these and other grievances peculiarly their own, by a doubt as to whether they carried with them the sympathy of the rest of the population. But as they are now fully confident of this, they do not intend to tamely submit much longer. The Government must remember that to the numerical strength of this party must be added the power at any moment to stir into a flame the slumbering embers of discontent smouldering in the breasts of our Indians."

I have now reached the period in the history of this affair when Louis Riel was to be invited and to arrive, and it is therefore necessary to trace the condition of affairs in a

Mr. BLAKE.

more general sense than that in which I have been endeavoring to do it heretofore. I have to trace the progress of the particular claim of which I have been speaking, the progress of the agitation, the warnings and the knowledge of the Government, and the course of events down to the imminence of the outbreak, and then to find out what the Government did and when they did anything in this particular claim. I have said that this was not the only grievance. I have referred to the other grievances. I have referred to the questions of the land and several other questions which were at the same time agitating the people, and to which I intend particularly to allude, but there were also of course other things which tended to embitter the minds of many of the settlers. There were great disappointments resulting from change in the railway route, delays in branch railways, some failures in crops, hard times generally, the alleged monopoly by the Hudson Bay Company of contracts, and very serious apprehensions in the minds of the people of Indian troubles. And these various sticks helped to form the materials for a pretty big fire, and that fire was now about to be kindled so far as agitation could kindle it. I maintain, touching very lightly upon these topics at any time, that it is yet necessary to make this brief allusion to them, because at this moment I conceive the Government was called on to deal with this case in view of a new and very serious juncture. The question had reached such a pitch that the inhabitants had actually determined to send for Louis Riel. The influence of Louis Riel upon them was known to the Government. The First Minister has described it in his place in this House. He had pointed out that he was their El Mahdi, their Stuart, their La Rochejaquelin, their leader of the lost cause; a man of unbounded, unlimited influence. And he has pointed out, also, the position which he had formerly occupied; and surely an invitation to such an one to come amongst them, an invitation based, as this was, upon his former acts and achievements in the Province of Manitoba, was a striking and startling circumstance, and ought to have led the Government to the decision that any substantial grievances which really existed, any causes of complaints of long standing, should be adjusted without further delay, so as to give no substantial cause for disaffection, for agitation, for disturbance, for discontent; so as to remove all that could be removed, conscious, as they must have been, if they heeded the circumstances of the case, that even a complete removal at that stage would leave some soreness and irritation remaining; and knowing, as they must have known if they had properly studied the lessons of history, that the result of such a state of things as I have depicted, is that to the original grievances and complaints which had a solid foundation, there are always added, by those who agitate, new claims, less tenable, claims exaggerated, claims which the people are persuaded to demand and adhere to, just because of the discontented mind in which they had been plunged by the denial of justice, by the refusal of right, by neglect, contumely and contempt. Now, Sir, just at this very time, in June, 1884, there were other conjunctions of a serious character; another warning was given. In June, 1884, it was that the very serious Poundmaker disturbance occurred at Battleford; and if you look at the papers of that date, at the *Winnipeg Times* of that month, you will find an account of that disturbance, a disturbance which recalls, in many of its aspects, some of the late transactions at Battleford, a disturbance under which the people were obliged to place themselves in a state of siege, to vacate their houses, to take refuge in fortified posts, and prepare to resist what they believed to be an organised Indian attack. Nor was that the only case in which the Indian showed at that time a disposition to create disturbance and difficulty. The Government was well aware of that, and for proof I need advert to no more than the hon. gentleman's

speech upon this subject at an early period of the Session, when he himself described the condition of the Indian population, and their mental mood and attitude at that time. Just before this time, the Deputy Minister of the Department was at Calgary, I observe, on his return from the mountains, and on the same day on which he was there a telegram reached that very point showing the state of affairs. In a word, I may say, that every storm drum was up at that time, that everything indicated, both from the point of view of the half-breeds and of the Indians, that whatever apathy may have existed before, whatever neglect may have existed before, whatever indifference had existed before, were causes for redoubled energy, for redoubled promptness, for enhanced liberality of treatment, in order to the avoidance of the crisis due to that more formidable agitation which was soon to supervene. Well, Sir, in the month of June, 1884, a delegation consisting of Messrs. Isbister, Dumont, Ouillelt and Dumas, were appointed by a committee, and several resolutions were passed by the meeting which appointed that committee; but I have not been able to find those resolutions, so that I am not able to present them to the House as I would have desired. The delegates walked 700 miles into Montana to meet Riel, and they found him. They presented their papers to him, and they obtained from him a reply. He says:

"GENTLEMEN:—You have travelled more than 700 miles from the Saskatchewan country across the international line to make me a visit. The communities in the midst of which you live have sent you as their delegates to ask my advice on various difficulties which have rendered the British North-West unhappy under the administration of the Ottawa Government. Moreover, you invite me to go and stay amongst you, your hope being that I, for one, could help to better, in some respects, your condition. Cordial and pressing is your invitation; you want me and my family to accompany you; I am at liberty to excuse myself and say no; yet you are waiting for me; so that I have only to get ready, and your letters of delegation assure me that a friendly welcome awaits me in the midst of those who sent you.

"Gentlemen, your personal visit does me honor and causes great pleasure; but on account of its representative character your coming to me has the appearance of a remarkable circumstance which I record as one of the gratifications of my life—an event which my family will remember, and I pray to God that my assistance will prove so successful to you as to render this event a blessing amongst the many blessings of this, my 40th year. To be frank is the shortest. I doubt whether my advice given to you on this soil concerning affairs in Canadian territories, could cross the border and retain any influence. But here is another view of the matter: I am entitled, according to the 31st and 32nd clauses of the Manitoba Treaty, to land, of which the Canadian Government have directly or indirectly deprived me, and my claim to which is valid notwithstanding the fact that I have become an American citizen. Considering, then, that my interests are identical with yours, I accept your very kind invitation, and will go and spend some months amongst you, in the hope that by petitioning the Government we will obtain the redress of all our grievances.

"Montana has a population of which the native half-breed element constitutes a considerable portion, and if we include those white men who, through being connected by marriage, or in other ways, have a personal interest in their welfare, I believe that this element is a pretty strong one. I am just getting acquainted with them, and I am one of those who would like to unite and direct its vote for the furtherance of their best interests; moreover, I have made friends and acquaintances amongst whom I like to live. I go with you, but I come back in September.

"I have the honor to be, gentlemen delegates,  
Your humble servant,

"LOUIS RIEL."

And he accompanied the delegates to the Saskatchewan. There is a correspondence of the influential French paper of the North-West, *Le Manitoba*, which I believe is under the proprietorship of M. de la Rivière, a member of the Manitoba Government, I think, and with which it is supposed my hon. friend opposite, the member for Provencher, sometimes had—perhaps I may say sometimes has—a little to do with. *Le Manitoba* thus announced the arrival of Riel:

"I learned yesterday that Mr. Louis Riel was to go to-day to St. Laurent. You are aware, perhaps, that after the meetings of this spring, a delegation of the English and French Metis departed to visit the ex-President of the Provisional Government of Red River, then in Montana, to inform him of the needs of those of his fellow half-breeds—because he is a Metis—and beg him to come among them. It appears that the delegation has succeeded, at least to this degree; it is said that Mr. Riel is

coming with his family. O, if he would only have the happy idea to remain permanently amongst us! That man only can do good to his fellow countrymen, and he is the only one who can unite them all on any question. His name is great among the Metis, English or French; and there is no doubt that his influence, if well directed, will be of immense advantage to them. Yesterday the people were to assemble in crowds to meet him."

Then, on 10th July, the correspondent writes in the same paper:

"The members of the committee forming the delegation sent to Mr. Riel, and appointed in the month of May last, had a meeting on the 8th inst. at Chas. Nolin's, to receive the report of this delegation. Herewith is the report that the delegates presented to the committee, which was read by the secretary; and also the answer from Mr. Riel:

"To Messrs. the members of the committee in charge of the seven resolutions adopted by the population of the Saskatchewan.

"WM. CROMARTIE, *President.*  
"LOUIS SCHMIDT, *Secretary.*"

A number of statements are then made, which are immaterial, and the report goes on to say:

"After having made known to him the object of our mission, we presented to him our credentials and the six resolutions that we were to consider together, and also the document in which, in the name of the public, you invited him to come to the North-West. We asked him to come with us, if he could, and help us. This interview took place on the 4th of June. Mr. Riel read our papers and asked twenty-four hours to consider and give us an answer.

"The humble condition of his lodging made us think of the numerous occasions he had of becoming rich at the time he had the power in his hands. We recalled his firm attitude in the midst of thousands of dangers as meriting the confidence of his fellow countrymen. We knew what he had done for Manitoba and the North-West, and the little advantages he had personally received from the same. And returning from this long journey of nearly 1,400 miles, we feel twice as much confidence in that man whom we have been visiting in a foreign land. \* \*"

"Mr. Riel comes here to help us, without any pretension. He hopes that before long the people of the North-West will be perfectly united, and that the Government will very soon do justice to all.

"The speeches of Mr. Riel inspire us with the greatest confidence, because his instructions are to help us; but while helping us he does not want, in the slightest degree, to create needless difficulties to the Government.

"We have the honor to be, gentlemen, your most humble servants and delegates,

"GABRIEL DUMONT,  
"JAMES ISBISTER,  
"MOISE OUILLETTE,  
"MICHEL DUMAS."

The correspondent goes on to give the answer of Louis Riel, which I have already read. This same influential newspaper, on 17th of July, wrote, editorially, upon the North-West, in these words:

"For several months we have been receiving letters from the North-West which inform us of the agitation that is going on there.

"When the Act creating the Province of Manitoba was introduced in Ottawa, in 1870, the Federal Government, after long conference with the Rev. Father Ritchot, Judge Black and Mr. Scott, the three delegates of the colony of Assiniboia, had inserted in that measure some just and equitable provisions guaranteeing to the inhabitants of the colony the confirmation of the titles of the lands possessed by them up to 15th July, 1870. Another clause of the same Act gave a land grant of 1,400,000 acres to the half-breed children for the extinction of their rights as first proprietors of the country. Later on, by another Act, each head of a family received a land grant of 160 acres for the extinction of the same right. But all these provisions were made only in favor of the half-breeds living, at the date of the 15th July, 1870, on the territory comprised in the limits of the Province then created, and those of the half-breeds who were then and are still in the North-West never could participate in any manner in that act of justice on the part of the Federal Government."

The article proceeds to quote the resolution of the North-West Council of 1878, and the Act of Parliament of 1883, and it goes on to say:

"The great difficulty that the half-breeds meet with is, first, the obtaining a survey of their lands according to the limits and actual shape of those lands, the delay in the ratification of their titles, and the quasi refusal to give them the grant asked for the extinction of their Indian rights. These are to-day the causes of all the discontent. Several petitions have been sent to Ottawa; even delegates have been sent to the capital, at great expense, and yet without result. Is there a population in any of the other Provinces who would not have created a regular revolution if they had been subjected to such treatment? Certainly not.

"To-day meetings are called from all parts; the settlers who, though not being half-breeds, have the interests of the latter at heart, join with

them to demand justice and draw the attention of the Federal Government, who, let it be said, are far less guilty than the heads of the Department and its other officers. Our correspondent in Prince Albert sends us a word on this subject in the letter that we publish to-day; and since then a despatch informs us that a great meeting, composed of new settlers and French and English half-breeds, has been held a few miles from Prince Albert. At this meeting, the despatch says: Mr. Louis Riel spoke in very moderate terms. The Hon. Chas. Nolin, ex-member of the Government and of the Legislature of Manitoba, also spoke at this meeting, as well as Mr. W. S. Jackson. It was resolved to prepare a petition to the Government, asking that justice be done to the parties interested.

"Notwithstanding all the good reasons that our friends of the North-West can allege in support of their demands, notwithstanding all their neglected rights, we hope, we even have the certainty, that they will not be guilty of any act or any threat of violence, which could only be injurious to their cause. On the other hand, how can one avoid blaming the Federal Government, or rather the Department of the Interior, which is the primary cause of all this discontent?"

On 8th July, 1884, the Government received a telegram from Crozier, of the Mounted Police at Battleford:

"Louis Riel arrived at Duck Lake with family, brought in by half-breeds. They brought him in, it is said, as their leader, agitating their rights."

On 15th July Mr. Mathew Ryan, formerly stipendiary magistrate in the Territories, and who had been engaged as commissioner in connection with the enumeration of the half-breeds, wrote a letter, which was published in the *Manitoba Free Press*, from which a few extracts may be read:

"In common with many others, no doubt, I expected that the opening of the Sixth Council of the North-West council would be marked by some reference to the state of disquietude manifest in the half-breed settlements of St. Laurent and adjacent places."

After stating his own official relation to another phase of the question, Mr. Ryan proceeds:

"In the discharge of this duty, I found that a large number of half-breeds had no claim under the Act (that is, the original Manitoba Act), not having been residents of Manitoba at the date of the transfer. I also see that this exclusion caused much discontent, and I did not fail to urge, from time to time, that the proper remedy should be applied."

Mr. Ryan then states the memorandum of the North-West Council of 1878, and the Land Act of 1879, and adds:

"But nothing further has yet been done in the premises. In a letter which I have lately received from a gentleman in a high position in the Territories, it is written: 'For what reasons the Government has not, so far, done anything in the premises, is a mystery to me. The half-breeds feel that they are slighted, and the feeling of discontent is daily growing amongst them.'"

This letter derives a great portion of its significance from the fact that it was published at the time and became the property of the Government as well as the property of the public. At this time the Deputy Minister of the Interior, Mr. Burgess, was in the North-West, and upon his return, when suffering very severely, I believe, from an unfortunate accident, he was interviewed; but I have reason to believe that, according to his memory, the report of the interview is not correctly stated, and therefore I do not trouble the House with it. I would not refer to it at all, except for the fact that it was the foundation of action by the North-West Council. On 21st July, 1884, the North-West Council, being in session, and having before them the report of the interview with Mr. Burgess, passed a resolution, which is not brought down, but of which I find a copy in one of the newspapers, and have translated it. It was proposed by Mr. Macdowall, representative of Lorne district, comprising the disturbed district, and seconded by Mr. Jackson, of the Qu'Appelle district, which contains numerous half-breed letters:

"That this council regret the expressions attributed to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, in an interview with a reporter of the *Manitoba Free Press*, published 17th July, 1884, respecting the half-breed claims. In the absence of more definite information upon this subject, this council desires that it should be understood, notwithstanding that it recognises absolutely the justice of the claims of the Métis of these Territories, so far as concerns the grants of land which they demand,

Mr. BLAKE.

that the question of the claims of the half-breeds in these Territories be referred for disposition to the Executive."

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that there was action based upon, and very naturally based upon, the statement attributed to Mr. Burgess. I find, although the Government has not thought fit to bring down that resolution, that the Government replied to it, for I find the following in the *Moose Jaw News*, 30th July:—

"His Honor stated to the council that he had a telegram from Sir John A. Macdonald, to the effect that the Minister of the Interior, on his return from Europe will take into his serious consideration the questions relating to the half-breeds in the North-West Territory."

However, the Government has not thought it worth while to bring down the telegram from Mr. Dewdney, or the response from the First Minister, nor have they brought down any results of that serious consideration which was so promised earlier, at any rate, than the year 1885. On the 27th July, 1884, Mr. Crozier, Superintendent of Police, writes to the Government from Battleford, as follows:—

"I have the honor to inform you that Riel has held meetings at both Prince Albert and Duck Lake. I am informed that his meeting at the first named place was an open one; some little difficulty took place, but was promptly put down.

"At Duck Lake his audience was composed of French half-breeds and Indians. He is said, though I have not official information to that effect, to have told the Indians that they had 'rights' as well as the 'half-breeds,' and that he wished to be the means of having them redressed.

"I am also informed that he expressed a wish to confer with the Indian chiefs. I have already reported"—

But I wish to say that that report has not been brought down—

"that I believe the Indians sympathise with the half-breeds, nor could anything else be expected, being close blood relations and speaking the same language.

"What may be the result of the half-breed agitation, or what effect it may have upon the Indians, of course I cannot foretell. I before said"—

But the letter in which he said so has not been brought down—

"I before said, and still think, precautionary measures should be taken, such measures as will not only prevent turbulent spirits carrying their schemes to an extreme, but prevent both Indians and half-breeds even making an attempt to resist authority or organise for illegal purposes, for these constant 'excitements' must have a most injurious effect upon the country, and among those effects, not the least, a sense of insecurity among settlers.

"I believe now that Big Bear and his followers would have been upon their reserve but for the emissaries of Riel, who, it is said, invited him to meet that person at Duck Lake.

"Certain it is he has gone there, and that after having promised, and received provisions, to go to Fort Pitt, he had proceeded with the camp some distance on the road, but they turned back after hearing from Riel.

"There are very many rumors about as to what Riel has said to the Indians, that, if true, are intended to cause discontent among them as to their present condition."

On the 29th of July, 1884, the correspondent of *Le Manitoba* wrote a letter from Prince Albert, which was published the following month, to this effect:

"The week which has just finished has been very quiet, following always the old proverb: The calm after the storm. The *Times* of Prince Albert, seeing its ill success in its efforts to prejudice the English public opinion against Riel, has lowered its flag and it is holding itself silent. Meanwhile, the national movement continues its progress quietly and peaceably. Committees are being formed in the different parishes of the district, and each one is preparing a list of their grievances, which will be submitted at a general meeting of these committees, and upon which will be based the memorial which will be sent to the Government. The *Herald*, of Battleford, of the 12th July, seems to endeavor to ridicule these peaceable proceedings of the whole population, who desire to have their rights recognised, because Riel is there. It says, for example, that 'if Riel wants to establish a Government in the Saskatchewan, he will find, in his immediate neighborhood, many of his old partisans, and, no doubt, his former secretary, Louis Schmidt, will resign with pleasure his office of assistant clerk at the Land Office, at Prince Albert, to offer his services to his country and to his old master.'

"That deserves a word of answer. First, Mr. Riel has not, so far as I am aware, the intention of forming a Government on the Saskatchewan; but should he desire to do so, you would see coming to act as his secretary, not Mr. Schmidt, but a crowd of aspirants of the school of

the *Herald* itself, who would be but too proud to have employment under Mr. Riel. Mr. Laurie himself, so bending before the authorities, would have come quickly to cringe to him, even if only to obtain the modest position of deputy forest ranger. Now, as to Mr. Schmidt, personally, I do not suppose anybody imagines that in accepting an office from the Government he has renounced his title as a citizen and a half-breed. He will, no doubt, fulfil diligently and impartially his duties of public employé, but that will not oblige him to conceal his sympathies for those of his nation who have just rights to be recognised. The responsible persons, happily, do not see in the same light as the *Herald* the agitation which is going on in the North-West; and, if they see no ground to fear for the peace of the country, yet they know very well that the unanimous sentiments of a whole population must not be displayed."

Then follows the resolution of the North-West Council, of the 21st July, which I have just read. Meantime, Indian troubles were loom- ing still larger and larger, and detailed reports as to Poundmaker, and other matters of that description, were published in the newspapers. And here I may be permitted to make a brief reference to the defensive and quasi military precautions which were taken by the Government, both as showing a sense of danger and because I believe that the Government is greatly to be blamed in these regards. I have already proved, as I think, the blame which is to be attached to them, with reference to the killing out of the local corps of the North-West, and I might add the great neglect they had shown, also, with reference to the local corps proposed in the Province of Manitoba. I do not touch upon these subjects now. As to the operations of the Mounted Police, the report is admittedly meagre. The hon. gentleman acknowledged that the other day. It is eminently unsatisfactory, in not giving fuller details of their operations; and as to the militia operations, we want, as I have more than once said, some more information than we have yet obtained. The *Winnipeg Sun*, of 25th July, 1884, says:

"Col. Houghton returned last night from a tour of inspection of arms in the Saskatchewan district. As to the corps organised throughout the Territories, they had ceased drilling some time ago. In consequence of the lapse of the three years, the Government, in view of the unsettled state of affairs in the Saskatchewan district, and the probability of an outbreak among the half-breeds at any time, deemed it wise to collect all the arms, as in the event of an uprising they might be used with great advantage against the whites. Corps had been organised at Battleford, Carlton, Prince Albert and Duck Lake, and the arms of each company were found at headquarters. They were taken possession of and handed over to the Mounted Police for safe keeping. Col. Houghton visited Battleford, Carlton and Prince Albert, and personally looked after the work, but he arranged with Capt. Hughes, of Duck Lake, to send in the arms of the company which was organised there.

"The arms were found to be in very good condition, and will doubtless do to distribute again, when other volunteer corps are organised throughout the Territories, which is the intention of the Government. Col. Houghton stated, however, that he had no definite information from the Government on the point. Being asked about the discontent among the half-breeds, the colonel stated they were really in a bad way. Consequent upon the great drought which prevailed all summer, the crops all along the half-breed settlement are almost an entire failure, and starvation stares the poor creatures in the face. Col. Houghton did not have very much conversation with the settlers, but those with whom he did speak informed him of the bad state of affairs existing. They have not been able to procure patents for their lands, and they have other grievances against the Government. Col. Houghton believes if they had their patents they would be appeased, to a certain extent, as by the sale of a portion of their land they could keep the wolf from the door. At the meetings which were held, the opinion was expressed that they should receive the same treatment as was afforded the half-breeds in Manitoba."

Then there is further reference to the grievances and it goes on:

"Col. Houghton being asked about the presence of Riel among the settlers, said he did not see the hero of the Red River rebellion, although he was among the natives when he passed down. He was camping on the south fork of the Saskatchewan, and the half-breeds are endeavoring to secure the co-operation of the Indians in the agitation. If they succeed in rousing the latter to action, and a coalition is formed, a serious uprising will be the result."

Now, Sir, I have already proved to this House, from the published report of the Minister of Militia, that Col. Houghton, under his own signature, did send in a special report upon this very mission on which he was interviewed, and upon which he gave this statement to the interviewer.

I charge that that officer reported then imminent danger, the holding of meetings, the urgency of the case, the necessity of taking precautions at once to prevent the outbreak; but his report has not been brought down. In fact, that report is suppressed. On the 26th of July, in an editorial, the *Winnipeg Sun* says:

"It is impossible to understand what the Dominion Government means by refusing to hearken to the complaints of the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan region, and then by sending up the Deputy Adjutant General to disarm them. Does the Government think these well-disposed people would revolt without cause or provocation? If not, why does it not at once set about redressing the grievances that are driving them to such desperation that they are no longer to be trusted with weapons? Col. Houghton, no doubt, discharged his duty in the kindest manner, and the arms were quietly surrendered. But what a commentary on the policy of the Interior Department, that a district containing some of the oldest and best settlers in the country should have to be 'proclaimed.'"

It is the whole North-West which is now proposed to be proclaimed by the Bill before the House. Then, Sir, on the 5th of August, Sergt. Brooks, of the Mounted Police, stationed at Prince Albert, writes as follows:—

"In reporting to you as to what is transpiring here at Prince Albert and vicinity, I would say that since I have been here I have found everything quiet. There is very little talk about Riel. The principal part of the people who seem to agree with him are people who are hard up, and think they must do something to cause a little excitement. I have heard of very few who are in any way well-to-do speak favorably of him. There is no doubt but what all the half-breeds swear by him, and whatever he says is law with them. As near as I can learn, he is advising them all very strongly to remain peaceful. Big Bear is still at Beady's reserve. Whether he intends to see Riel or not, I do not know."

The rest of the letter does not seem material. On the 8th of August Serg. Brooks telegraphed as follows:—

"Returned from Duck Lake last night. Big Bear in council with ten other chiefs. Riel has held several private meetings at the south branch, attended by leading half-breeds. He has not seen Big Bear."

On the 14th of August Serg. Brooks reported as follows:—

"Riel is across, the river opposite here, at Batoche's house. He addressed a meeting to-day, as the people were coming from church. From what I can learn, he must have got very excited. One thing he stated was that the Indians' rights should be protected as well as their own. He has not had a meeting with Big Bear, but I am afraid that he has some private way of communicating with him. He is to cross the river to-morrow, and I believe is to remain on this side about a week, as he has asked Tompkins, the Indian farm instructor, to meet him at Duck Lake, for what reason I do not know. There is a man of the name of Jackson here, who came from Prince Albert—he is a brother of the druggist—who seems to be a right-hand man of Riel's. He is with him at present, and has been for some time. He has a great deal to say, and I believe he does more harm than any breed among them. There are a great many people through the country who have what they call grievances, and seem to agree with Riel. Whether they really do or not, is hard to say. I have been speaking to a number of people at Prince Albert, and men who signed the petition for him to go there and speak, simply did it because they thought it would draw the attention of the Government to the place. There is no doubt but that everyone is hard up, and they thought they must do something to draw their attention."

The rest does not appear to be material. On the 21st of August Brooks reported further:

"Both Big Bear and Riel have been in town. The former arrived on the 15th and Riel on the Sunday following. Their being in town caused very little excitement, and people did not seem to pay much attention to them. Riel stayed at Jackson's, the druggist, and before he left he and Lepine held conference with Big Bear, the result of which I have not been able to learn. Riel, of course, claims that he will have nothing to do with the Indians, and Big Bear says he did not come here to see Riel. However, they were at Jackson's house and had a talk, Riel leaving the next day for the south branch, and Big Bear the day after for Battleford—at least, so he said. I have heard it stated on pretty good authority that Riel has given up the idea of going back to Montana, and intends to remain in the Territory, which I think is quite likely, although he has stated to different parties that he would leave for Montana about the 1st September. I will forward returns showing the number of half-breeds and Indians in the vicinity by mail which leaves Duck Lake on Monday next."

The Saskatoon telegraph operator, on the 7th of September, 1884, reported that:

"About 20 Indians, under Black Moon, armed with rifles and swords, rode about the settlement, demanding grub, and threatening to take it if it was not given."

"Then, the House will remember the statement of the hon. First Minister as to the Government having thought it prudent, during this season, to arrange with the Hudson Bay Company for the occupation of Fort Carlton by the Mounted Police. We ought, I think, to have had a little fuller information on that. That post appears to have been chosen by the Comptroller of the Mounted Police, and it appears to have been so well chosen that when the rising took place, it was not considered any longer defensible, because the first thing that was done was to evacuate it. But I am dealing now with the conduct of the Government as evidencing a sense of danger, and I find that on the 3rd of September, 1884, the Comptroller of the Mounted Police recommended to the Minister as follows:—

"The undersigned has the honor to submit, for the Minister's consideration, that in view of the possibility of additional Mounted Police being required in the North Saskatchewan district, it is desirable that steps should be taken to secure accommodation for men and horses beyond the capacity of the Mounted Police post at Battleford, and it is suggested that arrangements might be made with the Hudson Bay Company for the use, for police purposes during the coming winter, of their buildings, or a portion thereof at Fort Carlton, which is about 15 miles north-west of Duck Lake, about 55 miles west of Prince Albert and 120 miles east of Battleford."

I have already called the attention of the House, and therefore do not repeat it, to the statement of an interview with Mr. White, and the views of the situation he then expressed; and here I will pass away from the subject of the Mounted Police to a point to which I have drawn the attention of the hon. gentleman more than once, and it seems to me to come fairly within the subject of defensive precautions; I refer to the condition of the 7-pounder mountain guns of the Mounted Police. On the 1st February, 1882, Commissioner Irvine uses this language:

"The carriages and limbers for the 7-pounder guns are fast becoming unserviceable. These carriages were constructed at Fort Walsh some years ago, under the direction of Inspector Neale. Considering the material at that officer's command, the carriages and limbers have proved most successful. I would, however, recommend that new ones be purchased, of the pattern lately approved by the Imperial authorities. A few signal rockets might, with advantage, be supplied us."

That report was on the 1st February, 1882, but nothing at all was done with the carriages and limbers; and on the 1st January, 1883, Commissioner Irvine reported again:

"I would remind you that the carriages and limbers of the 7-pounder mountain guns are fast becoming unserviceable. I recommend that new ones be purchased, of the pattern lately approved by the Imperial authorities"

Well, nothing was done in the year 1883 to secure new carriages and limbers, and on the 1st January, 1884, the commissioner reported as follows:—

"I have previously reported that the carriages and limbers of the 7-pounder guns are virtually unserviceable"—

So that it is stated now that they are virtually unserviceable, as one would infer from the previous language used in the mild sense customary in speaking of the condition of a military force.

"—are virtually unserviceable, and last year I recommended that carriages and limbers of the Imperial pattern be purchased. On close enquiry it was ascertained that such purchase would have entailed a very considerable expense. Carriages and limbers suitable for our purposes can be manufactured in this country at much smaller cost than would ensue were a purchase made from England. The supply officer at headquarters has now the required material for manufacture, and I trust that next summer may find us in possession of sufficient skilled labor to make carriages and limbers in this country."

So I find that for three years these carriages and limbers had remained in a practically unserviceable condition, and the result was, that when the time of stress came, when the guns were not to be mere toy guns, for show, but were to be used, these carriages and limbers had not been supplied; and these are the consequences as reported by the *Toronto Mail* correspondent in reference to the fight with Poundmaker at Cut Knife Creek:

Mr. BLAKE.

"Col. Otter had intended advancing right in upon the tepees to the front, but one of the 7-pounders was disabled by the breaking of the gun carriage, and it was not deemed advisable to push on. As a matter of fact, our small arms were not of much use, the two guns being our principal reliance. The Gatling did good work in clearing the groves and clumps, but the moment the enemy dropped down into the coulees it was of little more use than our rifles. The shrapnel of B battery did most of the damage, and the disabling of one of the guns was, under such circumstances, a serious misfortune.

The same correspondent, on the 4th of May, writes, and the *Toronto Mail*, on the 19th May, publishes the following:—

"At last it seemed as though the ammunition of the Indians was being exhausted, and Col. Otter decided on making a rush to the tepees and burning the whole encampment. There were just two courses open to him, namely, either to withdraw his troops or make a grand rush for their camp. But here fate settled the question. The trail of one of the 7-pounders broke as the gun was discharged, rendering it, of course, useless. The other was cracked some time before, and had been strengthened by a piece of 2 inch oak, which was bolted on the lower side. But the constant firing had loosened this, and every time the gun was discharged it jumped out of the trunnion holes. In fact, it was a race between the gun and the gunners. The former jumped back every time it was discharged, and the latter had to follow it and carry it back to its place again. It would have been folly to attempt to destroy the tepees without the guns, and so Col. Otter decided on withdrawing."

And this is the consequence, Sir, of treating for three years the statements that the carriages and limbers of the guns were unserviceable, with silence and inaction—this is the melancholy consequence, that victory was prevented, that defeat became imminent, in consequence of both the guns becoming unserviceable. Now, Sir, there are pieces of information which it would be very good to have, which we have not; and I will, at this stage, collect a few of them, as they deal with the season of 1884, after the arrival of Riel. In the first place, as I have more than once remarked, several Ministers themselves visited the North-West, among them the hon. Minister of Public Works, the Acting Minister of Railways, I suppose, in his capacity as such, and also in his capacity as Minister of Immigration and Agriculture. During the summer the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Postmaster General visited the west. The Minister of Public Works was charged, as he himself once declared, by the First Minister, to spy out the land, not like the old spies of the promised land, for the good things therein, but to spy out the land for the grievances. His business was to find out what the complaints were of the people of that country. That was the mission on which he went to the North-West and which he discharged. It is gratifying to know that having, presumably, regard to his own nationality, he had on that mission an opportunity of meeting a portion of the aggrieved class of the population to whom I have been referring, and he dealt with them as I will point out later on. Then there were the deputies. There was the Deputy Minister of the Interior, the Comptroller of the Mounted Police, and that year, or the year before, the Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs had gone out there. There were upon the spot numerous persons; there was an *embarras des richesses* in the way of officers. First of all, there was that Lieutenant Governor, of whom the First Minister boasted some years ago that he was a very good judge of men, and a man of long experience, and that he was never more satisfied to an appointment being wise than in this case—that the appointment of Mr. Dewdney had given and would give eminent satisfaction. Then there were the Indian agents, the farm instructors, the Crown land agents, the Crown timber agents, the registrars, the land board, the inspector of colonisation companies, the inspector of agencies, the stipendary magistrates, the mounted police, the militia, the school masters, the North-West Council; and besides these, there were the non-official class of men deeply interested in the prosperity of the country, and to whom hon. gentlemen have frequently and properly appealed for advice, assistance and information, the officers of the Hudson Bay Company and the clergy of the country. Does any one suppose there is not more information as to what was

going on in 1884 than what the Government have brought down? That there is no more than that cannot be credited. But the hon gentleman put in a saving clause; he said there was more, but it would be dangerous to the givers of it to bring it down. It would hurt the missionaries and officials of the North-West to have it shown among the Indians and half-breeds that they had sympathised with their grievances and asked the Government to redress them. Because those who warned the Government knew how serious was the case; because they urged that some steps should be taken to remedy those grievances, inasmuch as the lives, and safety, and happiness, and comfort of the inhabitants of the Territories were to be imperilled, the hon. gentleman would not bring down these papers; and these persons stand in a position in which their warnings, declarations, suggestions, advice and information are not brought down because it would be dangerous to their lives to do so? The absence of these papers is dangerous to their honor. There were officers in this neighborhood, besides the officers of the class to which I have referred, a new class of officers. The Government tried its hand at the old-fashioned way of appeasing the leaders of agitation. Louis Schmidt, the secretary of the Riel invitation meeting, was appointed an assistant land agent; Mr. Isbister says in print that he was offered and declined the position of Indian farm instructor; that Mr. Dumais was offered the position of Indian instructor, which he accepted, though we have been unable to obtain information from the Government on that subject; and that Gabriel Dumont was given a ferry license. During that summer, I have reason to believe that amongst the unofficial persons who yet were clothed with great authority and responsibility in this matter, and who communicated with the Government, was Bishop Grandin. I believe he wrote more than once, saying, in substance, that the half-breeds were greatly dissatisfied; that he and his clergy were losing all influence with them; that they were no longer respected; that they were frequently accused by their people of having no real sympathy with the half-breeds and their grievances; that it was said that, on the contrary, the clergy's sympathy was always sure to be with the Government; adding, that unless a prompt settlement of their just claims was effected serious troubles were sure to come soon; and pointing out that the half-breeds being the link between the whites and the Indians, it was important that all cause of dissatisfaction should be removed, as if trouble should arise with the half-breeds it would spread to the Indians, and the consequences would be terrible. I believe this is the substance of the information which was received by the letters that were written. I am positive letters were written, and my reason is because the newspaper I have referred to more than once, and which has given me so much valuable information, contains a letter, dated St. Albert, 24th of April, 1885, from Bishop Grandin to Archbishop Taché, in which he says this:

"Father Lacombe tells me that a copy of certain letters, which I addressed last year to our hon. Government, would be pleasing to you. I will have them copied and send them to you."

The rest of the letter gives a touching account of their troubles. I have therefore proved that Bishop Grandin wrote to the Dominion authorities in the year 1884, and that his letter gave an account of the troubles he and his various missionaries had been involved in, in consequence of the unhappy circumstances prevailing. I have reason to believe, also, from other information, that Archbishop Taché himself wrote, that Mr. Macdowall wrote, that Father André and others wrote, and I can hardly believe otherwise than that Mr. Duck and Mr. Pearce wrote. Then, there was Sheriff Chapleau, who was interviewed in the fall of 1884, and expressed his opinion of the condition of things. It seems to me that the sheriff of the Territory, the officer charged with the administration of justice, and being himself of the French nationality, would surely have taken some steps to point out

to the Government the condition of affairs. I believe Judge Rouleau wrote twice to Mr. Dewdney about the disaffection of the half-breeds, urging prompt redress, and Mr. Dewdney answered that he had forwarded his letters and urged prompt settlement. In the latter part of 1884 Judge Rouleau wrote to the First Minister himself, directly and strongly on the question. After the July sitting of the North-West Council Judge Rouleau, Mr. Hayter Reed, and Mr. Forget went to Duck Lake. The ostensible mission of the first two was to select the site for a court, and that of Mr. Forget to inspect ferries and schools; but according to my information, their main object was to ascertain the feeling of the half-breeds on the situation, and certainly, if it was not, it ought to have been, after all the warnings the Government had received. A report of this mission was, I believe, made to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, and through him to the Government, that there existed considerable dissatisfaction, which might lead to serious consequences, unless promptly remedied, and the views of Bishop Grandin, and probably of Father André and others, were, as I believe, obtained. But none of these papers have been communicated to us. I have also been informed that Mr. Forget has stated that Mr. Dewdney had repeatedly warned the Government, and could clear himself from the heavy load of responsibility which unquestionably devolved upon him if he did not give any warning. Where are these warnings? Then there are the missing Mounted Police reports, some of which are proved to exist, by the statements I have made, and there is the missing report of Col. Houghton, the existence of which I have proved, and then, in the month of October, Governor Dewdney himself visited St. Albert and various places near that country, perhaps, not in the immediate neighborhood of the disturbed region, but a neighborhood which would give him naturally the opportunity of communication with men of great importance, and I can hardly conceive that after that visit he should not have acquired and communicated much information. In truth, Sir, we have gotten and are getting only what cannot be refused to us, as the Government thinks. We have got only what they dare not detain; and, if the further papers, which ought to be produced and which exist, are brought down, that which is, I argue, made plain enough without them would be made plainer still. On the 5th September a great meeting took place at St. Laurent, and the *Manitoba* shortly afterwards published an account of this meeting, with an editorial preface, from which this is an extract:

"The *Manitoba* is the organ of the population of French origin, not only of this Province, but also of the new Provinces of the North-West; and we are always pleased to open our columns to the friends of our cause and of our rights. Here is the last letter of our correspondent, dated the 16th September, 1884:

"SIR,—I think I shall interest your readers by giving them a short report of the great meeting held at St. Laurent, on the 5th September. This meeting was composed of French half-breeds, from all the surrounding parishes, and had been called for the purpose of respectfully submitting to His Lordship Mgr. Grandin, and to the other members of the clergy of the diocese of St. Albert, regret at not having their co-operation in the movement going on to-day to obtain from the Federal Government what the half-breed population claims to be entitled to. There were also present at the meeting His Lordship Mgr. Grandin, bishop of St. Albert, the Rev. Father Fourmond, of the St. Laurent mission, the Rev. Father Touze, of the mission of the Sacred Heart, and the Rev. Father Lecoq, of the mission of Cumberland.

"Mr. Louis Riel was appointed president of the meeting, the object of which relates to these two questions: 1st. Why do the clergy keep out of the movement going on to-day, and even seem hostile to it? 2nd. Are the claims of the half-breeds upon the Government good, just and legitimate?

"Mr. Gabriel Dumont briefly stated the uneasiness felt by his compatriots at the abstention of the clergy from taking part in their deliberations. Our intentions, he said, are wrongly interpreted or wrongly understood, and the abstention of the clergy from coming to our aid can only be injurious to us. Mr. Dumont, overcome by emotion, begged His Lordship to direct and enlighten them, adding that his voice, always respected as that of God, would be listened to with the same docility as in the past.

"The venerable prelate deigned to reply immediately, that if, for some time, the relations between the clergy and the half-breed popula-

tion, concerning the events which have arisen, have seemed cool, indifferent even, still this reserve in no way proved a diminution of affection and of charity, but was only the effect of absolute prudence, necessary under present circumstances, in view of the mystery with which the proceedings up to that day had been surrounded—mystery which not only left the clergy without sufficient light to pronounce intelligently, but also necessarily gave rise to serious suspicions, to fears and alarms really painful. Speak plainly, added His Lordship; tell us what you want, and we shall tell you what we think. If justice is on your side, we will help you with all our might, as we have always done in the past. His Grace was listened to with respect and a religious attention.

"Mr. Charles Nolin spoke next, with an emotion and a conviction which gained for him the most sympathetic attention. He said he bitterly deplored the painful abandonment in which the half-breed population were left by those in whom they had always found devoted friends and fathers, while such an important question for this population is agitated. They are all the more sensible of this abandonment because they have an invincible faith in the rectitude of their intentions and in the justice of their cause. Mr. Nolin concluded by a statement of the principal points, showing the basis of their claims on the Federal Government. Our demands, he said, must be made respectfully, no doubt, but they must also be made with earnestness, force and perseverance. No rebellion; this mode has never been seriously in the mind of anyone, because it would be a crime; we will keep to legitimate means. "His Lordship again declared his affection and devotion to the well-being of his flock on all occasions, where the rights of religion, of honor and of justice were not compromised by their mode of action."

Then there is a discussion upon certain local questions in regard to schools, which is immaterial. Then:

"Mr. Riel, president of the meeting, spoke next. In order, he said, to completely dissipate all misunderstanding, to take away all bad suspicion, and especially to show the value and importance of our demands, I will give a statement of our principal claims.

"We want:

"1st. The sub-division of the North-West Territories into Provinces; "2nd. For the settlers of the North-West the same advantages as those granted in 1870 to the settlers of Manitoba;

"3rd. A grant of 240 acres of land to the half-breeds who have not yet received that grant from the Government;

"4th. An immediate gratuitous grant, by letters patent, to the proprietors who occupy them, of the lands of which they are in possession;

"5th. The offer for sale, by the Government, of half a million of acres of land, the products of this sale to be placed at interest and applied to the aid of half-breeds in the establishment of hospitals, orphanages, schools, etc., or in supplying the poorer persons with ploughs or other agricultural implements, and in distributing seeds in the spring;

"6th. The reservation of about one hundred townships, chosen in the swampy lands, which are not likely to be settled before a long time. These lands to be distributed to the half-breed children of the coming generation and during 120 years, each child to receive his share when he reaches the age of 18 years;

"7th. A subvention of at least one thousand dollars to sustain an establishment of nuns in each place where a great number of half-breed families are established;

"8th. An amelioration in the conditions of labor asked from the Indians, and a greater care of their persons, so as to prevent them from dying with hunger.

"His Lordship acceded again to the wishes of the meeting, and gave his opinions on the different propositions submitted by the president. Among these propositions there are some, said His Lordship, which touch too nearly to politics, and must leave us indifferent, never wishing to take part in political events, and of a more or less doubtful interest to the population and to religion. The other propositions, added His Lordship, I have myself taken steps for a long time in regard to your special interest. I made all possible advances towards the Government to obtain justice. I have even obtained promises that I believed official, but that I regret to see forgotten to-day. I felt the same discontent that you have felt yourselves, and I did not fail to complain in high places."

The extract I read before now finds its proper place:

"His Lordship dwelt on the necessity of a close union and a great confidence in God, on the necessity of being truly Christian and religious, in order to succeed. You want, said His Lordship, to possess all those qualities to affirm your national character. You will never be anything and will never have any influence without a perfect union. At this moment the Rev. Father Fourmond spoke, showing the inappreciable advantages that union, concord and mutual help would bring to the population, advantages which were both political and religious.

The rest of the paper applies to matters which are not material. Then Serg. Keenan, on the 17th of September, 1884, reports from Batoche:

"On Friday last, 5th inst., a meeting of Riel's supporters was convened at St. Laurent (about seven miles from here) at which nearly all the half-breeds in the surrounding settlements were present.

"There were also a number of half-breeds and white men from Prince Albert, including Messrs. Jackson, Scott and Isbister, three of Riel's strongest supporters in that district.

MR. BLAKE.

"The meeting, I believe, was called for the purpose of carrying on the work. Speeches were made, condemning the Government generally, and Mr. Jackson stated that this country belonged to the Indians, and not to the Dominion of Canada.

"I met Riel a few days ago, and during our conversation he told me that the Government, through Bishop Grandin, had offered him a seat in the council or in the Dominion Senate."

In the same month of September, 1884, it is reported in *Le Manitoba* that the Minister of Public Works was at Qu'Appelle, and the paper goes on to say:

"After mass Sir Hector Langevin addressed the Metis. They asked that the Government should give them scrip, as it did to those of Manitoba. Sir Hector considered the request reasonable, and promised to submit it to his colleagues."

I have no doubt he did so—by word of mouth. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman took pains to do so, but of course he did not do it in writing, because the writing is not brought down. On this occasion he appears to have had less influence with his colleagues than in some other instances. It also appears that the hon. gentleman had a correspondence with Mr. Jackson, a member of the council from the North-West Territories, because one of the commissioners, on the 8th April, 1885, refers Sir David Macpherson to Jackson's letter of the 3rd of September, in reference to the half-breeds' grievances; but unhappily that letter has not been brought down. So that all that concerns the hon. gentleman's interview, his correspondence, his mission and his action, has been forgotten; or care has been taken to prevent them from being brought before this House. Then the hon. gentleman, after having attended to this matter, attended to the not unimportant part of ministerial duties, the festive part, in the manner reported in the *Manitoba Free Press* of 11th September, 1884:

"At a banquet given to the Hon. Messrs. Langevin and McLellan, at Winnipeg, on their return from visiting the North-West, Sir Hector Langevin said: 'He had conversed with men both in the towns and country. He had asked if there were any grievances, and they had said there were none. Both men in the towns and farmers were satisfied with their positions. Only two farmers had told him they had any grievances, and this was because there were no ladies in the place.'"

I have no doubt the hon. gentleman's language was received with "laughter and applause." Blood and tears have followed since from his superficial and mistaken view of the North-West situation. On the 25th September, 1884, Serg. Keenan reports from Batoche as follows:—

"I have the honor to state that since my last report all has been quiet here. There has been, however, frequent meetings of Riel's committee held in different parts of the settlement. It is almost impossible for me to obtain any information as to what transpires at these meetings, as they are conducted with secrecy, and no person, excepting members of the committee, is allowed to take part in them. At all the public meetings Riel and his supporters have been very moderate, or rather cautious, in their utterances; but I learn that they appear in disguise at these open gatherings, and advocate very different measures in their councils. The last meeting was held a week ago, at the house of Baptiste Boyer, one of the chief supporters of the movement. Charles Nolin, another member, and one of the most unreasonable, proposed that the half-breeds make certain demands on the Government, and if not complied with they take up arms at once, and commence killing every white man they can find, and incite the Indians to do the same. I obtained this information from an old country Frenchman, who belonged to the committee, and left it on account of the extreme and unreasonable measures it advocated. This man, Nolin, is the most dangerous of the half-breeds, for the reason that he is strongly in favor of tampering with the Indians."

On the 23rd October *Le Manitoba* published a statement of the demands of the natives, as presented by Louis Riel at the meeting of the 5th September. It does not appear to be in the exact words, but its substance is similar to that which I read awhile ago; therefore I merely refer to it without repeating it. It was in October, as I have said, that Lieutenant Governor Dewdney visited St. Albert, Edmonton and Stobart, which is in the same neighborhood. He saw the bishop and clergy upon the subject, and must have learned of the troubles. But where is his report? In November, 1884, a petition was circulated largely in the North-West Territories, to which I referred in a former

speech dealing with this question, which petition called upon the Government to grant relief in respect to the grievances to which I have referred. But it is not brought down. There is a report in the *Regina Leader* of a meeting at Moosomin some time in December, 1884, on the subject of the settlers' rights, and amongst the resolutions passed at that meeting was this one :

"That the Government should recognise the claims of the half-breeds, as was done in the Province of Manitoba, and thus determine a question calculated to disturb the peaceful development of the country."

But nothing is brought down. Then, on the 20th October, from Prince Albert, Major Crozier reports :

"I beg to state that constable Elliott returned from Carlton on the evening of the 15th, and reported to me that a man named Tomkins, who is employed by the Indian Department of that place as interpreter, has told him that Riel was drilling men at St. Jérôme, and that a large meeting had been held there on the 12th, at midnight.

"He further told him that a chief from Muskeg Lake had been sent to see Big Bear, to request him to attend a meeting of Riel's, to be held at Batoche in two weeks' time. I sent a man in plain clothes to the vicinity of St. Jérôme to find out, if possible, the truth of the reports. He returned yesterday, and reports all quiet. He states that there is a rumor of a large meeting to be held at Batoche in two or three weeks, as soon as all the crops are in. He could find out nothing about any drill having been performed.

"I have stationed a man in plain clothes in the vicinity of Batoche, who will keep me informed regarding the movements of Riel.

"The half-breed population are in a very discontented state, principally attributable to the utter failure of their crops."

On the 20th November a letter is written by a person whose name is not given. It contains statements principally about the Indians. It declares arrangements had been made for a general gathering this summer (1885) at Duck Lake; that invitations had been issued for all persons to come. It was also stated that :

"William Badger went to their reserve on behalf of Louis Riel, and demanded of the chiefs Attackakwoops and Mustowasis if he would be allowed to speak. He was told that he could not say anything, as they did not wish their names to appear among people who were trying to make trouble."

A considerable amount of information is given as to the discontented state of the Indians. Then, on the 2nd January, 1885, Major Crozier telegraphed as follows to the Comptroller of the North-West Mounted Police :—

"Riel proposed to Macdowall to go. States if Government would give him assistance in money; suppose \$5,000 enough."

On the 31st December Inspector Howe, from Carlton, reports :

"On the 9th December there was a large half-breed meeting called by Riel at St. Laurent, for the purpose of again talking over their Bill of Rights.

"On the 22nd December Mr. Macdowall, member of the North-West Council, accompanied by Father André, Roman Catholic priest at Prince Albert, proceeded to St. Laurent, at the request of Riel, who desired to see and talk with Mr. Macdowall as member for the district. On Mr. Macdowall's arrival at St. Laurent, Riel informed him that he wished to make a proposition to him, of which he wished representation made to Government.

"He first stated that he was very poor, and that he did not know what would become of him; was afraid he would starve, and starvation made men desperate; that he had great power over the half-breeds, and that he could influence them, politically or otherwise, as he thought fit. He said he was tired of Canada, and wished to return to Montana, but had not the means to do so; and that if the Government would give him pecuniary assistance, and something to settle on his wife and family (Mr. Macdowall thinks \$5,000 would be accepted by him)—that if the Government grants his request he will at once leave for Montana and remain there. He would guarantee to give up all connection with the half-breeds in the country, and having, he says, such great influence over them, he will guarantee that all claims they now have against the Government will be at once dropped. By this he means that he will throw over all his half-breed supporters and return to Montana himself."

On 23rd December, 1884, Gagnon reports :

"I have the honor to report that during the last month the half-breeds of St. Laurent and Batoche settlements held a public meeting to adopt a petition drawn up by a committee, and that this petition, signed by

the settlers of both settlements, has been forwarded to Ottawa. This meeting, from all reports, seems to have been very orderly.

"Several of the other smaller reunions have taken place during the same period, but all have reference to school matters. The half-breeds are pressing Riel to settle amongst them, and have given him, as a token of their gratitude for services rendered, a house well furnished, and will further, on 2nd January next, present him with a purse.

"These testimonials of the good will of the majority would go towards denying certain rumors, which say that several are lacking confidence in their leader; that his way of acting and speaking denotes a very hot head, and that he does not now agree with their priest. There is no doubt that a great number are still led by him, and would act upon his dictates. Some time ago I sent several men to the south branch to have horses shod. The river being full of floating ice, they could not cross. Some way or other, the report was brought to the east side of the river that these men were sent to arrest Riel, who was then at the crossing. Within half an hour over 100 men had collected to protect him. There is a certain amount of suffering among the half-breeds, but not to the extent it was expected to reach. Large quantities of supplies are required for this part of the country, and all who have horses can make a living by freighting. As far as I can see, the chief grievance of the half-breeds is, that they are afraid that the Government will not sanction the way they, amongst themselves, have agreed to take their homesteads—ten chains frontage on the river, by two miles back."

On the 8th December a meeting was held at Moosomin, at which a resolution was passed in favor of the recognition of the half-breeds' rights, as in Manitoba. Early in January there was a meeting held at Edmonton, on North-West Council affairs, at which Mr. Oliver, a member of the council, spoke. He stated that the order defining the powers of the council did not arrive till after the Session had opened. He complained that funds were controlled by the Government. There was a meeting, very shortly afterwards, at Saskatchewan city, at which Mr. Oliver spoke. He stated that the half-breed lands resolution of the North-West Council was moved by Mr. Macdowall, seconded by Mr. Jackson, and unanimously supported by the council; to which an answer had been received by telegraph, that the matter would be considered at the ensuing meeting of the Ottawa Cabinet, in September. The *Qu'Appelle Gazette* on 22nd January makes this announcement:

"We are informed that Louis Riel and others are engaged in drafting a petition to the Dominion Government, demanding certain concessions, which they say have been promised to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories, and it is the expressed intention of the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan district that if these concessions are not granted which are asked for, to resort to arms, to force a compliance with their demands, Mr. Vankoughnet's statement to the contrary notwithstanding."

There was a meeting in Sturgeon church on 7th February, at which Mr. Oliver again spoke, and referred to efforts made in council to press on the attention of the Federal Government the necessity of taking action on certain matters of personal interest to the people of the North-West, namely, school lands, timber dues, grazing lands and half-breed lands. In the same month resolutions were passed at mass meetings of settlers, held throughout Assiniboia, at which it was resolved :

"That the Government should promptly recognise the claims of half-breeds, as was done in the Province of Manitoba, and thus determine a question calculated to retard the present development of the country."

In the election address of Mr. Wilson, published in the *Edmonton Bulletin* on 31st January, he says :

"I consider that the half-breeds of the country are entitled to the same treatment as their brethren received in Manitoba; and therefore I will support, as far as possible, any efforts made to secure that which they have a right to look for."

On 14th January, 1885, Mr. Crozier reports :

"On my return from Carlton and Prince Albert I was informed that a party of Indians had gone west to Edmonton, and would notify on the road all the Indians that there would be a large gathering at Duck Lake next spring. (I presume the annual sun dance being the occasion of the gathering). On further enquiry I find that they went only to Red Pheasant's reserve, at the Eagle Hills, and from that they returned to Duck Lake, being persuaded to do so by one of the leading Indians there. This is the second time Indians have come here on the same mission that I know of, others may have gone on. Certainly, there is an effort being made to have a large gathering at Duck Lake next spring. I was informed, also, that there will be an effort made to get the Qu'Appelle and other Indians in the south-easterly part of the Territory to assemble there. Little Pine, too, it appears, when at Blackfoot Crossing, tried

to arrange to get as many as possible of Blackfoot and Southern Indians to come north in the spring. He has told the Indians that he has arranged that many of them will be there. Poundmaker says that Little Pine told his young men not to dispose of their guns, and he further says that Little Pine has come to some understanding with the Blackfeet, but is not sure as to the nature. He, Poundmaker, says, when Little Pine recovers his eyesight he will get full particulars."

And so on. On the 25th February Irvine telegraphs :

"Gagnon telegraphs : 'Half-breeds held a meeting at South Branch yesterday. Object to beg Riel to stay in country ; he will stay ; evidently his own meeting ; orderly.'"

On 26th January Gagnon reports :

"I have the honor to report that during the last month nothing of importance has occurred amongst the half-breeds in this district. They had, after New Year, a social meeting, at which they presented their chief, Riel, with the sum of \$60, as a token of their good-will. The meeting was very orderly and loyal, and no allusions were made to the actual troubles. It seems that Riel has had difficulty in getting enough supplies for his own family lately, and had to beg assistance from the Roman Catholic missionary at St. Laurent, who assisted him. It has been stated to me that the petition prepared had been sent to Ottawa ; but it appears that only a letter, preparatory to sending the petition, has been forwarded."

No trace of that letter appears in these papers—

"The petition is undergoing being signed, and will be forwarded next month."

On 27th February there is a report in the *Prince Albert Times* of a trouble at Halero settlement, on the south branch. It says :

"We learn that considerable excitement has been prevailing in the vicinity of the south branch for the last few weeks. At one meeting we understand the natives turned out armed, a rumor having got about that Riel was to be arrested. A large meeting is to be held next Tuesday at the Halcrow settlement."

You have thus seen, Mr. Speaker, the course of events, from the time Riel came into the country, so far as it is described in the papers which the Government have brought down and in the public newspapers. But I must once again remind you that all the time there were running along with the question I have been dealing with other questions which had grown up. The land, the surveys, the reserves, and the vague claims which, on the sub-stratum of solid ground of grievance unredressed, Riel had conjured up. But those mentioned were the most substantial ; and I am presently to give you the proofs. Meantime, I have now carried the story down to the end of January, within a few weeks of the outbreak ; for on 10th March Gagnon telegraphed from Carlton that half-breeds were excited and preparing arms ; and thenceforward news comes thick and fast. I do not go into the history of the outbreak. That will be discussed with fuller material next Session, but we know that it took shape in March early, and surely there were warnings enough, even apart from those suppressed. It was an outbreak almost entirely of French half-breeds, supported by Indians. There were a few Scotch or English half-breeds, but the attitude of the bulk was neutral. The attitude of the English and Scotch half-breeds in the immediate neighborhood appears, I say, to have been neutral, if we can judge from a rather extraordinary meeting held on 22nd of March. The meeting was held at St. Catharines church ; the Rev. E. Mattheson was chairman and W. Craig, secretary. Two resolutions were passed :

"First, that the members of this meeting continue to sympathise, as they have always done, with the French half-breeds, in their desire to obtain their legal rights by all constitutional means.

"Second, that they do not approve of the resort to arms or the rising of the Indians, and wish to remain neutral."

It was resolved to forward a copy of these minutes to the officer in charge at Carlton and another to L. Riel. After the outbreak the comments of the press appeared, and it is only necessary to say that the Conservative press declared with extraordinary unanimity that the half-breeds had grievances, and they referred to those two points—the question of the extinguishment of the Indian title and the question of the surveys and the half-breed lands. I could quote to you, Mr. Speaker, if I had time, articles from the

Mr. BLAKE.

*Mail*, and from the principal French Canadian Conservative newspapers, and from *Le Manitoba*, in this sense. *Le Manitoba*, on the 3rd of May last, reports an interview with Archbishop Taché, a few days before, at Qu'Appelle, in which the Archbishop said :

"The labors of the land commission are giving satisfaction, and if this measure of justice had been taken three months earlier it would have prevented the rising."

Now, Sir, having advanced a little beyond the period of the action actually taken by the Government, but only two or three weeks, in order to find ourselves in the actual face of the rising, I come to the first action this Administration took after the Act of the 15th of May, 1879, which authorises them to deal with this question ; and the first action, as shown by the papers, was on the 26th of January, 1885. I have shown you the condition of things as it was in 1878 ; I have shown you the state of things as it presented itself to the Ministers at that time ; I have shown you the report of the Deputy Minister, and of the authorities as to its pressing and urgent character ; I have shown you the legislative authority with which they clothed themselves, and there is an absolute blank as to that executive action which they asked to be allowed to take from the time they received that power in May, 1879, until the 26th of January, 1885. And I ask you, under what circumstances it was, after having read the correspondences to which I have referred, that on the 26th of January, 1885, that action, however inadequate it may be regarded, was taken. Is it not perfectly clear and obvious that it was taken under the pressure of this excitement, this agitation, these meetings, these difficulties, after neglect, supineness, apathy, procrastination, beyond example or excuse. On that day, 26th January, 1885, the Minister of the Interior reported to Council : That, with a view of settling equitably the claims of the half-breeds—first, the claims of those in Manitoba and the North-West, who would have been entitled to land had they resided in Manitoba at the time of the transfer—and those are the claims with which I am dealing up to this time ; and secondly, the claims of those who, residing in Manitoba, did not participate in the grant—and those are the claims of the unenumerated half-breeds of Manitoba, with which I propose to deal separately—he says it is desirable to do—what ? To ascertain the numbers of half-breeds—to ascertain the number of all of the half-breeds ; and he recommends that he be authorised to obtain an enumeration of them, and to employ three persons to make such enumeration. There is no declaration as to what the settlement should be, no statement of the principle upon which action is to be taken. The proposal is to number the unenumerated half-breeds of Manitoba as well, and thus to settle, through this machinery, another grievance, which I shall deal with next. The proposal is only to obtain power to appoint three persons to number the people. On the 28th January, accordingly, the Minister's advice was followed and he obtained that power, and that step seems to have exhausted his energies. He seems, once again, to have adopted a passive attitude, with the exception that on the 4th February, 1885, he sent this telegram to Mr. Dawdney :

"Government has decided to investigate claims of half-breeds, and, with that view, has directed enumeration of those who did not participate in grant under Manitoba Act. No representations received recently."

You see by the last sentence of that telegram—"no representations received recently"—that there was obviously communication from the North-West upon which the Minister acted. But we do not get that communication, and the Minister says that no representation was received recently. Well, Sir, I have given you a bead roll of representations, not all of them, because we have not got them here, but all which the inculpated Government chooses to bring down, which makes it the very acme of absurdity to say that no representations have been made. He does not

instruct the Lieutenant Governor to communicate this course to the half-breeds. There is no telegram instructing him to tell the half-breeds that a census had been ordered—nothing but this simple telegram; and that being sent, as I said, he pauses, and precious hours were lost, because had decided action been then taken it would have gone far to break the back of the whole affair. When do we find the next movement? The next paper brought down is a telegram of 18th March, 1885, from the Minister to the Lieutenant Governor:

"It is wished that Mr. Forget should be a member of the commission on half-breed claims. Is he available? Answer."

Why, after waiting from the 26th January to the 18th of March, this haste to get Mr. Forget's consent? What was the sudden hurry? What awoke him? Why, the storm had broken while the Minister was sleeping, and the storm having broken, he was trying to keep the storm off. On the 10th of March the commissioner telegraphs from Regina to the comptroller:

"Just received the following telegram from Gagnon, dated to-day, from Carlton. Have shown it to Lieutenant Governor: 'Half-breeds excited. Move about more than usual—preparing arms. Do not know cause or object of these preparations.'"

On the 11th March Superintendent Crozier telegraphs from Carlton:

"Half-breeds greatly excited; reported they threaten attack on Carlton before 16th. Half-breeds refuse to take freight or employment for Government. Will stop all freight coming into the country after 16th of this month. Getting arms ready. Leader will not allow people to leave home, as they may be required. Origin of trouble, I think, letter received, stating Riel not recognised British subject. They expect arms from the States. Have ordered twenty-five men from Battleford, and one gun, to come here at once."

On the 14th of March Col. Irvine telegraphs from Regina:

"Lieutenant Governor received telegram dated Carlton, to-day, from Crozier, saying half-breed rebellion may break out at any moment and joined by Indians, and asking that his division be largely increased. Would recommend that at least 100 men be sent at once, before roads break up. Please instruct."

On the 15th of March the comptroller telegraphs Col. Irvine:

"Start for the north quickly as possible, with all available men up to 100. Telegraph marching-out state, and report passing telegraph station."

There was the state of things on the 18th of March, and now I have given you the explanation of what had waked up the Minister, and why he was telegraphing to find out whether Forget would accept a seat on the commission to number the half-breeds. The Minister of the Interior had his telegrams, too, though he does not show them. He knew the cause of the trouble; he did not believe any cock-and-bull story about Riel not being recognised as a British subject. He knew it was the half-breed claims; and he sought, alas, too late, to do that which he ought to have done years before. But those other telegrams of his are not brought down; they are suppressed. On the 19th of March Mr. Dewdney replies in the affirmative to the telegram of the 18th; and on the same day Mr. Burgess writes a letter to ———— I presume to the three commissioners—enquiring:

"Whether he would be ready to act upon a commission which the Government is about to appoint, for the purpose of investigating the claims of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories, and asking a telegraphic reply."

On the 22nd there is a telegram from Winnipeg, Ruttan to Pearce, but that to which it replies is left out:

"Goulet out west; locality uncertain; expected return Monday; did not receive letter or telegram; his brother thinks no doubt will accept appointment."

That, obviously, is a reply to a telegram from Pearce, wanting to know where Goulet is. But it is not produced. So that you find there was positively at length a little ripple of excitement in the Depart-

ment of the Interior, for they were telegraphing to the North-West to obtain people to attend to this matter. Then, on the 26th of March, the First Minister gave his account in the House of the appointment of the commission, which is a remarkable statement, in contrast with the facts, which I would like to read, but which I have not the strength or the breath to read. On the 28th of March Mr. Macpherson reports again to council. It was now seen that more was required than a census; it was seen that the proposal simply to send a commission to number the people, without deciding on their claims, would not answer; and on the 30th of March an Order in Council was made on Mr. Macpherson's report. That Order in Council recites his report as, first, recommending the settlement of the claims; second, recommending the expediency of satisfying those claims by granting—first, to each half-breed head of a family resident in the North-West Territories at the transfer, the lot of which he is at present in undisputed and *bond fide* occupation, by virtue of residence and occupation, to the extent of 160 acres, any deficiency below 160 acres to be made up by scrip, redeemable in land, at \$1 an acre; and, in case such head of a family is not in occupation of the land, then an amount of scrip to be redeemable in land to the amount of \$160; second, to each child of a half-breed resident in the North-West Territories at the transfer, and born before the 15th of July, 1870, the lot in his possession, up to 240 acres, any deficiency to be made up in scrip, as before; and if the child is not in possession of any land, scrip to the extent of the 240 acres. The order goes on to say that the Minister of the Interior, on the representation made, that it was desirable to have made an enumeration of the half-breeds in Manitoba and the North-West Territories who would have been entitled to land had they resided in Manitoba, was authorised, on the 28th of January, to appoint commissioners, and the following gentlemen were accordingly appointed to carry into effect the order: Messrs. Street, Goulet and Forget; that the Minister of the Interior thought that the scope of the enquiry to be made by the commissioners appointed under the Order in Council of January should be enlarged, and that the commissioners should be empowered not only to enumerate half-breeds resident outside, but also to report to the Minister of the Interior the persons entitled to be dealt with, and also the extent, including all outside of the old Province of Manitoba; that he also thought the commissioners should exercise all the powers and functions provided by the Dominion Lands Act, and recommended that the Order in Council of the 28th of January should be cancelled; and the Minister recommended that the commissioners to make their enquiry and report should be the same as those appointed under the authority of the Order in Council of the 28th of January, namely, Messrs. Street, Goulet and Forget; and it is ordered accordingly. I may say there is no evidence of Messrs. Street, Goulet and Forget having been appointed on the Order of January at all; nothing has been brought down on that subject. On the contrary, we find enquiries made, whether they would accept at a date when the March appointment was imminent. You will observe, first, that there is an acknowledgment of the defective character of the Order in Council of the 28th of January—that more ought to be done than to enumerate. You will observe, secondly, that power is given to investigate and report upon claims, and to give certificates to each claimant who was found entitled to them; you will observe the first attempt, in the third place, that there is an attempt made to define the principle of the grants—to say what, in the opinion of the Government, the people should have; and that definition is a wrong definition, which the Government was forced to retract and retire from in a few days. You will observe, in the next place, that the allegation that Messrs. Street, Goulet and Forget were appointed under that Order in Council of the

28th of January is unproved, and that Order in Council is cancelled. It would not answer; it could not stand the stress of the weather; it was a fair-weather order; the storm had come, and it was quite inadequate to the occasion. On the 30th of March the commission is issued to Messrs. Street, Forget and Goulet, in the terms of the Order in Council authorising them to enumerate and report the persons entitled under the Act; and on the same 30th of March, 1885, there are instructions from Burgess to Street, the chairman of the commission, in which he says:

"The advance of spring renders it desirable that as little delay as possible may occur in the work of the commissioners."

If it were in order I would move to strike out the word "spring," and to substitute the word "Riel" in lieu thereof; I think it is much more likely to have been true. However, with that command of euphemistic phraseology which is peculiar to Government departments, that is the language of the order. Then, the commissioners leave Winnipeg on the 7th of April; an itinerary is provided; the secretary of the land board is ordered to place the whole staff of the land office at their disposal. They are told; "If you meet anyone on the trails, take steps at once to investigate on the spot." Why such a change? They were to go out in the highways and hedges and compel them to come in—if you meet them on the trails, stop them, and investigate their claims; do not stand on any ceremony; set up the staff of justice wherever you are, because the trail will lead to St. Laurent. Forms, and notices, and lists were provided; the Indian agents were ordered to attend the meetings of the commissioners; the treaty Indians were to be told by the commission that if they desired enfranchisement they would be dealt with equitably and liberally. In the case of squatters who were not half-breeds, they were to do nothing, but to take the evidence and forward it, and assure the people that their claims would receive the prompt and liberal consideration of the Government, through the land board. They were told to grant certificates to the half-breed heads of families and their children, and to recognise the illegitimate children. Circulars or letters were to be addressed to land agents, timber agents, Indian agents and Mounted Police, asking them to aid the work of the commission. What a change! What a pleasing and cheering spectacle is the action of the Government at this stage! What a pity they did not do this earlier! What a sad commentary on the condition of things they had allowed to exist for so many years! It is true they show great diligence now; but alas it is too late. On the 30th of March a letter was sent to Mr. Egan, the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, telling him that posters are to be distributed, at the earliest possible moment, over the whole railway system. These were posters announcing the messengers of peace. A letter is sent to the secretary of the land board, asking him to assist in every way—to put his whole staff at the disposal of the commission—and to supply notices: first, to the Lieutenant Governor; second, to the Mounted Police Commissioner; third, to each post office; fourth, to each land office; fifth, to each Crown timber office; sixth, to each Customs office; seventh, to each Inland Revenue office; eighth, to each registry office; ninth to each telegraph office in Manitoba and the North-West Territories; also, to each Roman Catholic priest, Protestant minister or missionary, and to each Hudson Bay post. The glad news was to be disseminated all over the Territory, that now, at last, the commission was coming. Then there is a letter to the Indian Department, asking them to give the commission their assistance. The Minister says, in the letter:

"It is of the highest public importance that instructions to this effect should be issued immediately."

Then, on the 30th of March, a letter is sent to Governor Dewdney, advising him in advance, so that no time may be lost in taking the steps suggested. On the 31st of March, Burgess telegraphs to Burpee at the Land Office:

Mr. BLAKE.

"No word from Roger Goulet. Endeavor to find his whereabouts, and reply quickly as possible."

On the 31st of March, Burgess telegraphs to Jackson, member of the council at Qu'Appelle:

"Half-breed commission will be at Qu'Appelle on the 7th and 8th April."

Why this haste? Why this agitation?

#### PROTESTANT VOLUNTEERS IN THE 65th BATTALION.

Mr. CARON. I desire to read an answer to a telegram sent to Col. Ouimet, in reference to a private in his corps, one Conway. He says:

"Conway, the private referred to, enlisted as a Catholic. He, for the first time, to cause mischief, pretended, on the occasion in question to be a Protestant. However, he was punished, not for having refused to attend Catholic services, but for having incited his comrades to mutiny, and having used insulting language to his captain."

"J. A. OUMET."

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. Before recess I was discussing the subject of the recognition, under the order of 30th March, 1885, of the rights of the half-breeds in respect to the extinguishment of the Indian title, and I have shown that the recognition is inadequate in this respect. In the case, say, of the half-breed head of a family, he would be entitled, under the arrangements made under the Manitoba Act, to 160 acres, or scrip for 160 acres, in respect of the extinguishment of the Indian title, but he was only, under the order and instructions, to be permitted to obtain so much of that scrip as should be in excess of the acreage to which he would be entitled to by occupation. If he was in occupation of 160 acres that would nullify his claim altogether in respect to the Indian title; and so of the minor: he was entitled to scrip for 240 acres, but if he were in occupation of 240 or any less quantity to which he would be entitled as a settler, that occupation would, *pro tanto*, under these documents, diminish his right to scrip for 240 acres in respect of the Indian title. Thus, even at this stage, the Government declined to recognise the rights of the half-breeds; but they were very soon obliged to recede from that illiberal position, for no sooner had the chief commissioner arrived at Manitoba than he telegraphs, on the 4th April, to Mr. Macpherson, as follows:—

"If desired by half-breeds, would it not be advisable to grant scrip, say one sixty or two forty dollars, permitting them to acquire title to land in occupation through possession. Otherwise, Government really gives nothing for Indian title."

He followed that up on the 5th April by the following telegram:—

"Commission agree in recommending that power be granted them to deal with occupying half-breed in manner surmised in my message of yesterday; also, if possible, to enable commission to settle claims of supplementary Manitoba half-breeds, by allowing them same terms as North-West half-breeds."

On the 5th of April he wrote the Minister of the Interior:

"We arrived here early this morning and met my fellow commissioners at the Dominion lands office at 10 o'clock. They introduced the subject as to which I telegraphed you yesterday, and spoke very strongly as to its being one which was likely to be a serious stumbling block in our dealings with the half-breeds. Lest you should not fully have understood my telegram, I will shortly state the point. Suppose we find that a half-breed has been upon and since 13th July, 1877, in occupation of a parcel, say 160 acres, under circumstances which, if he were a white settler, would entitle him to a grant of the land under the homestead clauses of the Dominion Lands Act, under the authority we now possess we could, if he were the head of a family, allow him nothing more than the 160 acres; we could allow him nothing for his claim as a half-breed; and inasmuch as the Government has all along been purporting to deal with the half-breeds as if they had some general right beyond those of ordinary incoming settlers, my fellow commissioners say that great dissatisfaction and disappointment will be created if we give to these occupying half-breeds only that which an ordinary settler can claim, and

nothing for the extinguishment of his Indian title. Mr. Pierce discussed the matter very fully with us, and concurred in the advisability of our obtaining, if possible, the power to enable us to allow the half-breed to claim the land occupied by him under the homestead provisions, and, in addition, to give him his scrip for \$160 or \$240, as the case may be, for his Indian title."

Then there is a telegram from this same Mr. Street, chairman of the half-breed commission:

"Important conference to-day with influential half-breeds' deputation. All difficulty removed, excepting two. First, all children will refuse money scrip, demanding certificate for two forty acres land instead, like Manitoba. Several bishops and priests support this demand. Second, half-breeds having homes on small front unacceptable to buy these at \$1 per acre, and free grant one sixty acres from nearest vacant Government land, additional to allowance to extinguish Indian title. See Jackson's letter, 3rd September, to Langevin. These two concessions absolutely necessary if commissions—"

(Remainder of telegram undecipherable).

On 6th April, 1885, the Minister of Interior telegraphed to Mr. Street:

"No objection to your suggestion to give scrip and allow occupants to acquire title through possession when desired by them."

So that it was not until the 6th April that the concession was made to place these persons in exactly the same position as the Manitoba half-breeds in this regard. On the same date, 6th April, Mr. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior, telegraphs Mr. Street:

"Manitoba supplementary claims are being considered and disposed of here in all cases where evidence has been filed, which comprise nearly all that class. You need not advertise for evidence, but if any offer, you may take it and forward here."

On the same 6th of April the Minister telegraphs once again to Mr. Street:

"Pray remember that Government determined, in January, before there was any disturbance, to appoint commission, and that half-breeds were notified thereof on 4th February."

He is very anxious to show that he did it a very long time ago, and so he wants Mr. Street to remember; and, in his communications to the people, to point out that in January there was a determination to appoint a commission—but that was a very different kind of thing—and that the half-breeds were notified. Of such notification, however, we have received no proof. There was no disturbance, the Minister says. Was there no disturbance from June, 1884, when Louis Riel came to the country? Was there no disturbance at an earlier period? Were there not meetings? Were there not petitions? Were not the petitions and contributions a condition of discontent? Were there no remonstrances, letters, warnings, as to the condition of the people. But the Minister says there was no disturbance before—there was none in January. Then on the 10th, the 11th and the 12th of April there were telegrams discussing and settling the mode of dealing with the water frontages at Qu'Appelle, which were left unsettled, as I will show, until the outbreak, and were arranged by the commission. Subsequently, amended forms of certificates, in accordance with the extended authority as to Indian title, were sent to the commissioners. Hence, the forms of certificates which had been originally provided would have been inadequate for the settlement which the Government, at the instigation of the commissioners, after they reached Winnipeg, agreed to make; and on the 18th of April the following Order in Council was passed: The Committee, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, advise that the Order in Council, dated 30th of March ultimo, making provision for the manner in which claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title preferred by half-breeds resident in the North-West Territories outside of the limits of Manitoba, previous to the 15th day of July, 1870, be amended, by providing:

"1. That the small water frontages, of which half-breeds are at present in *bona fide* possession, by virtue of residence and cultivation, be sold to them at \$1 per acre, the area in no case to exceed 40 acres, and payment therefor to be made within two years.

"2. That in satisfaction of their claims as actual settlers upon these small water frontages, which are proposed to be sold to them, they be permitted to select from lands open for homestead and pre-emption entry, as nearly as possible in the vicinity of their holdings, one-quarter section of 160 acres, more or less, the patents for which, however, shall not issue until payment has been made in full for the lands of which they are now in occupation, as aforesaid.

"3. That in the case of children of half-breed, heads of families residing in the North-West prior to the 16th of July, 1870, and born before that date, instead of an issue of \$240 in scrip they be granted a certificate entitling them to select 240 acres of land from any lands open for homestead and pre-emption entry.

Then comes the Commissioners' notice:

"Notice is hereby given that the undersigned have been appointed by letters patent, dated 30th of March, 1885, from Her Majesty the Queen, under the Great Seal of the Dominion of Canada, commissioners, with authority, among other things, to make a remuneration to the half-breeds, who, previous to the 15th of July, 1870, were resident within the ceded portion of the North-West Territory and outside the limits of the original Province of Manitoba; and to investigate their claims, as such half-breeds, existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title, and to issue certificates to such half-breeds as shall prove before the commission their claims to consideration under sub-section e of section 81 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.

"And the commissioners will attend for the purpose of receiving, hearing and adjudicating upon such claims at the places mentioned below."

And the places mentioned there, according to the itinerary furnished from the office of the Interior, were:

"At Fort Qu'Appelle, April 8th, 9th, to April 14th, both days inclusive; at Touchwood Hills, April 16th and 17th; at Regina, April 23rd to April 27th, both days inclusive; at Maple Creek, April 29th; at Calgary, May 1st to the 6th, both days included; at Fort McLeod, May 9th to May 12th, both days inclusive. Dates for the sitting of the committee at St. Albert, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Victoria, Fort Pitt, Battleford, St. Laurent, St. Louis de Langevin, Duck Lake, St. Antoine de Padoue and Prince Albert, will shortly be fixed. Dated the 4th April, 1885."

Thus showing you the wide area over which, in the opinion of the Government, it was necessary that these men should sit, in order to adjudicate upon these claims, no less than 17 different points being mentioned, of which 5 are in the focus of the disturbed districts. Now, I have only this to add: that the course the Government pursued in March and April, in reference to this commission, indicated their own sense of the importance of the removal of that grievance. They felt it was important to proceed, even in the middle of the outbreak, not to lose an hour, to give every publicity that was possible throughout the North-West, to the fact that justice was about to be done, and they felt that it was important, because they felt it was necessary, in order to secure the quiet and the inaction of the half-breeds in other parts of the territory, that not a moment should be lost in doing that tardy justice. I have now gone over the situation, with reference to the claims, in this regard, of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories, and I think I have established to you a case of delay, neglect and mismanagement beyond explanation and beyond excuse. I now turn to a cognate question, the question of the unenumerated half-breeds of the old Province of Manitoba. After the enumeration which took place in the early days, and the allotment of the 1,400,000 acres upon the basis that those enumerated were all that were entitled, it was found that many had not been counted. Of those, presumably, the bulk were absent in the North-West Territories, where many of the Manitoba half-breeds used to resort during the period of the Buffalo hunt, and for purposes of freighting. On the 9th April, 1875, the Dominion lands agent at Winnipeg was authorised to take evidence in the cases of those unenumerated half-breeds, and Mr. Justice Ryan and Mr. Machar were appointed in the same year, 1875, also, to make an enumeration. They did some work, and they reported, in 1876, that their work was incomplete. Mr. Ryan was ordered, by Order in Council of the 14th June, 1876, to take evidence, if offered, within two years from that time, at any point in the Territories in which he might be, he being at that time a stipendiary magistrate in the Territories. On the 19th June, 1876, this letter was written to Mr. Ryan on the subject:

"SIR,—I am directed by the hon. the Minister to inform you that representations having been lately made by his Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, to the effect that it would greatly facilitate the settlement of claims to half-breed lands scrip in Manitoba if authority were issued to you to take evidence in relation thereto of claimants who had removed from the Province into the North-West Territory previous to the late sittings of yourself and Mr. Machar, as commissioners, and that you were willing to undertake such duty; acting upon the suggestion of His Grace, being desirous of removing, as far as possible, any further obstacles to the final settlement of these claims, the Minister has been authorised, by an Order of the Privy Council, to request you to continue to act as commissioner, to take the evidence, in the usual form, of such claimants as may come before you for the purpose, at Swan River or elsewhere, where your duties as stipendiary magistrate may call you in the North-West Territory; such authority, however, not to extend beyond two years from the date of the Order, that is to say, the 14th instant. The Minister will be glad to know whether you are willing to take upon yourself such additional duty as the Order in Council may involve."

There was some correspondence with Mr. Ryan and some action upon that in 1876 and 1877. On the 7th May, 1877, Mr. George Newcombe and A. Mills, agents, respectively, of the Government, at Emerson and Portage la Prairie, were ordered to take evidence on the same subject. In June, 1878, a proposal was made, with reference to the Saskatchewan half-breeds, to extend the authority of Mr. Ryan, and on the 28th June, 1878, and the Minister announced that he would probably appoint Mr. Duck, Dominion land agent for the Saskatchewan, to make that investigation. Mr. Duck was so appointed, and on the 24th February, 1879, I see the Saskatchewan *Herald* alludes to Mr. Duck's recent visit to Battleford, and announces his mission to be to receive applications of persons claiming to be entitled to half-breed and old settlers' scrip. I have no more information on these subjects than that which I have stated. The reports of these various officers have not been brought down. Some kind of ticket or voucher was given by them to those who examined into their cases, but there was no recognition of their right. In the spring of 1880 a petition was sent in to the First Minister, as Minister of the Interior, by the residents of Manitoba village, Lake Manitoba, North-West Territories, humbly representing that:

"Whereas, under the terms of the Manitoba Act, scrip was to be issued to the half-breed heads of families and allotment of lands made to the children of the same resident in Manitoba on the 15th July, A.D. 1870, and whereas, subsequently, many of their families removed to the interior, and have not yet benefited by the terms of the said Manitoba Act; and whereas it appears that the allotments of land made in Manitoba for the benefit of children of said half-breed heads of families are likely to prove insufficient to cover all the claimants under the said Act: Now, therefore, your petitioners, who are interested in these matters, do most humbly pray that you will place us on an equal footing, and cause scrip to be issued to us at an early date in satisfaction of our just and lawful claims."

On the 10th May, 1880, that petition was acknowledged, and it was promised to be laid before the Minister for his consideration. There was a similar petition, couched in the same language, from the Saskatchewan region. It was signed by 102 names, and was in like form to that which I have read. It was forwarded to the Minister of the Interior by Mr. Thos. McKay, of Prince Albert, on the 19th May, 1880, and on the 10th July, 1880, consideration of that petition was promised on the Minister's return to Ottawa. On the 6th June, 1881, Mr. Lawrence Clarke, who had then become a member of the North-West Council, petitioned the North-West Council, then sitting at Battleford, as follows:—

"That there are residents within the North-West Territories in various settlements, but more particularly, so far as the personal knowledge of the undersigned extends, about Edmonton, Carlton, Duck Lake, St. Laurent, Prince Albert and Qu'Appelle, a number of half-breeds who were residents in what is now the Province of Manitoba at and before the 15th day of July, 1870, but who, in the interval between this date and the distribution of the scrips and lands specially provided in the terms of transfer, had removed from their residences, and are now living in the North-West Territories.

"That the undersigned, from such information as he has been able to collect, is quite convinced the total number of the above-described class of half-breeds is not large, and that proof of their claims has long since, in the majority of cases, been taken by Mr. Ryan, before his commission lapsed, or since by the local land agents, and which proof, for some time back, has been in the possession of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa.

Mr. BLAKE.

"That these half-breeds, in many instances, were not aware of the sitting of the commissioners in Manitoba being limited in point of time, and, in nearly every instance, even had they been aware of such being the case, were not possessed of means to bear the expense consequent upon attendance thereat.

"That the general feeling of the community is that these half-breeds, possessing even rights with those who have already received scrips or grants of land in Manitoba, have not had that measure of justice meted out to them to which, by the terms of the surrender, they were entitled.

"The undersigned considers the subject as one of considerable importance, and very desirable for the peace, welfare and good government of the Territories, that it should be taken up and adjusted by the Dominion Government with as little further delay as possible.

"And, therefore, the undersigned respectfully recommend that, with the approval of council, Your Honor may see fit to bring the subject of dealing expeditiously, equitably and finally with the claims of the class of half-breeds above mentioned under the notice of His Excellency the Governor General."

That was transmitted by the North-West Council on the 14th June, 1881, with a request that it should be laid before His Excellency, and be by him placed under the consideration of his Ministers. On the 22nd July, 1881, this memorial, with the other papers relating to the half-breed claims, was laid before the Acting Minister of the Interior by the Deputy Minister of the Interior, with this memorandum:

"The undersigned submits for the information of the Acting Minister the file herewith on the subject of the claims preferred by the half-breeds in the North-West Territories to lands or scrip, following upon the grants in this behalf made by Parliament to the half-breeds of Manitoba.

"In reference to the class of half-breeds who moved from Manitoba to the North-West Territories without having received land or scrip, mentioned by Mr. Lawrence Clarke, the undersigned may state that proof as to the right of many of these people to participate in land or scrip have been investigated, but the return did not come in time to enable the persons who would appear to be entitled to participate in the land grant of 1,400,000 acres before the said grant had become entirely exhausted. It remains now for the Government to say whether they will make an additional grant to meet such claims, whether they will issue scrip and meet the demand, or, finally, whether, in view of its being, to a considerable extent, the fault of the parties themselves that their claims were not made in time, they should be refused altogether."

You will observe from that statement of the Deputy Minister of the Department, that at that time it was entirely undetermined by the Government whether they would recognise, and if so, in what shape and to what extent, these claims. He submitted the question once again on the 22nd of July, 1881, when these urgent remonstrances were presented through the North-West Council to the consideration of the Minister. From information I have received, I believe that the member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), and, amongst others, Mr. Bannatyne and Mr. Schultz, formerly a member of this House and now a member of the Senate, and others, intervened, from time to time, to press this subject upon the consideration of the Government; that there was a considerable pressure upon the Department of the Interior, which pressure, however, with a capacity for the resistance of pressure which is unsurpassed, that Department sustained immovably. There were several orders for papers, but save in one case none of those orders were complied with. On the 29th March, 1882, in answer to a motion made by Mr. Schultz, then member for Lisgar, all the claims of the half-breeds who were temporarily absent were brought down. There were 429 names of cases which, up to that time, had been investigated, and that return was laid on the Table. The pressure increased. Many of these claims were sold; more of them were pledged. Discontent had arisen; many of the claimants had removed into the Territories at various points, and another germ of trouble was created wherever a few of these men were together. They were to be found in Qu'Appelle, in the St. Laurent settlement, and at various other points in the North-West Territories, and every one of them was a man with a grievance in this respect. In 1883 the pressure was renewed, but fruitlessly. In 1884 the pressure was renewed; and on the 9th May, 1884, the Deputy Minister of the Interior made a report, recommending the settlement of those claims, and going into the whole case, and that was submitted to the Minister; but that report has not been

brought down. The Minister did not act upon that report. Nothing was done upon it at all; and even late in the year 1885 no decision was arrived at, and the outbreak of the trouble began. In March, 1885, the Deputy Minister made a second report, further pressing a settlement of those claims. At last, spurred by the rebellion—for nothing less than a rebellion seems adequate to stir up this Government—the Minister reported and recommended a settlement on the 9th of April, 1885. It was not until then that settlements were proposed by the Minister, although it was pressed in the years 1879, 1880 and 1881; although the papers had been specially laid before him in the year 1881; although the pressure was renewed in 1882, 1883 and 1884; although his own Deputy had brought the question under his consideration on the 9th May, 1884, with a report recommending immediate action; although it was well known that large numbers of those half-breeds were all through the Territories and in the disturbed quarters; although all the disturbance and agitation were known, nothing moved him, nothing stirred him, nothing could resist the great inertia that possessed him but the rebellion. But in April he moved—too late, of course, to save the trouble. Many had been disaffected by this neglect. That settlement is now going on, and 439—I suppose the 439 whose names were laid on the Table on the 29th March, 1882—half-breeds, whose cases had been investigated, are now having their cases settled; and in all about 500 have been and are to be settled in that regard. I say this brief statement I have made of the claims of the unenumerated half-breeds of Manitoba proves with equal force and cogency the neglect, delay and mismanagement which I have charged against the Government in that regard. Now, Sir, having dealt with these two classes of questions, I will touch but very briefly upon some other incidents. As I have said, it does not do to consider this matter without looking at all its bearings, and the question of representation, local and federal, was a question strongly pressed upon the attention of the Government and formed a difficulty in the Territories. But I shall not take time to deal with the details of that. So, also, with reference to the regulations affecting firewood, fencing and house timber. The regulations in the summer of 1879, caused protests and indignation in that year. There was an absurd arrangement, under which, I believe, a man had to get a permit if he wanted to light a camp fire on his way through the prairie, the practical effect of which was that he was exposed to prosecution if he did not; and other equally absurd regulations were made. In February, 1880, a petition was sent from Edmonton and Saskatchewan on that subject, and some of the regulations were cancelled. There were frequent other protests early. There was a protest in November, 1884, from Moosomin, and in September, 1884, from Prince Albert. In May, 1884, there is a strong article in *Le Manitoba* pointing out the grievances of these regulations, as they applied to the wood on the reserves for ordinary use in the old Province as well as in the new Territories. Then there was a question with reference to the mail service, which was very inadequate, and the improvement of the River Saskatchewan, for which we granted votes repeatedly, but which votes were never used. Then came the white settlers' grievances, in the Prince Albert settlement, as to their lands, which, as I have said, were in a large measure common to the half-breeds. I shall not go into them in detail. The papers on the Table prove abundantly the neglect, the bungling, the delay of the Government. The statement of these troubles includes, amongst other things, the fact that the land office was not opened until after two years after the agent was appointed; that the old settlers' claims were not satisfied, and patents were not given; that an enormous inconvenience was caused by the regulations in the unsurveyed Territories, an inconvenience far greater than existed in the surveyed Territories, because it

was impossible for the pioneer settler on unsurveyed land to know whether it was an odd or even lot that he was settling upon, and therefore he was left without security for his holding. By the application of the orders and regulations which, from time to time, were issued, to the cases of settlement, which had begun under other orders and regulations, a gross injustice was attempted to be done, and in respect to this much agitation ensued, until the wholesome principle was laid down in the year 1884, that each man's case should be treated as under the custom, law and regulation in force at the time when he made his settlement. There were delays in communicating the orders of the Department and consequent serious hardships, and very serious trouble arose to the settlers with regard to settlement duties performed in unsurveyed townships before entry, in which there was a typical case, affecting nearly 300 of other cases, in the instance of the man Miller, to which I shall refer briefly. There were delays in the surveys, and delays in settling a principle of action with regard to the settlers. Now, there was a special report by Mr. Russell, the Surveyor General, in 1877, and there were special reports in 1879 by Mr. Duck, who was appointed agent in August, 1878. No office, however, was opened. In 1880, 102 inhabitants of Prince Albert and Edmonton asked for patents to the old settlers. Mr. Duck was appointed to take evidence in 1881. He took the evidence; and in March, 1882, he reported. No action was taken on that report till 1884, and much agitation occurred meanwhile. There were not many of the old settlers, but they had settled on some of the choicest spots, which had afterwards become towns and village sites, and very numerous homesteads and titles were dependent on the question whether the titles of the old settlers would be recognised. In 1880, although the Government did not think fit to open an office, they appointed a registrar. In 1881 the report of the Minister of the Interior admits inconvenience, delay and reasonable complaints of the settlers, and says they have been enabled to provide a remedy by the appointment of the land board. In 1881 there is a memorial from the North-West Council; in June, a protest from Mr. Clarke and Rev. Father André, on the subject of opening the office, and at length, in August 1881, the office was ordered to be opened by the agent who had been two years on the spot without the office being opened. Difficulties at once arose as to the application of the various orders and regulations, which, from time to time, had been passed since settlers came in; and in October, 1881, a public meeting was held, declaring very emphatically the views of the settlers upon various points, and the resolutions were placed in the hands of Mr. Clarke, as I have already stated. I have given you the resolution relating to the extinguishment of the Indian title, and the other had regard to the claims of the settlers to their lands. From November, 1881, to April, 1882, there was correspondence with Mr. Clarke. In January, 1882, instructions were issued at Ottawa as to land entries, but those instructions were not sent to the Prince Albert agent till the summer of 1882; and inasmuch as they altered the condition of things, and established a new state of things, they inflicted great hardship and difficulty, as Mr. Pearce reported. On 27th March, 1882, Lieutenant Governor Dewdney pressed for early action, and pointed out that delays were complicating settlement, and enclosed a letter from Mr. Macdowall, at Prince Albert, in that sense. In the Session of 1882 and 1883 came a petition to this House, signed by 394 settlers, and in the Session 1883 came the debate upon my motion with respect to that petition, to which I will refer presently. In April, 1883, there was the report of Mr. Russell, recommending a plan of settlement. In July, 1883, it was proposed that Mr. Russell should go there; he had been ill since February previous. In October, 1883, the North-West Council memorialised the Government

to expedite the settlement of the claims at Prince Albert. In October, 1883, there was a meeting at Prince Albert, at which strong resolutions were passed. In that month the Minister himself reports :

"Settlement of this question without further delay is of the utmost importance to the settlers, and I propose the land board and Mr. Pearce shall act."

In the winter of 1883-84 there was agitation, meetings and articles in the press. On 15th January, 1884, Mr. Pearce commenced an investigation at Prince Albert, and in the course of between six and seven weeks he accomplished the whole enquiry into all these cases at Prince Albert—I speak not of St. Laurent—which had been the subject of agitation, difficulty and that hope deferred which maketh the heart sick, and the want of which enquiry had produced so much discontent and trouble. In March, 1884, having gone down to Winnipeg, he sent his report to the Minister. In April, 1884, the Minister approved that report, and directed the settlement to proceed. I am not now entering at all into the principle of the settlement; I have been dealing solely with the mode in which the business was conducted. I have brought you down to the point at which Mr. Pearce, in six weeks, dealt with all those cases, comprising more than 1,000 affidavits and many hundreds of claims; and the Minister approved the report, and ordered the settlement to proceed. Unhappily, most unhappily, St. Laurent was not embraced in the report, at that time, and the cause of that I shall have to point out later. I now advert, for an instant, to a particular type of claim, to the Miller type, not in the interest of one individual settler, but because it appears from the official reports to be typical of about 300 cases. The old settlers, before the survey, were, by law, entitled to enter and have the benefit of residence upon land as part of their homesteading period. But in 1879 the Department, unfortunately, alleged that this was against the law; they directed it should not be done. The result was, that the settlers did not enter within the three months provided after townships were open for settlement. Had they not been, in effect, deceived by this notice, they would have entered and got the benefit of their past residence. But they were only given three months, and being deceived by the notice from the Department, only five entries were made in Prince Albert and St. Laurent, instead of nearly 300. Correspondence ensued. Questions passed from Prince Albert to the Department, and back again, and it actually seemed utterly impossible to make the Department comprehend the difficulty. I wish I had time to read the letters; I hope they will be read before this debate closes, for they show how utterly impossible it was to get the Department to understand the difficulty and apply a proper remedy. It was not until four years afterwards—from 1879 up to 1883—that it was found possible to get the Department to understand the matter and apply a remedy. In fact, it was not until another visit had been made by Mr. Pearce, in 1884, that a settlement was arrived at, or no less than five years since the difficulty arose. You can perhaps, hardly understand the trouble caused by this bungling. Amongst the grievances complained of by both whites and half-breeds was the large reserves. The country was unsurveyed, and you could not, therefore, tell the odd or even sections. But in 1879 the odd sections were reserved for railway purposes; and if a man took up a section, he did not know at what price or on what terms he would be able to obtain it if it should prove an odd section. The same trouble arose in regard to Hudson Bay sections and school sections. Then there came the enormous Canadian Pacific Railway reserve. The company obtained a reserve of the odd sections in a tract of nearly 40,000,000 acres. Then there were the colonisation companies' tracts near the settlements and partly settled. Then the pretence was made that settlers on even sections must deal with the companies; and that colonisation companies had some rights in respect

Mr. BLAKE

to those sections, as to which the Government alleged, and the terms of their agreement showed, that they had no special right, and this pretence known to the Government to be set up by the colonisation companies, this effort represented to the Government that the colonisation companies were persuading the people that they must deal with them, was fostered and promoted by the Government, by the system complained of by the North-West Council and others, of appointing, for that particular purpose, whomsoever might be the agent of the colonisation company to be the Government agent. Well, he was not paid as a Government agent; he was the colonisation company's agent, but he was given double power, power as Government agent too, which, of course, helped the colonisation companies in this mode of treating settlers. Now, there were many remonstrances upon this subject. Many of the earlier remonstrances to which I have already alluded touched upon this question also, but I shall refer only to some of the later ones. In the *Saskatchewan Herald* of 3rd of July, 1881, there was an editorial upon these regulations :

"One omission in the regulations that seriously affects the pioneer is that no provision is made for those who have taken up land in advance of the survey, except in the case of parties who may settle on railway lands to the north of the line, who will be allowed to purchase a quantity not exceeding 320 acres, at \$1.25 an acre. It is admitted on all hands that to the pioneers are due the credit of proving to the world how admirably adapted our inland plains are for settlement. By their enterprise the clouds of darkness that have for many years wrapt their capabilities in gloom have been dispelled; and surely they are entitled to some consideration. Sir John A. Macdonald, in his report, as Minister of the Interior, admits 'that squatters are not, as a rule, speculators, but in the majority of instances prove industrious and valuable cultivators of the soil, and as such are entitled to receive protection.' It is gratifying to hear this admission from Sir John, and he would have won himself the goodwill of every one of the squatters, and given a great impetus to them as cultivators of the soil, if he had given effect to his views, by providing a protection to which he admits they are entitled. It is impossible to survey this vast country all at once, and it is also impossible to confine settlement within prescribed limits. One of the causes that, in some cases, operate against making extensive permanent improvements, is the fear that the settler entertains: that he finds himself on a lot reserved for some special purpose, such for instance as on a school or Hudson Bay lot. The great object to be attained is the settlement of the country, which can best be secured by the encouragement of those who lead the van in the forward march of civilisation, and this can most effectually be done by the introduction into the regulations of a clause providing that where a settler finds himself on one or the other of these lots, he should be allowed to keep it, giving to the school fund or the company an equivalent in land elsewhere. This would meet the case, and cause no embarrassment to the Department. The opinion of Sir John on the value of the squatter justified the change asked for, and its introduction would give light and force to the policy that allows the expenditure of large sums of money for the introduction of immigrants from beyond the sea."

The petition of the settlers of Prince Albert and vicinity, of 1882 and 1883, has the following clause:—

"And whereas, prior to the 9th of October, 1879, all lands in the North-West Territories, whether odd or even-numbered, were opened for purchase or homestead, and many of your petitioners took up even-numbered sections, cultivated and improved the same, with the intention of purchasing them at the then Government price, but in consequence of an Order in Council at the date last aforesaid, are prohibited from purchasing the same."

It also says:

"Some of your petitioners, prior to survey, took up claims which they cultivated and improved, and which, after survey, were found to be on sections reserved by the Government or the Hudson Bay Company, and are now threatened with ejection by the company, unless they deliver up possession thereof. Your petitioners consider that a great injustice would be done these settlers if turned off their claims without compensation."

There is also a clause as to the colonisation companies. When I brought this subject up in the House, in 1883, on the 7th of March, I said:

"It is also suggested that colonisation companies surround the district, and the agents of these companies have taken care to forbid all immigrants from going on their lands; and the result has been that many intending settlers have departed and gone across the line."

The hon. gentleman, in answer to that statement, said:

"We cannot help it if people act under the impression that colonisation companies can keep them off their tracts. Land jobbers and land speculators may tell the people: These lands belong to us; and some persons are frightened enough to buy off their claim, whether it is good

or not. We cannot help that. All I can say with reference to these colonisation companies is that there is not anything to prevent any settler going in and settling on an even-numbered lot, under the general regulations, making his entry and getting his patent at the end of three years."

But, as I have already stated, the attitude of the colonisation companies was notorious, and that attitude was encouraged and rendered effectual by the appointment of their agents as the Government agents for the tract. On the 9th of October, 1883, a memorial was forwarded to the Governor General by the North-West Council, containing this clause :

"The reservations held by the Government at Regina and Moose Jaw, and the reserve known as the Mile Belt reserve, are detrimental to growth and prosperity; large blocks of land being held by the Government, and settlers being debarred from locating upon them, paralyse the expansive force of this young country, and by bounding the railway tract, comparatively uninhabited, give the traveller a false idea of the North-West, and an inadequate and sometimes a misleading impression of the character of the soil. Your memorialists are aware, too, that many *bonâ fide* settlers, have located on lands included on these reserves, innocent of any order to the contrary, and have, in many cases, been driven from their claims, and in others have been prevented from obtaining those advantages which the inducement held out by the Government led them to expect. Your memorialists, therefore, pray that immediate action be taken to remove these barriers to the development of the country."

And they also make this declaration :

"That the system of granting immense tracts of the choicest lands of the Territories to colonisation companies is inimical to the best interests of the country. Your memorialists, therefore, pray that no more such grants be made; that the companies now holding the same be compelled to fulfil the conditions imposed on them in letter and in spirit; and that the agents of the companies be not allowed to act as the agents of the Government in any respect; that granting lands already thickly settled, as in the case of the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company, is contrary to the intention of the Land Act; that the company profits to an undue extent by the energy and forethought of the pioneers of the country, who are prevented from reaping the advantages of their own labors, in that the odd-numbered sections are locked up for speculative purposes, which would otherwise be open for settlement, or held for sale by the Government on reasonable terms. Your memorialists, therefore, pray that Your Excellency's Government will enquire into the matter and redress the above grievances."

The other day the First Minister gave, with reference to the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Company, a statement as to the settlers. The surveys of that company's tract were approved on the 25th of June, 1883, as to the bulk, on the 12th of February, 1883, and the 2nd of April, 1883, as to the remainder, and the surveyor who went on it and surveyed it reported 44 settlers on that tract, so that there were that many before it was surveyed. The Inspector of Colonisation Companies reported 49 settlers prior to the commencement of settlement by the company. This is an instance of mistaken action. At the October meeting, in 1883, at Prince Albert, a resolution was passed, endorsing the memorial of the North-West colony, asking the annulment of grants of land made to colonisation companies of lands previously settled on. On the 29th of February, 1884, a public meeting was held at Collestone's school house, Prince Albert, Mr. Macdowall, the representative of the district in the council, being present to explain his course, and the second resolution passed was this :

"That we view with alarm the action of the Government in reserving large tracts of land in this locality for the use of colonisation companies, town sites or other purposes, and desire that as soon as possible all lands in the North-West Territories shall be held for homesteads to actual settlers only."

Then there was a meeting held at Moosomin, in December, 1874, at which the following resolution was passed :—

"The principle of allowing individuals or corporations to control large tracts of land being prejudicial, advantage of any failure on the part of colonisation companies already organised to faithfully fulfil conditions, should be seized to cancel their claims."

Now, Sir, so much with reference to the general and the particular case of the Edmonton company. But I wish to give you two special instances, some facts which are within my reach. Take the case of the Qu'Appelle half-breeds, as to whom there are numerous papers brought down. On the 5th of May, 1873, there was an address presented by the

half-breeds of Qu'Appelle to Lieutenant Governor Morris, asking for protection in respect of their holdings. In 1874, when the Indian treaty was made, Mr. Laird, the Minister of Interior, and Mr. Morris, were at Qu'Appelle, and the half-breeds sent in a petition to Lieutenant Governor Morris, for the recognition of their holdings along the rivers. Lieutenant Governor Morris, under authority, assured them that their holdings would be respected, and enclosed the papers to Ottawa. In October, 1874, Father Decorby, of Qu'Appelle, wrote to the Minister of the Interior to the same effect, as to holdings on streams. At this time no Indian reserves were set apart, and no surveys had been made. In the summer of 1881 a petition was sent to the Governor General from 112 of the Qu'Appelle half-breeds, which states :

"That when Her Majesty's commissioners came here, in the autumn of 1874, to treat with the Indians of this region, they, on behalf of Her Majesty, gave a promise to your petitioners that their rights would be recognised and respected. Your petitioners, therefore, pray that the Government will be pleased to cause a survey to be made of their present holdings, similar to the old settlers' claims on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, in the Province of Manitoba, allotting to each actual settler a certain number of acres, fronting on the lakes or rivers as the case may happen, throughout the settlement, and running two miles back north or south as the case may be, with a privilege of two miles additional for hay and wood purposes."

That was acknowledged and promised to be considered on the 20th September, 1881, but no action was taken on it. On the 29th August, 1882, Governor Dewdney telegraphed to Sir John A. Macdonald from Qu'Appelle as follows :—

"Half-breed holding old claims in valley waited on me to-day and complained that Osler Land Company are warning them off, and claiming their lands. Would recommend that this company be notified not to interfere with them. Have written."

On that day a petition had been presented to Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney from these half-breeds, in these terms :

"That as far back as the year 1860 and up to 1879 we settled or squatted on land situate on the banks of the Qu'Appelle River, erected comfortable dwellings and out buildings thereon, ploughed and cultivated the soil, and by continued residence have complied with all the Government conditions.

"2. That we have erected a church and school in a central position, built and opened up roads and bridges, and made numerous improvements, which are to-day of great value to the new settlers.

"3. That the surveys lately made have discovered some of us to be on railway land now owned by the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co., whose agent has informed us that we must either buy the lands from them or move off. In fact, we are informed that they have sold some of the land at present occupied by a *bonâ fide* settler.

"4. That we have refused to comply with the request of the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co., and claim a patent from the Crown for our respective pieces of land, or quarter sections, fully believing that we are justly and legally entitled to the same.

"5. We would therefore respectfully ask Your Honor to lay our claims before the right hon. Minister of the Interior, who, we know, will do us justice in the matter, and request his earliest attention and answer."

On the 29th August, 1882, Lieutenant Governor Dewdney enclosed that petition to the Minister of the Interior, with these words :

"The declarations set forth in the petition are, to my knowledge, generally correct. I have informed the petitioners that I will duly communicate to them your answer in connection with the said petition.

"With reference to their claims, I yesterday had the honor to address a telegram to you, and the recommendation therein contained I now beg to reiterate.

"As I glean that many of the claims are somewhat conflicting, and in some instances run part on even and part on odd-numbered sections, I would respectfully suggest that either Mr. Commissioner Walsh or Mr. Inspector Pearce be instructed to examine into and adjust them on an equitable basis, and that without delay, as the half-breeds interested are very uneasy about their holdings, and may be looked upon as the pioneers of the district."

That letter was written, Sir, on the 29th of August, 1882. It was acknowledged, and was to be submitted to the Minister on his return to the Department. On 19th March, 1883, Lieutenant Governor Dewdney writes again, saying :

"Last summer I forwarded a petition from the half-breeds in reference to their claims in this district to the Department of Interior, on the occasion of a claim being made by the Qu'Appelle and Ontario Land Company to some of their land.

"There are a number of half-breeds in this district who have been settled in the Qu'Appelle valley for many years. These went on their

usual hunt for buffalo, returning to their homes at different times during each year. Others have settled since 1879, and have remained pretty constantly on their lands.

"The Dominion land surveys have demonstrated that many of them have been living on the same section, and as land became valuable a scramble was made by land speculators to obtain the right, titles and interest of those settled in the most favored locality.

"The sooner the claims of these half-breeds are determined the better, as a number of them are *bonâ fide* settlers and deserve consideration.

"These settlers have not claimed their land, as was done in some parts of the North-West, by small frontages running back some miles, although the bulk of them built their homesteads close to each other and near the water, where they could easily catch fish. They, however, consider they are entitled to as much land in area as they would have been had they taken up their claims, as had been the custom with half-breeds."

And then he states the difficulty, suggesting a plan of settlement, and suggests that if the question is left to arbitration it should be left to some independent man. Now I have told you of Mr. Dewdney's telegram of August and his letter of August, 1882, in which he requested this pressing case to be considered. Do you know when that letter was answered? It was answered on the 6th of July, 1883, ten months after the date of its receipt, and its answer was:

"I am directed by the Minister of the Interior to send you herewith the enclosed copies of the correspondence concerning the claims of certain half-breed settlers in the Qu'Appelle valley, and to request that you will, at your convenience, investigate and report upon these claims."

And the reference to Mr. Commissioner Walsh took place on that 6th of July, 1882—the letter is here. So that this pressing case, referred to by the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories, by telegram and letter, remained for ten months, although he had suggested a reference to Commissioner Walsh, without the Department possessing sufficient animation either to order the reference or to answer the letter; and it was not until the expiration of that period that the step was taken, even, of ordering the reference. Then Mr. Jackson, the member of the council for the district, on 8th December, 1883, says:

"You will pardon the liberty I now take in addressing you privately, when I tell you that it is at the urgent request of a large deputation of half-breeds that I do so. They, in common with the country, have heard of the generally satisfactory settlement of the mile belt and reserve question,—"

You know, the satisfactory settlement was, that the wrong was undone, as far as it could be, after a while—

"and urge perhaps with reason, that if their own grievances, upon which the Government have been repeatedly petitioned and memorialised, were brought personally to your notice, some immediate action would be taken. Under any circumstances, there would not be very many to deal with, and the settlement of their claims need not be a troublesome one; but there are half-breeds in the Territories who have never received anything from the Government, and who, it has been admitted, are entitled to some consideration."

On 13th March, 1884, after a more reasonable interval of delay—only three months this time—Mr. Hall, the secretary, informed Mr. Jackson that the letter was duly received, and he says:

"The Minister has himself been very anxious to have this question settled, and on the 18th September last Mr. A. Walsh, commissioner of Dominion lands at Winnipeg, was instructed to visit this locality, and make an investigation into the claims of these half-breeds, and other matters. Owing, however, to an unusual pressure of business, Mr. Walsh has so far been unable to visit this locality, but he has again been written to and requested to make this investigation at the earliest possible opportunity."

Now, Sir, so far as I can ascertain, these claims were only settled under the pressure of the rebellion in April, 1885, because the very principle of the decision is that which was discussed by telegram and letter between Mr. Street and Mr. Macpherson, after Mr. Street has reached Winnipeg. The questions how much should be given to them on the water, and on what terms they should have the lands outside, were only settled in April, 1885. There is a combined instance of neglect to settle old claims, and trouble arising out of the reserves. And may I be permitted to enquire if these delays took place when the Minister was so very anxious, what would have been the case if he had not possessed such a

Mr. BLAKE.

tender interest? Then, I turn to the case of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company. That company's tract of land is in the immediate vicinity of these troubles. And the facts, so far as I have been able to gather them, are briefly these: In 1882 Mr. J. White, M.P., East Hastings, and Mr. J. C. Jamieson, of the Belleville *Intelligencer*, procured the passage of an Order in Council in favor of the projected company, and an agreement for some very choice lands. That agreement was made in June, 1882, and it was intended and provided by the charter of the company that they should also deal in lumber limits and coal lands. It was arranged, on the formation of the company, that the profits should be divided into twelve shares, or parts, of which two were to be what are called, in the parlance of these jobbers, "blind." The shareholders, other than White and Jamieson, were to advance the needed money, and White and Jamieson were to receive each one-twelfth of the net profits, without making any advance or incurring any risk. This agreement, by which they were to receive one-twelfth part of the profits, was in consideration of the fact that they had procured the Order in Council and forwarded the company's interests; and in virtue of the agreement, that they were to continue to assist and promote the interests of the company. It was a versatile company, not confining itself to its specific line, but intending to dabble in timber limits and coal lands as well. The hon. the Minister of Customs knew all about this arrangement. The company found that another river township would be valuable, and these gentlemen, in 1883, applied for an exchange, and obtained an Order in Council in the fall of 1883, whereby they got township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian in exchange for township 43 in the same range. That was a township on the Saskatchewan of extraordinary value. Mr. Jamieson was secretary of the company at \$600 a year; the other shareholders advanced all the money necessary to pay to the Government its 20,000 odd dollars. The land grant was not surveyed at the date of the original application, and with the exception of township 45, which I have just mentioned, a survey of which was approved in December, 1882, no surveys were approved before the fall of 1883. The First Minister gave the dates of the approvals as follow:

Tp. 45a, R. 26, w. 2nd Mer., surveyed	season '83;	approved	18th Sept., '83
" 46a " 26 "	" "	May, '83	" 19th April, '84
" 45a " 27 "	" "	season '83	" 18th Sept., '83
" 45 " 27 "	" "	" '82	" 22nd Dec., '82
" 41 " 28 "	" "	Feb. '83	" 18th July, '83
" 45a " 28 "	" "	March, '83	" 15th Nov., '83
" 43 " 28 "	" "	season '83;	not approved.

The inspector of colonisation companies reported twenty-nine settlers on the tract, and I believe he reported also a church site on it. The company never did anything that I have been able to find out; the bulk of the twenty-nine settlers went in on township 45, range 27, west 2nd meridian, which is the river township to which I have referred. Its name is the parish of St. Louis de Langevin. Who is its patron saint? I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will consider of its case. A church and a mission were established here, and the names of most of the settlers on the tract will be found on some of the petitions which I will have presently to read to the House, and on some still more melancholy lists afterwards. The company found the settlers there, and the settlers who hold these river lots held the key of the position. The company asked the Government, during the Session of 1884, to give them possession or to exchange for other vacant land, or to refund the money; but the Minister refused, saying the matter was in the company's hands, as they had the right and title to the land and could eject. In 1884, about the end of February, the company applied again for relief; they wanted their money back; the Minister refused, telling them they had the right and title to eject. They declined to eject, saying it would raise a rebellion, and the matter became more unsettled than ever. The agreement with

the company and its title prevented the settlement by the Government of several claims of settlers on the tract, and amongst them are to be found several of the insurgents who fought in the different fights in the neighborhood of Batoche. Some of the settlers were in before 1880, some in 1881, some in 1882, and others in 1883 and 1884. This tract passes just behind that range of country which takes in Gabriel's Crossing, Batoche and St. Laurent. To the northward of that range the river takes a great curve, and this tract of territory, running just behind the river range, strikes the river to the northward, where is St. Louis de Langevin, and as far as I can judge from the map, it was across a portion of this company's tract that the march was made into Batoche, and it was over its lands that the fighting began and the guns were fired. According to Mr. Stephenson's report of last year, it is a very fine property indeed; the soil is choice, and its proximity to the river gives it peculiar advantages. So fine a property should never have been granted, and never would, I suppose, but for the special circumstances to which I have referred. Nor is this the only case in which grants were made on like conditions and understandings; for if you take the Shell River Colonisation Company, I believe you can find repeated there the earlier part of the history I have just given. Now, I turn to the question specially of the claims of the half-breeds to their holdings, and the claims, both of the whites and half-breeds, in respect of surveys, the claims particularly for river lot surveys and special surveys; and I must say the series of papers is so very defective that I counted myself about 30 palpable omissions in this series, but from what information we have can be gathered certain results that are tolerably plain. So long ago as June, 1873, it appears there was an interview on the part of Bishop Grandin with the First Minister and the Minister of Public Works; and in September, 1873, a letter was written by the bishop, following that interview, to the Governor General, an important letter, as I judge from the subsequent references; but I cannot say more of it than that, because, unfortunately, it is not brought down. The reply to that letter was through the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, and that reply is not brought down. In June, 1874, Governor Morris encloses a statement of Mr. McKay, as to affairs in Prince Albert. In 1875 Bishop Grandin writes a long letter to the Minister of the Interior, in which he refers to the uneasiness of the half-breed people, their suspicion of the Government, and his efforts to disabuse their minds of the idea of leaving the country. In July, 1875, the Hon. Mr. Laird replied very fully to that letter. He referred to the experted legislation under the Territories Acts of 1874, and to the desire of the Government to deal justly by the people. In January, 1876, Bishop Grandin replied, stating the uneasiness and distrust had disappeared, and the Métis were settling down in the North-West Territories and had abandoned the plan a great many of them had formed of going across the lines. Major Walker writes, on the 29th of December, 1876, to Governor Laird, from Carlton, that many disputes about lands in and near Prince Albert had arisen, that a survey was necessary, and he recommended strongly a survey of St. Albert and St. Laurent, which are in the same position. This would save disputes and ill-feeling. In February, 1877, Governor Laird transmits that letter, saying the subject was one affecting the prosperity of the settlement, and hoping the labors of the special survey will be continued and points fixed. He adds that where settlements are along the bank of rivers, it is proper to adapt the surveys to the country, giving an average of ten to twenty chains frontage, the lots running back 160 acres, and that where settlements are along the river, the system of survey on Red and Assiniboine will have to be conceded.

He suggests that settlers should be allowed their frontages with depth enough to make 160 acres; that settlers before transfer should not be obliged to wait three years under Homestead Act, and that Battleford should be surveyed. The Surveyor General, in March 1877, reports on this letter as follows: 1st. The special survey is to be extended to the settlements on the Saskatchewan that season. 2nd. Where settlements are on rivers, it is proposed to adapt the survey to the locality, giving an average, where practicable, of ten or twenty chains frontage, lots running back 160 acres. 3rd. Relief should be given to old settlers, as to their patents, and legislation is needed for that purpose; and Battleford is to be surveyed next year. On the 26th March, 1877, Mr. Mills, Minister of Interior, writes to Governor Laird enclosing that report and endorsing its suggestions. About the beginning of 1878 there is a petition from 151 inhabitants of Prince Albert, stating that the settlement is growing, that land disputes are arising, and surveys are wanted; and, as to the river settlement, requesting a narrow frontage and a depth of two miles the same privilege as given to old settlers in Manitoba. In January, 1878, another petition was sent from Prince Albert for surveys; and, of course, I need hardly say that many of these claims were common to whites and half-breeds. It may be convenient here to point out that there were different plans of survey: first, the general plan; second, the special settlement and town site plan; and third, the river front plan, on the general system applicable to the locality, which was, as you will see, ten chains front by eighty chains in depth. On the 1st February, 1878, there was a public meeting of the settlers of St. Laurent, at which Gabriel Dumont was president and Alexander Fisher secretary, and amongst the resolutions presented in form of a petition was this one:

"That it is of urgent consequence that the Government should cause to be surveyed, with the least possible delay, the lands occupied and cultivated by the Métis and the other old settlers, and that the said lands should be granted to them."

They also asked for implements and seed grain, giving reasons for their poverty. On the 13th February, 1878, Governor Laird transmits this petition, saying:

"It is important that the land policy of the Government towards old settlers and others living for many years in the Territory should be declared. It appears to me that they have a claim to some more speedy means of acquiring a title for settlement purposes than the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act. To prevent disputes between neighbors, it is highly desirable that the survey of lands settled upon along the principal rivers should be prosecuted with all convenient speed."

On the 13th March, 1878, these papers were referred to the Surveyor General for his report, and he reported thus:

"That it is intended that the several subjects affecting Dominion lands alluded to shall be discussed during Mr. L. Russell's visit to the Saskatchewan in the course of the ensuing season, the result of the discussion to be reported by Mr. Russell, with a view to legislation or other action."

And on the 18th March, 1878, the Minister of the Interior replied to Governor Laird:

"The propriety of passing an Act to secure for the half-breeds some more speedy means of acquiring a title for settlement purposes than under the provisions of the present homestead and Dominion lands law has for some time engaged my attention. As regards the application of the petitioners for an early survey of the settled lands along the principal rivers, I have to request you to inform the petitioners that the survey of such lands has already been carried out, to some extent, and will be prosecuted as rapidly as the funds at the disposal of the Department will permit."

In March, 1878, there was a petition of French Canadians and half-breeds of St. Albert, referring to the petition of St. Laurent, and alleging:

"That it is of the greatest importance that the Government cause to be surveyed, with as little delay as possible, the lands occupied and cultivated by the half-breeds or old residents of the country, and that patents for the said lands be granted to them."

That was transmitted on the 10th April by Mr. Laird, and during the seasons of 1877 and 1878 special surveys were made of Prince Albert and at St. Laurent. The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 25th August, 1878, contains this statement :

"Mr. Montague Aldous and Mr. J. L. Reid are engaged in surveying the old settlement belt. They take, as a starting point, the front corner post, agreed upon by the owners of the respective claims as being their boundary, from which a line is run north and south, giving each farm an average depth of two miles, with whatever frontage was originally claimed."

There is a report from Mr. Russell, which is not brought down, but which is frequently alluded to, in the year 1877, and which, from the allusions made to it, obviously contained detailed statements of the condition of the settlers of Prince Albert, and possibly of St. Laurent. There is also a detailed report of Mr. Aldous for 1878, which is not brought down, but is alluded to as if it contained such information. That was the condition of things in 1878, that the survey of the special settlement has been gone through, and the papers show that the survey of St. Laurent—not, of course, the whole neighborhood of St. Laurent, but of St. Laurent parish—the special survey—was approved by the Government in March, 1879, obviously, therefore, having been completed during the season of 1878. On the 30th November, 1878, land agent Duck writes to the Interior Department as to the Prince Albert settlement survey :

"I ask advice as to the amount of river frontage allowed individual settlers: that is, can I allow a settler to homestead and preempt two quarter sections, both having a river frontage?"

He goes on to say there are a large number of settlers anxious to make the necessary entries to secure themselves. The Department replied, on the 14th January, 1879 :

"The rule with respect to river front lots is that they are ten chains in width; one of these can be taken as a homestead claim and another as a preemption by the same person. In surveying the townships fronting on the Saskatchewan, all river lots will be posted in ten chains widths, with a depth back from the river of two miles. The departure from this rule that has been made in the case of the holdings of older settlers in Prince Albert and other places was made in view that the intention of the Government so to lay out the lands on the river had not been made generally known previous to their occupation. But, in the present and all future time, people are to understand that no one can hold, in any manner, more land on the river than I have above indicated, that is to say, twenty chains as homestead and preemption."

I wish you to mark this statement, given for the information of the people as to the general plan which was adopted with reference to the river lots. It was that each lot should be 10 chains by 80 chains, and that no one in future time could hold more than 10 chains as a homestead and 10 chains as a preemption :

"A petition was given me to lay before the Minister of this Department, from certain settlers eastward of the main Prince Albert settlement, to be permitted to retain their lands with the half mile width of frontage, in which manner they had taken up and occupied them. I have not yet succeeded in having this granted, although I have favorably recommended it, in view of the reason before stated, that in taking up the lands they did so in accordance with the published regulations of the Dominion Lands Act, setting forth the system of their survey. Should any enquiry be made of you by the parties interested, you may inform them that the matter is still in abeyance."

You will observe that we get no more information about that particular petition, but it is a petition of persons who had taken up their lots according to the general law, according to the quarter-section principle; and they said: Let us have them; but at that time the Government had a settled policy as to granting only river lots on rivers, and although the officer thought they ought to have them, having taken them up before the notice was given, he had been unable to obtain that concession for them; but the general principle is perfectly clearly stated. In the Dominion Lands Act of 1879, the 16th section, after declaring: "That nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the lands upon the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, surrendered by the Indians to the late Earl of Selkirk," from being surveyed, and so on, proceeds :

Mr. BLAKE.

"Or to prevent fractional sections or lands bordering on any river, lake or other watercourse, from being divided, or such lands from being laid out in lots of any certain frontage or depth, in such manner as may be desirable, or to prevent the sub-division of sections, or other legal sub-divisions, into wood lots, or from describing the said lands upon the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, or such sub-divisions of fractional sections or other lots, or wood lots, for patents, by numbers answering to a plan of record, or by metes and bounds, or by both, as may seem expedient."

So that that principle which I have read you as laid down by the Department was expressly authorised by the Dominion Lands Act, which created an exception in the case of lands bordering on rivers, giving to the Department power to survey them as might be deemed advisable. In 1879 Mr. W. F. King, who was in charge of a special survey, reports that he began work on the 19th June, and then he says :

"Having received no instructions on winter work, I left Lac la Biche on the 8th October."

The *Saskatchewan Herald* of the 3rd November, 1879, thus observes in regard to this :

"Mr. W. F. King, of the special survey, lately passed east on his way to Ottawa. It seems wasteful and injudicious, in view of the rapid extension of settlements westward and the urgent necessity that exists for laying out Indian reserves, to keep surveyors tramping up and down from Ottawa half across the continent every year, causing the loss of the best working part of the season. There are many kinds of work that could, at a very trifling expense, be done as well in winter as in summer. In coming from Ottawa to Edmonton district, a party just gets nicely settled to work when it is time to start home. Supplies cannot be furnished here cheaper than they can be freighted out by the Government."

On the 5th July, 1880, the *Saskatchewan Herald* further observes, on the mode of conducting the surveys :

"If no party can be despatched from Ottawa this season in time to do the work, it might be entrusted to some of the special survey staff who will be wintering in the country. Every consideration of progress favors the encouragement of settlement to that point elected by the people; but when the impulse of the people agrees with the plans of the Government, it is difficult to find a reason why the neighborhood should not be surveyed at the earliest possible moment."

About this time, in the year 1880, certain inhabitants of Prince Albert petitioned, and in their petition they asked :

"The same consideration as is extended to settlers on river lots in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and to other settlers on the Saskatchewan; saying that some have improved in 1874, some in 1879, and some in the present year; and asking for a speedy survey of 2 chains front and 80 chains depth, as others hereabouts."

On the 27th September, 1880, the *Saskatchewan Herald* says :

"The Government has ordered the survey of a quantity of land in the Carrot River country, so as to have it ready for the expected emigration next year. It is wise policy to afford every facility to incoming settlers at the points on which public attention is centreing; and the principle might be advantageously extended so as to take in those settlements in the west whose chief drawback is that they are not surveyed, and where, for that reason, extensive and permanent improvements are kept back. The land at Prince Albert, St. Laurent, Carlton and Duck Lake has been surveyed for some years; much has been taken up by settlers squatting upon it; yet the land office at Prince Albert has not been opened for the receipt of applications for homesteads, to the great detriment of these settlements. The survey of the town site of Battleford, and of a few townships around it and Edmonton, would contribute, in no small degree, to the benefit of the country at large, by providing on the spot much of the supplies required for the Mounted Police and the Indians."

On the 15th September, 1880, the *Saskatchewan Herald* contains a description of the handsome shop just finished by Batoche, at Batoche's ferry, and it states that :

"Crops at Duck Lake are generally of the most satisfactory character and the settlement is progressing rapidly. Most of the lots are taken up. Great inconvenience and no small amount of unpleasantness among neighbors are due to the impossibility of making the homestead entries, although the land has been surveyed for some years. Steam grist and saw mill, and steam threshing mill, just brought in."

Now, Sir, I would like, had I the time and strength, here to tell you the story of the Battleford surveys. It is really a most interesting episode, for it indicates the character of the dealings of the Department; but I pass it by, and proceed to deal with the question of the half-breeds at Duck Lake and vicinity. In June, 1881, a petition was presented

by Rev. Father André to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which is as follows:—

"In presenting this petition to your hon. body, allow me to observe that I came to Battleford, urged not only by my own grievance, but by the entreaties of the half-breed population about Duck Lake and St. Laurent, and they joined their earnest prayers to mine to call your special attention to the unsatisfactory state of the land question in the country. Disputes and difficulties are continually arising touching the limits and rights of property of landholders in the country, and there is no proper authority to settle these questions, however, conducive to the peace and tranquillity of the country. The land has almost entirely been surveyed in the electoral district of Lorne for now over two years, and a land office has been in existence in Prince Albert for nearly four years; but as the land agent is not authorised to enter claims or to issue patents, the settlers have no way to secure the lands they hold in possession, and which they have improved through considerable expense and exertion."

Then there is a reference to the judicial difficulties. He goes on:

"I beg your indulgence to be obliged to make you acquainted with a grievance of mine which, however, may give you an idea of the state of things calling for a prompt remedy. I hold at Duck Lake a tract of land of about twenty acres, of which I have been in peaceful possession for two years. The land was fenced in and cost me a great deal of money, and was always respected as the Catholic mission's property at that lake. I was one of the first settlers at that place, and through my exertions the settlement increased rapidly, and nobody ever troubled me in my lawful possession of that land, until last March, when a man by the name of J. Kelly jumped my claim, and notwithstanding my protestations, claimed the land as his own, and took the frame of a house upon it, depriving me, in that manner, of half my property. And this is not the only occurrence of the kind at that lake."

"As your honourable body is now assembled at Battleford to legislate upon such measures as will, in your prudence and wisdom, be more suitable to promote the good and welfare of this country, allow me to call upon you to use all your influence and authority to draw the attention of the Government, at Ottawa upon this state of things, and to urge upon them the necessity of taking such prompt measure as will relieve the people of the burden of this grievance, because if not promptly attended to, things may become grave and serious. Wishing the best success to your good will to promote the welfare of the country, and so forth."

At the same time there was a petition from Mr. Clarke from Prince Albert, 1881, asking for the opening of the land office. On the 14th of June the Lieutenant Governor transmits these two petitions, and uses this language:

"Apart from the representations in the memorials in question, I am aware that serious disputes are arising in the Prince Albert, St. Laurent and Duck Lake settlements, regarding claims to land, and I would therefore respectfully urge that in so far as it may be consistent with the policy of the Dominion Government the prayer of the memorials may receive early consideration."

At last, upon the pressure of these memorials, after an interval of two years after the appointment of an agent and more than two years after a portion of the survey, the office was ordered to be opened, and in August, 1881, it was opened. On the 11th March, 1882, Mr. Duck, the land agent, writes:

"Sir,—As the majority of the settlers on the south branch of the River Saskatchewan, in the vicinity of the parish of St. Laurent, have taken up their lands previous to the survey, with narrow frontages, similar to those river claims in other parts of this district, and in view of the difficulty likely to be experienced in this office in adjusting the boundaries of these claims in accordance with the sectional survey, I have at the request of several of the settlers so situated, the honor to request information as to the possibility of re-surveying these sections into river lots on a similar plan to that adopted on the Prince Albert settlement, none of these claims having as yet been entered in this office."

Now, then, the office was opened, as I have said, in August, 1881. No claims had been entered in March, 1882, and the settlers brought forward this request. I have shown you the policy of the Government, as stated in 1879, with reference to river lots on the Saskatchewan. A section survey was made of part of the St. Laurent settlement—I do not speak of the special survey on the river in the neighborhood of St. Laurent; settlers had taken their lots, according to the recognised custom, in the narrow frontages, but without survey at all, and they called for a survey according to the old custom and the system which had been recognised in 1879. Now, Sir, it took seven months and a-half to answer that letter. On the 21st of October, 1882, the secretary writes acknowledging the receipt of the letter of the 11th March previous, and says:

"I have to inform you that it is not the intention of the Government to cause any re-surveys to be made. Of course, any sub-division differing from the regular survey which they may desire they can procure for themselves, when the lands come into their possession. You will please, therefore, communicate this decision to the persons interested."

I need hardly say that the lands might never come into their possession according to that plan, because, as the surveys were township surveys, disregarding the river altogether, it was, in no case, possible to know the numbers, or to adjust the frontages, depths, or improvements, and the rear lots might be taken up by other persons. On the 4th September, 1882, a petition was forwarded from St. Antoine de Padoue to Sir John A. Macdonald, Minister of the Interior, which contained signatures of persons, of whom the great bulk were subsequently insurgents. St. Antoine de Padoue is a parish south of St. Laurent, and the church is at Batoche, which is mentioned as having been shelled in the engagement. The petition, which is in French, is as follows, being translated into English:

"ST. ANTOINE DE PADOUE,

"SOUTH BRANCH OF THE SASKATCHEWAN,

"4th September, 1884.

"To the Right Honorable Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,  
"Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

"Sir,—We, the undersigned French half-breeds, for the most part, settled on the Saskatchewan, in the district of Prince Albert, North-West Territory, approach your honorable person in this petition to expose with confidence the difficult position in which we find ourselves, with regard to the lands which we occupy in that portion of the Territory. We call the attention of the Government upon this matter, which preoccupies us greatly:

"Obliged, most of us, to abandon the prairies, which no longer can furnish us with means of living, we have come in great numbers during the course of the summer, and settled along the south branch of the Saskatchewan. Being satisfied with the soil and the country, we have gone actively to work to clear the land, with the hope of sowing next spring, and, in the meantime, to build up houses for the winter, which will soon be at hand. The surveyed lands being already occupied or sold, we were forced to occupy lands which are not yet surveyed, besides being ignorant, for the greatest part, of the rules and the regulations of the Government regarding the Dominion lands. What was not, therefore, our astonishment and anxiety when we were told that once the land is surveyed we shall be obliged to pay two dollars per acre to the Government, if our lands are comprised in the odd-numbered sections. Desirous, moreover, of living together, so as to be able to obtain more easily a school-house and a church, we are, Monsieur the Minister, poor people, who have not the means of paying the price of those lands without being totally ruined, if we lose result of our labors by allowing them to pass into the hands of strangers, who shall go to the land office at Prince Albert and pay the price stipulated by the Government."

"In our anxiety, we appeal to your spirit of justice as Minister of the Interior and leader of the Government and we implore you to at once reassure us by giving orders so that we shall not be troubled on our lands, and that the Government will grant us the privilege of considering us as occupants of even sections, since we occupy those lands in good faith; and having occupied this country since such a long time as masters, and having so often defended it against the Indians at the price of our blood, we think that it is not asking too much that the Government give us the right of occupying peacefully our lands, and that it should make some exceptions to its regulations, by granting gratuitously lands to the North West half-breeds. We further desire that Government should give orders to have the lands surveyed along the river ten chains wide by two miles long: it is the old custom of this country to distribute land in this manner, and thus it would enable us to recognise the limits of our respective lands."

Monsieur the Minister; we hope that you will favorably receive this petition which we send you, and that we shall know your decision as soon as possible. This is our anxious wish, while praying the Almighty to protect you and to keep you at the head of this great country of Canada, which you govern with so much wisdom.

"We have the honor to remain, Monsieur the Minister, your humble petitioners:—Gabriel Dumont (wounded); Baptiste Rochlot (prisoner); Patrice Touron (prisoner); Calixte Touron (killed); François Touron (prisoner); Joseph Vandale (killed); Joseph Delorme (killed); Baptiste Vandale (prisoner); Adolphe Nolin (prisoner); Ignace Poitras (prisoner); Maxime Poitras (prisoner); Emmanuel Champagne (prisoner) and others.

#### NEW MEMBER.

Mr. Walter Shanly, member elect for the electoral district of South Grenville, was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Hickey, and took his seat.

## NORTH-WEST TROUBLES.

Mr. BLAKE. That letter was not so long unanswered. On the 13th October, 1882, it is acknowledged by the Deputy Minister of the Interior, addressed to Mr. Charles Nolin, St. Antoine de Padoue, south branch of the Saskatchewan, as follows:—

"In reply, I am directed to request you to inform the petitioners that when the proper time arrives the case of each *bona fide* settler will be dealt with on its own merits; but as regards the surveying of the land in question, that all lands in the North-West Territories will be surveyed according to the system now in force."

So you will observe, Sir, that so far as regards their difficulty with respect to the odd lots, no redress is suggested, and as regards surveys, they are told that the section survey is to be the only survey for them. On the 16th January, 1883, Rev. Father André, Superior of St. Laurent, North-West Territories, wrote to the Minister of the Interior, Sir John A. Macdonald, as follows:—

"I write you for the purpose of calling your attention to the painfully embarrassing position in which the French half-breeds settled on the southerly banks of the Saskatchewan are placed.

"According to an old custom in Manitoba, they took up their lots 10 chains wide in front, by two miles in depth, trusting that the Government, acting on the rule already established, would survey these lands into lots 10 chains in width by two miles in depth. Their surprise may be imagined when they saw the land along the Saskatchewan measured off into squares of 40 chains, without heed being given to their just claims and protests. What is the result of this abnormal division? Our half-breeds are overwhelmed with difficulties on account of their lands, and this proceeding will now sow discord among our people and will render the Government odious in their eyes, considering it as guilty of a gross injustice towards them. This survey lamentably mixes things. Some lose their lands, which are being grabbed by their neighbors, others see the fruits of their industry and their improvements dissipated. This unhappy state of things could be easily made to cease, by giving ear to their just claims; and how can this be refused them when you granted a similar favor to Prince Albert. All the lands along the branches of the Saskatchewan have been surveyed in this manner. Every body was satisfied, and not the least complaint was heard about the survey. I cannot understand, Sir, why your surveyors should have two different methods of parcelling the public domain—one for Prince Albert, 10 chains in width by 2 miles in length, which we approve, and which we claim as a right, seeing you have granted it for Prince Albert—the other of blocking out the lands in squares of 40 chains, without taking the river or the location of the settlers into consideration. The latter method we protest solemnly against, all of us, and humbly pray, Sir, that you order a new survey, and thus validate our request. Already the people of this colony have addressed to you a petition on this subject, but the answer given under your directions is not one calculated to inspire them with the hope that you would right the wrong of what they complain. Knowing the difficult situation in which our people are placed, I have resolved to make another effort, which I trust will bring happy results, and I dare to hope that you will accede to their just requests, and no later than next summer order a new survey of the lands on the south branch of the Saskatchewan. By your kind concurrence in this matter you will do an act of justice to our people, and render them a service for which they will ever be thankful."

No acknowledgement of or answer to that letter is brought down. The petition of the settlers of Prince Albert of 1882-83 contains the following:—

"And whereas a great number of immigrants, not only from the older Provinces of the Dominion, but from Great Britain as well, came to this section of the country during last spring and summer, with the intention of taking up homesteads, but in consequence of the small tract of country that has been surveyed, all of which has been taken up, they went away."

The petition continues:

"We would urge on your hon. House the importance of having a portion of the wood lands lying to the north of the north branch of the Saskatchewan, and opposite Prince Albert, surveyed into wood lots, so that your petitioners and other settlers may receive at your hands their just allotment, as these lands are being rapidly depleted by those who are not actual settlers, and who have not the welfare of this country at heart."

I pointed out, in my speech on the motion for papers:

"There are about 3,000 farmers in this settlement, and there is said—although the district contains a good deal of good land—to be considerable poor land; and there being only a small amount of land surveyed and properly certified at the Department, it was found impossible to locate upon lands with any certain knowledge of whether they were within odd or even-numbered sections."

Mr. BLAKE.

The First Minister, in answering me, on that occasion, said:

"Similar complaints are made in every new settlement by persons who are anxious to have the country opened to them and surveyed, and patents granted. No matter whether it is in an outlying district, or in the vicinity of more settled parts, they are anxious to have all the advantages of an old, well organised, well settled country. One reason of the delays at Prince Albert has been alluded to by my hon. friend, that is the nature of the surveys. The settlers are scattered along the North Saskatchewan for a great distance. Some of them have complained that they should have long, narrow strips of land, running back three or four miles into the country, such as we were obliged to grant to the settlers along the Red River and Assiniboine River, for the purpose of settling all the disputes that existed in that country. It is not proposed in any way to carry out the same system in Prince Albert. The general system of survey in the North-West has been applied to the Prince Albert district, and, of course, the lines as run will not in every distance form the boundaries of the different sections or quarter-sections which the settlers have taken up, without reference to any survey whatever. But no persons have been removed or ousted. There must be a system of give and take. The survey there has been going on, and the proper officer has been sent there for the purpose of confirming settlers who have *bona fide* claims according to law. Many cases must arise of settlers going in and taking up fancy spots; and some system must be arranged by which the system of survey shall be adhered to, and the settlers substantially protected at the same time."

Then, with reference to the question of delays in the surveys, the hon. gentleman also stated:

"The Department cannot pretend to survey at once, at the call of a body of settlers, who go and settle wherever they please in the outlying districts of that vast country, whenever called upon or where people want their farms marked out. The returns laid before Parliament during the past three years show how very active the Surveyor General's branch of the Department of the Interior has been in laying out townships. Some three or four hundred townships have been laid out during the past year. Every Dominion surveyor who has passed the examination and can be got, we are only too glad to employ and send up to the North-West. Of course, the first surveys were made in the vicinity of the Red River, and extended westward, and the main force of the surveyors has been employed on the line of the Pacific Railway westward. But surveys have been going on at the same time in other portions of the country—at Prince Albert, at Edmonton, and at other points, and along the boundary south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government intend to ask Parliament to give them a large grant for surveying next season. With the increasing number of applications from surveyors, and increasing experience, we hope that the present year will show a very much larger reach of country surveyed than has been covered in any previous year. I hope that perhaps five or six hundred townships will be under survey during the year 1883. If we have a favorable season for the purpose, we expect to be able to cover that quantity of ground. Last year and the year before, the weather in the spring of the year was adverse, and in some portions of the country to be surveyed it was found impossible for the surveyors to get in until well on in the summer. We hope those were abnormal conditions. We have a large staff, and with a long summer we ought to be able this year to cover a great quantity of ground. There will be no objection to the granting of this motion."

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman seemed to treat the case of these people as if it were a new and a remote settlement. But it was one of the oldest settlements of the Territories. The people had gone in early; more people were going in year by year; they were exposed to great hardship and disappointment, and special encouragement should have been given to them, instead of engaging in the mad race of surveying so many millions of acres, upon which a single settler has not yet gone. I admit that great attention should be given to opening up the country for settlement, but I say a little more attention should have been given to enabling those to get on who are actually in. Now, Sir, in the same years of 1882 and 1883, there was going on that trouble which commenced in the fall of 1882, with reference to St. Albert and Edmonton and Saskatchewan, that to which I already alluded on the subject of surveys. On this question, important as it is, nothing at all has been brought down; but from other sources I have been able to gather some unofficial information, which will not be uninteresting to the House, and will throw some light upon the question. In October, 1882, some surveyors sent out by the Government were already engaged in the surveys at St. Albert, on Sturgeon River, a tributary of the Saskatchewan, and on the Saskatchewan. For the more perfect understanding of the facts, they applied for the assistance of the missionary

in charge of the place, to give notice to the people of Prince Albert that they did not wish to imply, by adopting the general system of survey, that the rights of the settlers to a subsequent special survey would not be recognised. They said, through him, that the people need not be annoyed at seeing them drawing lines from north and south and east to west through their lands and properties. According to them, it was a simple matter of form, and the means of continuing more easily the survey, by way of townships, once out of the settlement; and after they were gone a special surveyor, then employed at Edmonton, would come to St. Albert to make the special survey. Some weeks later that surveyor commenced his work. The people were contented; things were going for the best, when there arrived from Ottawa an order to cease the work, with a notice to the settlers of St. Albert that they must be satisfied with the general survey. No such order or notice has been brought down. This unjust order was no sooner known than the discontent of the settlers was at its height. Who would uphold their rights? Who would prevent the ruin of the settlement? Their thoughts went, naturally, towards the mission. His Lordship the Bishop being absent, the missionary at once despatched a messenger to Edmonton, with the following despatch to the telegraph office:—

“To His Lordship Bishop Grandin, Ottawa,

“Survey by township impossible for St. Albert. It will ruin the settlement. General discontent. See immediately the Minister of the Interior.”

Here I may observe that we have no information brought down to us as to the time when, and the circumstances under which, the Government altered that policy which I have pointed out as to the surveys of these lands. Unfortunately, the telegraphic line was out of order; the despatch was nearly 15 days before reaching its destination, and under these circumstances it was thought well that the situation should be made known, and the following notice was sent to the journal of the locality:—

“The colony of St. Albert is to-day in a state of real excitement, and is very discontented at the unjust manner in which it seems to be treated. The inhabitants of this colony have occupied their lands many years already, and most of them even before the annexation of these Territories to Canada. St. Albert was founded in 1860 by the Catholic mission, which immediately gathered around itself a considerable number of inhabitants. To-day about two hundred families are established on both sides of the Sturgeon River, in a radius of six or eight miles to the east, and six miles to the west. These families are mostly half-breeds, born and brought up in that country, which is certainly theirs by every title; they have incontestable rights to the land, rights which have been conceded by the Manitoba Act. New settlers amongst us have bought lands occupied long before the annexation to Canada. We certainly form the most ancient, and, up to the present time, the most numerous colony of the district, and now they seem to act as if we did not exist. They try to treat us as they tried to treat the people of Manitoba before the troubles of 1870. They will not recognise our right to have a river survey; we must content ourselves, they say, with a township survey. Such an arrangement is at once unjust and absurd, for it would be the ruin of the colony. There is not one of the old settlers who would not witness the partial or total loss of his labors or his improvements; in many cases two, three or four families would find themselves on the same half or the same quarter-section, since, in the system of survey, they wish to impose upon us, the river does not form a limit. Our population is peaceful, calm and submissive; but if it were the victim of such an injustice, if the inhabitants were to be treated as a conquered people, if they were not to receive, in the name of justice, what has been granted to Edmonton, Prince Albert and in the Province of Manitoba, they would protest and would submit only to open force.

“In the name and in the interest of the population of St. Albert.

“H. LEDUC, Priest.”

“Two or three weeks elapsed while they were waiting for a despatch from Ottawa. Finally, doubting as to whether the despatch had been transmitted to Bishop Grandin at the capital, doubting still more whether justice would be obtained from the Minister of the Interior, fearing matters would go from bad to worse, the inhabitants of the country resolved to hold a public meeting in the schoolhouse at St. Albert, on Monday, the 8th January. At the day and hour fixed, all the male population of the colony gathered at the appointed place. Everybody appeared, much excited and discontented, and the topic of all conversations was the survey of lands, the injustice that the Government was about to perpetrate, in refusing to acknowledge the rights of the settlers, the hardships, the fatigues, the difficulties sustained by them

in clearing, cultivating and improving their lands, etc. Some spoke of nothing less than imitating the conduct of the Manitoba half-breeds in 1870, and repelling the injustice by arms. Under these circumstances, Father Lestanc providentially arrived from Battleford, at St. Albert. When the population was assembled in the school-house, the object of the meeting was announced. The necessity of doing nothing that might compromise the cause of the colony was pointed out, but at the same time the urgency of taking every legal means to enlighten the Government on the situation and the injustice with which they were threatened. The meeting appointed a president, and Father Lestanc was called to the office of secretary. The discussion became lively at once; each one pleaded for his rights, expressed his cause of complaints and of discontent, and the best and most effective means to be taken were discussed. Finally, the conclusion, which seemed the most likely to obtain the desired object, was reached—to obtain prompt and entire justice. It was decided that the population should send a delegation of two members to the Government at Ottawa.”

And Mr. Maloney, the president of the meeting, and Father Leduc, were chosen as delegates, and, as I said, the sum of \$600 was subscribed to pay their expenses. This letter was written to them:

“To Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney:

“GENTLEMEN,—The committee appointed by the inhabitants of St. Albert, at a public meeting at Edmonton and Fort Saskatchewan, request you to start and go to Ottawa, in order to inform the Government of Canada of the causes of our complaints, as they are set out in the annexed documents.”

But these documents have not been brought down:

“We do not doubt that it is owing to a want of reliable information that the Government seems ready to do us a great injustice. We are certain that the Hon. Sir John Macdonald, Minister of the Interior, is disposed to render full justice to all the subjects of Her Majesty, our gracious Sovereign. We are equally convinced that he will recognise the same rights and privileges to us as those recently conceded to the ancient colony of Prince Albert, and that he will favorably receive your demands. We rely, gentlemen, on your zeal and your devotion to our common cause. You will know how to lay it before the Government and defend it, and we hope for the complete success of your delegation.

“Signed on behalf of the committee,

“W. CUST, *President*.

“SAM. CUNNINGHAM, *Secretary*.”

Shortly afterwards these gentlemen started on their long and painful journey. On their way they stopped at Fort Saskatchewan for a day, where the inhabitants gathered, and added a contribution of \$100 towards the expenses of the mission. After twenty-four days' travel through the prairies and woods, they reached Qu'Appelle station. They stopped a little while at Winnipeg, where they received the advice and suggestions of Archbishop Taché, as to the conduct of their mission. Ultimately they reached Ottawa, and they found there Bishop Grandin, who had been engaged in the discharge of his duties, of which, as I said, I have but a very meagre account. They explained that Bishop Grandin had received good promises, fine promises, but they say:

“It needs more than promises or words—*verba volant—acts and authentic writings are necessary—scripta manent.*”

They had many discussions with the Minister, and having received from him, as to their own demands, some favorable answers, they requested these also to be written, saying:

“Mais en fin de compte nous n'avons encore que de l'eau bénite de cour. Il faut battre le fer quand il est chaud.”

And the Minister having told them that if they would send in a written statement they would get a written answer, they sent in a letter, which the Government have not brought down, but which, notwithstanding, I will take the liberty to read:

“To the Hon. D. L. Macpherson, Acting Minister of the Interior, at Ottawa.

“SIR,—We, the undersigned, delegates of the inhabitants of St. Albert, Edmonton and Fort Saskatchewan, appointed by them to come to Ottawa to set forth their demands and their complaints to the Government of Canada, have the honor to address to you the enclosed memorandum, summarily indicating the said complaints and demands.

“In the interview which you had the kindness to grant to us on the 7th instant, you have favorably listened to our requests, and we have been happy to learn that full and entire satisfaction would be given by the Government to the population that we represent.

"We would now be extremely obliged if this assurance were given us in writing.

"(Signed),            "H. LEDUC, Priest.  
                              " P. MALONEY.

This memorandum, which is enclosed, and which, though not brought down, I will also read, is addressed to the Acting Minister of the Interior (Sir David Macpherson) :

"The inhabitants of St. Albert, in the Territories of the North-West, pray the Government of the day to be good enough to take into consideration the establishment by them of a large and flourishing colony on the Sturgeon River, 9 miles from Edmonton, in the district of Alberta, North-West Territories. In 1861 His Grace Archbishop Tache, chose this locality for the founding of a Catholic mission, and the next year buildings were erected and numerous settlers established themselves at the mission. Some years later many families had settled there, and had chosen land and cultivated it. At the period of annexation to Canada St. Albert had a population of over 900 souls. Though twice decimated by small-pox in 1870, the colony became even more flourishing than before. New settlers arrived, and either took up land or bought land already occupied, and St. Albert is more prosperous than ever. The settlers waited patiently a special survey of their lands, in the hope that their rights would be recognised; and thus things stood when, in December last, they were told that they would have to content themselves with the township survey. Such a survey would be nothing short of the ruin and destruction of the colony established on each side of the river and on the banks of the lake. In order to be nearer the church and the school the settlers had built close to each other, taking narrow strips of land, but claiming always two miles in depth, as has been allowed in Manitoba and at Prince Albert. If it is intended now to compel them to be governed by the general system of survey, they will find themselves 7, 8, 9 or 10 on the same section; they will lose the fruit of their labors and improvements, and will be thrown into complete disorder. That is why the inhabitants of St. Albert ask, through the medium of their delegates, the Government of the Dominion to grant them a river survey, with two miles in depth, as in Manitoba and at Prince Albert. Having occupied their lands for a long time, even before the annexation of the Territories to Canada, they demand the acknowledgment of their rights and the issue of letters patent. The settlers of St. Albert, Edmonton, and of Fort Saskatchewan, beg that the river survey be extended from Edmonton to Fort Saskatchewan, inclusive; there, also, with two miles of depth from the banks of the river, as has been conceded on Red River and the Assiniboine. In case the land comprised within these two miles of depth, has been already occupied in good faith by some settlers before the survey, then let a mile only in depth be granted; but with the privilege of taking elsewhere a preemption of 160 acres of the lands of the Government."

Then they asked also for the immediate opening of a land office, and the early issue of the patents, and they asked that all lands occupied in good faith before the survey was made, and before it was possible to know whether it would be surveyed or not, should be recognised as the property of the occupant, and that none of the first occupants should be obliged to pay more than would have been exacted by the land board at the moment they took possession, and that the subsequent laws relative to preemption and occupation should not have a retroactive effect. They asked for representation in the Commons, and lastly made a demand with reference to the unextinguished Indian title, which I read in dealing with that portion of the case. There were three weeks of expectation after this memorandum went before the Minister, without a new interview being had. They then went, accompanied by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) and the hon. the Minister of Militia (Mr. Caron), to ask a written reply to all their demands and petitions. They were assured anew that they would be entirely satisfied; that the Government was actively engaged with the business of the delegation; that the work of framing the reply was going on and would be soon completed, and that the reply would be, in a few days, addressed to them. Subsequently, they learnt, from Mr. Royal, that the thing was going on according to their wish, slowly but surely. During this time Bishop Grandin had worked without ceasing for the success of his mission and that of the delegates. Then follow some general statements as to Bishop Grandin's success on matters more particularly affecting the interests of the church and education, but I have not the statement of what Bishop Grandin accomplished with reference to the matters now in hand. These are still in the pigeon holes. Then there was a very

Mr. BLAKE.

long interview with the First Minister. All the petitions were examined and discussed, and although all were not granted, the most important were not rejected. The paper then proceeds to say that all this business was done by word of mouth, but that His Grace the Archbishop would not leave until he had the authentic document signed by the proper party. If I am rightly informed, he had to leave on the promise that the document would reach him at Winnipeg, but I have not learned that he ever got it. It is not brought down. The result of the mission of these people, Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney, as stated to me, is this :

"A special river survey is granted; lands occupied or possessed before the annexation of the North-West to the Dominion will be recognised by the Government; the survey will extend two miles back, starting from the river; those who had established themselves before the survey on lands that are now reserved will not be troubled in their settlement; a land office will be opened at Edmonton, and a registration office is also granted; a French magistrate or a judge will be named; the House is now occupied with the question of the Métis."

But although these gentlemen were urgently claiming a writing and pointing out the importance of it, and although in subsequent papers it appears to be stated they did get their writing, that writing is not brought down, and I am not able to read it to you. You see by these statements that the result, as far as the people of St. Albert and Edmonton and of Fort Saskatchewan were concerned, if the information which I have is trustworthy, was that the decision and determination of the Government to depart, as far as the River Saskatchewan was concerned, from their old river survey plan and to stick to the township lots, had to be altered, owing to the pressure that they had to yield, and that they did concede to the extent I have mentioned. The question is, whether having conceded, as far as these people were concerned, on the north bank of the Saskatchewan, they ought not to have acceded also, as far as those of the south branch were concerned, who had complained earlier, were complaining still, and to whom it was a very serious question. Upon that subject a little light is shown by the general report of Mr. Pearce, their officer, on the 12th of March, 1885, with reference to the settlement of claims, in which he said :

"From correspondence in the files sent to me, it appears that it was the intention of the Government, as late as the spring of 1883, to re-survey into river lots the portion of land settled on by these half-breeds at St. Laurent."

But no such papers are brought down, and we are therefore in the dark as to the foundation of that observation of Mr. Pearce, reliable as it must be. Then, on the 19th September, 1883, Mr. Pearce writes from the Land Commissioner's office at Winnipeg, as follows:—

"Sir,—During my recent visit to Prince Albert I learned that portions of land had been held by French half-breeds, for the most part, for many years, without entry having been obtained, although two years had already elapsed since the townships became open for entry.

"I instructed the agent to detail his assistant, who is conversant with the French language, to make an inspection of these lands, and to inform the settlers of the necessity of making their entries immediately

"The agent had been taking some of these entries lately and, at the same time, receiving the applications and recommending for patent. As mentioned in another communication, the Land Act does not permit such a course, unless entries are made within three months of date of land being open for entry.

"I consequently instructed him to discontinue the practice, until specially informed on the matter."

There crops out again with special reference to the half-breeds, the difficulty created by the unfortunate Order of 1879, to which I have already made some reference, under which, on a misapprehension, the settlers were informed that their old settlement would not count, and that they were practically precluded from any benefit of that settlement, and, so did not enter; but here, as I would judge, the abstention from entering these lands was in part due to the circumstance of the demand for the re-survey into river lots. In October, 1883, the North-West Council memorialised the Government on the subject :

"Your memorialists also pray for more extended surveys in the country of the North Saskatchewan; that the special settlement survey in the South Saskatchewan, in the parish of St. Antoine, made by Mr. Aldous, D. L. S., be approved; and that the land agent at Prince Albert be instructed to receive entries for such lands; that the land in the parish of Grandin, St. Laurent and St. Louis, and fronting on the South Saskatchewan, be surveyed in ten chain lots, it being occupied by settlers in this manner."

These are the townships on the scene in question. That was despatched on the 9th October, 1883, and referred by the Privy Council to the President of the Council and the Minister of the Interior, on the 18th October, 1883, but nothing, so far as we can find, came of that reference. Nothing is brought down. In October, 1883, there was a mass meeting of the inhabitants of Prince Albert, at which over 150 were present, and the 4th resolution endorsed the recent memorial of the North-West Council, embracing, among other things, this:

"Insisting on the necessity of more surveys in the North Saskatchewan district."

The 5th resolution referred to a question of wood lots:

"That this meeting has heard with alarm that the lands on the north side of the Saskatchewan River, immediately opposite the town of Prince Albert, which it had been understood would be laid off as wood lots for the use of the settlers, and which, for some time, have been reserved for unknown purposes, are now being surveyed and sub-divided into townships and sections, it is said either for settlement or railway reserves—the effect of which will be to deprive the settlers of the means of obtaining wood for domestic purposes except from a great distance and at a great expense."

But nothing is brought down. And a copy was ordered to be sent to Sir John A. Macdonald. On the 19th November, 1883, a petition was sent, signed by 31 persons from St. Louis de Langevin—that is the parish on the river front of which the lands of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company are situated—to Mr. Duck, in these words:—

"Sir,—The undersigned farmers, residing in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, on the south branch of the Saskatchewan, have the honor to make you the following recital of their wrongs, with regard to the lands which they occupy.

"Several amongst us are here since the years 1873-74, and '75; others, more numerous, since 1880. We have all of us taken possession of our lands, according to the mode formerly followed on the Red River and Assiniboine lands, to wit: river lots.

"In the fall of 1880 we petitioned the Minister of the Interior at Ottawa to grant us a special survey in river lots, such as was granted to the Prince Albert settlement and to part of that of St. Laurent. We all of us have signed the said petition, not excepting Mr. Michel Canny, who has since entered his land at your office in a square lot, and against whose act we strongly protest by these presents."

I have not seen this petition, which they say they sent in 1880. It is not brought down:

"Since then we have sent new petitions for the same object at different times, supporting our case with the influence of all the persons of high standing who took an interest in us, as Mr. Joseph Royal, M.P., S. H. Macdowall, M.C., N. O. L. Clarke, S.G., His Lordship Bishop Grandin, and the Rev. Father Leduc.

"Finally, last spring, the Rev. Father Leduc, who had been sent as delegate to Ottawa by the populations of Edmonton and of St. Albert, showed us the answer of the Government, which promised a special survey for all the inhabited lands of the Saskatchewan. Since then we have been waiting in vain."

We want to see that letter that Father Leduc showed these people. But it is not brought down.

"As we have said at the beginning, several amongst us have occupied their lands long enough to have a right to a patent, and I nevertheless it is impossible to have them even entered at your office.

"We therefore humbly beg you to communicate to the Government which you represent the wrongs which are partly indicated above, and to beg it to put an end to them as quickly as possible, for the greater welfare and tranquillity of the loyal subjects of Her Majesty the Queen of England, the undersigned.

"Your very humble servants."

There are thirty-one signatures to that petition, of whom sixteen were on the colonisation company's tract. On the 9th December, 1883, Mr. Louis Schmidt and Mr. Baptiste Boucher, who was one of those wounded in the fights, addressed a letter to Mr. Duck, with reference to this petition saying:

"Since the annexed petition has been made and signed, some circumstances well calculated to redouble the anxiety which we already felt with regard to our lands, have taken place. To our knowledge, a certain Thos. Salter has again gone and entered a quarter of a section of land at your office, and this parcel of land, situated three-quarters of a mile from the river, was already taken as part of the river lot, with work done upon it on the river shore. We regret that the Government has not communicated to you their intention to grant river lots, so that you might thus enter at your office the lands comprised in the river lots. We hope that you will make your Government understand the true position in which we are placed, so that it may put a stop to it."

So that the petition reached Mr. Duck with this added circumstance of difficulty, and among the signers were Maxime Lépine, a prisoner; Baptiste Boucher, wounded; Isidore Dumas, killed; Charles Lavallée, wounded; William Swain, wounded, in the recent engagements. This petition and letter were enclosed to the Department on the 17th December, 1883, by Mr. Duck, who says:

"I have the honor to enclose herewith file No. 924 of this office, covering a letter from Mr. Louis Schmidt and others, as also a petition signed by a number of the inhabitants of the parish of Louis de Langevin, praying for a re-survey of the lands on the River Saskatchewan, within the parish into lots of ten chains frontage, on a plan similar to that adopted in the parish of St. Laurent. As I have already expressed my opinion as to the desirability of such a re-survey, I have the honor to refer you to my previous letters on the subject."

So that you find Mr. Pearce and Mr. Duck repeatedly expressing their views as to the desirability of this re-survey, but no heed is given. No answer is returned. Well, Sir, the difficulties connected with the lands began to grow great, and on the 1st of February, 1884, a meeting of the settlers residing at St. Catharines is reported as being held on the 21st of January, 1884. A committee consisting of William Kennedy, James Isbister and Thomas Swain were appointed to draft a petition to the Government, setting forth the grievances under which the people were laboring with regard to land matters, and praying Inspector Pearce to take them into consideration, and requesting him to forward the petition to the Government. A resolution was passed to the effect that the half-breed population of the North-West were unjustly treated, in not having the same privileges as regards land grants and scrip extended to them which had been enjoyed by their brethren in Manitoba. At a subsequent meeting at Lindsay school house, Red Deer Hill, these resolutions were endorsed, giving power to the committee to add any others. Thomas Millar, Charles Adams and Wm. Platt, secretary, were appointed a committee. A meeting of the settlers of the south branch was held on the 29th January. Mr. Andrew Spence was called to the chair, and Mr. Phillip Turner was appointed secretary. The resolution passed at St. Catharines and the ridge were read and discussed. A committee was appointed to draw up a memorial to the Government, namely, Messrs. A. Spence, W. McCorrister and Robert Stevens. Mr. S. J. Jackson was authorised to obtain the co-operation of the French settlers in carrying out the resolutions passed at various meetings; but so far as I have been able to observe, I do not find any of these petitions or resolutions amongst the papers produced. Then, on the 19th January, 1884, Father Vegreville, missionary at St. Louis de Langevin, wrote to Capt. Deville, chief inspector of surveys:

"I have just seen the inspector, Mr. Pearce. To my great surprise, this gentleman was unable to answer, in a satisfactory manner, the questions I put to him. He confined himself to advising me to write to you, promising to do so himself immediately. About a dozen years ago some settlers established themselves upon the bank of the branch of the river Saskatchewan. Towards the end of the winter of 1881 the missionary at St. Laurent (west side of the river, section 21, township 44, range 1, W. 3) no longer able to serve the whole population, which was growing and extending to a distance, I was called upon to establish a new mission at Batoche Crossing, township 43, range 1, W. 3, about eight miles above St. Laurent, and on the opposite bank, which was becoming more rapidly populated. The presence of the missionary, combined with the local advantages of good land situated on the banks of a great river, led those poor people to ask that their lands should be surveyed, in order that they might enter them, and be enabled to obtain possession by means of patents.

"I, myself, caused Mr. Duck, the Dominion land surveyor, to write several times to Ottawa, and always without success, until finally I became discouraged myself, and several people were obliged to leave the settlement, some selling their land for a nominal price, and others abandoning it without any compensation.

"In February, 1883, the Rev. Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney were deputed by the settlement to set forth our complaints and present our demands to the Government. They were given a written promise that the lands we occupied should be surveyed in river lots of 10 chains frontage by 2 miles in depth, and that this survey should take place in the autumn following, (1883).

"The autumn has passed, and winter is coming. What has become of the promises? Has any surveyor been instructed to do the work, and has he failed in his duty? That is what we ask of you to-day.

"I do not put these questions to you, Sir, in my own name alone, or in the name of the two missions that I have established upon the right bank of the south branch of the Saskatchewan. I repeat what Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney have said to the members of the Government in the winter of 1883. I tell you again what our settlers have said to the land agents at Prince Albert. I am the faithful interpreter of the sentiment of the population. Please consider the consequences of a painful delay. The settlers have formed and are every day forming settlements, without knowing where the limits of their future properties will be. These limits being right lines and inflexible parallels, will cut up fields, will pass through houses and will separate fields for convenience of access to which the houses have been built—these will be the inevitable consequences to those who have already built, or who may build hereafter, until a survey is made. What great inconvenience, what deplorable consequences! However, three-fourths of these troubles might have been avoided if the survey had been done when it was asked for and when it was promised.

"I hope, Sir, that the misfortunes which bear so heavily upon our population will soon come to an end, and the more so, as a word from you will suffice. You have the kindness to remind the surveyors charged with this work that it is more necessary in this part of the country than elsewhere, in places where settlement has not yet commenced. If the surveyors have not yet been selected, there are enough others in the country to enable you to name a staff, who could go upon the spot and make the people happy and satisfied, so far as circumstances will permit. I understand you to tell me to have patience; that everything will come out right in the end. Those are words which, permit me to say, I can no longer accept. There is a double proof of it. Prince Albert was settled the same time that this colony began. The inhabitants of Prince Albert have had their lands surveyed a long time and have received their patents. In the second place, I do not want it to be said that there is in this country places where the emigrants are treated like helots."

"Opposite to the mission which we have established, that is to say, on the north shore Tp. 45 E. 27 and 28, W. 2, there are only two families, and already in the two townships the river squares have been changed into river lots. I see them marked on the map. For the last ten years a few families have been living on the north shore; there are about thirty at present. Next summer there will not be enough room for a part of those who have promised to come, and there is not a river lot which is surveyed. What would the immigrants do if they knew that in this country they can be treated with such unheard of partiality?

"If I was on the spot I could get this letter signed by the fathers of families, representing a population of 2,000 souls; but I prefer to send it to you immediately, hoping to receive your answer before the departure of Mr. Pearce."

On 14th February Mr. Deville, to whom that letter was addressed, transmitted it to the Deputy Minister, and in doing so, said:

"I beg to draw your attention to the clause stating that last year the Rev. W. Leduc and Mr. Maloney obtained from the Government written assurances that the lands occupied by French settlers on the south branch of the Saskatchewan would be laid out into river lots. I am not in a position to state whether or not such is the case, but I am aware a similar promise was made for the Saskatchewan, Edmonton and St. Albert settlements."

So we have evidence, in these papers I have read, of the fact that this promise was made for the settlement represented by Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney:

"The wishes of the settlers could easily be met without inconvenience or prejudice to the Government by adopting the following course: (1.) If the inspector of agencies, when on the ground, should be satisfied that the great majority of the settlers in a township desire river lots, then he should have power to direct that every homestead fronting on the river in that township shall be composed of four quarter sections, forming a lot of twenty chains in width by one mile in depth. (2.) Except when all occupants of a section prefer having it allotted into quarter sections, in which case their request should be complied with. (3.) Except when all the occupants of two sections desire that the lots should be ten chains in width and should extend two miles, to the depth of the two sections, in which case their wishes should also be complied with.

"A lot twenty chains wide by one mile deep would be described in the patent as composed of four quarter sections. A lot ten chains wide by two miles deep would be described as the western, eastern, northern or southern halves of eight quarter sections. The areas could easily be found by reference to this office."

MR. BLAKE.

On the 10th March the secretary of the Department wrote Mr. Deville a letter, as follows:—

"A copy of your letter and a translation of that of the Rev. Mr. Vegreville have been sent to Mr. Commissioner Walsh, with a statement that the Minister approves of your suggestion, and a request that the inspector of Dominion land agencies be instructed accordingly."

Meantime, other correspondence was going on on the subject, and Mr. Pearce himself, on the 17th January, 1884, had written to the Minister of the Interior. He says:

"I have the honor to report that I was this day called upon by the Rev. Father Vegreville and Hon. Charles Nolin, in reference to the survey into river lots of the land bordering on the south branch of the Saskatchewan River, in townships 45, ranges 27 and 28, west 2nd meridian, and townships 44, and ranges west 3rd meridian. They state that the Government promised that sub-division into river lots would be made last year, and that it has not been done. At their request, I promised to submit the matter for your consideration. They will themselves communicate with you on the subject."

On the 10th March, 1884, the secretary of the Department wrote to Mr. Deville, enclosing a copy of that letter, and making this enquiry:

"Will you please state, for the information of the Minister, how this matter stands and what promises have been made to the petitioners?"

On the 12th March Mr. Deville answers:

"Some river lots have been laid out in the above townships, but the greater part of the river fronts has been sub-divided into sections. Rev. V. Vegreville and Hon. Chas. Nolin refer probably to a promise of the Minister to Rev. W. Leduc and Mr. Maloney, that certain lands would be laid out into river lots. I do not know whether or not such a promise has been made. As to the proper course to be adopted, I would refer you to my letter of the 14th ult. to the Deputy Minister."

That is the letter which I have already read. Mr. Pearce's report on the Prince Albert settlement contains this statement:

"Two classes of settlers have entered the Prince Albert district from Manitoba, namely, the English-speaking settlers, largely composed of half-breeds, and the French-speaking settlers, who are probably wholly half-breeds. The latter class settled in the neighborhood of Stobart, Duck Lake and the south branch. Those in the latter district have not yet made entry to their lands, nor have any claims been preferred by them, owing to the fact that they anticipated a re-survey of the district into river lots. When this re-survey is completed, the settlers will, no doubt, prefer their claims."

Mr. Pearce received from the Department Mr. Deville's plan which I have already read, and on reply he writes in March, as follows:—

"That if he (Mr. Pearce) personally had time to make a survey of these settlers' holdings he has no doubt that entries could be granted in legal sub-division or fractional parts thereof, so that each person's interest would be as well protected as if laid off in river lots, but that he has not time to do as that suggestion would demand, much as he would like that kind of work. He also states that he thinks, owing to the points and bays on the river, it will be found that no regular width of lots will meet the wishes of those people; that their improvements are in all corners; that they seem determined to have their holdings laid out in river lots, and it will be found that they will expect the lines between every lot plainly defined on the ground at least. That is what Mr. Pearce states he inferred from interviews he had with them. Further, he tried to explain to them how their wishes could be met by means of a legal sub-division survey or fractional portions thereof; but he fears they did not comprehend what he desired to impart. In fact, it was a matter which he took particular pains to discuss with others, and the better educated portion of the community, and the answer invariably was: That is plain enough to you as a surveyor, but it is Greek to us." Those parties are *bonâ fide* settlers and as such have or will acquire title; and if they wish their land laid off in a certain way, why should the Government object; in fact, it is the duty of the Government to survey it as requested."

"Mr. Inspector Pearce further states that neither the agent nor his assistants are sufficiently conversant with surveys to go to the ground and allot these lands by land survey or fractional portion thereof, and would recommend one of two courses to be adopted: (1) To send with agent on the ground a surveyor who can make a rough traverse of improvements on each section, and then entries can be given by legal sub-division, so as to preserve to each man his improvements, as far as possible. (2) To lay out in river lots on ground, employing a surveyor of considerable experience in that kind of work; if he or his assistants spoke English so much the better, and give him sufficient latitude in his instructions, so that he could make the lot of such width as to preserve to each claimant, so far as possible, his improvements. In both cases he would suggest the township road allowance to be kept open. If the first course is adopted, he begs leave to suggest that Col. Sproat or

J. L. Reid, D.L.S., who are now on the ground, be instructed to proceed with the agent and assist to carry it out, as he thinks time would be saved by so doing—expense also. All of which is respectfully submitted."

There was the suggestion of the man on the ground who had knowledge, who had seen the land and discussed the question with the people, who knew the facts and the difficulties, and who suggests two methods; but I find no statement in these papers of any action being taken on the subject after the report of Mr. Pearce. This was, mind you, in the spring of 1884, and after the Prince Albert settlers had been settled with. The question of the survey of the neighborhood of St. Laurent, in the half-breed settlement, was still undecided. On 26th April, 1884, Mr. Louis Schmidt wrote to the Minister as follows:—

"I am one of the settlers in the South Saskatchewan, in the electoral district of Lorne, who during the last 4 years, have sent petitions upon petitions to your Department to have their lands surveyed in 10 or 20 chains frontage by 1 or 2 miles long, as the same has been done for the Prince Albert settlement on both the north and south branches of the Saskatchewan. I regret to say that so far our prayer has not yet been granted, nor even an answer of any kind has been given, and I feel bound to say that such a state of things is almost intolerable.

"The most part of those settlers, and I am among the number, have lived on and cultivated their lands for over three years, and ought to be entitled to a patent from the Crown, yet as they have taken up their land close to each other, and in the hope of having them sub-divided in river lots, they have not been able to enter them in the lands office. You see, Sir, in a glance, the real state of things, and I need not occupy your valuable time any longer in entering into more details. I pray you, therefore, most earnestly, to have the matter remedied for the satisfaction of so many loyal subjects of her Majesty and

"Your humble servant,

"LOUIS SCHMIDT."

That letter was written on the 26th of April, 1884. It was not answered until 15th July, 1884, and the answer was as follows:—

"I have to inform you that immediately upon the return of the Deputy Minister of the Interior from the North-West, which is expected to be within a very few days, your letter will be brought to his attention with a view to immediate action being taken in the matter."

So that even on the 15th of July Mr. Pearce's suggestion as to satisfying these people had not been accepted, nor any method devised for dealing with the question. The Saskatchewan *Herald* of the 3rd of May, 1884, announced that the Government had rescinded the Order making the system of narrow river lots, as laid down in Red River, applicable to the principal rivers in the North-West. It goes on:

"When the older settlements on the Saskatchewan were founded, land was taken up, regardless of any other consideration than that there should be a river frontage, and every one accommodated his lines to the peculiarities of the location. This plan was found to interfere seriously with the Government survey in the Territories, and was disregarded, except in the case of some settlements, to which it was conceded. Last winter the Edmonton delegates pressed for its application to the settlements they represented; and the Government, believing that their arguments held good, as regarded the rest of the country, granted their request and extended the plan to all the rivers. With the progress of surveys, however, it became evident that the disadvantages were greatly in excess of any benefits or conveniences to be derived from the extension of the system of narrow frontages, and its discontinuance has therefore been decided on. There is a great deal of broken land on the banks of the Saskatchewan, so that in many places a man might have a river front and yet be unable to reach the water. There will always be broken and irregular lots on the rivers, and we believe an adherence to the rectangular system will, in the end, give the greater satisfaction."

There you have the announcement of the discontinuance of that practice. I am not now engaged in discussing the policy of that discontinuance, as applied to the Saskatchewan district, with a view of dealing generally, but I am dealing with the policy of the discontinuance of that practice, as applied to those who had settled while the practice was otherwise, who had been told it was the rule, who had settled according to the ancient custom of the country, who saw this privilege granted to the people at Prince Albert in 1878, and 1879 at Edmonton, at Saskatchewan, in 1883, and who saw it refused, or, at any rate, not granted to them in 1883 and 1884. On the 17th of July, 1884, *Le Manitoba*, after discussing the half-breed claims to the Indian titles, says:

"The great difficulty that the Métis have met with is in obtaining first, the survey of their lands, according to the actual limits and form of these lands. The slowness in the confirmation of their titles and the quasi refusal to accord them the grant asked for the extinction of their Indian rights are to-day the cause of all the discontent. Many petitions have been addressed to Ottawa, even delegates have been sent to the capital, at great cost, and still nothing has been accomplished."

Well, then, Sir, this was the state of things in the middle of 1884, when Louis Riel was asked to come: and now I turn back to the spring of that year, and the winter of that year—to February, 1884, when Mr. Pearce had gone up, after these long delays, to settle the claims at Prince Albert and St. Laurent. His mission was to deal with those places. He dealt with the case of Prince Albert, but he did not deal with St. Laurent, or Stobart, Duck Lake, Batoche, Grandin, St. Antoine de Padoue and St. Louis de Langevin; and why did he not? As I have told you, the cases of the white settlers of Prince Albert, after being investigated in January and February, were reported on in March; the proposed settlements were approved by the Minister in April, and if the settlements were just and reasonable the question was ended. But why did Mr. Pearce not go down to St. Laurent and these other places and dispose of their fewer claims? It was this question of the surveys and plans which prevented him. I will read you his telegram from Prince Albert in February, 1884:

"Have taken the evidence of all claims excepting St. Laurent and vicinity. Plans not received. As claimants there speak French, propose agent take evidence, when plans received and forward land board. I intend proceeding Winnipeg Wednesday, unless otherwise ordered. Made no report as yet."

Upon receipt of that telegram Mr. Hall writes to Mr. Deville:

"In what state is the survey of St. Laurent, on the Saskatchewan? Mr. Pearce says that the plans have not yet been received at the Prince Albert agency, and until they are of course the claims of the settlers cannot be enquired into."

We have no answer to that letter, and no information as to when those plans were received. The secretary of the Department writes to Mr. Pearce in acknowledgment of his telegram:

"The suggestion contained in your telegram received here from Prince Albert, that the agent of that district be named to take the evidence in regard to the claims of settlers at St. Laurent, is approved of.

"Mr. Gauvreau has had considerable experience in the business of the Department, and ought to be quite capable of taking the evidence. I have sent to the chief inspector of surveys, enquiring in what state of progress the survey is, and when I hear from him I shall let you know."

I do not know whether Mr. Pearce ever heard from Mr. Burgess, but there is no letter brought down informing Mr. Pearce of the result of the enquiry. Now, the special survey at St. Laurent was approved by the Government in March, 1879, and that special survey was open for entry only in March, 1884, after Mr. Pearce had left the settlement altogether, I presume because the plans never had been sent up, and I suppose that they had been sent up on learning of this mistake; but for four years the special settlement was in the hands of the Government approved, but yet the lands were not opened. As to the settlers whose claims were investigated later, between forty and fifty were on that special survey, and between thirty and forty were between Gabriel's Crossing and Batoche, so that the great bulk of those dealt with were on the special survey—who were about one-half of the settlers—were not allowed to enter, although the surveys were approved in 1879, until after Mr. Pearce left the settlement in 1884. These other townships, or at least most of them, were approved in September 1881; one in November, 1883, and the other in December, 1883. Now, I have no answer to give you as to why the St. Laurent survey was not sent up before. But as to why no entries were made in the other townships I have already shown you that it was because the inhabitants were persistently asking that the method and practice under which they settled should be recognised and conceded to

them, as it was to Prince Albert, as to the people of the north branch, as to the people of Edmonton, as to the people of St. Albert, as to the people of Fort Saskatchewan, and because they did not wish for, and, in fact, could not avail themselves, as they understood it, of the township survey, in order to get their lands. Mr. Pearce has given us his reason, in his letter of September, 1883, which I have read. He says these entries were not made because the re-survey was being expected, and the decision as to the re-survey was still being expected when Mr. Pearce was there in February, 1884. But there was another reason. The agent had been stopped by Mr. Pearce in September, 1883, in pursuance of the bungle of the Millar type. However the local agent was directed to investigate, and he did investigate, in May, 1884. The papers are brought down, but the investigation did not touch the lands of St. Louis de Langevin at all, because that was sacred soil; it was colonisation company's land, and it could not be touched, and therefore there was no investigation made of their cases. But the investigation was made of the other cases, and they were generally settled in one way or another. The first settlement in a few cases took place in each of the years 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878, and many settlements in each of the years 1879, 1881, 1882 and 1883. In some cases, as appears by the papers, there were very large improvements, and the names of many of those people appear in the lists of killed, wounded and prisoners. Now, I do not know what was the principle of the settlement that was made; but I point out that had the surveys been made and approved, and the plans sent up, the investigation might have taken place in February, 1884, as it was intended to do, as Mr. Pearce was ready to do, and as he was only prevented from doing by the circumstances to which I have alluded. Then, in May, 1884, when the investigation did take place, the excitement had got higher, and in June, 1884, Riel came into the country, and these complaints and disputes and difficulties about lands remained, and the agitation went on increasing. What was the relative condition, Sir, at that time, of the white settlement at Prince Albert and the half-breed settlements at St. Laurent and in the vicinity? The white settlement had had a hearing; it had had an investigation in January and in February, a report in March, and the decision of the Minister in April. What was the situation in the case of the half-breed settlements at St. Laurent? They had nothing until May; they had then an investigation of the agent; the report was sent on and nothing was done. Mr. Pearce did not report; he was not asked to report, according to any of the papers which have been brought down, although I ask, would not the ordinary dictates of prudence, say: Now, in the month of May you have the report of the agent on the cases of these half-breed settlers; send down your report on them, so that we may act at once and decide their future in reference to these lands. But he was not asked to report on any papers brought down to us, and, in fact, he did not report until the 17th of October; and then he reported late, but still in time, if this report had been acted upon. On the 17th of October he reported on St. Laurent, Duck Lake, Batoche, Grandin, St. Antoine de Padoue, though not on St. Louis de Langevin; and having reported, what came of his report? It came down to Ottawa, and it was buried in the Department. While the report on the white settlers, which dealt with many hundreds of cases, and which established new principles, was disposed of in about three weeks, the report on the comparatively few cases, less than 100, dealing on the recognised old principles with the St. Laurent claims, was held over at Ottawa from the 17th of October, 1884, until the 9th of February, 1885, just while the difficulty was arising, while all the meetings were being held, while all the agitation and excitement was taking place, and on the 9th of February at last that report was approved by this telegram:

Mr. BLAKE.

"February 9, 1885.—Report of land board on St. Laurent claims approved. Instruct Prince Albert agent to give effect thereto."

You can know the reason; the account I have given you in the last few hours shows you that February and March were notable months in the Department of the Interior. There had been warnings; the half-breed enumeration was arranged on the 23th of January; on the 4th of February Governor Dewdney was told of it; and on the 9th of the same February they found time to deal with the ninety-five cases of the St. Laurent settlers, and telegraphed to say that it was approved. Doubtless this was on account of further warnings not brought down; but the grace came too late. Once again, I say I am not criticising the decisions; I am dealing with the question of there being a decision. The decision was reached on the 9th of February; by the time it reached the local agent the people were just on the eve of speaking out, and I observe by the *Mail* correspondent that in the wrecked house of one of the rebels was found a letter of the agent, informing him what his fate was to be. Thus, in this regard, there was the grossest apathy, delay, neglect, procrastination and incapacity which can be conceived; because, if there ever was a time when men should have been prompt it was at that time. In the fall of the year, the cases of the whites had been settled; those of the half-breeds had not. They were agitating and complaining; their chief was among them, inciting and inflaming them; an increased force had been sent among them; the Government had done something towards repression; were they to do nothing towards redress? No; the papers come down in October, and they lie half October, all November, all December, all January, and until the 9th of February, in the office, without the Government touching them, without telling these people that they should have their lands, and on what terms they might have them. And so I say, both as to their lands and as to the half-breed Indian title, the statements I have made I believe are beyond successful contradiction. In old and sterner times men would have been impeached for conducting in this way the public affairs of the country. In these milder days we have substituted votes of censure, and I move:

To leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following instead thereof: It be *Resolved*,—That in the administration of North-West affairs by the present Government, prior to the recent outbreak, there have occurred grave instances of neglect, delay and mismanagement in matters affecting the peace, welfare and good government of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whether, in the long and elaborate speech of the hon. gentleman, he has established a rightful censure upon the Government, whether he has shown that we have been guilty of negligence, of oppression, of mal-administration, I leave to the judgment of the House and the country. But there is one thing I think there can be no doubt about on either side, and that is that the hon. gentleman, in his speech, has furnished gratuitously a most able brief for the counsel of Louis Riel. I venture to say that not one of the counsel for that unfortunate man will be able to advance or will be able to adduce such arguments as the hon. gentleman has done this day, irrespective of the consequences which he should have known would have flown from his language.

Mr. LISTER. Who caused it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You may sneer but you will find, this House will find, that in the speeches of the counsel for Riel, when the trial takes place, as it will, within a few days, the substance, the basis, the apex and the bottom of that defence will be the speech of the hon. gentleman. And it was so from the beginning. From the beginning of this Session, every motion the hon. gentleman made, every question he asked, every return he called for—it was all done with the one object, the miserable, the wretched object of trying to get a case against the Government rather than get justice for the people of the North-West. I would ask

any hon. member in this House if the whole speech of the hon. gentleman is not a justification, an apology, an excuse for the rising in the North-West; a justification, an apology, an excuse for murder.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—a justification, an excuse for anarchy.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You are the criminals.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I say that the whole course of the Opposition in this House, the whole course of the Opposition out of this House, every effort made by them, every statement made by them in the House and the press, has been with the object of injuring the Government, irrespective of the country, whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say. What care they whether the future prospects of the North-West be prejudiced or affected? If they can get up a cry or a means of attack on the Government, they do not care. They would rather rule in hell than serve in heaven. There are two things that will rise in the minds of the auditors of the hon. gentleman's speech, and those are, that he never alluded, except very cursorily, to the course of events before 1878-79. How reticent he was about the policy of the Government of which he was a member sometimes, and sometimes not. In the next place, he has not ventured, in the whole of his seven hours' speech, to say that the alleged grievances of the half-breeds were just.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true he has quoted their grievances; it is true he has gone down to the cellars of the reading room and raked up every newspaper coming from the North-West, to read little paragraphs written by country editors for the special benefit of their special locality. He has read them as evidence of writings withheld by the Government. Whenever he has read a paper he has said: There is no answer to this; and he supposes there must have been an answer, and that answer must have been suppressed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). So they were.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for South Huron—no, he does not say that; he is a gentleman, though a mistaken gentleman. It is the hon. gentleman behind him who has said it. I say, in the first place, the hon. gentleman has never, in the whole course of his long speech, said that the claims of the half-breeds to be put on the same footing with the half-breeds of Manitoba were just and legal. He has not dropped a single word to that effect. Why? Because the Government of which he was a member decided solemnly they had no such claim; that they had no claims at all, no more than the white settler who went in. The hon. gentleman, sometimes in the Government and sometimes not there—I cannot tell whether he was in at the very hour when the policy of the Mackenzie Government was declared in a solemn despatch—but he had it; he has had it in his hands; he has read a portion of it to-night; he has not quoted the whole of that despatch—that despatch in which the hon. member for Bothwell declared that the half-breeds had no rights. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) deny that there is such a despatch? Does the hon. gentleman deny that he does not know it, that he has not read it, that he has not read a portion of it? Then I shall read it. Thus runs the solemn despatch of the 13th February, 1878, written by the then Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Laird. I shall read the whole of the despatch. It is addressed to the hon. member for Bothwell, Minister of the Interior:

"I have the honor to transmit herewith a petition of certain half-breeds of St. Laurent, relating to several matters affecting their interests in this country. Though the petition is addressed to the Lieutenant

Governor of the North-West Territory, yet, as it refers to questions for the most part wholly under the control of the Dominion Parliament and Government, I am requested to forward it to His Excellency the Governor in Council. I hope you will have the goodness at an early day to lay it before His Excellency in Council."

At an early day—the hon. gentleman is very anxious about an early day:

"Should it be the intention of the Government to appoint any additional members to the Council of the North-West Territories, the prayer of the petitioners, that such should be selected from the old residents of the country, is well worthy of consideration. It is important that the land policy of the Government towards old settlers and others living for many years in the territory should be declared. It appears to me that they have a claim to some more speedy means—"

Speedy!

"speedy means for acquiring a title for settlement purposes than the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act. To prevent disputes between neighbors, it is highly desirable that the survey of lands settled upon along the principal rivers should be prosecuted with all convenient speed."

Just put that map on the Table, please, and see what speed has been made with the survey.

"With respect to the prayer for assistance in procuring seeds and implements to commence farming operations, it is similar to the request made to me by the half-breeds of Bow River during the Blackfeet treaty negotiations, and which I forwarded to you and commended to the favorable consideration of the Government."

That is signed by Mr. Laird. This is the answer of the Government, a portion of which the hon. gentleman alluded to, but he did not read the whole:

"Department of the Interior, Ottawa, 18th March, 1878."

The Government went out, I think, in October, 1878.

An hon. MEMBER. September.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, October. They ought to have gone out in September, but they did not.

"Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch (No. 47) of the 13th ultimo, covering a petition addressed to you by certain half-breeds of the parish of St. Laurent, relating to several matters affecting the interest of the half-breeds in the North-West. You are requested to inform the petitioners that I shall have much pleasure—"

Mr. Mills will have much pleasure; I beg his pardon, the Minister of the Interior of that day, will have much pleasure—

"in submitting their petition for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council. In the meantime, you may intimate to the petitioners that should it be thought desirable to appoint additional members to the Council of the North-West, I shall be prepared to recommend for His Excellency's consideration their application that such members should be selected from the old residents in the Territories"—

Not elected—

"and that if possible one of them should be of French Canadian origin. The propriety of passing an Act to secure for the half-breeds some more speedy means of acquiring a title for settlement purposes than under the provisions of the present homestead and Dominion Lands Act has for some time past, engaged my attention."

Well, he took office in 1873.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the Government got in in 1873, and I suppose his predecessor was not a dummy; his predecessor was as able as the hon. gentleman himself, his predecessor had the same responsibility as himself, and the hon. gentleman, being his successor in the same Administration, took upon himself all the responsibility of what his predecessor did or did not do.

"As regards the application of the petitioners for an early survey of the settled lands along the principal rivers, I have to request you to inform the petitioners that the survey of such lands has already been carried out, to some extent, and will be prosecuted as rapidly as the funds at the disposal of the Department will permit."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Exactly; but that Government did not choose to apply for the funds; and, if they had applied for the funds, they would have got them. They left the thing alone.

"The application of the petitioners to be aided by the Government with seeds and agricultural implements in their farming operations I confess I am not disposed to view favorably. I do not see upon what grounds the half-breeds can claim to be treated, in this particular, differently from the white settlers in the Territories."

I agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

"The half-breeds who have, in some respects, the advantage over new settlers in the Territories, should be impressed with the necessity of settling down in fixed localities and directing their energies towards pastoral or agricultural pursuits, in which case lands would, no doubt, be assigned to them, in the same way as to white settlers. But beyond this, they must not look to the Government for any special assistance in their farming operations.

"The petitioners are in error in supposing that the Government has given seeds or farming implements, to any other class of white settlers in the North-West.

"Money has been advanced, in some cases, to certain settlers, on the distinct understanding that it would be repaid to the Government by the parties to whom it was advanced. I may add that the result of this experiment has not been such as to induce the Government to repeat it."

There is that despatch, in which the hon. the Minister of Interior, administering the affairs of the North-West, tells the half-breeds of the North-West that they have no greater claims than the white settlers at that period; and what were the claims of the white settlers at that period? They were simply this: that any man going there who was 18 years of age and upwards could settle down on 160 acres of land, and, if he cultivated for three years, he could get his patent for that land. These were the claims and the only claims that the white man going from Ontario or Quebec, or any of the Provinces of Canada, had; he could have 160 acres free, and, if he chose to buy, he could have 160 acres more by preemption; and the hon. gentleman declared that the half-breeds in the North-West should have no other and no greater claims than the white men. Now the hon. gentleman very properly argues that the half-breeds have, in some respects, great advantages over the new settlers going into that country. He says that these half-breeds should be impressed with the necessity of settling down in fixed localities. They know the country; they were born in the country; they were trained in the country. They knew what the conditions of the country were, what the climatic conditions were; they knew what to expect. They knew that if they do not choose to cultivate the land, they must look elsewhere for means of subsistence. Now, Mr. Speaker, the truth is, that the dissatisfaction which has arisen in the North-West has deeper roots than mere discontent by the half-breeds and others who are not getting their patents or getting their claims asserted. From the very inception of the acquisition of this country by Canada from the Hudson Bay Company there was discontent. In the first place, the Hudson Bay subordinates living in the country were very much dissatisfied that the company should be pushed off their throne. They governed that country; they were the sovereigns of that country, and everything that they could do secretly was done for the purpose of preventing the Government getting possession of that country. That discontent was sedulously spread among the whites, and among the half-breeds, and, perhaps, in some degree, among the Indians. That discontent continued, aye, and continues yet. The half-breeds never have been satisfied with the transfer of the country to Canada. They were willing to remain in their semi-free condition under the Hudson Bay Company, but they were not satisfied to come under the Government of the Dominion; and in 1870 this dissatisfaction culminated in an outbreak. That was subdued, but the feeling still lingered. In 1874 Mr. Gabriel Dumont was still a rebel—Mr. Gabriel Dumont—I speak of him with respect, because he was a brave man; although he was a rebel, although he has committed crimes,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

for which, if proved guilty, he would forfeit his life, still, everyone must have respect for him, that certainly they have not for Louis Riel. But in 1874 Gabriel Dumont was forming a Provincial Government. He never was satisfied under the Crown of Great Britain. And there is a letter from Governor Morris, of the 22nd of June, 1874, inclusive of a statement of John McKay, relating to the conduct of Gabriel Dumont. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of John McKay as a respectable man. I believe he is a respectable man, and Mr. McKay, at that time, reported that Gabriel Dumont was trying to form a Provincial Government, of which he was to be president. Now, Sir, from that time until now that feeling has been seething. It is there. The claims of the half-breeds are a mere pretext, and the real desire is that that country should sever its connection with the Dominion of Canada, should become independent in some way. All the grievances that have been alleged are merely a pretext to cover that fixed principle that existed in the minds of the people there, or of some of them, that there should be an independent Government established in the North-West. Now, I have spoken about the action taken by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I have read a despatch of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when Minister of the Interior, showing that the half-breeds, as half-breeds, had no other claim and had no greater claim than the whites. But, Sir, it has been alleged that the Government had neglected the claims of the half-breeds; it has been alleged that my hon. friend the Secretary of State made an inaccurate statement when he said that the half-breeds had not exercised their right to petition. The hon. gentleman quoted several despatches, several communications from the North-West to the Government here, in 1878, and before that year, and before the late Government went out; and he asked, how could we be so blind as to not know that such things existed? Why, Sir, that was ancient history, as the hon. gentleman said. Those complaints were made before 1878, and the answer was given in the hon. gentleman's statement, that they had no claims whatever, any more than the whites who went in there. The hon. gentleman has read and quoted as if it were a paper condemning the Government, a letter signed by Mr. Matthew Ryan, formerly stipendiary magistrate in the North-West, but who has now ceased to be such. He speaks of the rights of the half-breeds in the North-West, and this is what he says:

"Having been appointed, on the 1st of January, 1876, stipendiary magistrate for the North-West Territories, I was also informed by the Minister of Justice that my commission to investigate the land claims was to be considered in effect for another year, in order to allow of the half-breeds in the North-West, who were unable to attend the sittings of the commissioners in Manitoba, to establish their claims before me. In the discharge of this duty, I found that a large number of half-breeds had no claim under the Act, not having been residents of Manitoba on the date of transfer, the 15th July, 1870. I could also see that this exclusion caused much discontent, and I did not fail to urge, from time to time, that the proper remedy should be applied."

To whom did they appeal? To hon. gentlemen opposite. Through 1876-77-78 they appealed to the Government composed of hon. gentlemen opposite; and he says they appealed again and again. He made repeated applications on behalf of those poor people; but not one step was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to remedy those grievances. How could the hon. gentleman do it? He declared they had no right and no claim, and therefore he could not, of course, take any step. From 1873-74 to 1878 not one single step was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in order to relieve the discontent, if it existed, in order to allay grievances if they existed—not one single step was taken to relieve these poor people for whom the hon. member who has just addressed the House has expressed so much sympathy; they were left out in the cold; their claims were not considered, their petitions were not answered. The hon.

gentleman has read several documents, and he says that some of them were not answered, or that the answers do not appear among the papers. In January or February, 1878, a petition asking redress was presented to the Government of that day, and until the time the Government went out of power not even an acknowledgment of the receipt of the petition was sent. What was the condition of affairs when we took office in 1878? We found that the preceding Government had taken no steps whatever; that they had not remedied the grievances; that they had not even discussed them. In 1869 we obtained possession of the country; in 1870 Manitoba was established as a Province. It is within the recollection of several members of this House—at all events, it is in the history of the country—that in 1870, in order to secure peace and order—in fact, to obtain possession of the country—it was necessary to enter into an arrangement by which that Province might be acquired, that turbulent feelings might be put down and Canada might secure peace and quiet in that country. In order to accomplish that result the Government of the day entered into negotiations with certain delegates from the Province of Manitoba, which culminated in the Act of 1870, creating Manitoba a Province. In that Act it is provided that in order to secure the extinguishment of the Indian title 1,400,000 acres of land should be settled upon the families of the half-breeds living within the limits of the then Province. Whether they had any right to those lands or not was not so much the question as it was a question of policy to make an arrangement with the inhabitants of that Province, in order, in fact, to make a Province at all—in order to introduce law and order there, and assert the sovereignty of the Dominion. The Hudson Bay Company, the old proprietors of the country, had guaranteed certain rights to parties; they had acknowledged certain claims acquired in certain settlements, not only along the banks of Red River, but of the Assiniboia, and it was provided that, after a careful calculation, 1,400,000 acres would be quite sufficient for the purpose of compensating these men for what was called the extinguishment of the Indian title. That phrase was an incorrect one, because the half-breeds did not allow themselves to be Indians. If they are Indians, they go with the tribe; if they are half-breeds they are whites, and they stand in exactly the same relation to the Hudson Bay Company and Canada as if they were altogether white. That was the principle under which the arrangement was made and the Province of Manitoba was established. All white settlers who had not lost their land by lack of occupation or by silent acquiescence in the old Province of Assiniboia were allowed to keep their lands. So far as the half-breeds were concerned, 1,400,000 acres were set apart for the purpose of meeting their claims. There was a census taken, under Lieutenant Governor Archibald, the first Governor of that Province, and it was reported that there were about 10,000 half-breeds with their families that had a right to claim the land. If that census had been adhered to there would have been no difficulty. It was accurate, as accurate as a census can be taken in a new country without municipal institutions and means for enumerating the people one by one. But it was a correct census, and for it 1,400,000 acres had been assigned to meet the half-breed claims; and if that census had been adhered to, there never would have been any trouble. But the truth of the matter is, that the moment we went out of power it was necessary that everything we had done should be reversed, and the Government of the day chose to say that there were not 10,000 half-breeds in the Province of Manitoba, and they appointed Mr. Matthew Ryan and Mr. Machar, the latter a gentleman whom the hon. member for South Huron knows something about, for the purpose of undoing—I will not say of undoing, but of disregarding the census previously taken. That is the fact. If the census that had been taken and returned

by Governor Archibald had been accepted there would have been land enough in the appropriation to have settled all trouble, as well for the half-breeds who were actually registered and got their lands as for the half-breeds who happened to be away on the plains at the time the final adjudication was made. But it did not suit the Government of the day to accept that. Oh, no. The claims of the half-breeds in Manitoba were bought up by speculators. It was an unfortunate thing for those poor people; but it is true that this grant of scrip and land to those poor people was a curse and not a blessing. The scrip was bought up; the lands were bought up by white speculators, and the consequences are apparent. I am told that even at this moment, in the vicinity of Winnipeg, instead of the surrounding country comprising smiling farms, settled with industrious people, the land is unsettled, in consequence of the scrip having been bought up for a song by speculators. In enacting the legislation necessary to the erection of the Province of Manitoba, in 1870, the Parliament of Canada provided that a tract of 1,400,000 acres of land should be set apart, from which to make grants to the children of the half-breeds resident in the Province at the date of the transfer, which date, for the purposes of the Act, was fixed as the 15th day of July, 1870. An enumeration of those entitled to share in this allotment was obtained by a census, which Lieutenant Governor Archibald, in December, 1870, reported as having been carefully taken, and which showed that the number was then estimated not to exceed 10,000. It was then decided to grant to each of the half-breed inhabitants of the Province a free patent for 140 acres of land, in extinguishment of their Indian title; but the question was raised as to whether the legal construction of the Manitoba Act permitted the heads of families to obtain any share of the 1,400,000 acres reserved by the Act. This question having been submitted to the law officers of the Crown, they decided that the half-breed heads of families were not so entitled; and the Government of the day then concluded that there would be such a reduction in the number of persons entitled to share, consequent upon the decision of the law officers of the Crown, as would permit of the children of half-breed heads of families born at the time of the transfer receiving an allotment at the rate of 190 acres each. The Indian title of the half-breed heads of families was extinguished, under an Act passed in 1874 (37 Victoria, chapter 20), by issuing scrip for \$160 to each, that is to say, to the mother as well as to the father. Upon the census made under the direction of Lieutenant Governor Archibald an allotment was made to the half-breed children at the rate of 190 acres each, in 1873, all the lands affected having been previously surveyed with that object in view. It will be remembered, however, that in the fall of this year a change of Government took place, and the gentlemen who then became responsible for the administration of public affairs, in accordance with a general plan adopted for the purpose of discrediting the acts of their predecessors, and also for the purpose of finding employment for their hungry followers, rushed to the conclusion that the half-breed census was in some way or another deficient, and that they must make a new examination into the claims and obtain a new enumeration of the claimants. In May, 1875, nearly two years after this matter had been satisfactorily closed by an allotment made under the auspices of their predecessors, a commission, consisting of Mr. Matthew Ryan, of Montreal, and Mr. J. M. Machar, of Kingston, was sent out to visit the several parishes and make this new enumeration. The final report of this commission was submitted to the Governor General in Council in March, 1876; but examination shows that the commissioners themselves admitted their work to be incomplete, and the agent of Dominion lands, at Winnipeg, was authorised to continue the enumeration. In consequence of the incompleteness of the examination and

enumeration made by Messrs. Machar and Ryan, the actual number of half-breed children entitled to share in the 1,400,000 acres was grossly underestimated; but with all its errors, the Government preferred the work of their own incompetent enumerators, performed in the most perfunctory manner, some six years after the date of the transfer, to the carefully compiled census made under the direction of Mr. Archibald, immediately after the transfer, and when the opportunities of ascertaining the facts must necessarily have been better than they were at the time of the investigation made by Messrs. Ryan and Machar. The actual number of claims enumerated by Ryan and Machar was 5,088; the Dominion lands agent, on the 10th August, 1876, reported 226 more; and the Minister of the Interior at the time jumped to the conclusion, upon what grounds no one can tell, that about 500 more half-breeds would probably be entitled to share in the allotment. So, with a largeness of heart unparalleled in their dealings with the half-breeds of Manitoba or any other section of the people of Canada, the Government decided that they would give to each half-breed child entitled to share in the reserve a free patent for 240 acres. This might look like liberality to the half-breeds, but if we take a peep behind the screen we find that before that date, apparently despairing of ever receiving patents for their lands, the majority of the claimants had disposed of their rights for a mere song, to speculative friends of the Government; and it was no doubt for the benefit of cormorants of this class that the hearts of Mr. Laird and his colleagues so suddenly expanded. If proof were wanted of this, it is easily to be found in the manner in which the work of apportioning the land amongst the rightful claimants was afterwards proceeded with. Not a solitary allotment upon this new and liberal basis was made until March, 1877, and when the present Government returned to office, in 1878, they found that the half-breeds of St. Boniface, St. Norbert, St. François Xavier, Baie St. Paul, and St. Agathe, containing more than one-half of the half-breed population, amongst whom the reserved lands were to be distributed, had not only not received their patents, but the allotments had not even been made. And thus, Mr. Speaker, you see that the Government of that day, who, if they had taken the census of Mr. Archibald, would have found full and ample indemnity and compensation for the rights, real or supposed, of the half-breeds of Manitoba, cut them down one-half, handed over 240 acres, instead of the 150 or the 190, to the white speculators, their friends, who had bought these claims. And now, what do we find? We find that the difference between the 5,000 and the 10,000 are now on the plains, and now they are claiming the amounts which those hon. gentlemen deprived them of when they were in the Government. They are now claiming the land, and they find an advocate in the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake). They claim the lands which they ought to have got long ago—not to such an extent, certainly, but to a reasonable extent, if the Government of that time had accepted the census taken under Mr. Archibald, instead of cutting it down one half, in order to double the value to their own friends of that day. But, Sir, to speak a little more of the conduct of the Government of that day, let me call the attention of the House for a moment to the conduct of the Minister, through his own officer, Mr. Ryan. Mr. Ryan was one of the commissioners appointed to enquire into these claims. He got his commission extended, in order to get on the plains, in order to ascertain what the claims of those men were, who, from one reason or another, had not been present to assert those claims. Well, Sir, Mr. Ryan telegraphed or wrote to the Department, to ask for leave to enquire into the claims of the people there. He asked for leave to go round on circuit and settle with those people. What did the hon. gentleman say? He said: You shall do nothing of the kind. He said, as was stated in the paper which was partially read by

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ryan was originally appointed with Mr. Machar. He afterwards had his commission extended, and he was told to go to the applicants and see what could be done. Mr. Ryan, among many other telegrams, sent the following:—

“28th June, 1878.—Half-breeds pressing me. Will time of investigation be extended.”

Mr. Laird telegraphed from Battleford:

“24th June, 1878.—Observe Mr. Ryan's authority; investigate half-breeds' claims under order 14th June, 1876, lapsed; recommend time be extended one year; he is now here; applicants waiting answer.”

He was refused that time; the enquiry was never made—

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Ryan's time was extended, and that Mr. Duff was appointed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And in a letter, dated Dominion Land Office, Winnipeg, 16th March, 1877. Mr. Codd, the agent of Dominion lands, writes to the Surveyor General:

“I have the honor to submit for your consideration the enclosed communication from Mr. Police Magistrate Ryan, not considering that the matter is one coming properly within the sphere of my official duty. Without offering, therefore, a recommendation in the matter, permit to remark that it seems to me to be no part of the duties of the Government to compel, so to speak, the half-breeds to prove their claims.”

That is Mr. Codd's advice. Written across the face of that letter, in the handwriting of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the Minister of the Interior, at that time, are these words:

“It is not necessary to look up parties who have claims. If they care for their interests, they themselves will come forward and establish their claims.”

Thus it was, Sir, that the whole of the claims and rights of these people were ignored by the Government before we came in. It was stated that they had no greater claims than the whites, and I am not at all sure that the hon. gentleman was not right in his logic; but, at the same time, if that be so, I cannot understand the long indictment which the hon. gentleman has delivered against the successors of the Government of which he was a member. Now, Sir, the question was one of very great difficulty. As I have already stated, the settlement in Manitoba and for Manitoba was for that Province alone. There were very few half-breeds outside of the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba. Whether they had claims, or whether they had not claims, it was necessary that peace should be restored; it was necessary that a Government should be established; it was necessary that the new Province of Manitoba should be organised; and therefore this grant of 1,400,000 acres was made to the half-breeds having possessory rights along the Assiniboine and the Red Rivers. Outside of those cases, the question was altogether open, as the hon. gentleman's despatch shows. Now, the half-breeds must be considered either as white men or as Indians. A great many of them chose to be considered as Indians, to go to the bands of their brothers to enjoy all the advantages of the treaties, to get their annuities, their supplies, and the presents that were given to them. Others said: No; we are white men; we will be considered as white men; we will have the right of white men; and if so, they had the same rights as other white men living outside of the Province of Manitoba, who had settled before the 15th of July, 1870. Now, Sir, these rights have never been denied to them. Not one half-breed has ever been dispossessed of his land. Not one white settler who was in that country at any time before we acquired it, has ever been dispossessed of his lands. Not one act of depression has been announced by the hon. gentleman; no man has come to him and said I have lost my land, I have lost my patrimony, I have lost my house. No man has said he is not in the same complete and happy and undisturbed possession of his land as he

was in 1870. Aye, Sir, it is so; there is no pretence that there has been any oppression or any eviction; there is no pretence that there has been any ousting of any man, woman, or child in the great North-West by the action, direct or indirect, of the Government. Mind you, we only got the Province in 1870; we have only been able to introduce, by small degrees, anything like government or organisation since 1870. The thing was going on quietly but slowly, I must say, between 1870 and 1873, when the responsibility of the Government of that country devolved on hon. gentlemen opposite. From 1873 to 1878 that country was stagnant; from 1873 to 1878 not one single step was taken to vindicate the rights of the Indian or the half-breeds, or to assert the rights of the white man; from 1873 to 1878 is a blank leaf in the history of Canada. What step did that Government take in order to assert the rights of the half-breeds? What step did they take, in order to settle the boundary question of the boundary between man and man? What step did they take to survey the lands along the rivers? Look at that plan, and it will show what they did in their five years, and it will show what we did since we came back to office. They did nothing; they took no steps whatever. To be sure, the people went on, and they went on happily, and they would have gone on happily to this moment, had it not been that after the Conservative Government came in the whole end and aim of the Opposition was to excite and arouse those people. During five years they were quite ignorant of their wrongs; during five years they did not know they were suffering; they lived under their own roof-tree; they had their house, be it a humble turf house, or a wooden house, or be it a tent; and during the five years those hon. gentlemen were in they did not complain; they did not know they were wronged; they did not know they were trodden down and oppressed. It required the teaching of hon. gentlemen opposite and the radical press that they were going to lose their property, that they were oppressed, downtrodden, and I charge distinctly upon the Grit party and their associates in this House and out of the House, not only the responsibility but all the consequences. Why should the people, from 1878 to 1884, be more unhappy than were the people from 1873 to 1878? Was there any difference in their circumstances? Was there any attempt made to deprive them of the land and to change their position for the worse. No, they stood exactly, in March, 1885, as they did in the hon. gentleman's time. They were happy, peaceful and contented, until they were told by political agitators for political purposes—and for more sordid purposes than political purposes. In the great game of politics, parties some times go to great extremes; parties on both sides do what may not be considered within the strict lines of rectitude.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear; Franchise Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hear the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) talking about rectitude. I have shown him up a little. The hon. gentleman who comes here to support the hon. member for the west riding (Mr. Blake), and who, from the beginning of his administration, tried to keep down and crush and destroy the interests and the rights, or, rather, the claims, of those people which he is now advocating. But I say that both political parties may exceed the rules of rectitude. There is something large in the ground; something large in the political field. But there is not that excuse in this case. The game is not so much for political advantage, but it is for the purpose of enabling the land grabbers and speculators, who have a hold on these poor people, to make the most out of them. I believe the most of the claims of these poor people in the North-West are now mortgaged; I believe they have made assignments of them to white men, and that these people

will not be any richer by their claims being allowed. Perhaps the hon. member for Huron knows something about buying these claims?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Ask the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) and the hon. Minister of Customs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend near me (Mr. Bowell) just puts me in mind of a circumstance *a propos* of the frequent interruptions of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). The hon. member for the west riding (Mr. Blake) complained of the delays in issuing the patents, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) will, I dare say, make a speech about the delay in issuing patents. Well, in the office of the Department of Interior there is a letter from the hon. gentleman, insisting that no patent shall issue to a certain man, because the hon. gentleman has a claim against him of \$3,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should he not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is men like him whom we charge with the disturbance, whom we charge with all the discontent and all the effect of the discontent in the North-West: men who have gone there to make their fortune by some means or other; men who get hold of the people—and when they say: Oh, the patents ought to be issued; we ought not to allow speculators to hold the country; we ought to have the patents issued on the very day; we ought to protect the settlers against the speculator and the shaver, the people going in with money to fleece the settlers—when this cry is raised we find it raised by men like the hon. gentleman, who will vote and attack the Government for delay in issuing patents, and who, yet, is one of those who will ask that a patent be delayed in order that he may get his pound of flesh. When we took office, in 1878, we had to consider this question. The Government before us had altogether ignored the rights of the half-breeds; they had refused to listen to the representations of their own agent, Mr. Matthew Ryan, made under his own hand. Until 1879 there was no legal power, and the Government before us did not ask that power to deal honestly or fairly with the claims of the half-breeds. We only came in in November, 1878, but in the Parliament of 1879 we took power to deal with that subject, according to the best of our discretion. We wished to do the best for the North-West; we wished to do the best for the half-breeds and the country generally; we could have no other object in view. We had just come into power, after a defeated, a discredited Administration had gone out, with the united voice of the majority of the people. We had everything to gain by doing what was right, and we attempted to do what was right. What did we do? We wrote to the leading men of the North-West. We wrote to Archbishop Taché and to the other bishops, of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken; we wrote to Mr. Laird, and we got their opinions, and their opinions were united against the granting of scrip; their opinions were united against giving patents to the half-breeds. The hon. gentleman did not read that Col. Denis, my respected, and worthy, and able deputy, who now, I am sorry to say, is retired, wrote that remarkable despatch to which the hon. gentleman alluded, a despatch creditable to him and in some degree creditable to me, as sanctioning every word he wrote, asking the best advice we could get as to what we would do with these people, to save them from their own improvidence and grant them their rights, so far as was consistent with the general prosperity of the country. At the expense of being a little tedious, I will look over what these hon. gentlemen have said. The confidential despatch or letter of Col. Dennis I need not read, because it has been alluded to with sufficient fulness by the hon. gentleman, but let us take the answer of Archbishop Taché. Nobody can doubt that he was a

friend of the Indian; nobody can doubt that he was a friend of the half-breeds, and that, when he was writing back to the Department, he was pleading the cause of the half-breeds and fighting their battles, and pointing out, whether pleasing or displeasing to them, their interests. And what does he say? Does he advocate the granting of the scrip? Does he advocate the giving away of the lands? No; his opinion was quite the reverse. The hon. gentleman read a portion of this letter, in which he stated that the half-breeds are a highly sensitive race, that they feel and resent injury or insult; in fact, that they were daily humiliated in regard to their origin, and so on. Let us see what the Archbishop says:

"Every one acknowledges the desirability for the half-breeds to settle definitively on lands, to cultivate them. Here is a scheme I take the liberty to propose:

"(a.) I estimate the half-breed population actually in the North-West to number about twelve hundred families. Let the Government make twelve reserves for them, in the very places the half-breeds themselves will like to have them.

"(b.) Each reserve should be for one hundred families at least, and contain an area of twelve square miles of available land, that is to say, the extent of four townships.

"(c.) All the half-breeds, men, women and children, residing in the North-West on the 1st January, 1879, ought to receive two more negotiable scrips for eighty acres of land each, to be located by them in anyone of the twelve above-mentioned reserves.

"(d.) Said lands could neither be sold, mortgaged nor taxed, before they should have passed through the hands of, at least, the third generation of those who receive them, or of their representatives. I say, at least, because I am strongly inclined to believe that it is desirable that such land be entirely unalienable; and such an idea cannot seem unreasonable to those who consider the advantages deriving from a similar policy, with regard to real and unalienable estates of noblemen."

Now, every half-breed in the North-West, if he does not claim as an Indian and has not accepted as an Indian, belonging to an Indian band and enjoying all the advantages of an Indian, and they are great, because the treaties are liberal, the annuities are large, the supply of implements, cattle, seeds, and so on, is very generous, on the whole—and any half-breed who chooses to be an Indian can go with his tribe—but any half-breed who says I will be considered a white man has all the privileges of a white man; he can get his 160 acres, and after three years' cultivation he gets his land. Here is the friend of the half-breeds, Archbishop Taché, who says he shall not get that, but shall only have a claim to land, shall not have the use of it, unless he cultivates it himself, but he shall not be able to alienate it, that he cannot mortgage it or sell it; and who would take the land under these restrictions, when, under the more liberal law of the Dominion of Canada, every half-breed can enter himself for 160 acres and get his patent after three years, the same as an emigrant from Ontario and Quebec? So, when the Government took up the question which had been left on their hands unsettled, what was best to do for the half-breeds, they were told by Archbishop Taché that the half-breeds would get no land, no matter whether they settled upon it, no matter whether they built a house of marble or a house of clay, that they should have no rights upon it till the third generation. When that was presented to us, do you not think we should consider and pause before we handed over those lands to these people? Archbishop Taché, knowing and believing, having well ascertained that the granting of land to these people would lead to their alienating it for a few dollars, if a man wanted to make a present to his wife of a dress, or if the husband could get the present of a few dollars, or, perhaps, in some cases, a few gallons of whiskey. If we look over the various recommendations of the various bodies, in the North West we get the same result. Bishop MacLean who knew the country well, was not in favor of granting the patent for this land to these men. The bishop of Rupert's Land, who has lately gone there, honestly says he has been too short a time there to judge, and therefore he gives no opinion. But what does the North-West council

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

of 1878 say? The hon. gentleman quoted a portion but not the whole of it. I have not the original document, but I will read it from a letter of Mr. Matthew Ryan, who was a member of the council that passed the order. This was the resolution passed by the North-West council:—

"That in view of the fact that grants of land and issues of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinction of the Indian title for the lands of that Province, there will be dissatisfaction among the half-breeds of the Territories unless they receive some like consideration; that this consideration would most tend to the advantage of the half-breeds were it given in the form of a non-transferable location ticket for, say, 160 acres to each half-breed head of a family, and to each half-breed child at the time of the transfer to Canada, the ticket to be issued immediately to any half-breed of eighteen years or over, who furnishes evidence of his claim; that each half-breed obtaining such location ticket should be allowed to locate it upon any unoccupied Dominion lands, but the title of the land so entered should remain in the Crown for ten years."

The recommendation of Archbishop Taché was that the title should be kept away from the half-breeds for three generations. The recommendation of the council was that it should be kept away for ten years. What was the policy of the Government? Go, take your 160 acres; take your pre-emption for 160 acres more, and you shall stand as well as a white man, and shall get your patent after three years, no matter what the Archbishop or the North-West council have told us. We, the Government of the Dominion of Canada, have more confidence in the half-breeds even than their own Archbishop and their own council. We say: We give you the land; occupy it, cultivate it, live on it, be happy on it, and at the end of three years you will get 160 acres, and you will stand free and independent, a freeholder, a yeoman, a free man in the North-West. You shall not be subject to this paternal Government which has been urged upon you by your own friends in the North-West. Although we are so far away, although we do not know you, although we are charged with dealing unjustly by you, we have more confidence in you than your own friends. We will not ask you to remain for three generations as slaves of the soil—to remain ten years without your deed. We tell you that in three years you may go and occupy your land, and may God's blessing be with you. Sir, that is the policy of the Government, and that is the policy the hon. gentleman has maligned, that he has condemned, that he would curse. The policy of the Government has been generous, it has been free, it has been considerate, and mind you, Mr. Speaker, the Government have held that the land that he has is found in occupation of, and that he had the right to on the 15th July, 1870, that it was his, and the Government could not deprive him of it. The Dominion Act gave it to him. Every man, woman and child, under the Dominion laws, passed, I do not know whether originally by us and afterwards amended by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the Dominion Acts, one and all, declare that being in occupation of land before the Act passed they have now an inalienable right to their lands, no matter whether they are on odd-numbered or even-numbered sections. The Act says that in all unsurveyed lands the party, found in possession shall retain possession of that land, not only the half-breeds, whether English or French, but every white settler, every man in the North-West, whether he is a Hudson Bay factor, or clerk, or runner—every one of them had their rights under the Dominion Lands Act. It did not, in any way, interfere with the rights of the settlers. Everyone of those men may say to us: We have occupied this land; this is ours; we will get out a deed for that, and that is secured to us by the Dominion Lands Act; but we will take up, as settlers, 160 acres of land elsewhere. Every half-breed has that right. No one could deprive him of it. No one could say: If you are going to take your 160 acres as a homestead, you will lose your land as an old settler. They had a right to both, and those claims have been rejected; those claims are now inherent. And I tell you this, as I said before, that no one, no man, no woman,

has been dispossessed or distressed since the Government of Canada came into possession of that country. Well, Sir, what had the Government to do? We had all our friends; we had the Archbishop; we had even Mr. Jackson, of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken, who now represents the half-breeds in the North-West council; we had him stating that there should be no grant given to the half-breeds, except on condition of five years of continuous occupation. There was a conflict of opinion; I will not trouble the House with showing that there was an infinity of opinions; an infinity of advice was offered to the Government, how best to deal with the half-breeds, and the Government had only one thing to think of—what was the best for the people, what was it best to do for them, to save them even against their own improvidence, and at the same time not to keep back the settlement of the country. This, Mr. Speaker, may account, to any reasonable man, for what the hon. gentleman talks of as delay. They were not suffering anything. The half-breed had his own lot, he was not cultivating the land that he had. Giving him his land and giving him more land was giving him nothing. The nomadic half-breed, who had been brought up to hunt, having had merely his shanty to repair to in the dead season, when there was no game—what advantage was it to him to give him 160 or 240 acres more? It was of no use to him whatever, but it would have been of great use to the speculators who were working on him and telling him that he was suffering. Oh! How awfully he was suffering, ruined, destroyed, starving, because he did not get 240 acres somewhere else, or the scrip for it, that he might sell it for \$50! No, Sir; the whole thing is a farce. Now, Mr. Speaker, we, at the last moment, made concessions, and we did it for the sake of peace. The Government knew, my hon. friend, Sir David Macpherson, the Minister of Interior, knew that we were not acting in the interests of the half-breeds in granting them scrip, in granting him the land. We had tried, after consulting man after man, expert after expert, to find what was best for the country, and we found, without one single exception, they were all opposed to granting unlimited scrip and immediate patents to the half-breeds. But, Sir, an agitation arose, and the hon. gentlemen has rung the changes on Riel being brought into that country. Who brought him into the country? Not the Indians; not the half-breeds. The half-breeds did not pay the money. The white speculators in Prince Albert gave their money to Gabriel Dumont, and gave it to Lepine, and gave it to others. They had all got their assignments from the half-breeds; they had all got in their pockets the scrip or the assignment, and they sent down to bring Riel in as an agent to be a means of attaining their unhallowed ends. It is to the white men, it is to men of our own race and lineage, and not to the half-breeds, nor yet to the Indians, that we are to attribute the war, the loss of life, the loss of money, and the discredit that this country would have suffered had it not been for the gallant conduct of our volunteers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am able to prove that there has been a deep-laid conspiracy. I am able to establish that the cry of the half-breed grievances was merely a pretext. I am able to show that white man after white man has entered into it. And I tell you this, further, Mr. Speaker—I do not mean in the least degree to impugn the hon. member for West Durham; I do not at all mean to say that he was in any way a party to it; but I tell him this, and I can prove this, that they have unscrupulously used his name and used the name of his party, and they have used that name, not only in the North-West with the half-breeds, not only along the frontier, but they have used it at Washington; at Washington his name has been quoted. I do not believe the hon. gentleman is liable to the charge; but it only shows that you cannot touch pitch without becoming fouled. The hon. gentleman, I know, in his anxiety to get evidence against this Government, in his anxiety to get evidence, no

matter from whom or in what way—I can show, if need be, under his own handwriting and signature, that he has gone very far.

Mr. BLAKE. Show it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will prove it, with very great reluctance. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman ever heard of a person called J. E. Brown.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well. J. E. Brown was a man formerly in the Mounted Police in the North-West. J. E. Brown living in that country employed himself in the very useful but perhaps unpopular occupation of trying to be a detective. J. E. Brown, in his anxiety, not only to extol the merits of the North-West but also, perhaps, to do a little in a pecuniary way, wrote to the hon. member for the west riding of Durham, and told him he could give him a good deal of information—and he would like to get a pass. The hon. gentleman said he could not give him a pass, but he would try to see him in Toronto, and if he could not do so, he would try and get a confidential friend to see him. I have not the man's letter, but I have the hon. gentleman's reply. The man must have written saying: I am going to apply for a survey from the Dominion Government; it will prove rather inconvenient to me if I lost the office, and therefore, perhaps, you will not use my name in that connection, but treat it confidentially, until after I get the appointment. Then, of course, I will give you the information. The hon. gentleman answered him, that he would keep all his communications confidential until after he had got the office. J. E. Brown was to come to the Government here, and was to go on his knees and say he was a friend of the Government, and appeal to the Government and get employment on a survey, and then supply the hon. gentleman with information. The hon. gentleman indicates that I have not got those letters.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not say you have not got these letters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we will read them. Mr. Blake writes:

“OTTAWA, 7th May.

“I have your letter of the 6th, and should be very glad indeed to learn from you any facts connected with the management of affairs in the North-West Territories. I would willingly comply with your request for a pass to Ottawa if it were in my power, but I have no means of procuring railway passes. It is possible, though by no means certain, I may be in Toronto for a few hours within the next few days, and if so I would try to arrange an interview with you, or if I am unable to manage that, I can arrange an interview with a confidential friend of mine, who would note down, for my own ear only, all you should choose to communicate, if this would be agreeable to you.

“Yours faithfully,  
“EDWARD BLAKE.”

That is the prologue to the play.

“OTTAWA, 12th May, 1885.

“DEAR SIR,—I have your letter, and will ask a friend to make an appointment with you. I will take care, as you desire, that your name shall not be used to your prejudice. I will not disclose it until you have had ample opportunity of securing an appointment for the surveys this year, if you are fortunate enough to do so. But I fancy there will not be a great deal of surveying done. I should gladly assist you in procuring employment if it were in my power, but I have no means of forwarding your interests in this respect. With thanks for your good wishes,

“I am, yours faithfully,  
“EDWARD BLAKE.”

In the hon. gentleman's anxiety to show what a wicked Government this is, to prove how derelict it is in its duty, that it deserves the censure of the country, he tells this man to go on, apply for a position on the surveys, get it if he can, although he does not think there will be many surveys this year, and he will not reveal his name until after he has got the appointment. Then information is to be given by

this man who came on his knees to the Government, to show how the Government were injuriously affecting the interests of the country. That is not the way an hon. member usually gets information. We find, in consequence of the continual pressure of the white men, in consequence of the fact that the half-breeds at Prince Albert were the slaves of the white men, of the fact that they held meetings and might rise in arms or might do whatever the white men chose to ask them to do—we made up our mind that although we did not consider it for the interest of the people in the Territories, yet if they would accept nothing else, and we offered them 160 acres of land—if they would place themselves at the mercy of cormorants, who were ruining them and holding them as slaves, and continually keeping up an agitation, we cannot help it; we will give you scrip, although we know it is not in your interest, and it will be thrown away, and will be secured by people who will give you the smallest possible sum for it; but we cannot help it; this matter must be settled. I do not hesitate to say that I did it with the greatest reluctance. I do not easily yield, if there is a better course open; but at the very last moment I yielded, and I said: "Well, for God's sake let them have the scrip; they will either drink it or waste it or sell it; but let us have peace." And my successor, my respected and able successor, Sir David Macpherson, acted upon that decision, which was carried out in January. At that time we knew there was a discontented people; that the white people were making trouble. I say, and I appeal to the judgment of the House to say, if we did not act as we ought to have acted when, in 1879, when we took possession of the Government, when we found that the Government who were behind us had taken not a single step to settle this question; when we found that the Government had denied the right of the half-breed; when the whole thing was thrown upon us—if we did not act wisely, afterwards when we took power, when we went to the chief men of the country, to the men who were known to be friends of the half-breeds, when we went to the hierarchy and the clergy, both Catholic and Protestant; we went to everybody who could give us information, and they were unanimous in saying that it was wrong that this scrip should be used in this way, and that the land could be got possession of for little or nothing. We held out as long as we could, but such was the influence of the half-breeds, who already got a share of their lands in Manitoba, that they went to the North-West, they became dwellers on the plains, they played Indians, and pretended that they had lived in Manitoba; that they were suffering; that their Manitoba friends had got lands and scrip; and nine-tenths of the men claiming it had already got scrip, and were attempting to put up bargains in the North-West. Fourteen out of seventeen petitioners, in one case, were shown to have got lands already in Manitoba. Isidore Dumont, brother of Gabriel Dumont, had land; he applied again, and it was one of his grievances that he did not get more land in the North-West. Gabriel Dumont got not only his 160 acres, as promised, but he had the best house in Batoche; and so it was with very many of these men—they had already got their lands and scrip, but they were greedy to get more. Appetite grew with eating; and though they had got all much more than originally by law they ought to have got, they are clamoring for more. If time would permit, I could prove many such cases; but, perhaps, I may take another occasion, as the hon. gentleman has said we are going to hear from him again on this subject—I may take another occasion to show that the fact of the half-breed not getting, at the moment he wants it, his scrip or his claim for 240 acres, was a mere pretence; yet, Riel, from the beginning, when he went into the country until he left, went there for the purpose of making money. He came there for the most sordid purposes possible, and he told all kinds of lies. Among other things,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

he said that the hon. member for East York, when he was in the Government offered him \$20,000, and I offered him \$30,000—he remembered perhaps, the old matter, when he got some money on the frontier, in order to clear away. One of the letters read to-day by the hon. gentleman was that he had been promised a senatorship or a seat in the Cabinet. He came there, and he ruled these men for the most sordid purposes. The white men in Prince Albert and the vicinity, or many of them, subscribed to bring him there, and encouraged him there, for the sake of making a little fuss and drawing attention to Prince Albert and for the sake of threatening the Government into settling the claims of the half-breeds, or, in other words, putting money into their pockets. Sir, I shall not detain the House any longer on the subject. As the hon. gentleman has stated, it is a subject which cannot rest here. This subject must be fully dealt with. I have not alluded to the statements of the hon. gentleman, with respect to the land regulations, the treatment of the whites; and these questions the hon. gentleman has ingeniously mixed up with the question he brought before the House. He has been preparing himself for, I will not say how long, while this House was studiously and earnestly discussing the Franchise Bill; while they were occupied night and day working out that great problem, the hon. gentleman was diving into this question. Well, he has dived into it, and he has gone pretty low into its depths. The hon. gentleman first took up the half-breeds, then the land laws, then the whites, then the colonisation companies—and I do not know what else. But let him take each subject separately, clause by clause, sentence by sentence, impeachment by impeachment, charge by charge, and deal with them, and I shall meet him, and convince this House that the charges are groundless, that the Government are safe and sound, in the opinions of the people and of the country, because they have done what they believed to be the best in their judgment, ought to be done; and because I know that although perhaps they may have made occasional mistakes, although in the tentative process of settling a new country, they have committed, perhaps, an occasional error, they were not too proud to change; and when they came to the conclusion that they had committed an error, they did not indulge in the miserable vanity of thinking they could do no wrong. When they found that any of their conclusions, from their own judgment or on reference to their responsible officers, had better be altered, they were brave enough and honest enough to admit the error, and cure the error, and make amendment. What was the consequence? Sir, I believe we stand well among the whites of the North-West. I know we stand well with the red men of the North-West.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear, but I can prove by the testimony of every Indian that has been in arms—of Poundmaker, and Big Bear, and Beardy, and Little Pine, and Little Poplar, and all those Indians—I can show to you, not only that they have been well treated, but that those who have been their guardians, their clergy, and those who watched over them, admit that the Indians had no wrongs to redress; and if you will read the press of the North-West, read such papers as the Saskatchewan *Herald*, and will find that we were wrong—that we have been pampering and coaxing the Indians; that we must take a new course, we must vindicate the position of the white man, we must teach the Indians what law is; we must not pauperise them, as they say we have been doing.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. Why, Sir, I have come to this House again

and again and stated the case of the Indians. I have said it was a case of hardship, and we could not, as christian men, allow them to starve. We have done all we could to put them on themselves; we have done all we could to make them work as agriculturists; we have done all we could, by the supply of cattle, agricultural implements and instruction, to change them from a nomadic to an agricultural life. We have had very considerable success; we have had infinitely more success during our short period, than the United States have had during twenty five years. We have had a wonderful success; but still we have had the Indians; and then in these half-breeds, enticed by white men, the savage instinct was awakened; the desire of plunder—aye, and, perhaps, the desire of scalping—the savage idea of a warlike glory, which pervades the breast of most men, civilised or uncivilised, was aroused in them, and forgetting all the kindness that had been bestowed upon them, forgetting all the gifts that had been given to them, forgetting all that the Government, the white people and the Parliament of Canada had been doing for them, in trying to rescue them from barbarity; forgetting that we had given them reserves, the means to cultivate those reserves, and the means of education how to cultivate them—forgetting all these things, they rose against us. Why, Sir, we are not responsible for that; we cannot change the barbarian, the savage, into a civilised man. Look at the United States; consider the millions that they have expended in defending their frontier; look at the war that is now going on on the south-western frontier, where there is infinitely more loss of life among the tribes of Apaches than has occurred in all our North-West. It is an inglorious war, and there has been a great loss of life; but Americans do not take the part of the rebel and the traitor; that is reserved for the leader of the Opposition in the Parliament of Canada. We acquired the North-West country in 1870. Not a life was lost, not a blow was struck, not a pound nor a dollar was spent in warfare, in that long period that has since intervened. I have not hesitated to tell this House, again and again, that we could not always hope to maintain peace with the Indians; that the savage was still a savage, and that until he ceased to be savage, we were always in danger of a collision, in danger of war, in danger of an outbreak. I am only surprised that we have been able so long to maintain peace—that from 1870 until 1885 not one single blow, not one single murder, not one single loss of life, has taken place. Look at the United States; along the whole frontier of the United States there has been war; millions have been expended there; their best and their bravest have fallen. I personally knew General Custer, and admired the gallant soldier, the American hero; yet he went, and he fell with his band, and not a man was left to tell the tale—they were all swept away. The American army have suffered by hundreds; the American Treasury has been depleted by millions. We have, from a combination of unfortunate circumstances, had one war inconsiderately commenced, wickedly commenced, criminally commenced by the instigators. We put that down speedily and gallantly; and, Sir, it is one consolation, that if we have seen young men sacrificed, if we have lost from this House, as a consequence of that war, one of the most respected members, they went up there of their own accord to fight the battle of their country; they have gained glory and distinction, and they have convinced, not only us—we do not want that conviction—but the mother country, in whose good opinion we take so much pride, that we have as good a militia as their own, that we have men who, untrained as they are, still can listen to the voice of discipline, and will do everything they are called upon to do to maintain the credit of their country. Their action has raised the credit of Canada, not only among the right-minded thinking men of the world, but even in the sordid purlieus

of the stock exchange. The credit of Canada has risen, because Canada has shown, as a vindicator of herself, that she is worthy of being a nation, and worthy of the credit of the world.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:10 a.m., Tuesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bowell: That the House resolve itself again into Committee of Ways and Means, and the motion of Mr. Blake in amendment thereto.

Mr. LAURIER. There is an old saying well known to all of us that a good lawyer can make of a bad cause a good one. The speech of the right hon. gentleman yesterday must have convinced everyone of us that there are cases so desperately bad that all the ingenuity of the ablest counsel cannot make them appear good. The case must be desperate indeed when a gentleman of the high position which the right hon. gentleman occupies in this House, does not scruple to torture the words of his opponent, in order to make out a case for himself. In the very beginning of his speech, the hon. gentleman adopted that system, and he kept it up to the end. In almost his opening sentence the right hon. gentleman stated that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition—in the long, as he characterised it, and as he might have said, the most able speech ever delivered by my hon. friend—while presenting the claims of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories to a special grant of land, had not in a single instance stated that the claim was a just one. The hon. gentleman forgot, and he should not have forgotten, that my hon. friend at the very outset of his speech affirmed the justice of the case of the half-breeds in the most characteristic manner, in the following language:

"Justice is the same everywhere. Justice is the same, whether it be on the banks of the Saskatchewan or on the banks of the Red River; justice demands that the same treatment which has been extended to the half-breeds on the banks of the Red River shall also be extended to the half-breeds on the banks of the Saskatchewan."

The right hon. gentleman, Sir, forgot that statement, and the case has to be a desperate one indeed when it has to be supported with such a distortion of facts. Again, the hon. gentleman, proceeding in the same line, in order to clear himself of the charge that was brought against him of having failed for seven years to dispose of the claims of the half-breeds, stated that the Mackenzie Administration had not only failed to dispose of those claims, but had actually denied their justice; and in order to prove his statement he proceeded to quote with great apparent glee from a State paper of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) while in the Mackenzie Government. That paper was addressed to Mr. Laird, at that time Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, in answer to an application made by him for seed grain on behalf of the half-breeds. The hon. member for Bothwell wrote as follows:—

"The application of the petitioners to be aided by the Government with seed and agricultural implements in their farming operations, I confess I am not disposed to view favorably. I do not see upon what grounds the half-breeds can claim to be treated in this particular, different from the white settlers in the Territories.

"The half-breeds who have, in some respects, the advantages over new settlers in the Territories, should be impressed with the necessity of settling down in fixed localities and directing their energies towards pastoral or agricultural pursuits, in which case lands would, no doubt, be assigned to them in the same way as to white settlers. But beyond this they must not look to the Government for any special assistance in their farming operations."

So that this paper of my hon. friend from Bothwell did not at all apply to the question of the lands and the extinguishment of the Indian title, but it applied to the treatment of the half-breeds and their claim to be aided by being furnished seed, and agricultural implements. That was all, and yet during the whole of the speech of the right hon. gentleman, he insisted that the Mackenzie Government had denied the claims of the half-breeds to a special grant of land in extinguishment of the Indian title. Then again, continuing in the same strain, the right hon. gentleman charged his predecessors with dereliction of duty, because they had failed, while in power, to settle the land claims of the half-breeds. Sir, is it possible that the right hon. gentleman had the courage to advance such a plea as this in justification of himself? How long is it since the Mackenzie Administration has fallen from power? It is six full years; nearly seven years have elapsed since then. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it was a crime in the Mackenzie Administration to have failed to settle those claims, how can the hon. gentleman defend himself when he has allowed nearly seven years to elapse without doing so either? The charge against the Mackenzie Administration is perfectly groundless, as I shall demonstrate before I take my seat, but if that pretended excuse be the only justification which the right hon. gentleman can urge in his behalf, I leave it to the judgment of this country to say whether it is a sufficient justification or not. Now, the hon. gentleman proceeded very exultingly to declare that there had been no case of oppression, that there was not even a pretension that the people had been oppressed, that not a single half-breed had been removed from his holding. No cause for oppression! Why, Mr. Speaker, was it not oppression when men had long been settled upon their lands, even before the country was transferred to Canada, when they had made homes for themselves, when they had put buildings upon their lands, and when, under the policy of the present Government, land surveyors were sent among them, who ran lines across their fields, splitting up farms and fields, who ran their lines so as to put the buildings on one side and the field on the other; and after these people had sent delegation after delegation to this Government for redress, had been constantly refused redress. If this was not a case of oppression, I would like to know what can constitute oppression in the eyes of the right hon. gentleman? The homes of these people were invaded—not accidentally but deliberately—under the policy of the Government for the survey of that country; and yet, the hon. gentleman says there was no case of oppression. Sir, what was it then that Father André protested against when he wrote to the Government in the following manner, first setting forth that settlers there have settled according to the old customs, ten chains fronting on the river; and trusting the Government would survey accordingly, he adds:

"Their surprise may be imagined when they saw the lands along the Saskatchewan measured off into squares of forty chains, without heed being given to their just claims and protests."

What is it that Father Vigreville protested against when he wrote to Captain Devile, chief of the surveys:

"I, myself, caused Mr. Duck, the Dominion land surveyor, to write several times to Ottawa, and always without success, until finally I became discouraged myself, and several people were obliged to leave the settlement, some selling their land for a nominal price, and others abandoning it without any compensation.

Mr. LAURIER,

"In February, 1883, the Rev. Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney were deputed by the settlement to set forth our complaints and present our demands to the Government. They were given a written promise that the lands we occupied should be surveyed in river lots of 10 chains frontage by 2 miles in depth, and that this survey should take place in the autumn following (1883). I understand you to tell me to have patience; that everything will come out right in the end. Those are words which, permit me to say, I cannot accept; the time is past.

The hon. gentleman then proceeded to say that no half-breed had ever been molested, that no half-breed had ever lost his holding. In an organ of the Government, *Le Manitoba*, of 13th May last, I find the following letter from half-breeds, which was first published in English in the *Edmonton Bulletin*. I have it here in French, and I will re-translate it into the original English. This is what the paper goes on to say:

"Far from obtaining liberal terms, we have not even obtained justice. Last summer we had the agent of the Government to settle all questions relating to lands in this locality. If the agent's only object had been to provoke the half-breed rebellion, he could not have done better than by following the course he has done, and giving the decision he has recorded, which decisions are always characterised by the most manifest injustice. It would be impossible to state a case of a section of land in dispute between a half-breed and a stranger where the half-breed has not been sacrificed. In many instances half-breeds who for a long time have been in possession of these lands, have had their lands taken away from them and divided among strangers newly arrived; and these unfortunate half-breeds have been thereby forced to leave the place and go and settle elsewhere, where the same fate perhaps awaits them in the future. Is it believed we have no grievances? We have grievances and we feel them deeply.

"Signed,  
SAMUEL CUNNINGHAM,  
OCTAVE BELLEROSE,  
JOHN CUNNINGHAM,  
BAPTISTE COURTEPATTE,  
JOHN ROWLAND,  
O. ROWLAND,  
L. CHASTELLAIRE,  
L. GORIVEAU."

Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to say that the whole blame of the rebellion and its consequence must be cast upon the Grit party. When the hon. gentleman has made such a statement as I have just referred to, that there are no grievances among the half-breeds in the North-West, he may as well say that the Grit party is responsible for the rebellion and all its consequences. Such rant—for such language is nothing more than rant—is unworthy of him. Yet, such language is quite in keeping with the language which the hon. gentleman has used ever since the opening of these troubles. Ever since these North-West troubles arose the tactics of hon. gentlemen have been to wash their hands of all responsibility and proclaim themselves quite innocent of the blood shed, and lay all the blame on the insurgents. To every enquiry made, as to the origin of these troubles the same answer is given: The half-breeds have no cause, they have no grievances. Such has been the language of the hon. gentleman all through. Speaking on a recent occasion on the same subject, he stated, what he repeated again yesterday, that the half-breeds had no cause, that the rebellion was a causeless rebellion; and he concluded in the following language:—

"We believe, with all the consciousness of being right, that the judgment of the country will be that we have acted well, that we have acted to the best of our abilities, and that, in this case, our abilities have not been wrongly directed."

And again, speaking on the same subject on another occasion, he made another declaration. At that time he believed that the rebellion was not due to the Grit party—that is a new thought, a new grievance—but was due to Louis Riel. He said:

"From former occurrences in the North-West, he (Riel) is considered a sort of martyr in the cause—a sort of half-breed Mahdī—and they look up to him with a sort of superstitious regard, and from that feeling he is able to act upon these poor people."

Such was the language of the hon. gentleman. The only explanation he could give of the rebellion has been this: That the insurgents have no grievances, but that they had been the victims and dupes of Louis Riel. Such an expla-

nation is exceedingly futile. From what we know of Louis Riel, he does not appear to be one of those extraordinary men, who can command general sway over their fellow countrymen. And there is no man in the world, whatever his power may be, who could take men from a state of peace and bring them into war, simply by his influence, unless there were deep-seated and long-felt feelings of grievances. The hon. gentleman compared Louis Riel to the Mahdi. We know little about the Mahdi. But we do know this: That the people of the Soudan who were brought into rebellion had been suffering for years and years from most despotic rule. They had been for years ground by excessive taxation, and the Mahdi brought them into rebellion, by promising to relieve them from the state of suffering in which they were then placed. I can illustrate what I am now saying, that no man however powerful, can exercise such influence as is attributed to Louis Riel, by a page from our own history. Few men have there been anywhere who have wielded greater sway over his fellow-countrymen than did Mr. Papineau at a certain time in the history of Lower Canada, and no man ever lived who had been more profusely endorsed by nature to be the idol of a nation. A man of commanding presence, of majestic countenance, of impassioned eloquence, of unblemished character, of pure disinterested patriotism, for years and years he held over the hearts of his fellow countrymen almost unbounded sway, and even to this day the mention of his name will arouse throughout the length and breadth of Lower Canada, a thrill of enthusiasm in the breasts of all, men or women old or young. What was the secret of that great power he held at one time? Was it simply his eloquence, his commanding intellect, or even his pure patriotism? No doubt, they all contributed; but the main cause of his authority over his fellow-countrymen was this, that at that time, his fellow countrymen were an oppressed race, and he was the champion of their cause. But when the day of relief came, the influence of Mr. Papineau, however great it might have been and however great it still remained, ceased to be paramount. When eventually the Union Act was carried, Papineau violently assaulted it, showed all its defects, deficiencies and dangers, and yet he could not raise his followers and the people to agitate for the repeal of that Act. What was the reason? The conditions were no more the same. Imperfect as was the Union Act it still gave a measure of freedom and justice to the people, and men who at the mere sound of Mr. Papineau's voice would have gladly courted death on battle fields or scaffold, then stood silent and irresponsible, though he asked them nothing more than a constitutional agitation for a repeal of the Union Act. Conditions were no more the same; tyranny and oppression had made rebels of the people of Lower Canada, while justice and freedom made them true and loyal subjects, which they have been ever since. And now to tell us that Louis Riel, simply by his influence, could bring these men from peace to war; to tell us that they had no grievances; to tell us that they were brought into a state of rebellion either through pure malice or through imbecile adherence to an adventurer, is an insult to the intelligence of the people at large, and an unjust aspersion on the people of the Saskatchewan. The hon. gentleman tells us that the people of the Saskatchewan river have no wrongs, this is but a continuation of the system which has been followed all along with regard to these people. They have been denied their just rights, and now they are slandered by the same men whose unjust course towards them drove them to the unfortunate proceedings they have adopted since. This I do charge upon the Government: that they have for years and years ignored the just claims of the half breeds of the Saskatchewan, that for years and years, these people have been petitioning the Government and always in vain. I say they have been treated by this Government with an indifference amounting to undisguised contempt, that they have been goaded into the unfortunate course they have adopted, and

if this rebellion be a crime, I say the responsibility for that crime weighs as much upon the men who, by their conduct, have caused the rebellion, as upon those who engaged in it. The right hon. gentleman said yesterday that the leader of the opposition had prepared a brief for the lawyers of Louis Riel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; that is true.

Mr. LAURIER. They say now it is true. I say this, that if the conduct of the Government is part of the defence of Louis Riel, then the Government must take the consequences. It will not do for them to say: You must not attack us, because by attacking us you will save Louis Riel. The Government have put Louis Riel on his trial for life and death, and I suppose it is not his blood they are looking for. I suppose, if they are looking to anything, they are looking to nothing but substantial British justice, and if, in the facts brought out yesterday by my hon. friend, there is something which would go in favor of the defence of Louis Riel, then Louis Riel has the full right to that part of his defence. I say more. I repeat that I do not believe that the men who to-day have put Louis Riel on his trial for his life and death do not desire his blood, that they are only looking for justice; and if justice requires that in the numerous papers which have been suppressed, which have not been brought down to this House, there is anything which can go in favor of Louis Riel's defence, it is their duty to bring them down, and if they were concealing anything which could serve for the defence of Louis Riel, I would charge them with helping to his murder, if he were tried in the absence of such portion of his defence. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to attempt to rouse the prejudices of the masses with respect to this matter. There are prejudices in this country of many kinds. We are not yet so built up as a nation as to forget our respective origins, and I say frankly that the people of my own Province, who have a community of origin with the insurgents, sympathise with them, just as the sympathies of the people of Ontario who are of a different origin would go altogether in the other direction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, sir.

Mr. LAURIER. No? Why is it then that it was repeated yesterday, that it is repeated to-day in the press, that it will be asserted and repeated to-morrow, and again and again, that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has prepared a brief for the lawyers of Louis Riel. Why, Sir, that is appealing to the worst kind and the lowest prejudices of the masses. It is said, and truly said, in your language, Sir, that blood is thicker than water. I am of French origin, and I confess that if I were to act only from the blood which runs in my veins, it would carry me strongly in favor of these people; but above all, I claim to be in favor of what is just and right and fair, to be in favor of justice to every man, and I say, let justice be done, and let the consequences fall upon the guilty ones, whether on the head of Louis Riel, or on the shoulders of the Government. Sir, the Government are all the more unjustifiable in their conduct, that the experience of the past ought to have made them more cautious. It is an ominous fact that, although this young Confederation has existed only eighteen years, it has already been assailed twice by armed rebellion. Of the first rebellion we now know the causes. Light has been let upon that subject. What was the cause of the first rebellion on the Red River in 1869 and 1870? The cause as we now know, is, that the Government—this Government, the men who are in power now, and who were in power then—attempted to take possession of the country without any regard to the rights of the people as a whole, whilst they invaded the rights of the people as individuals. It may be conceived that these people, who had been accustomed to the wild liberty of the prairie, who had been accustomed for generations and generations to rove all over the whole continent, who looked

upon the country as their own, and regarded as their own every plot of land on which they chose to pitch their tents; I say it may be well conceived that these people, half wild as they were, would regard with something like jealousy the doings of a Government which suddenly came in upon them, and assumed authority over the Territory. Then what took place at that time? One would have thought that it would have been at least prudent on the part of the Government to take some conciliatory steps towards these people, but instead of that they went into the country and treated the people as people used to be treated in feudal times, as if they had been part and parcel of the territory which was purchased from the Hudson's Bay Company—treating the people, I say, as if they were serfs in feudal times—part of the ground which was sold. The people resented such a course. But that was not all. The Government attempted a system of survey which was the most odious that could be devised for the people. Some of the people had holdings or properties, with fields and buildings, and the surveyors sent by the Government paid no heed to their holdings, but ran their lines across their possessions, and, as might be imagined, a great disturbance took place. The facts are well illustrated by the history of the rebellion, and I cannot do better on this subject than quote the following from the report of Mr. Donald A. Smith, who was at that time appointed agent to investigate the matter:

"A not inconsiderable number of them remained true to their allegiance during all the trouble through which they have had to pass, and with these will now be found associated many others whose minds had for a time been poisoned with gross misrepresentations made by designing men, for their own selfish ends. A knowledge of the true state of the case of the advantages they would derive from a union with Canada, had been carefully kept from them, and they were told to judge of Canadians generally by the acts and bearing of some of the less reflecting immigrants, who had denounced them as cumberers of the ground, who must speedily make way for a superior race about to pour in upon them. It is also true that in the unauthorised proceedings of some of the recent Canadian arrivals, some plausible ground had been given for the jealousy and alarm with which the contemplated change of Government was regarded by the native population. In various localities these adventurers had been industriously marking off for themselves considerable, and in some cases very extensive and exceptionally valuable tracts of land, thereby impressing the minds of the people with the belief that the time had come when, in their own country, they were to be entirely supplanted by strangers—a belief, however, I have no doubt, which might have been entirely precluded by the prevention of all such operations, until Canada had fully unfolded her policy and shown the groundlessness of these fears."

Upon the same subject, a book written by Mr. Tuttle, "The History of Manitoba," speaks as follows upon the attitude and the feeling of the French half-breeds:—

"The feeling of the French half-breeds may be briefly expressed as this: That they questioned the right of the Dominion Government to take possession of what they considered their country, without their consent. The feeling was shown in the stoppage of the surveyors, Snow and Webb."

More characteristic yet, a pamphlet, written by Louis Riel, in 1874, and published at the office of the *Nouveau Monde*, reads thus:

"The North-West Territories were transferred to Canada only on the 15th July, 1870; but Canada commenced in 1868-69 public works in its own name, in Rupert's Land and the North-West, without having obtained the authority of the Hudson Bay Company. The arrival of the Canadian agents in the country was signalised by the contempt which they affected for the authority of the Hudson Bay Company and for the old settlers. They attempted to take possession of the best lands of the half-breeds, especially at Pointe des Chênes, a parish about 30 miles east of Fort Garry. They pretended that they had bought those lands from the Indians. After Mr. Snow had commenced the work of the Dawson route between the Lake of the Woods and Pointe des Chênes, in 1868, in the name of Canada, another intruder under the same authority, commenced a survey in the summer of 1869 around Fort Garry, of the public and private lands as well under a new system of survey which deranged, without explanation at all, the existing order of things, and disturbed without scruple the old settlers in the peaceful and legal possession of their lands."

So, Sir, you see that the grievances of the half-breeds at that time were two-fold. They complained first that Canada had taken possession of their country without respect for their rights as a people; and they complained, in the second place, that the Government, by their system of survey, had invaded

Mr. LAURIER.

their actual possessions and properties. Well, they rebelled; they could not stand this; and the consequence of this rebellion, whatever it may have been otherwise, was that the Government were forced to grant to the half-breeds what they had denied hitherto; that is, the Government acknowledged their right of sovereignty in the land by the distribution of 1,400,000 acres among them, in extinguishment of the Indian title, and abandoned the old system of survey and adopted a new system by which the holdings of the half-breeds were respected. Now, it might have been hoped that the experience of the past would have made the Government more cautious, and would have taught them to treat a highly sensitive people like the half-breeds, with something like fairness and consideration. Indeed, the Government seem to be just like the Bourbons, who, according to Napoleon, neither learned anything nor forgot anything; in this matter the Government seem not to have learned anything or forgotten anything. I say the present Government are far more open to censure for the uprising on the Saskatchewan River than they were for the uprising on the Red River. Guilty as they were in 1869 for their treatment of the half-breeds on the Red River, this, at least, might be said in attenuation, that they had no time to change their policy—that the rebellion sprang up on them before they had time to retrace their steps and correct the errors which more caution at the outset might have averted. But on this present occasion, if millions of dollars have been expended within a few weeks, if valuable lives have been lost and some of the most precious blood of Canada has been shed, if the horrors of civil war, and worse yet of Indian war, have to be deplored, what is the reason? Is it because the Government have not had time to mend a vicious policy, to retrace their steps? Sir, it is because for years and years the Government have pursued a system which they are even now pursuing, of denying that the people had grievances to complain of. It is because for years and years the Government have closed their ears not to hear the complaints, because they have closed their eyes not to see the wrongs, because they have acted like the ostrich which buries its head in the sand so as not to see the danger, and thus ignores the danger; this is the reason that we have had an uprising on the Saskatchewan; and as I said, the Government are far more open to censure for this uprising than they were for the uprising of 1869-70. There was no disturbance on the Saskatchewan River in 1869-70, and the reason is obvious; in 1869-70 the Government had not attempted to assert their authority on the banks of the Saskatchewan River; they did not push on their authority at that time beyond the Red River, and therefore the people on the Saskatchewan River, not being interfered with in any way, continued to live as they had lived hitherto. But the day came when the Government of Canada undertook to assert their authority on the Saskatchewan, and properly so, in order to open that fine country to immigration from the east, the half-breeds on that river showed the same anxiety and made the same claims as the half-breeds on the Red River had done. I have shown you that the claims of the half-breeds on the Red River were two-fold—they claimed that their rights to the soil should be recognised in some manner and they were recognised; and they asked that they should not be troubled in their holdings, and those claims were conceded to them. As soon as the Canadian Government attempted to assert their authority on the Saskatchewan River, the half-breeds there made exactly the same claims. At the outset they demanded nothing more or less than that their rights to the soil and their rights in the extinguishment of the Indian title should be recognised, and that the lands they held, they should be allowed to continue to hold without disturbance. With regard to the first question, I am not aware, though the hon. gentleman said to the contrary yesterday, that the

half-breeds of Saskatchewan River ever formulated any demand as to lands before the year 1878, or the last days of 1877. The hon. gentleman said that demands had been made to the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I believe that some demands from the Qu'Appelle district were made before 1878, but no demand, so far as I am aware, from the banks of the Saskatchewan, came to the Government before 1878; and the reason is obvious. The country had just only been opened for settlement; the Government had not attempted to exercise authority over the territory for more than 3 years; Mr. Laird, who was the first Lieutenant Governor, was appointed in 1876, and he only reached Battleford in 1877; in fact it took him several months of travel to get at the seat of Government at Battleford. In 1877, a petition was formulated by the half-breeds, and it ran as follows:—

"Your petitioners would humbly represent that their rights to a participation in the issue of half-breed or old settlers scrip are as valid and binding as those of the half-breeds and old settlers of Manitoba, and are expected by them to be regarded as scrupulously as in that Province; and with a view to the adjustment of the same your petitioners would humbly request that a census of said half-breeds and old settlers be taken at as early a date as may be conveniently determined upon, with a view to apportioning to those of them, who have not already been included in the census of Manitoba, their just allotments of land and scrip."

Then, some time in the month of February, a deputation came from St. Laurent to interview Mr. Laird about the same matter, and they presented him a petition, making in substance, the same demand. This petition was addressed, not to the Government at Ottawa, but to the Lieutenant Governor himself; he referred it to his council; the council did not sit until the following month of August; and in that month the council adopted the resolution which has been several times quoted yesterday, whereby the claims of the half-breeds for an apportionment of land were presented to the favorable consideration of the Government at Ottawa. The resolution ran as follows:—

"That in view of the fact that grants of land and issues of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands of that Province, there will undoubtedly be general dissatisfaction among the half-breeds of the said Territories unless they receive some like consideration."

Then Mr. Laird visited Duck Lake settlement in the following month of September. He was again interviewed by a deputation of the St. Laurent settlement, and they asked him particulars as to what had become of their petition, and what treatment it had received at the hands of the Government. Mr. Laird explained that the council having sat only in August, the Government had not yet had time to consider their application. They were satisfied with the explanation, and their spokesmen cordially thanked the Lieutenant Governor for the kind manner in which he had replied to their enquiries. The half-breeds, it must be said, displayed on that occasion a most gentle spirit; they could not have acted with greater propriety. Then came the fall of the Mackenzie Government and a new Government came into power, the Government of the hon. gentleman opposite. In 1879 the Government took power to deal with the half-breeds in the same manner as the former Government took power to deal with the half-breeds of the Red River, and after the manner suggested by the North-West Council; that is to say, the Government took power for the extinguishment of the Indian title, in so far as it was vested in the half-breeds. Before going further, it is appropriate that we should at once, in order to fix the responsibility of the Government in this matter, refer to the whole legislation on this matter; the Act of 1870, which was the first Act, the Act of 1874, which was the second Act, and then the Act of 1879, to see exactly what was the purport and the object and the cause of the legislation then put upon the Statute Book. The Act of 1870 ran as follows:—

"And whereas it is expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the Province, to appropriate a portion of such ungranted lands, to the extent of 1,400,000 acres thereof, for the benefit of the families of the half-breed residents, it is hereby enacted, that, under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor General in Council, the Lieutenant Governor shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the Province as he may deem expedient, to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the said transfer to Canada."

So the object of the Act is perfectly clear; it is an allotment of land to the extent of 1,400,000 acres for the avowed purpose of dividing the same among the children of the heads of half-breed families, towards the extinguishment of the Indian title. Then the Act of 1874, ran as follows:—

"Whereas, by the 31st section of the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 3, it was enacted as expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the Province of Manitoba, to appropriate one million four hundred thousand acres of such lands, for the benefit of the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the transfer thereof to Canada; and whereas no provision has been made for extinguishing the Indian title to such lands as respects the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the period named; and whereas it is expedient to make such provision, and it is deemed advisable to effect the same by grant of land, or by any issue of scrip redeemable in Dominion lands."

Here, again, the same spirit is apparent, the same object is avowed. The grant is made in extinguishment of the Indian title, in so far as it was vested in the half-breeds; and in 1879, the Act passed by hon. gentlemen opposite upon this question, enacted as follows:—

"The Government have power to satisfy any claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title, preferred by half-breeds resident in the North-West Territories outside of the limits of Manitoba, on the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, by granting land to such persons to such extent and on such terms and conditions, as may be deemed expedient."

So there cannot be any ambiguity. Provision was introduced in the last statute by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves with the express object of extinguishing the Indian title vested in the half-breeds. This Act never was put in force, its provisions never were carried out. What was the reason? We do not know yet. The Government never told us; I do not believe the Government know themselves the reason. But it was important that this provision should be acted upon. As early as 1879, the Government appointed Mr. Davin to make a report upon the matter. It does not appear he ever reported but it appears that several influential persons in the Territories, among them Archbishop Taché, were consulted on the matter. Upon the importance of at once dealing fairly and generously with the half-breeds. His Grace Archbishop Taché wrote as follows:—

"It must be freely admitted that the half-breeds of the North-West have a claim to favorable consideration. Great uneasiness is felt by them in consequence of no steps having yet been taken in their behalf. A liberal policy on the part of the Government would attract to its side a moral and physical power which in the present critical relations of the various tribes of Indians towards each other and towards the Government, would prove of the greatest value to the Dominion. On the other hand the half-breed element if dissatisfied would form a standing menace to the peace and prosperity of the Territories. There is no doubt that the state of affairs in the Territories in relation to the Indians and half-breeds, is calling for the serious consideration of the Government, and measures should be adopted to cultivate and maintain relations with the half-breed population calculated to attract them to us." \* \* \* \* \*

"The half-breeds are a highly sensitive race; they keenly resent injury or insult, and daily complain on that point. In fact they are daily humiliated with regard to their origin by the way they are spoken of, not only in newspapers, but also in official and semi-official documents."

Mr. GIROUARD. What is the date of that?

Mr. LAURIER. January, 1879. Then, at the same time, the archbishop suggested a plan to the Government. He suggested that a certain tract of land be apportioned to them. He goes on to say:

"All the half-breeds, men, women and children, residing in the North-West on the 1st January, 1879, ought to receive two non-negotiable scrips for 80 acres of land each, to be located by them in one of the twelve above-mentioned reserves, said lands to be neither sold, mortgaged nor taxed until they should have passed through the hands of at least the third generation of those who receive them or of their representatives."

This was the plan suggested by Archbishop Taché to the Government to adopt. The Government did not adopt it; they would not adopt it; the right hon. gentleman said he would not adopt it. What was the reason? The hon. gentleman stated yesterday that he would not adopt the plan of Archbishop Taché, because, forsooth, the plan of Archbishop Taché would have made the half-breeds wards of the Government; he would rather trust to them; he had a plan of his own for their settlement, for their establishment. What was that plan of his own? Where was it? When was it executed? When was it shown to the country? Where was it published? When was it communicated to the half-breeds themselves? Sir, I believe the right hon. gentleman, when he says he had a plan for the settlement of the half-breed claims, is boasting—it is a vain and idle boast. The hon. gentleman never had any plan at all for the settlement of the half-breeds, or if he had any, it was just like the plan of General Trochu to compel the Germans to raise the siege of Paris; it was a fine plan, according to him, but no one ever saw it, he never attempted to execute it; and the hon. gentleman's plan is in the same manner. And, more than that, I say that if the Government did not carry out the plan of Bishop Taché, did not settle the claims of the half-breeds, it is because the Prime Minister was opposed, in principle and in practice to the extinguishment of the Indian title, in so far as it is vested in the half-breeds. I say that the reason why the Government have not, from 1879 to 1885, settled the claims of the half-breeds to a grant of land, is simply because the Prime Minister held that the half-breeds were not entitled to a special grant of land, and this I can prove out of his own mouth. Not later than the 26th March, the Prime Minister, speaking upon this very question, expressed himself as follows:—

“As a whole, the half-breeds have been told that if they desire to be considered as Indians, there are most liberal reserves that they could go with the others; but that if they desired to be considered white men, they would get 160 acres of land as homesteads. But they are not satisfied with that; they want to get land scrip of equal quantity—I think upwards of 200 acres—and then get, as a matter of course, their homesteads as well.”

Sir, this was the policy to which the hon. gentleman objected, that the half-breeds should get their grant of lands in extinguishment of the Indian title, and then be at liberty to settle on the lands in the North-West. That principle, to which the hon. gentleman objected, is the very principle which has been admitted in our Statute Books ever since 1870. According to the Act of 1870, and the Act of 1874, which completed it, an allotment of land was made to the half-breeds simply in extinguishment of the Indian title, and the half-breed, after he had received the scrip for his land in extinguishment of the Indian title, was at liberty, as every other subject, and even as every foreigner, to go to the North-West and homestead upon any land, and claim it as his own. But the hon. gentleman would not give that to the half-breed. In fact, he said, as late as the 26th of March last, that the half-breeds were asking to have 160 acres of land, the same as every homesteader, and besides that, 200 acres for the extinguishment of their Indian title, and to this he objected; and this then, Sir, is the reason why, from 1878 to 1885, the half-breed question has not been dealt with by the hon. gentleman. I say, the policy of the Government, as indicated in the Statute Book, has been that the half-breeds were entitled, just as much as the Indians, to the extinguishment of the Indian title, but, as white men, instead of taking compensation for their Indian title collectively they were allowed to take it individually, and that is the only difference between them and the Indians, so far as the extinguishment of the Indian title was concerned. And, is land such a scarce article in the North-West? Have we not an abundance of land in the North-West? And will we seriously be told that it was not just or fair that the half-breeds should be allotted a lot of the wide lands of the North-West while the same privi-

Mr. LAURIER.

leges had been granted to the half-breeds in Manitoba? What reason could there be for not giving to the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan River the very same privileges and rights which had been given to the half-breeds on the Red River? As my hon. friend said yesterday, is not justice the same everywhere—upon the Saskatchewan as upon the Red River? If the half-breeds on the Red River were given a special grant of land in extinguishment of the Indian title, did not justice demand that the same privileges and rights should be given to the half-breeds upon the Saskatchewan River? The officers of the Government in the North-West Territories, the North-West Council, the settlers themselves were more generous to the half-breeds than the right hon. gentleman. Again and again the people of the North-West called the attention of the Government to this. I have already quoted the resolution of the council passed in 1879 upon that question. Again, in 1881, Mr. Clarke, a member of the council, presented a resolution:

“That the half-breeds have always been recognised as possessing rights in the same soil, subject to which the Dominion accepted the transfer of the Territories, and while ample provision has been made for those resident in Manitoba, on the 15th July, 1870, nothing has been done towards extinguishing that portion of the Indian title to lands and territories outside the Province of Manitoba, as originally formed by the Act of 1870.”

Then he goes on to say that the same thing should be done for the half-breeds in the North-West Territory. I believe the council passed a resolution upon this, and transmitted it to the Government, but the Government paid no heed to it. Later on the people of the North-West Territory held meetings and passed resolutions advocating the very same course in favor of the half-breeds. A meeting took place at St. Albert, in October of this year, where it was resolved:

“Whereas the Indian title in this district or territory has not been extinct, and the old settlers and half-breed population of Manitoba ever granted scrip in commutation of such title, and such allowance has not been made to the residents in this territory, resolved that the right hon. the Minister of the Interior be requested to grant such scrip to such settlers, thus placing them on an equal footing with their confères in Manitoba.”

This resolution was transmitted to the Government by Mr. Charles Nolin. There was an answer from the Government which was quite in keeping with the principle enunciated yesterday by the right hon. gentleman. The answer was as follows:—

“Resolution No. 3—As by treaty with the Indians, their title to any portion of the Territory included within the District of Lorne has been extinguished, this resolution would need explanation.”

Well, Sir, that was transmitted to the people of the North-West. Mr. Clark, who had looked into the matter, sent a conclusive answer, setting forth all the legislation from 1874 to 1879, and showing conclusively that the policy of this Government had been the extinguishment of the Indian titles in favor of the half-breeds. Then resolutions were also passed by the people in favor of the same policy, but all without avail. At last Riel was sent for and brought into the country, and it would seem that then at least the Government would have yielded what they had so far refused, but still they moved not. And when did they move? At the time, as was shown by my hon. friend yesterday, when the rebellion was ripe in the North-West Territories on the 26th January, they did something; and what was it? They simply asked for a census. At that time they had no policy upon the matter. When they issued the Order in Council on the 26th January, 1885, to take a census of the half-breeds in the North-West, at that time they had no policy, because, as I have shown by the language of the right hon. gentleman, on the 26th March following, he would not acknowledge that the half-breeds were entitled to a special grant in extinguishment of the Indian title. He simply pretended that they had no more rights than the ordinary settlers; that all they could do was simply to go on to the lands unsettled and take up a homestead or pre-emption, and nothing

more; so that at that very time, on the 26th March, the Government had no policy whatever. But, Sir, something took place then which gave the Government a policy, and what was it? Sir, on the very day the hon. gentleman was speaking here in this House, when he stated that the half-breeds of the North West had no more rights than the ordinary settler, that all they could ask for was a homestead or pre-emption, on that very day the fight at Duck Lake was going on; and the bullets of the Duck Lake fight did more to settle this question than six long years of prayers and petitions had done. Six long years of constant petitioning had failed to secure justice for these people, had failed to procure a remedy of the grievances of which they complained, but the bullets of Duck Lake immediately set the Government in motion and immediately brought them to terms. On the 30th March, four days afterwards, the Government came down with an Order in Council in which, for the first time, the rights of the half-breeds were to some extent acknowledged. Not completely acknowledged however; by this Order in Council the half-breeds were allowed a certain grant of land, not however, in extinguishment of the Indian title, but with conditions of settlement. Then commissioners were appointed and proceeded to the disturbed districts. One of the commissioners, Mr. Street, being on the spot, looking at the matter, advised the Government that it was necessary in order to satisfy these people to give them a special grant of land, the same as had been given to the half-breeds in Manitoba, irrespective of conditions of settlement; and since that time forsooth, the commissioners have been distributing scrip amongst the half-breeds in North-West Territory. At last Mr. Speaker, these men who have been petitioning for that special grant ever since 1878 and who up to March, 1885, could not obtain it—at last they succeeded in their request. Still, Sir, justice is doubly just and doubly precious when it is freely and gently given, but justice loses most of its value when it is tardily and grudgingly conceded as it was on this occasion. Even last night the hon. gentleman would not say that in so doing, the Government were doing justice to the half-breeds of Manitoba; he would not say that he recognised their rights; he simply said that he would do it, and did it for the sake of peace. For the sake of peace, when we were in the midst of war! for the sake of peace, when insurgents were in the field, and when blood had been shed! Does the hon. gentleman suppose that this tardy concession will conciliate the feelings of the half-breeds? No, Sir; the feeling that will remain in their hearts will be that they were denied their rights while they confined themselves to petitioning for them, but as soon as they took up their old rusty muskets they brought the Government to their knees and secured what constitutional means could not obtain. This is the feeling which will remain in the hearts of the half-breeds. It is the same with regard to the unenumerated claims in Manitoba. There were a certain number of half-breeds who had not been enumerated in Manitoba, who had also a right to a special grant of land. They petitioned the Government; the North-West Council also petitioned the Government, the friends of the Government in the North-West petitioned, and all without avail. But on the 9th April, after the rebellion had been raging for some time, the Government again came to their knees and granted to threats and violence what had been refused to petitions and prayers. In fact, the Government have not even the courage of Falstaff, for, if I remember rightly, Falstaff said that: "Were reasons as plentiful as berries, I would not give a reason upon compulsion." But the Government would not give anything except upon compulsion. They resisted the prayers and petitions of the settlers, but when the settlers came with arms in their hands the Government immediately yielded, and granted their requests. Sir, there was, as I said before, another claim which was made by the half-breeds—it was that

they should not be disturbed in their holdings. It was that they were to be allowed to occupy their holdings such as they were, and keep them on without molestation. The Government had adopted the American, the rectangular system of surveying, and a very good system it is—I have not a word to say against it—but it seems nothing but fair and right that where there had been settlement in advance of surveys, the Government should have acknowledged that fact, and the surveys should have been made according to the settlements. It is characteristic of all French settlements in America that they have all been made upon the banks of rivers and all the lands divided so that the people can live close to one another. That is a feature of the French race. The French race, it will be admitted without dispute, is of a more sociable disposition than the Teutonic race. The characteristics of the two races are distinctly marked in Lower Canada. In Lower Canada, if you go through an old country settlement you will find the farm houses scattered in all directions, wherever is most convenient for the farmer. They may be one mile or more apart; but the moment you go into the French settlement, you will find all the farm houses on the road side, all within a stone's throw of one another, so as to afford the people easy and constant communication. In fact the people of Lower Canada, in all the French settlements, are in constant and daily communication. This is a characteristic not only of French settlements in Lower Canada, but of all French settlements in America. It is the same in old France. The rural population in France chiefly dwell in hamlets, in Lower Canada as close to one another as the circumstances of the country will allow. And I found this feature in the old Acadian settlements in Nova Scotia. In King's county, for instance, in the old classic land of Evangeline, there was a settlement in the old days that was called Rivière aux Canards, there the farms have been settled in narrow strips; all are close to each other, and the settlement is called to-day, so far as I know, by the suggestive name Canard Street. That, in the eyes of the population, represents a street more than an ordinary farm settlement. The adventurers whose blood now runs in the veins of the half-breed population in the North-West, came from France and Lower Canada. The same trait exists among them. The half-breed population in the North-West to-day, wherever they have a settlement, have taken their lands in exactly the same way as have all the French population, whether on the banks of the St. Lawrence, in Acadia or in Louisiana. When the Government took possession of the North-West they found those settlements on the Saskatchewan River in exactly the same fashion as all other French settlements. The lands were divided into narrow strips, and the farms were all close upon one another. Was it anything but right and fair that the holdings of those people should be respected; that the lands which had been divided by the people among themselves should not be interfered with, and that the rectangular surveys should give way so soon as they came in contact with settlements. This was the policy followed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when he was in charge of the Department of the Interior. I noticed yesterday that the First Minister, when he addressed himself to this subject, passed rather gently, lightly and sweetly over it. He did not say much upon it. He merely said that the hon. member for Bothwell, when at the head of the Department, had not been so diligent as he might have been. But he extolled his own activity. He said that the Government of which he was a member had displayed the greatest diligence in the matter. Not only did the hon. gentleman make that double assertion, but he said he would prove it. And then, with a somewhat ostentatious manner, he took a map and had laid it on the Table. Look at the map, he said, and it will show how much we have surveyed. And so soon as the House rose I saw a

number of the hon. gentleman's followers, who had deep faith and reposed confidence in his word, go to the Table and look for evidences of the energy and activity of their leader; and, from the blank stare which was seen on their faces, it was evident that the map did not show much, that it did not show anything—for the facts are these: the surveys have been carried on by the hon. member for Bothwell when in charge of the Department.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Bothwell surveyed less than 2,000,000 acres. The former Conservative Government surveyed more than 9,000,000 acres and the present Government more than 55,000,000 acres.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman knows that the world was not created in a day. The first thing created was light. The first thing to be done in order to make surveys was to draw the meridian lines, and the reports show that my hon. friend directed his efforts in 1877 to drawing meridian lines in order to proceed with the survey of townships. That was the first thing to be done. I hope this explanation will satisfy the hon. member for North Perth. In fact, as far back as 1876 my hon. friend had addressed himself to this subject, and addressed himself to it in that thorough manner in which he approaches any subject. Governor Laird in 1877 addressed my hon. friend as follows upon the subject of surveys:

"The subject is one materially affecting the prosperity of these and other settlements in the Territory. I would hope, therefore, that the labors of a special survey party will be continued during the ensuing summer."

That was in February, 1877, showing that as far back as the summer previous, that is to say, the summer of 1876, the hon. gentleman had commenced the special survey. And what was the answer of the hon. gentleman? He gave an answer apposite to the question, not only saying that there would be surveys, but that the surveys would be made according to the holdings of the people. This is what the hon. gentleman wrote upon that occasion:

"The programme of the special survey party provides for the work being extended during the coming season to intersect the Saskatchewan in the vicinity of the principal settlements on that river. It is proposed in all cases where settlements have been formed along the rivers in the territory to adapt the surveys to the farms as existing, that is to say, giving a frontage of 10 or 20 chains on the river, and running the lots back so as to give 160 acres."

That was the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) in 1877, which had been inaugurated even in the previous year. But I admit this: the people were impatient. The surveys could not proceed as rapidly as they desired, and the reason is given in the papers brought down to-day. The surveys could not be proceeded with because the meridian lines had first to be established. They again approached the Government upon this matter, and as my hon. friend stated—I need not give the authority, as it was quoted yesterday—that policy would have been pursued as speedily as could be permitted. But in 1878 there was a change of Government, and this I charge upon hon. gentlemen opposite, that with the change of Government came a change of policy as well, and that instead of henceforth respecting the holdings of the people, and having special surveys where settlements had preceded survey, they subjected the people whether their lands were settled or not, to the system of the rectangular survey. They sacrificed the peace of their country to the whim of having a uniform rectangular survey. Sir, when this new system of survey was first commenced, there were, as may be imagined, complaints in that territory. The people who had settled upon narrow front lots complained of that system, and as far back as March, 1882, Mr. Duck, the agent at Prince Albert, addressed this letter to the Department:

"As the majority of the settlers on the south branch of the Saskatchewan River, in the vicinity of the parish of St. Laurent, have taken up their lands previous to the survey with narrow frontages, similar to those river claims in other parts of the district, and in view of the difficulty

Mr. LAURIER.

likely to be experienced in this office in adjusting the boundaries of these claims, in accordance with the section survey, I have, at the request of the settlers so situated, the honor to request information as to the possibility of re-surveying these sections into river lots in a similar plan to that adopted in Prince Albert settlement."

That was on the 11th March, 1882, and on the 4th September, Mr. Duck had not yet received an answer from the Department; and not having received an answer to those complaints which he had sent to Ottawa at the request of the settlers, the settlers themselves tried their luck in the matter. They petitioned the Government in these words:

"We desire also that you should give orders that the lands should be surveyed along the river in lots, 10 chains wide and two miles long. That is the old usage of the country to divide the lands in this manner, and it would facilitate us in knowing the boundaries of our respective lands."

Then on the 13th of October, an official answer came from the Department of the Interior stating as follows:—

"But as regards the surveying of the land in question that all lands in the North-West Territories will be surveyed according to the system now in force."

That was the policy adopted and promulgated by the Department of the Interior on the 13th October, 1882, that henceforth all lands should be surveyed in the North-West Territories on the new system no matter whether they were occupied or not, or whether they were settled or not. On the 21st of October, Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, at last answered the letter of Mr. Duck which had been written on the 11th of March previously, and this is what he said:

"... It is not the intention of the Government to cause any re-survey to be made. Of course, any sub-division, differing from the regular survey, they may desire, they can procure for themselves when the lands come into their possession. You will please, therefore, communicate this decision to the persons interested."

When the settlers asked to have the surveys made according to their holdings the answer was peremptorily: no, you will tell the people that if they want their lands sub-divided afterwards, they can do so, but henceforth the system of survey will be that adopted by the Government. I ask any man in this House, I ask any impartial man, could there be any more vexatious tyranny than that which was thus exercised by the Government, over the people of the Saskatchewan River, who had laid out their land in narrow lots, who had built their fences accordingly, who had placed their houses accordingly, who had tilled the soil, and made improvements accordingly—could there be any more vexatious tyranny than that exercised by the Government when they came forward and ran their lines upon these holdings, irrespective of the possession of the people, or the improvements they had made? Could there be any greater tyranny than running their lines across a man's farm and his buildings, as if these lands were unoccupied or unsettled upon? That was a piece of tyranny without excuse. I say there can be no excuse whatever for the course of the Government in that matter. I say it would have been cheap justice in their hands if they had listened to the prayers of the half-breeds and told them: we will respect your possessions such as you have them. Not only so, but the missionaries of the land, the men of peace, who as a rule in that country do not interfere with the peoples' business, so far as that goes, thought it their duty to remonstrate time and again. Father Leduc came here and interviewed the Government; Father André wrote letters, and Father Vègreville wrote letters, which were quoted by my hon. friend,—as eloquent letters as could be written, letters which were pleading for the just rights of the people, but they remained unanswered. It is asked what are the grievances of the people of the North-West Territories? I ask any man, could there be a greater grievance, even in the old Provinces of Canada, than that the Government should attempt to re-survey the lands according to a new, regular and scientific system. I say that if such a thing

were attempted, there would be an outbreak here as there was there. Nothing is more dear to every poor man than his poor patch of land, reclaimed from the wilderness by his own toil, and it was an unjustifiable and unwarrantable piece of tyranny on the part of the Government to act as they did. I can understand why these people, goaded as they were by this systematic ignoring of their claims, at last resorted to a most unfortunate course. Men have rebelled time and again for less just causes than these people had. Look at the conduct of the Government. For 6 long years, the people of the North-West have been petitioning for their rights; for 6 long years they had used every constitutional means which the law could place at their disposal in order to get justice. They sent petitions; they met in assemblies; they passed resolutions; they sent in delegations. The petitions remained unanswered; the resolutions adopted in their meetings were ignored. The delegations were received most courteously, with sweet smiles and sweeter words, which were put down in writing, but were forgotten as soon as the delegates had turned their backs for home. For these long years, the Government never moved. After these long years of useless petitioning, the half-breeds resorted to a most significant course; they sent for Louis Riel, and brought him into the country. This should at last have opened the eyes of the Government. They knew that Riel was a daring man; they knew that the people of the North-West had had their hearts filled with ever accumulating bitterness, and they must have known that under the circumstances there were all the elements for a sudden conflagration, the results of which might be, as they have proved to be, disastrous. Yet the Government never moved. Louis Riel did not remain idle; he held numerous meetings, which were attended, not only by the half-breeds, but by the white settlers; the situation was discussed; the people's grievances were set forth; yet the Government never moved. The Government could not plead ignorance, because the press of the country, the papers published on the Saskatchewan and the papers published in Manitoba, supporting the Government, warned them time and again of what was going on; yet they never moved. Moreover, the officers of the Government warned them again and again. If you look at the correspondence you will find that Mr. Duck the local agent at Prince Albert, again and again urged upon the Government the necessity of remedying individual grievances, and his letters always remained unanswered. You will find that Mr. Pearce, a most indefatigable officer of the Government, time and again pointed out the dangers ahead, and suggested remedies; but the Government never moved. What was it the half-breeds were asking for? Anything unjust or unfair? It was so just that it had been granted to the half-breeds of Manitoba; it was so just that it was granted by the Government themselves at last, when it was too late; yet when it was time the Government never moved. But if the Government remained passive, public opinion became alarmed. Distant as that country was, difficult as was the communication with it, sometimes a faint echo reached here of what was going on in that Territory. As far back as 1883 my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition called the attention of the Government to the complaints which were made by the people of the Territories. He was met on that occasion by the Prime Minister telling him that all was well. But the member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) then sounded a note of alarm, and pointed out that there were possibilities of danger. Such warnings coming from such a staunch supporter of the Administration should at least have excited the attention of the Government; yet they never moved. Again, in the following Session, my friend the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) set forth the grievances of the North-West, and asked for a committee.

The Government answered that everything was serene there; they would not move. This present Session my hon. friend again called the attention of the Government to the state of the country when he moved the Bill for the representation of the North-West Territories. That Bill came on for its second reading on the 11th of March. At that time the atmosphere was already vibrating with the first waves of the great storm that was soon to roll over the land. The Government could not fail to be aware of what was going on. In fact, we have proof that at that time their agents were sounding the note of alarm in their ears; yet they never moved. The Minister of Public Works rose up in his place, and very quietly moved the adjournment of the debate. That was all the encouragement given to those people. Even at that time it was perhaps not too late. If the Government had shown any good-will at all, it is possible that the people, hearing of it, would have modified their attitude, and this outbreak would perhaps have been spared to us. Later on we had the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister which I have already quoted, telling us that the Government relied on their friends for support, that their consciences told them that they had done everything that could be done to pacify the country. Such boasting of the Government on the eve of a rebellion which they had brought on the land by their own misconduct, is I believe unparalleled in history, unless indeed we recall the language of Emile Olivier in the *Corps Législatif* in 1870, when he said he was going to war with a light heart, when he was plunging his country in the greatest calamities that ever befell a nation. And to crown the whole we have a letter from the Secretary of State saying on the 6th of June:

"If the half-breeds had serious grievances against the Canadian Government the ordinary channel of petition was open to them as to all free citizens. They did not avail themselves of it."

Sir, this is simply adding insult to injury. The half-breeds did not petition? What more could they do than they have done in a constitutional manner? To tell the truth, for these long years they have been petitioning and petitioning, begging and begging, knocking and knocking at the door of the Government, and the Government never lifted a finger to come to their rescue; that is the truth of the matter. The Government never did anything to meet the wishes, the prayers of those people. Yes, I beg pardon, they did something; they sent a police force to Carlton. When the people were petitioning for their rights and holding meetings to discuss their grievances, the Government became aware of what was going on, and instead of remedying their grievances, sent a police force to Carlton in order to overawe the people. That is the sort of justice they got from the Government of Canada until they rose in insurrection. Sir, if something more than everything else could condemn the action of this Government, it would be this act of sending the police force to Carlton to meet the petitions of the people by an armed force. This is not British justice; this is not British administration; this is not the manner in which a British Government usually meets the demands of its subjects; but, Sir, this is the Russian way of administering law. This is the way Russia meets the demands of Poland. Whenever the Poles rise and claim their rights, the Russians do exactly what has been done by the Canadian Government—they send armed troops to Warsaw. Now, there is in connection with this matter another point which I have not heard referred to, but which seems to be in the minds of a good many people. It is not expressed, but I think the feeling permeates the very atmosphere, not only of this House, but of the whole of this country. I have not heard it stated, but it is in the minds of many that if these men have rebelled, it is because they are, to a certain extent, of French origin. The First Minister stated yesterday that Gabriel Dumont and his friends are and always were rebels. It is not to my knowledge that Dumont or any one of those who took up arms on the Saskatchewan

any more than on the Red River, ever had the thought of rebelling against the authority of Her Majesty. It was not against Her Majesty the Queen; they rebelled against the tyranny of the Canadian Government. It is quite possible that the half-breeds just reclaimed from a nomadic life, having practically been under the authority of the British rule not more than 7 or 8 years, have not yet learned to love the British flag, because so far the flag in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite has not carried that justice which has gone with the British flag everywhere for the last fifty years. But this I say, and I say it coming from a Province where, less than 50 years ago, every man of the race to which I belong was a rebel, and where to-day every man of that race is a true and loyal subject, as true and as loyal as any that breathes—I say give these men justice, give them freedom, give them their rights, treat them as for the last 40 years you have treated the people of Lower Canada, and by-and-bye, throughout those Territories, you will have contentment, peace and harmony where to-day discord, hatred and war are ruining the land.

Mr. GIROUARD. Some two or three months ago, at the beginning of the rising of the North-West, I felt it my duty to look into the facts which were alleged to have been the cause of the uprising. Like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and like every French Canadian, my sympathies were with the so-called rebels. I thought these rebels, the half-breeds of the North-West, had grievances, as the French Canadians had in 1837. Not being familiar with the facts, I had to make a special study of the political history of Manitoba and the North-West. I admit I was ignorant of the facts then. Like a great many others, I thought that my fellow countrymen of that far country were ill-used. But what has been the result of my study, and I have studied the question, not for the purpose of preparing a plea to defend the Government; I have done so as an independent member of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes; I think there are very few members on the other side who have shown as much independence as I have in the past. I commenced that study for the sole purpose of getting information, as a representative of the people, who cares more for the sake of the country than for the sake of power, and I came to the conclusion that the half-breeds had grievances, undoubtedly, but not grievances of such magnitude as to warrant their resorting to arms. The whole speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down can be resumed in two points. He says, in the first place, the policy of the present Government was not to extinguish the Indian title in favor of the half-breeds, and in the second place, he charges this Government with being guilty of gross mismanagement in not dividing the river lots according to the old custom which prevailed on the Red River. It seems to me very astonishing that, in order to find fault with the present Government, the hon. gentleman should be obliged to repudiate the policy of the Government of which he was a member. He tried ineffectually to show that the policy of the late Government was the reverse of what it really was. Its policy was, so far as the treatment of the half-breeds was concerned, not to give them a particle of the Indian title, but to treat them as white settlers. The leader of the Opposition had ample time to make a close examination of all the documents that have been produced, documents which he had, but which a great many other members had not, for this reason, that the moment the return containing these papers was laid on the Table, the papers disappeared without having even been endorsed in the Sessional Papers Office. I applied for them several times, but was unable to get them or any clue to where they were. I do not want to accuse any one; it was undoubtedly the right of the hon. gentleman to take possession of the papers, but I deny his right to exclusive possession. I had the

Mr. LAURIER.

right to see them. It was my good fortune, however, to peruse within the last twenty four hours a second copy, which was prepared for the Senate. I was greatly surprised when I heard the leader of the Opposition the other evening, after quoting document after document, after quoting the petition of the half-breeds of St. Albert and St. Laurent to the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) in 1878—I was surprised, I say, that he quoted those petitions without quoting the replies, trying thereby to impress upon the House and upon the country that these were representations made to the present Government which had remained unanswered. I could hardly credit it. I had read enough of those papers to know that the quotations made by the leader of the Opposition were not complete. What is the answer which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the Minister of Interior at that time, gave? And there is no man in this House, or out of it, who can be convinced that the answer of the hon. gentleman had some other bearing than upon the application for assistance for seed grain or agricultural implements; it is an expression of the Government's unwillingness to consider the demands of the half-breeds to the Indian title. What is the answer?

"The half-breeds, who have, in some respects, the advantage over new settlers in the Territories, should be impressed with the necessity of settling down in fixed localities and directing their energies to agricultural pursuits, in which case land would no doubt (not a sure thing it appears) be assigned to them in the same way as to the white settlers."

I am willing to leave it to any independent man to tell me if this means the half-breeds shall have greater rights than the settlers, but this is not all. In order that no doubt should remain in the minds of the half-breeds, the hon. gentleman added: "But beyond this they must not look to the Government for any special assistance in their farming operations." It is really surprising that, in order to obtain a party triumph, the speaker who has just taken his seat should be obliged to repudiate his party, but he has done more, he has been obliged to mis-state the policy of the present Government. He has made special mention of the speech of the Premier in March last, when he said that, according to his own opinion, the half-breeds were not entitled to more consideration than the white settlers, taking the same opinion as was expressed by the Minister of the Interior of the late Administration; but what the Premier did not say on that occasion he said last night, and his policy is there to say that, from 1870 to the present time, sacrificing his own opinion, he has taken the policy of his colleagues and has given to the half-breeds a right to what we call the Indian title. The policy of the Government in this respect was sanctioned in the Manitoba Act of 1870. Hon. gentlemen opposite who pretend that their adversaries are like the Bourbons, that they cannot learn anything, came to power in 1873, and were there for five years, and what have they learned? They even forgot the principle of treating these half-breeds which had been laid down by the present Administration and the present party; and, in 1879, in order to give encouragement to that class of the population of the North-West which had been so grossly ignored by the late Administration, the present Government laid down again its policy to give the half-breed the right to the Indian title in the soil. I think this is about a *résumé* of the first part of the argument of the hon. member. Allow me to say one word *en passant*—I intend to refer to it more fully later on—in reference to the second portion of his plea, or his speech. He says: You have grossly ill-used these half-breeds in not giving them river lots at St. Laurent. Is the hon. member aware that these surveys were made by the late Administration? Is he aware of it? Are you aware that the surveys of the land on the Saskatchewan for the parish of St. Laurent were made in 1878, under the direction of the late Administration? I would like to have an answer.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GIROUARD. If the last speaker will not answer, I will put the question to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS. The reservation was surveyed out so as to exactly suit the river lot system, so as to grant lots 10 chains in width and 2 miles in depth, and I have the map here, and I can show the hon. gentleman that it has been since changed.

Mr. GIROUARD. I will ask the hon. gentleman to show it immediately. Show it.

Mr. MILLS. There it is.

Mr. GIROUARD. Do you pretend that this map shows that the surveys made in 1878 were re-surveyed? There is no such proof, and you cannot produce any.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Look at it again.

Mr. GIROUARD. You may look at it again. This map shows, as it showed at all times, that they took the rectangular system of survey at St. Laurent, more or less.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes, I say more or less. I am referring to the surveys made in 1878. They were made at Prince Albert 10 chains by 2 miles, but as to St. Laurent, the surveys were 20 chains or more and 1 mile as they are to-day. These surveys have never been remade, and I am going to show immediately that these surveys were made in 1878 under the late Administration and not under the present Administration; and, if all the anathemas and maledictions of the last speaker ought to fall upon anybody, they ought to fall upon the late Administration. In the report of the Minister of the Interior for 1878, this reference is made to the surveys of the settlements of Prince Albert and St. Laurent, and, as the present Government came to office only in October, 1878, you cannot possibly imagine that these surveys were made under the direction of the present Government.

"Surveys of the settlements of Prince Albert and St. Laurent on the Saskatchewan, in the North-West Territories, were made; also a small survey involving the alteration of certain lines in the settlement belt in the Parish of Ste. Agathe, in Manitoba." (Sessional papers, 1879.)

There is another reference to the same survey made by Mr. Lindsay Russell, in his report dated 31st December, 1878. It says:

"Owing to their remoteness, and the comparatively late date at which their survey was commenced, the full returns and reports for them have not yet been received. They are all in the vicinity of Prince Albert settlement, and in the country included between the north and south branches of the Saskatchewan, near their junction. The survey of the river frontage lots in that settlement, and also of the similar lots for half the settlement of St. Laurent on the south branch, was effected."

I think I have disposed of nearly the whole argument of the last speaker. But suppose, as the late Minister of the Interior said, that these surveys, although made as river lots in the beginning, had been resurveyed according to the rectangular system; suppose more than that, that these half-breeds had been treated purely and simply like white settlers, are we going to be told that these were grievances grave enough to justify an appeal to arms? Are you going to compare these grievances with the grievances of the French Canadians of 1837? Are you going to compare the present state of the French population in the North-West, where they number about 5,000 or 6,000 with the state of the French population in Lower Canada in 1837, when they were about half a million? Look at the grievances of the French Canadians in 1837, having a large majority in the Assembly, but being taxed by the Legis-

lative Council and the Governor not responsible to the people. Is there any comparison between the two cases? There is nothing of the kind, and I repeat that, supposing the half-breeds had all the grievances which the hon. gentleman has mentioned—which they have not—they had no ground, no reason for a rebellion. If we were going to maintain the principle that the population under those circumstances would be justified in appealing to arms, I would like to know if the whole of this country would not have been justified in resorting to arms during the five years of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite from 1873 to 1878 not only a portion of the country, but from one end of it to the other. The last speaker says that the doings of the Mackenzie Administration had nothing to do with the question. Sir, that is not the way I intend to consider this question. I intend to examine the policy, the conduct, and the acts of the last Administration as well as of this one. What is the motion before the House? The motion is that the people have no confidence in the present Government, and they should give their confidence to the hon. gentlemen opposite; therefore I am bound to examine wherein the hon. gentlemen opposite would do better than this Government, and in order to ascertain that I must examine what they did when they were in power. In order to understand the bearings of this whole question it would be necessary to examine, first, the position of the country when the Canadian Government came in possession of it in 1869; in the second place to examine the treatment of the Indians who were to be found in large numbers in that territory; and, in the third place, to glance at the so-called grievances of the half-breeds. As soon as Confederation was formed the Canadian Government took the initiatory steps to secure that vast country lying west of Ontario then known as Rupert's Land and North-Western Territory. During the Session of 1867-68 an address to Her Majesty was voted by Parliament, asking that that vast territory should be added to the Dominion, and in the following year it was acquired for £300,000 from the Hudson Bay Company, the then proprietors, by the Canadian Government, acting through Sir George Cartier and the Hon. Wm. Macdougall. When moving that address before this House, Mr. Macdougall said:

"The great idea of the Confederation Act was, that we should form one people from east to west, a new nationality side by side, with the Republic, which was our only safe and true policy. All the relations between Great Britain and these colonies had been changed by the great war in the United States, and it was the opinion of the statesmen of the Mother Country, that we must reconstruct and in so doing, we must bear some burdens to provide an increase of population, with our own instincts, and to whom we could offer the rights and privileges enjoyed in the Mother Country. With this idea the Government had resolved to ask Great Britain to hand over to us the sovereignty of the North-West Territory."

In 1873 a large addition was made to this country by a concession from the Imperial Government of the balance of the British possessions in North America, and thus Canada became the largest country in the world, Russia and China alone excepted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When did that event happen?

Mr. GIROUARD. This happened in 1873.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think you had better consult your authorities.

Mr. GIROUARD. The territory was acquired in 1873.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But the hon. gentleman said the balance of the continent was acquired in 1873.

Mr. GIROUARD. That is the date, I think.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is some mistake.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not think it is material to the debate. My impression is that it was in 1873.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was four years after.

Mr. GIROUARD. My impression is that it was in 1873; but as I say, it is not material to the debate whether this territory was acquired in 1873 or 1877; and really hon. gentlemen opposite must be very fond of interruptions to make one like this. Now, it will not be out of place, in order to understand what the Government has done for that territory to mention exactly its area. I do not refer to the changes which have been made by the last decision of the Privy Council on the boundary question; I do not think it will affect the result very much. I have here a table of the areas of the North-West Territories and the several Provinces of the Dominion, together with the areas of some of the nations of the world, showing the comparative extent of our own domain:

	Square miles.
Manitoba.....	123,200
Territories—	
(1876) Keewatin.....	450,000
(1882) Assiniboia.....	95,000
" Saskatchewan.....	114,000
" Alberta.....	100,000
" Athabaska.....	122,000
Territories undivided.....	1,784,252
	<u>2,665,252</u>
Total.....	2,788,452
Prince Edward Island.....	2,133
Nova Scotia.....	20,907
New Brunswick.....	27,174
Quebec.....	188,688
Ontario.....	101,733
British Columbia.....	341,305
	<u>681,940</u>
Total.....	3,470,392
Russia, $\frac{1}{4}$ of terrestrial part of the world.....	8,387,816
China, $\frac{1}{4}$ of land of globe.....	4,419,150
Brazil.....	3,275,326
United States.....	3,095,245
British India.....	868,244
Austria.....	240,942
German Empire.....	212,033
France.....	204,177
United Kingdom.....	120,832
Italy.....	114,296

Therefore the Territory which we acquired in 1869, with the addition which was made to it in 1873, or, if the hon. gentlemen opposite prefer, 1877, Canada contains one twenty-eighth of all the land in the world, and is fourteen times larger than France, and twenty-three times larger than the United Kingdom. This valuable country was very little known even at the time of its purchase by the Canadian Government. In fact Hon. Joseph Howe who had paid a flying visit to it during the winter of 1869 conceived such a poor opinion of its value that he returned determined to advise his colleagues to have nothing to do with it. Although it was visited for nearly 150 years by Montreal fur traders and Canadian voyageurs, no one but Catholic missionaries and the officials of the Hudson Bay Company had the slightest idea of its importance for agricultural purposes. The buffalo robes and furs collected by the North-West fur traders were always on hand in the markets of Montreal and London, but no one could have the slightest suspicion that the buffalo would so soon disappear before railways and civilisation. The population of the whole North-West then consisted of 1,000 white men, 33,000 or 34,000 Indians and a few settlements of half-breeds, numbering 12,000 or 13,000. There were no means of communication except the canoe, cart, traîneaux, or snow shoes. There was only one steamer, the *International*, which plied between Lake Winnipeg and a town I believe called Georgetown in Minnesota. In 1869-70, Hon. William Macdougall took 14 days to travel from St. Paul to St. Vincent, a distance travelled to-day in less than eighteen hours. In 1871, Bishop Grandin took fifty-two days to proceed to St. Albert from St. Boniface, which, as hon. members know, is opposite Winnipeg. Mail service was almost unknown. There was a monthly mail service to the outside world; but as to inland service it was almost

Mr. GIROUARD.

unknown. I need not say that the laws were very simple. Property could, of course, be transferred by deeds in writing, which were recorded in the office of the Hudson Bay Company, in just about the same way as transfers of property were recorded in the Province of Quebec in the office of the seigneur, but it could also be transformed by verbal agreements. There was no registry office. There was a court of justice at Fort Garry; but so far as courts of justice in remote districts were concerned, they were unknown. I need not talk of jails; there was no necessity for them. The whole of the district was governed in a paternal manner by a Governor and council, assisted by some sub-council as at remote points, and also by the officials of the company. Most of the trade consisted of exchanging the furs of the half-breeds and of the Indians for other commodities of life which were to be found in the stores of the Hudson Bay Company. In fact the Hudson Bay Company had a monopoly of the trade up to about 1858. In all the remote settlements or posts, it could hardly be said that there was any organised Government. Major Butler, speaking of the very district where the recent rebellion took place, wrote to Governor Archibald in 1871:

"The institutions of law and order, as understood in civilised communities, are wholly unknown in the regions of the Saskatchewan, inasmuch as the country is without any executive organisation, and destitute of any means to enforce the authority of the law."

This want of authority was also felt in the most central post, Fort Garry. About five weeks ago I was reading in one of the Manitoba papers that about 1858, Louis Riel, father of the present Louis Riel, went to the Court House, and there found the judge sitting. One of his countrymen had been arrested for having traded outside of the stores of the Hudson Bay Company,—and that was his crime. He went to the judge and told him: Your Honor, I am not willing that my brother should remain in jail (there was a jail at Fort Garry) for ever; I give you till one o'clock to try him. The judge commenced the trial at once. At the hour fixed, the trial was not over. Riel advanced in court and said: May it please the court, I declare the prisoner acquitted. *Vive la liberté*. A very remarkable fact is this, that Louis Riel and his followers who set the prisoner at large were not molested for fear of more serious trouble ensuing. I give you, Mr. Speaker, this incident to show that even in the very central post of the Hudson Bay Company, Fort Garry, it was some times impossible to enforce the authority of the law. Such was the state of the country when the Canadian Government took possession of it in 1869. To save expense the intention appears to have been for a time at least to govern it as it had been governed for more than a century by a Governor and council. The hon. gentleman who has last spoken said that when we took possession in 1869 we considered the population of the country as a portion of the territory. Was it not to be governed as it had been for years and for almost a century before that time? That population had been governed by a Governor and council; and is it not worthy of admiration that instead of displaying any contempt for that government, Canada wished to continue the government and institutions which had prevailed in the Territory for almost centuries. As early as 1863 a temporary Act was passed, for the government of the North-West. It provided for the appointment of a Governor and a council not exceeding fifteen nor less than seven members to administer the affairs of the country, with such powers as might be from time to time conferred on them by the Governor in Council. It is not necessary to enter at length into the events that followed; but allow me to say, in answer to a remark which fell from the lips of the last speaker, that the rebellion of 1870, if you want to call it so, was very different from the present rebellion. In 1870 when the Canadian Government sent their surveyors and Mr. Macdougall, as the Canadian Governor, to take posses-

sion of the country, the transfer from the Hudson Bay Company to the Government had not even been signed. So the Canadian Government had at that time no title to the country. But it is very different in this case. Not only have we our title but we have been in possession for nearly 15 years, and therefore the two situations cannot be compared. Although it is not necessary to enter at any length into the events which caused the rebellion or the troubles of 1870, I would say that the Hon. Mr. Macdougall who was appointed Lieutenant Governor in 1869 proceeded to exercise the functions of his office, but was forcibly refused admission to the country. The population, and more especially the French half-breeds of Manitoba, were resisting the new state of things. A Provisional Government was formed, with Louis Riel as President, and only surrendered on condition of an amnesty, the recognition of certain land claims and the granting of responsible government. The portion of the Territory adjoining the Province of Ontario was constituted a Province by the name of Manitoba. Representation was given to the Province in the Senate and the House of Commons. A Legislature was created, consisting of a Legislative Assembly, and of a Legislative Council which has since been abolished. Clause 30 of the Act provides:

"All ungranted or waste lands in the Province shall be, from and after the date of the said transfer, vested in the Crown, and administered by the Government of Canada for the purposes of the Government of the Dominion, subject to, and except and so far as the same may be affected by, the conditions and stipulations contained in the agreement for the surrender of Rupert's Land by the Hudson Bay Company to Her Majesty."

Then as to Indian titles, it was provided:

"And whereas, it is expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the Province, to appropriate a portion of such ungranted land, to the extent of 1,400,000 acres thereof, for the benefit of the families of the half-breed residents;

"It is hereby enacted, that, under regulations to be from time to time made, by the Governor General in Council, the Lieutenant Governor shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the Province as he may deem expedient, to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the said transfer to Canada, and the same shall be granted to the said children respectively, in such mode and on such conditions as to settlement and otherwise as the Governor General in Council may from time to time determine."

Then there are clauses providing for the quieting of title, and section 35 is as follows:—

"And with respect to such portion of Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory as is not included in the Province of Manitoba, it is hereby enacted that the Lieutenant Governor of the said Province shall be appointed by commission, under the great seal of Canada, to be Lieutenant Governor of the same\* under the name of the North-West Territories, and subject to the provisions of the Act in the next section mentioned."

That is the Act of 1869. The Manitoba Act also provided that both French and English should be the official languages before the Legislature, and in the courts of justice. The principle of separate schools was freely recognised. The privilege of a mixed jury was granted as in the Province of Quebec. Provision was made for the extinction of the Indian title, and free grants of land were made to the half-breeds and their children, which in 1873 by the Land Act were extended to the old white settlers and their children. All these concessions were granted by the Manitoba Act of 1870, Vic. 33, cap. 3. Whatever may be the diversity of opinion as to the causes, pretexts or circumstances of these troubles of 1869-70, there cannot be any doubt that without the French half-breeds, Manitoba would not have been granted the liberties and privileges of popular government, and this important reform bears testimony to the intelligence and patriotism of the French half-breeds. This has been admitted by many eye witnesses of the events of these days, and quite recently by Mr. Alexander McArthur, of Winnipeg, an old official of the Hudson Bay Company, a prisoner of Riel, when lecturing before the Historical and Scientific Society of Winnipeg, on the 4th October, 1882, and in fact the language he used shows his impartiality in the matter. He says:

"While the leaders of the half-breeds brought ignominy on themselves by imbuing their hands in blood, it cannot be denied that they obtained rights and privileges for themselves and their fellow countrymen, which but for the stand they took would never have been granted, and the boons so secured they have the satisfaction of knowing were equally participated in by those nations and residents of the country, who not only took part in the rising, but were many of them opposed to it and disposed to aid the other side."

The Manitoba Act also provided for a temporary government in that portion of Rupert's Land, and North-Western Territory not included in the Province of Manitoba. It enacted that until the end of the Session of 1871, it was to be left to the management of the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba with the aid of the council provided for by the Act of 1869. Considering the state of the country, its small population, this provisional Government was perhaps the only practicable one. Its services were fully acknowledged by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Mills) in his report of 1876. He said:

"It is due to that council to record the fact that their legislation and valuable practical suggestions submitted to Your Excellency from time to time through their official head, Lieutenant Governor Morris, aided the Government not a little in the good work of laying the foundations of law and order in the North-West, in securing the good will of the Indian tribes, and in establishing the prestige of the Dominion Government throughout the vast territory."

During the Sessions of 1871 and 1873 the appointment of a special Lieutenant Governor and Council for the North-West was provided for, but notwithstanding this provision and others which were adopted in 1873, the affairs of the Territories continued to be administered from Winnipeg. By an Order in Council of the 12th February, 1873, the Council was authorised to make provision for the administration of justice in the Territories and generally to make and establish such ordinances (not to exceed the jurisdiction of any Provincial Legislature) as may be necessary for the peace, order and good government of the said North-West Territories subject to the approbation of the Governor in Council. The council was to meet at least every six months in Winnipeg, and except in special cases public notice by advertisement of such meeting was to be required for at least 40 days. An annual meeting was held on the first Monday in June in each year. I will now give the names of the members of the first Legislative Council. Hon. Alexander Morris was appointed Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories on the 2nd day of December, 1872, and on the 28th day of the same month the following gentlemen were appointed members of the Council: Hon. Chas. A. Girard, Hon. Donald A. Smith, Hon. Henry J. Clarke, Hon. Paschal Breland, Hon. Alfred Boyd, John Schultz, Joseph Dubuc, Andrew G. B. Bannatyne, Wm. Fraser, Robert Hamilton, Wm. J. Christie. On the 30th October, 1873, Messrs. James MacKay, a half-breed, and William N. Kennedy were appointed. On the 1st January, 1874, Mr. Christie resigned and John H. McLaird married to a half-breed, was nominated in his place and Messrs. William Tait, married to half-breed, and Robert Cunningham, were also added to the list of the councillors by hon. gentlemen opposite. One of the last ordinances of the North-West Council was the passing of "An Act for the prevention of Prairie and Forest Fires in the North-West Territories," which in due time was transmitted to Ottawa for approbation with representation that it was of "urgent importance"; but up to 1876, when the papers connected with this measure were brought before the House, it had not been yet approved. The Conservative party in power soon after left office (1873). It was not, however, till two years after (1875) that the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite thought of providing for the removal of the seat of Government of the North-West, and it took another year to put this Act into operation; so three years were required to accomplish this important reform, recommended as most necessary and urgent by the great organ of the Liberal party. The *Toronto Globe*, of the 25th February, 1876, said:

" Heretofore the North-West Territory east and west of Manitoba has been governed by the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba and a species of half advisory, half legislative council of gentlemen chosen from among the residents in Winnipeg and its vicinity. They are themselves not slow to admit that their constitution is a farce, and it requires no effort of imagination in those even who have never been in the North-West to understand the impossibility of merchants and others in Winnipeg acting as a Legislature for the settlements on the Saskatchewan, and nearly a thousand miles away in the neighborhood of the Rocky Mountains. At one of the last sittings of this Winnipeg Council of which the former editor of the *Nouveau Monde* is a prominent member it was proposed to incorporate the clergy of the missionary dioceses of the North-West with land holding powers. The object of this was so apparent to those in Winnipeg who have seen the effect of the system there, that it was strenuously opposed by some of the English members, but in spite of their efforts it was carried, and would have come to Ottawa with such force as this nondescript council have been able to give to their legislation, had not Lieutenant Governor Morris refused to assent to the Bill."

We have several times in this Parliament incorporated ecclesiastical communities without objection from hon. gentlemen opposite, and have given them the right to hold real estate in the North-West; and this is the crime which is charged on the North-West Council, and which is put forth as the principal reason why it should be abolished. Under the new constitution the seat of the Government was removed to Fort Pelly, in the Territories. The council was composed of five members nominated by the Crown, including the two stipendiary magistrates, *ex officio*. The jurisdiction of the council extended over taxation for local and municipal purposes, property and civil rights, the administration of justice, including the organisation and maintenance of the courts of justice; education, with separate schools if desired by any minority; public health, licensing of inns, landmarks and boundaries, game and wild animals, and the care and protection thereof; roads and highways, the protection of timber, gaols, &c., and generally all matters of a merely local or private nature. Nearly all the powers of Local Legislatures of the old Provinces were thus given to this North-West Council; and to give a representative character to this body the Act provides that any district not exceeding an area of one thousand square miles is entitled to be erected into an electoral district, and to elect a member to the council for its first one thousand inhabitants of adult age, exclusive of aliens and Indians, and to two members for two thousand inhabitants. When the number of elected members shall reach twenty-one, the Act provides that the council shall become *ipso facto* the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, having not only all the powers of the council, but also all the powers of a Legislative Assembly of the old Provinces, which the Governor in Council in Ottawa might confer upon it. The French language was ignored in the Act, but this grave error was corrected two years after, in 1877. A jury of six was granted in criminal cases, but the grand jury and the mixed jury system which prevails in Quebec and Manitoba was refused. With the hon. gentlemen opposite lies, therefore, the responsibility of the position of Louis Riel, who, as matter of right, is not entitled to a trial by his peers. He is entitled to have only six jurymen, and among these he is not entitled to have three of his own countrymen. In 1877 new powers were given to the North-West Council by Order in Council:

" And whereas, by the third section of the said Act, it is further enacted that 'the Lieutenant-Governor, by and with the advice of the Legislative Assembly, as the case may be, shall have such powers to make ordinances for the government of the North-West Territories as the Governor in Council may, from time to time, confer upon him: Provided always, that such powers shall not at any time be in excess of those conferred by the ninety-second section of The British North America Act, 1867,' upon the Legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion;

" Now, in pursuance of the powers by the said statute conferred, His Excellency, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, has been pleased further to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall be and he is hereby empowered to make ordinances in relation to the following subjects, that is to say:—

" 1. The establishment and tenure of territorial offices, and the appointment and payment of territorial officers;

Mr. GIROUARD.

" 2. The establishment, maintenance and management of prisons in and for the North-West Territories;

" 3. The establishment of municipal institutions in the Territories, in accordance with the provisions of the 'North-West Territories Act, 1875 and 1877';

" 4. The issue of shop, auctioneer and other licenses, in order to the raising of a revenue for territorial or municipal purposes;

" 5. The solemnisation of marriage in the Territories;

" 6. The administration of justice, including the constitution, organisation and maintenance of territorial courts of civil jurisdiction;

" 7. The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for enforcing any territorial ordinance;

" 8. Property and civil rights in the Territories, subject to any legislation by the Parliament of Canada upon these subjects, and—

" 9. Generally on matters of a merely local or private nature in the Territories."

I have heard it stated that hon. gentlemen opposite did nothing for the North-West during the time of their administration. I will not go so far; I am too much of an independent member to go that far. I will admit that the late Administration conferred upon the population of the North-West a constitution which is certainly worthy of admiration; but this is the only thing they did. That constitution is similar to the constitution of the old Provinces. To-day the Crown is represented in the North-West council very much in the same way as it is represented in this Parliament or in the Legislature of Quebec. There are two or three Stipendiary Magistrates and other nominees of the Crown numbering six altogether; and at the same time that constitution provides that the people of that country, the moment there is a certain population spread over a certain extent of territory, have a right to send a representative there to deal with what matters? Upon the local taxation, upon the municipal taxation, upon the administration of justice, upon in fact all the matters which are conferred by the constitution of 1867 on the old Provinces, and that is why I am willing to give credit to the late Administration for having done something toward the settlement of the North-West. Later on, I will say, in answer to those settlers who want to have those Territories divided into different Provinces and enjoy all the expense and luxury of the legislatures of the old Province, that in the constitution of the North-West they have all the privileges and liberties of a free people, without having, at the same time, the burden of local legislatures. It is a pity, indeed, that the late Administration did not go further when they were considering the constitution of the country. They nominated to hold office in that Territory people who were strangers to the population. You cannot find even a stipendiary magistrate, you cannot find a nominee, from the Governor down, with the exception of Mr. Forget—a very good nomination—who was clerk of the council and private secretary to the Governor, to represent the people of that country, selected from the people of that country. I am not surprised at this, because, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), the French half-breeds were like Indians; though, later on, on another policy, they were to be treated as white settlers. I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman, as Minister of the Interior, did not wish that the half-breeds should be represented in the North-West, because he considered half-breeds were like Indians; but why did he not take some of the new white settlers? Are you going to tell me you have provided a council of a representative character, without being able to find in the population of the place a single representative?

Mr. MILLS. We appointed a French half-breed, a member of the council.

Mr. GIROUARD. He was appointed in 1878; your council was appointed in 1876.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, because it was organised on my advice.

Mr. GIROUARD. I will give you the date of Mr. Berland's nomination. He was in the old council which was nominated in the constitution of 1869, and which

remained in office until 1876, but you did not renominate him, or Mr. Royal, or Mr. Delorme, a half-breed.

Mr. MILLS. They were residents of Manitoba.

Mr. GIROUARD. Why did not you nominate Mr. Breland who is not resident of Manitoba?

Mr. MILLS. We did.

Mr. GIROUARD. Not at that time. I will give you the date later on. I say this treatment of the people of the North-West was the subject of a great deal of complaint. The French population expected some attention from the Government. The old settlements of Qu'Appelle and St. Albert were important centres; the English settlement at Battleford and Prince Albert had considerably increased; the surrounding rural districts had been taken up by white settlers, who also thought they were entitled to some consideration. Affairs in the North-West attracted the attention of public men, and during the Session of 1878 they were the subject of a very interesting debate. It will be interesting to hear what were the opinions of the hon. member for Bothwell then.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman went last week to New Brunswick to find a member for that council.

Mr. GIROUARD. One member only. But I am going to show you that you took all the members for that council from Ontario, and its Governor from Prince Edward Island. The Hon. Mr. Langevin, now Sir Hector, called attention to this point. The debate took place on the 8th May, 1878:—

“ Mr. LANGEVIN said he wished to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the action of the Government in the North-West Territories. When the organisation of government took place in Manitoba, the hon. gentlemen opposite found fault with the Government of the right hon. member for Kingston, for the manner in which that was organised. They accused the late Government of having acted without proper consideration of the wants of the Provinces, without having consulted its people, and of having sent up a ready-made government. The hon. the First Minister said, in his speech at Kingston, of the 27th June, speaking of the right hon. member for Kingston:

“ He sent out Mr. Wm. Macdougall with a ready-made Cabinet to take possession, as if they had been the conquerors of the land, without asking the people what their opinions were as to the mode or nature of the authority under which they were to be placed.”

This was the opinion of the hon. the First Minister, and also of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. Before going further, he would state he did not admit the justice of this criticism. The late Government did not send a ready-made Government to the North-West. They sent a Governor and two officers, who were, in connection with other gentlemen, taken from that region, and who had the confidence of the people to form a Cabinet. It was natural that the hon. gentleman, in order to make a strong case before the electors of Ontario should have used the words already quoted; but, at all events, the hon. gentleman, after having found fault with the action of the late Government, should have done better. Let us see how the hon. gentleman and his Government acted towards that country. They appointed, as Lieutenant Governor, the Hon. Mr. Laird, one of their friends, who had been formerly Minister of the Interior, and had dealt with matters connected with the North-West, and whom they had a right, therefore, to send there. But whom did they select as members of the Executive Council of that Territory? Colonel Macleod was appointed at the head of the police and also Stipendiary Magistrate. Colonel Macleod did not possess the confidence of the people.

“ Mr. MILLS. Who were they? Indians?

“ Mr. LANGEVIN. Indians and half-breeds were people. He wondered would the hon. gentleman feel as he did, were he in Manitoba amongst those people. They were not to be despised although they were Indians. Mr. Mathew Ryan, lawyer from Montreal, was also appointed Stipendiary Magistrate, and was made also a member of the Executive Council; the next was Mr. Richardson. How were the officers selected for this territory? Mr. Scott, a gentleman from this part of the country, was appointed registrar; hon. Mr. St. John of Toronto was appointed sheriff; Mr. Dickson was sent there as an accountant and inspector; Captain McDonald was sent as Indian agent. This was the Government which had sent there, to use the language of the hon. the First Minister, “ a ready-made cabinet to take possession, as if they had been conquerors of the land.” The people not very unnaturally, objected to being presented with this ready-made cabinet. The hon. gentleman could not say that in the Territories or in Manitoba, they could not find a few members of the people who could help in governing that country and who would have the confidence of the half-breeds. But what people had they to govern? Indians? There were Indians and a great many half-breeds and white men as well.

These people had been cast aside. The Government said: We will send a ready-made cabinet; we despise those people and will govern them as we choose. His Excellency the Governor General formed a very different opinion of these people, and he would refer the hon. the Premier and his colleagues to the remarks of His Excellency concerning these half-breeds. They were a sensitive, proud race, and should not have been deprived of their share in the government of the country. He remembered the time when his race was excluded from the government of the country, when none but people imported from the old country had a right to sit in the councils of the Province, and he could imagine the feelings of those half-breeds of the North-West when they saw that none but people from Ontario or Montreal or the Lower Provinces were to have office in their Government. These people had no representative in this House, and it was left to some one to see whether they should be left in that position, or whether they should have their share in the offices and in the Government in that Territory. A deputation of half-breeds had lately called on the Lieutenant Governor of the Province to claim representation in the councils of their country, and he hoped, since the attention of the Government had been called to this matter openly before Parliament, that they would recognise the justice of the claims.

“ Mr. MILLS said the hon. gentleman had made somewhat extraordinary speech. The hon. gentleman might not have considered the effect which his speech would have on the minds of the people of the North-West.”

They are very careful indeed to direct properly the mind of the people of the North-West.

“ The circumstances were wholly different which govern the action of the late Government and of the present one. The country which Mr. Laird and the other gentlemen were sent to govern had very few inhabitants except Indians. But the right hon. member for Kingston sent his Government to a country in which there were several thousand white people, a people from whom rulers had already been chosen, and who had formerly a Council and Government of their own. What was the position in the North-West? Did the hon. gentlemen pretend to say that the half-breeds were an educated population, who appointed their chief the same as the Indians did, who followed the buffalo from place to place, and had no fixed habitation? That was the impression the hon. gentleman seemed to wish to create. Yet he must know, if he gave any attention to the condition of things in that country, that the half-breed population, with the single exception of the few who resided in the vicinity of Prince Albert, were, in no respect, different in their modes and conditions of life from the Indians.”

The hon. gentleman interrupted me a moment ago to say that, at the time he constituted the North-West Council, he appointed a half-breed.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Breland, and he is named in that speech.

Mr. GIROUARD. I say you did not; you appointed him in 1878.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. GIROUARD. Then do not contradict me when I say you did not appoint any half-breed before 1878.

Mr. MILLS. That is what I said.

Mr. GIROUARD. I was going to give you the reason why you appointed one then.

Mr. MILLS. You said we did not appoint any.

Mr. GIROUARD. You did not in 1876, when you organised the council. It was constituted under Act of Parliament of 1875, but you waited one year before you would put that new constitution into operation, and yet, when you came to make the nominations to that council, not only was there not one half-breed in it or one in office under it, but there was not on it one single white-man living in that country; they were all taken from Ontario and even from around Ottawa here, like Mr. Scott, who was placed in the registry office there, and was a brother of one of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman. I have mentioned that there was a complaint. It was not only made in the House but also outside of it. Take the petition which was sent at the beginning of 1878, the petition of the half-breeds of St. Albert and also of the half-breeds of St. Laurent. One of their first grievances is that they have no representative in the institutions of their country.

“ The humble petition of the undersigned French Canadians and half-breeds of St. Albert in the North-West Territories.—Information having been given to them that a petition had been signed by the half-breeds of St. Laurent on the 1st February last, they also respectfully show.

"That the population of the North-West Territories is mostly composed of French half-breeds without any stipendiary magistrate understanding or speaking their language."

And later on, there was a public meeting of indignation against the ruling of stipendiary magistrate Richardson who refused to allow the attendance of French half-breeds who had come from long distances to attend the criminal courts, on the ground that they did not understand English and he did not understand French and that he would simplify the matter very easily by telling them to go back home. There was immediately an indignation meeting held, and the people complained: That is the kind of magistrates they give; they are not only taken from outside the country, but they are men who do not even understand the language of the majority of the people. The petitioners continue to allege:

"Without any stipendiary magistrate understanding their language, and without any person of their own origin to represent them in the deliberations of the council of the North-West Territories, it is therefore resolved that a humble petition be addressed to his Excellency the Governor General praying that the two members of the council remaining still to be appointed under the authority of the Act of 1875 and its amendments be selected from the old residents of French origin, and, in order to give full and entire justice to the nationality of your petitioners, that the nomination of a stipendiary magistrate equally of French origin be proceeded with."

You would perhaps imagine that the reason why these half-breeds were not represented in the council was because the number was complete. No, there were six members to be appointed—I am sure of five—and they could easily have appointed one or two French half-breeds; but no, they did not do it. What was the answer of the Minister of the Interior, of date the 18th March, 1878? It is addressed to the Governor of the North-West Territories, through whom the petition of the people of St. Laurent and St. Albert had been sent to Ottawa.

"You are requested to inform the petitioners that I shall have much pleasure in submitting their petition for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

"In the meantime you may intimate to the petitioners that should it be thought desirable to appoint additional members to the council of the North West, I shall be prepared to recommend to His Excellency's consideration their application that such members should be selected from the old residents in the Territories and that if possible one of them should be of French Canadian origin."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the late Administration did nothing with the exception of creating this new constitution for the North-West, and appointing this half-breed in 1878; they did nothing to give to the population of the North-West any representation or any part in the government of that country, either legislative or judiciary. Other important matters came to their attention, but they had a very simple policy—they told the half-breeds that they were to be considered as white settlers. I will not refer again to that statement made by the Minister of the Interior. It is made in such clear language that no ambiguity is possible. The principle is laid down that the half-breeds must be treated like white settlers, and so they have been treated. Nothing was done towards the extinguishment of the Indian title; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious of benefiting from the experience of past Administrations, why did they not take the principle of the Administration which left office in 1873? Why did they not say to the half-breeds of the North-West: You shall be treated in the same way as the half-breeds of Manitoba? When they constituted their council in 1875 was the proper time, rather than in 1879, to declare what their policy was to be with reference to the half-breeds. When they sent their Governor up to the North-West and made four new treaties with the Indians, they ought to have laid down their policy in regard to the treatment of the half-breeds. But nothing was done concerning the half-breed claims and the Indian title; nothing was done concerning the surveys which affected not only the half-breeds but the white population as well. My hon. friend

Mr. GIROUARD.

from Quebec East stated that he did not think that any complaints came from the half-breeds of the North-West previous to 1877 or 1878. Perhaps he was like myself, and did not have occasion to look over all the papers which were brought down four or five weeks ago, and which were inaccessible to certain members of the House—at least to myself. But I will call his attention to the resolutions, which were in effect petitions, of the half-breeds, not only of Qu'Appelle but of the whole North-West, dated the 5th May, 1873 and which were transmitted on the 5th June following by Governor Morris. All the half-breeds of the North-West joined in that petition, their votes having been taken at a council as was then customary; and they say:

"We also ask of you, the Lieutenant Governor, to give us lands in compensation of our rights."

They received an answer from Governor Morris to the effect that their request would be transmitted to the Government. But the Government then in office left to make room for the hon. gentlemen opposite, and up to the present time there has been no answer given to that petition.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I mean up to 1878—when they left office. On the 1st of October, 1874, I find a letter from Father Decorby to the Honorable Mr. Laird on the same subject; in this he says:

"As the Government has entrusted the conduct of the affairs of the North-West to you, I take the liberty of addressing you a few explanations concerning Lake Qu'Appelle and the half-breed population settled there. The spirit of justice which animates you and the desire you have shown to contribute to the welfare of those whose interests have been confided to you, lead me to hope that you will kindly take them into consideration and bring them to the attention of the Government in order that it may treat the half-breeds of Lake Qu'Appelle with justice and generosity, according to the kind words of His Excellency, our Governor, Alexander Morris. I may remark at once that the half-breeds have a right to some privileges in this place. It was they who made a kind of conquest of it by obliging the Indian nations who formerly warred here to keep the peace. It is they who still keep them off, and it is to their presence that is due the honor of peace and the security which is enjoyed all around.

"I cannot state the exact period when the half-breeds began to winter at the Lake Qu'Appelle, but having explained to his Lordship the Bishop of St. Boniface, the wish to have a Catholic priest among them, my Lord Taché, now Archbishop of St. Boniface, went there himself in 1865 and chose the present site of the mission, gave orders for the erection of a chapel, and took for the requirements of the mission all the points comprised between the two streams called the Mission Streams, that is to say, of the extent of about a mile of front. The half-breeds then established there promised to respect the land reserved by His Lordship. \* \* \* Now, the half-breeds desire and ask the Government to leave their lands as they took them, that is, that they will not force them to exact lines."

Now take the petitions of the half-breeds of St. Laurent and St. Albert, transmitted by Mr. Laird on the 13th February, 1878, to which reference has so often been made:

"It is of immediate necessity that the Government cause to be surveyed within the shortest possible delay those lands occupied and cultivated by the half-breeds or former residents upon those lands.

"That the sudden change from a prairie life to an agricultural life brought about by the rapid disappearance of the buffalo and the hunting regulations of the council of the North West Territories have reduced your petitioners to a state of want and obliges them to address the Federal Government in order to obtain assistance in seed, grain and in agricultural implements. The same as has been given to certain foreign immigrants in the Province of Manitoba. The implements of agriculture always extremely rare are sold at so high a price that your petitioners are unable to purchase them."

Governor Laird accompanied the transmission of those two petitions with a recommendation or a report, which was sent on 13th February, 1878, as follows:—

"It is important that the land policy of the Government towards old settlers and others living for many years in the Territories should be declared. It appears to me that they have a claim to some more speedy means of acquiring a title for settlement purposes than the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act.

"To prevent disputes between neighbors, it is highly desirable that the survey of lands settled upon along the principal rivers should be prosecuted with all convenient speed.

"With respect to the prayer for assistance in procuring seeds and implements to commence farming operations, it is similar to the request made to me by the half-breeds of Bow River during the Blackfoot treaty

negotiations, and which I forwarded to you and commended to the favorable consideration to the Government."

It seems to me, therefore, that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) was in error when he made the statement that very few petitions had reached the late Administration prior to 1878. We find that almost at the last moment, before the Conservative Government left office, in the fall of 1873, the first complaint came in. Of course the Administration had not time to do it justice. We find from 1874, and subsequently, repeated representations were made to the late Administration, and they took five years to consider them, and did not even then declare a policy. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) complains that the present Administration has done nothing. We shall see what they have done. In the first place, they passed the statute of 1879. The following powers were given to the Governor in Council.

"To satisfy any claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title preferred by half-breeds resident in the North-West Territories, outside of the limits of Manitoba, on the 15th day of July, 1870, by granting land to such persons to such extent and on such terms and conditions as may be deemed expedient;

"To investigate and adjust claims preferred to Dominion lands situate outside of the Province of Manitoba, alleged to have been taken up and settled on previous to 15th July, 1870, and to grant to persons satisfactorily establishing undisturbed occupation of any such lands, prior to and being by themselves or their servants, tenants or agents, or those through whom they claim in actual, peaceable possession thereof, at the said date, so much land in connection with and in satisfaction of such claims as may be considered fair and reasonable."

Evidently the Government acted upon the recommendation of Governor Laird. Governor Laird, in his despatch accompanying the petition of the half-breeds of St. Laurent recommended the Government to adopt some policy. They did not do so. But, immediately on the present Government obtaining power, they adopted a policy, which was to recommend the claim of the half-breeds to the Indian title. It will be remembered also, that the half-breeds complained that they did not have a magistrate who spoke and understood French. In the fall of 1882, Mr Rouleau, stipendiary magistrate residing at Aylmer, Province of Quebec, was appointed stipendiary magistrate for the district of Saskatchewan, where the French Canadian and French half-breed population was mainly to be found, and this officer became a member of the council, making two French members altogether, Mr. Breland and Mr. Rouleau, out of six appointed by the Government. About the same time, the construction of the Canadian Pacific had opened new fields to immigration. Towns and villages were erected along its line from Brandon westward. A large number of people flew into the towns and rural districts, and form to-day a white population of about 40,000 or 50,000, some say 100,000 or more, who became entitled to representation in the council. Electoral districts have been constituted under the Act of 1875, and have been represented in the council, where they are to-day in majority over the nominees of the Crown. Eight districts have representation in the new council: Edmonton, Broadview, Qu-Appelle, Regina, Moose Jaw, Lorne, Calgary and Moose Mountain, and with the three stipendiary magistrates, and these nominated by the Government, form 14 members. This fact induced the *Edmonton Bulletin*, of the 30th January, 1885, to say:

"Every paper in the North-West gave a kick to the Council, but it is the fault of the people, who elect the majority of them."

One of the first duties of the Government under the terms of the Manitoba Act of 1870, was to extinguish the Indian title to the Territory of the North-West. The policy of the country has been to do this by a treaty, whereby the Indians cede their rights to the land in consideration of a certain indemnity which the Government agrees to pay to them. The Indians under treaty in Manitoba and the North-West represent a population of 33,959. The treaties are seven in number, and contain about the same agreements and stipulations:

		Population.
3rd August, 1871,	Chippewas and Crees, Treaty No. 1	3,395
21st " 1871,	" " " " " "	895
3rd October, 1873,	Sauteux " " " "	2,805
15th September, 1874,	" and Crees (Qu'Appelle) Treaty No. 4	7,079
20th " 1875,	" " (Lake Winnipeg) " "	5,315
23rd August, 1876,	Plain and Wood Crees (Fort Carlton and Pitt) Treaty No. 6	8,157
22nd May, 1877,	Blackfeet, Treaty No. 7	6,873

As an example, let us look at Treaty No. 7. It contains a cession from the Indians to the Crown of territory which is described, and "all their rights, titles and privileges whatsoever to the lands" of said Territory. The Indians reserve to themselves the right of hunting throughout the tract surrendered, subject to such regulations as the Government of the country may make from time to time, and saving such tracts of land as may be required or taken up from time to time for settlement, mining, trading or other purposes, by the Government of Canada or by any citizen duly authorised therefor by said Government. The treaty provides for a reserve of land, which is also described, and is sufficiently large to allow one square mile for each family of five. In settlement of past claims the treaty provides for the payment of a sum of \$12 to each man, woman and child. The price of the Indian title payable to the Indians at suitable places and dates, and annually to each chief \$25, each minor chief or councillor \$15, and to every Indian, of whatever age, \$5. A sum of \$2,000 is to be expended every year in the purchase of ammunition or some other purpose, as the Indians and Government may determine. Every head chief, minor chief, chief and councillor, is entitled every three years to a suitable suit of clothing. Each head and minor chief is to receive, for the use of their bands, once for all, ten axes, five handsaws, five augers, one grindstone and the necessary files and whetstones. Every family of five persons and under is to receive the following cattle for raising stock, two cows; family of more than five and less than ten persons, three cows; family over ten persons, four cows; every head and minor chief, for his band, one bull. If any band desire to cultivate the soil as well as raise stock, each family of such band shall receive one cow less; and in lieu thereof, when settled on their reserves and prepared to break up the soil, two hoes, one spade, one scythe, and two hay forks; and for every three families, one plough and one harrow; and for each band, enough potatoes, barley, oats and wheat to place other land actually broken up. All the said articles to be given once for all for the encouragement of the practice of agriculture among the Indians. Each head chief and minor chief and Stony chief is to receive a Winchester rifle. And finally, the Indians undertake to conduct and behave themselves as good and loyal subjects of Her Majesty. These are the stipulations generally inserted in treaties with Indians. Treat No. 7, however, signed in 1877 with the Blackfeet, is the only one which provides for the supply of Winchester rifles, a provision greatly to be regretted, introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite, which did its work of destruction among our troops during the recent battles. Treaty No. 6 and other treaties with the Plain and Woods Crees contains the undertaking, on the part of the Government, to grant, during the three years after two or more of the reserves shall be set apart to the Indians, a sum of one thousand dollars yearly, to be employed in the purchase of provisions for the use of the Indians as are actually engaged in cultivating the soil, and to assist them in such cultivation. A medicine chest is also to be kept by the Indian agent for the use of the Indians, the necessity of which is fully demonstrated by the report of the Mounted Police for 1884. It will be conceded that these Indian treaties are most liberal, and they do not comprise the numerous presents which had to be made as preliminaries before even talking of the terms of the treaties. *Le Metis*, of the 24th July, 1872, speaking of one of the treaties with the Sautaux, says:

" Mr. Simpson, at Fort Francis, spent \$4,000 or \$5,000 in presents to the Sautaux, who, before even speaking of treaty, had already laid down most exorbitant pretensions.

On rapporte que s'ils n'ont pas demandé chacun un carrosse, c'est uniquement parce qu'ils n'en ont pas encore l'idée."

Notwithstanding the liberality of the treaties towards the Indians, experience soon proved that they were insufficient. For some years it was supposed that it would be at least 25 years before the decrease of the buffalo would be seriously felt. It was then to be seen nearly over the whole North-West Territory. A correspondent of the New York *Sun*, writing from Mile's city, Montana, on the 24th of April 1885, says: "In 1815 the buffalo ranges extended as far east as Illinois, Minnesota and Iowa; in short, the Mississippi River marked the eastern boundary of their grazing grounds. On the west the main Rocky Mountain ridge was the limit of their pastures; and between these two natural boundaries the buffalo roamed over the vast plains of the west, migrating with the seasons north and south, from the shores of the Arctic to the Gulf of Mexico. They were at the mercy of various Indian tribes, but the Indians were merciful. From this one animal the red men drew the main necessities of life. The hides furnished clothing, beds and lodge coverings. The horns were used as ornaments, and also furnished various kitchen utensils. The flesh was their staple food, and their sinews became arrow cords. The Indians used the animal but did not abuse it. The herds in those days south of the present international boundary line strictly in the United States must have contained not less than 5,000,000 animals. In what is now Manitoba, Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, there must have been fully 5,000,000 more, as the Hudson Bay trappers who came south to trade with the Snake, Shoshone and Modé Indians always reported vast herds of bison in the neighborhood of Great Slave and Great Bear Lakes. The buffalo were all right, until about seven years ago, when the Indians were conquered, which opened up the country and let the hide hunters in. It took almost seven years, beginning with 1870, to exterminate the buffalo along the line of the Northern Pacific Railway, which, in the good old times, could have been seen blackening the Platte River bottom for miles. These poor silly beasts were so easily killed, and from their abundance, offered so rich a reward to the hide hunter, that every idle fellow in that part of the country could make good wages by butchering them. The Union Pacific railroad split the herds in half, and left a moiety to the north and a moiety to the south. Those in Texas were soon used up by sportsmen and professional hunters; but the great northern herd fled to Wyoming and Montana, where Sitting Bull and his followers took charge of and protected them, until Uncle Sam's soldiers began chasing him around the country, as well as the bison. From 1875 to 1880 fully 1,000,000 of these brutes were killed by soldiers and other white men. I heard of one enterprising pot-hunter on the Yellowstone who actually had a Gatling gun to help the slaughter along. He employed no less than thirty skinners to tear the hide from the poor animals as soon as they dropped, and each skinner received \$1 for every hide he brought in at night. The skinned carcasses, as well as numberless unskinned, were left to rot where they fell. In short, the manipulator of the artillery kept ahead of his employés and provided them with more than they could attend to." As early as 1875 a missionary wrote to *Le Métis*, on the 15th September, from the Saskatchewan district:

" Il est vraiment inquiétant de voir les buffalos diminuer à vue d'œil ! Encore quelques années et le gouvernement aura sur les bras ces différentes tribus du Nord-Ouest, qui lui demanderont de quoi les empêcher de mourir de faim."

The slaughter of the buffalo was so great that the Indians and half-breeds became alarmed. They could not understand the inaction on the part of the Government. If we are to believe the *Globe*, the *Mail* and the *Free Press* of Mr. GIROUARD,

Winnipeg, a Provisional Government which these papers called a republic, was proclaimed at St. Laurent, in 1875, with Gabriel Dumont as president, for the avowed purpose of protecting the buffalo, and obtaining a large tract of land for hunting purposes. Major General Smith and Col. French were sent with 55 Mounted Police to subdue the rebels, who, on learning of the arrival of the force, sent two emissaries to Fort Carlton to offer their surrender on condition of being pardoned, and they were pardoned. A correspondent of the *Globe*, of July, 1876, says during the winter of 1876 about 120,000 of these animals were killed. Mr. Schultz directed the attention of the Government to this important question during the Session of 1876." I believe that if the late Administration had made the slightest effort to protect the buffalo the recent troubles would never have happened. During the years 1874, 1875 and 1876 representations were made to them on all hands that the buffalo would soon disappear unless some protective measures were adopted by the Government; but nothing was done. If we have to feed the Indians for generations it will be because no action was taken by the late Government to preserve, for the Indians and half-breeds, who were living something like them, the buffalo, their main means of support. On the 20th of March, 1876, Mr. Schultz said:

" Among the papers which he hoped to have brought down by this motion would be found valuable suggestions as to the preservation of the buffalo. He (Mr. Schultz) would urge the importance of this matter upon the Government. So long as the buffalo were numerous there was little danger of difficulty with the plain tribes of Indians, with whom we were now being brought into contact. When these were extinct we must expect to deal with a race of paupers, rendered dangerous by want of food. The Rev. Father Lascombe, a high authority on all such matters, believes, in common with many others, that if the present rate of destruction goes on the race of buffalo will be extinct in 10 years. It is true that since the completion of the Union Pacific Railroad and the establishment of military and other settlements in the Missouri, Father Lascombe estimates the number killed yearly during the winter at 80,000, and about the same number in summer. Their present feeding ground comprises a length of, say, about 600 miles by about 150, and is bounded on the west by the Rocky Mountains, on the east by the Qu'Appelle Lakes, on the south by the Missouri, and on the north by the north branch of the Saskatchewan; and this limit is ever decreasing, by the destruction caused by the hunters of the Saskatchewan on the north, those from the Missouri on the south, and the red River Hunters on the east, to an extent and rapidly so alarming that it is estimated by the Reverend Father and others that in 10 years they will be extinct. Such a result is not at all improbable, since it is only a few years since the buffalo ranged east of the Red River, and since the last of the wood buffalo, an animal of the same species, but of larger size, which ranged between the Saskatchewan and the Slave Lakes, was killed, and the whole of the race is extinct. The use of the revolving pistol and the repeating rifle, instead of the ordinary loading gun, has helped to bring this about, aided by the destruction caused by wolves, sickness, accidents of various sorts and the wasteful destruction of the buffalo pound. Unfortunately, too, it is the robe of the female Buffalo which is the most valuable, and when killed for it she is always with calf. It is her flesh which makes the best meat, and being more easily hunted down than the bulls, it has caused a destruction which has resulted in many of the bands met with last summer being composed of a proportion of six or seven males to one female. The district where buffalo are found has narrowed with a startling rapidity during the last 10 years, buffalo having about that time been seen by him (Mr. Schultz) east of Red River. These facts point strongly to the necessity of preventive measures, and the facts spoken of are so well known to the Indians and half-breeds that they are anxious the Government should take action in the matter, if it were not for the fact that it would be impossible to prevent the killing of cows. At the same time there would be no objection to the killing of buffalo bulls at any season of the year; but since this is impossible, a stringent law is demanded, which will practically leave these animals undisturbed from the 1st November to 1st May, and an enactment to prevent the killing of calves at any season. If such a law were passed it is believed that in five years the buffalo would have so increased that these restrictions might be removed. He (Mr. Schultz) hoped that this matter would receive the consideration at the hands of the Government which its importance demanded, and that the papers bearing on this matter would be printed for the general information they would afford."

" Hon. Mr. Mackenzie said the matter to which the hon. member had particularly alluded—the preservation of the buffalo in the western prairies—had occupied a large share of the attention of the Government for a considerable time."

Nothing more; nothing whatever was done to protect this most important food of the Indians.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, there was.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am coming to that. True, the council of the North-West, at its first session, 1877, passed an ordinance for the protection of the buffalo; but for reasons which do not appear, was repealed the next session. Perhaps it did conflict with treaty obligations with Indians. The measure was, however, too important to be left to the local council. It was a question of death or life for the large number of Indians which were under the special care of the Dominion, and should have been dealt with by the Dominion Government. It is greatly to be regretted that the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite did not adopt the protective measures which had been suggested to the Government by Father Lacombe and other experienced residents. The Premier of the Administration of those days admitted, in March, 1876, that the matter occupied a large share of the attention of his Government for a considerable time, but nothing was done. Again, during the Session of 1877, this important matter was brought before the House and discussed at considerable length. New revelations were made and the policy of the Government announced. Mr. Schultz addressed the House on the subject. I will not repeat every speech made, but merely quote a few extracts:

"Several years ago, in speaking of the condition of the Indians of the North-West, he (Mr. Schultz) had pointed out the results likely to be occasioned by the entire destruction of the buffalo. The animal was invaluable to the Indians, because its flesh was his food, the hide his house and clothing, while the sale of its robe furnished him with all that he needed of European manufacture. Without this source of supply the Indian would become a pauper, and, by an easy transition, a marauder. To avert these results, it was obvious that the buffalo must be protected, at least, till a time arrived when the Indians who now inhabited these hunting grounds could be weaned from the chase and taught to depend wholly or in part upon agriculture. From one of the Government sources of information he was glad to see their attention directed towards this matter, and hon. gentlemen would find, in page 34 of the Minister of the Interior's report, the following statement of Mr. Dickinson, of that Department.

"The subject which at present takes precedence of all others in connection with the Indian question in the North-West Territories is the preservation of the buffalo. The rapid decrease in the numbers of the buffalo has become a matter of alarm to the Indians, who see that, unless steps are speedily taken to arrest it, their future condition will be one of extreme hardship. That the buffalo are decreasing in number in a rapidly increasing ratio is a fact admitted on all sides.

"I am aware that this question has already received some consideration on the part of the Government, and that representations have been made by parties better informed than I claim to be, as to the necessity of some action in regard to it. For this reason, I will not enter into the matter as fully as I would otherwise have done.

"While at the Qu'Appelle Lake the Cree chiefs, accompanied by their principle head men, waited upon me, and represented that they were becoming alarmed, on account of their means of subsistence failing, and begged me to report what they said to the Government, and to convey their request that something should be done to prevent the entire extermination of the buffalo. To show the importance they attached to this question, I may remark that each chief and his head men separately made the same request. In all my previous intercourse with the Indians I have never seen this course adopted. In discussing other matters, a spokesman is generally chosen, who speaks for all; the others merely signify their assent; but in this case it was evident they considered something more was necessary, and adopted this method to impress the gravity of their position upon me. In my opinion, the buffalo must be protected, or in a few years, not more than ten at the furthest, the whole number of Indians in the North-West, who now rely upon these animals for subsistence, will require to be fed and maintained principally at the expense of the Dominion Government. I can see no other alternative, as it is an impossibility to teach them in a short time to forsake their present mode of life and adopt that of civilised men. The subject is one which demands and should receive the early consideration of the Government, for the peace and consequent prosperity of the North-West Territories depend in a great measure upon it. Should the buffalo become exterminated, it is not to be expected that the starving Indians will refrain from helping themselves to the supplies to be found in the stores of the Hudson's Bay Company and other traders; compelled by hunger, outrages might be committed by them which would result in an Indian war. These are the views of every one who is well informed regarding the state of the country, and while I admit that the Indians at present are peaceable, well disposed, and have every confidence in the Government, I think there can be no doubt that they are correct."

These were the warnings made in 1876 by one of the officials of the late Administration. Let us see what has been their policy on receiving such strong remonstrances.

Mr. MILLS. Since 1879.

Mr. GIROUARD. I will let you know very soon. This report of Mr. Dickinson was made in 1876 and published

in the Sessional Papers of 1877, and quoted by Mr. Schultz during the debate of 1877. Other hon. gentlemen spoke on the subject. Let us see what Mr. Donald Smith said:

"The Hon. Donald A. Smith (Selkirk) said he was happy to be able to concur entirely with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz). It was very necessary that some steps should be taken to prevent the entire destruction of the buffalo in the North-West. This was a matter in which there might be reciprocity with the United States. We should give them the same measure which they gave us. They did not permit any except American citizens to go to their territories and trade and hunt, and even their own citizens were forced to get licenses. The slaughter and disappearance of the buffalo was owing in a large measure to the inducements held out to American traders. A large number of the robes went to the other side, and, while the Canadian trader lost profit so far as this was concerned, the buffalo were also rapidly decreasing, or rather, gradually but surely being killed out. He hoped that the Government would be able to devise some means to exclude, to some extent, the ingress of American traders, and also, as far as possible, to give protection to the buffalo."

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

### After Recess.

Mr. GIROUARD. When we rose at six o'clock, I was referring to the discussion which took place in the House of Commons in 1876 and in 1877, concerning the sudden disappearance of the buffalo. I also referred to the report of Mr. Dickinson, an officer of the late Administration, upon the subject, where he said that the most important question affecting the Indians was the preservation of the buffalo. I quoted the opinion of Mr. Schultz and of Mr. Smith. I will now continue to read extracts of the continuation of that debate. Mr. Mills, on behalf of the Government, rose and said:

"This subject had received the serious consideration of the Government. So far as he has been able to look into the matter, he was of the opinion that it had better be left to be dealt with by the Government of the North-West, rather than by the Parliament here. From the information in the possession of the Government, there could be no doubt that the buffalo were rapidly diminishing, and this diminution had sensibly increased since American traders had come across. Ever since the settlement of Manitoba, also, the buffalo had retreated farther and farther to the west. The half-breeds, in their pursuits, had invaded the country of the Blackfeet and Blood Indians, and much complaint had arisen therefrom. The Government had some information which they could supply, such as a report by the North-West council and a communication from one or two missionaries. He saw one of the missionaries a short time ago, and obtained from him all the information possible. He had come to the conclusion that it would be a very formidable undertaking. The missionary he spoke of said it would be necessary to induce the Indians to obey the law, as at present they had not sufficient respect for each other to observe any regulation. The result was, that those who would be disposed to refrain from destroying the buffalo were prevented from acting upon such a principle by the fact that others would not act in the same way. His informant's opinion further was, that it would be necessary to get the Indians to abandon the plains and live along the borders of some of the lakes for a period of four or five years. They could subsist by fishing and agriculture during that time, although the Government would also be obliged to contribute very considerably to their support. The Local Government of the North-West could probably devise a cheaper and better plan than this Parliament, it being on the spot and more familiar with the matter."

"Mr. Trow (I believe now the whip of the Opposition) said buffalo were very prolific, and if a law were passed to protect them for a few years, he had no doubt that they would soon increase. Although he frequently saw the bones of the buffalo bleaching in the sun in Manitoba, not a live buffalo could be seen, until four or five hundred miles west was reached. The buffalo must be protected, or else it would soon become extinct.

"Mr. Schultz (in reply to Mr. Mills) said: Father Lacombe suggested that no Buffalo should be killed from 1st November to 1st May in each year, and no calf at any time—this restriction to continue for five years. But the full-grown animal might be killed all the summer; hence the fear of his hon. friend, that the Government would have to support the Indians during the five years of enforcement of a preservation law, would be without foundation. The statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, on the same point, he must criticise somewhat. The hon. the Minister seemed to fear that if a protective statute were enacted great expense would be caused to the Government in supplying the Indians with the means of subsistence during the interval between 1st November and 1st May, when they were not allowed to kill the buffalo. Now he (Mr. Schultz) believed that no such great expense would be caused. Much of the food in the shape of dried meat and pemmican used by the Indians in the winter was made by them in the summer months, and if it was once understood that no buffalo were to be killed during the winter months, the Indians would lay in an extra supply of the dried meat, and the expenditure by the Government of a few

thousand dollars for twine for nets would be all the aid the Indians would require. On the score of expense, he must take issue on other grounds as well with the Minister of the Interior. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken seemed impressed with the belief that we were likely to have difficulty with the Indians if the buffalo supply speedily cut off. Now, the history of Indian difficulties in the United States taught us that, under any circumstances, it was far cheaper to feed the Indians than to fight them. \* \* \* He had every confidence in the good intentions of his hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, but as the Government of the North-West was an appointed one, and not responsible in any way to the people of that region, it would be necessary for the Government here, as they were responsible for the actions of the North-West Government, to see that important measures, like the one under consideration, receive prompt attention.

"Mr. Mills said that the hon. gentleman had misapprehended what he had stated. He had not said that it was necessary to prevent the Indians from destroying the buffalo for several years in succession, but for the period of each year extending from November to May. This was the statement made to him by Father Lacombe. He believed that the hon. gentleman was himself a member of the North-West council, and it had had power to deal with this question, but he was not aware that anything had been done.

"Mr. Schultz said that the hon. Minister had evidently not lately read the correspondence of the late North-West Council, for if he had he would find, among the papers which he hoped to have brought down by this motion, that the old North-West council had brought up the matter in the strongest form possible, and urged the necessity for a protective law of this kind."

So we have the policy expressed by the late Government, that they would do nothing to preserve the buffalo. At this time, in 1877, they did not say that the matter will continue to receive an important share of the consideration of the Government. They express that their policy is to do nothing; and when they left office, in 1878, the buffalo was almost—I might say altogether—extinct. It was too late for the present Administration to do anything to preserve it. The buffalo was destroyed for want of protection, and for this blunder of the late Administration, the country is forced to-day to feed, and not only to feed, but to fight the Indians, and will likely be obliged to do so until the grown-up generations are gone. At the time the present Administration came into power, the preservation of the buffalo was out of question. The Indian problem was how to take care of the Indians, irrespective of treaties, and how to civilise them. *Le Métis* said:

"Le Canada a une grosse difficulté à résoudre, celle des sauvages du Nord-Ouest. Ces pauvres gens meurent de faim \* \* \* Le gouvernement fait tout ce qu'il peut pour soulager leur misère actuelle, mais il semble en oublier la cause."

The *Métis* then states that the principal cause of the destitution of the Indian is their nomadic life, and asked the Government to settle them down somewhere. Immediately upon coming to power, the right hon. Premier of this Government announces its Indian policy for the future. In his report, dated 10th April, 1879, he says:

"The rapid disappearance of the buffalo, which is the staple article of food of the Indians and half-breeds of the North-West Territories, induces the belief that these people must, in a few years, be fed at the expense of the country, unless they, in the meantime, acquire some other means of subsistence than the buffalo hunt now affords. In order to enable them to become self-supporting as soon as possible, facilities must be provided by which they may acquire some practical knowledge of agriculture and of the care of stock.

"They will probably require some small supply of provisions each year while they are engaged in tilling and sowing their lands. Such assistance, however, should only be extended to those Indians who prove to be in earnest in endeavoring to become self-subsisting.

"The bands in the vicinity of the Rocky Mountains appear to prefer stock raising to agriculture, and they will be encouraged to become owners of herds of cattle."

On the 13th of the same month, 1880, Father Hugonard, speaking of the distress prevailing among the Indians and half-breeds in the North-West, gives this advice to the half-breeds of Manitoba, who had left their settled Province for the prairie life:

"Pauvres gens de Manitoba qui cherchez à vendre vos terres pour aller reprendre la vie de chasse et de traité, réfléchissez donc un peu au tort que vous préparez à vos familles. Ne comptez plus sur les chances de vivre dans les prairies de l'Ouest. Les sauvages eux-mêmes n'y trouveront pas de quoi subsister, et s'ils veulent éviter la mort, ils seront obligés sous peu de se livrer à l'agriculture. Tandis que vous possédez de riches terres, gardez-les avec soin et n'allez pas les vendre au premier venu."

M. G. GIROUARD.

In the Speech from the Throne for the Session of 1880 the situation of the Indians is thus referred to:

"In consequence of the entire failure in the food supply of the Indians in the North-West, a large expenditure has been necessarily incurred to save them from starvation. It is hoped that the efforts which are now being made to settle the several bands on the reserves and to induce them to betake themselves to the cultivation of the soil may prevent the necessity of similar calls for relief in the future."

On the contrary, the distress, instead of decreasing, has been ever since increasing. *Le Métis*, of the 10th April, 1878, says:

"The news from Battleford is to the effect that the greatest dissatisfaction prevails among the Indians."

In 1881 the Marquis of Lorne visited the North-West, and thus referred to the Indians in the Speech from the Throne, in the Session of 1882:

"During my journey I was met by numerous Indian tribes, all expressing confidence in the continuance of the traditional policy of kindness and justice which has hitherto marked the relations between the Government and the aborigines.

"I regret, however, that the necessity of supplementing the food supply to the Indians still exists, and is likely to continue for some years."

Referring to the year 1884, the Minister of the Interior, in his report, dated 1st January, 1885, says:

"Upon being advised of this fact, I directed that measures should be taken to prevent consequent suffering among the Indians. Supplementary contracts have accordingly been made with inhabitants of the Territories for the supply of additional quantities of flour, as they may be required at the various points. I also authorised the purchase of an additional quantity of ammunition and twine, in order that the Indians might be able to supply themselves and families with fish and game during the winter."

Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to feed the Indians, not only for a year, but until the present grown up generations are gone. It can hardly be expected that a man who has been brought up in hunting and war can immediately settle down to the civilised life of agriculture. We will have to feed him, or he will steal and fight for his life. Our only hope is with the children. Monseigneur Grandin said, in 1878:

"On ne parviendra jamais à civiliser les sauvages suffisamment pour en faire de bons citoyens, qu'en les prenant tout petits enfants."

The present Government acted upon this recommendation. The first Government aid towards schools was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, in 1876, but it amounted only to \$2,000. In 1877 only three schools were receiving Government aid, St. Albert, Lac la Biche and White Fish Lake. In 1878 ten Indian schools were in operation in Manitoba and four in the North-West. Mr. McCaul, Indian Superintendent for Manitoba, says, in his report, dated Winnipeg, 31st December, 1878:

"There are comparatively few Government schools in operation in this superintendency, and I regret to say that the majority of them are of a very inferior grade, on account of the incompetency of many of the teachers in charge. In numerous instances, where no schools have been established, the chiefs and councillors expressed the desire that their children might be educated, and requested me to ask the Government not only to send them teachers, but also to build them school houses. I attribute the low standard of the schools to the small amount allowed by the Government for the salary of teachers in each reserve, for only the most inefficient ones can be obtained at such a consideration. I would, therefore, beg leave to suggest that a larger allowance be granted for that purpose, and that only efficient teachers be engaged."

As to the yet "unorganised superintendency" of the North-West, as Hon. Mr. Laird was pleased to call it, in his report of the 5th December, 1878, speaking of the schools, he says:

"Only a few schools in this superintendency as yet received aid from the Government. All of these are mission schools. The schools connected with the Roman Catholic mission at St. Albert, Lac la Biche and Isle à la Croix receive aid for the Indian children instructed there. I have not been able to visit any of these institutions, but I hear them highly spoken of. The Church of England mission school at Touchwood Hills, near Chief Gordon's reserve, also received aid,

and an application has been made on behalf of a similar school at Assissippi, on Ahtahacoop's reserve, near Carlton, and of one at Eagle Hills reserve, near Battleford, which I trust will receive favorable consideration. The Canadian Methodists have also some good Indian schools, but if they are now in receipt of Government aid it is not forwarded through this office."

I may say, however, that it is was not without due representation coming from very high authorities in the North-West, if the late Administration paid so little attention to teaching the Indians. Amongst the papers which came into my hands only yesterday, I find a letter from His Lordship the Bishop of St. Albert, Monseigneur Grandin, to Lieutenant Governor Laird, dated 5th April, 1875. I will not quote the whole letter, but only extracts of it. His Lordship, in the course of his remarks, says:

"BISHOPRIC, ST. ALBERT,  
"5th April, 1875.

"SIR,—You will perhaps be surprised, that without having the advantage of knowing you, or of being known by you, I venture to address Your Honor personally.

"I would not have ventured on this boldness if the worthy Colonel Jarvis had not apprised me of your indulgence, and your great desire to render any service.

"Assured of your goodness, I will write to you at length, hoping you will have the patience to read and take into consideration what I shall tell you.

"The little news we receive from Manitoba had made us suppose that the Government at Ottawa was a good deal occupied about our country. However, until the arrival of the troops, we had not received the slightest mark of interest from that Government.

"Permit me, Sir, to tell you frankly that it appears to me, while encouraging emigration into the North-West Territories, the Government should consider the benefit of the present inhabitants of the North-West. Apart from the sending of the soldiers nothing has been done, at least, of which we are aware, and this single benefit is far from being known and appreciated by all.

"But they will say, 'the Métis are good for nothing—a people idle and without economy.'

"If they were a hundredfold worse, if you will, those who have such advantages over them should not forget that the Métis are generally descended from the servants of the Hudson Bay Company; that these servants, almost exclusively engaged in voyaging, did nothing, or nearly nothing, during their long winters, and could not consequently give their children a liking for work—not seeing its utility. Who was there to teach them notions of order and economy? The mothers had not the faintest idea. Besides, receiving each day the food necessary for the whole family, what was the good of managing? 'The company profits, and the company is rich,' says a proverb well known in the country.

"If they left the service the buffalos, then very numerous, supplied them with abundance of food with little labor. The surplus of provisions and the furs and skins, also very abundant, procured them the necessary clothing.

"But they do not even manage their money. How can they? Many of them never saw money, and have not the least idea of its value. Why deprive themselves of anything during the year? The only advantage they will acquire will be to learn, on the return of the courier (postman), that the books of York Factory contain many Louis to their credit.

"Others who have spent all their wages in fine clothes for themselves and their families have a pile of pleasant and useful little things. In this they behold a fortune. Money nor an account book is of any consideration.

"I ask Your Honor's pardon for such details; but I do not consider them altogether useless.

"Whatever draws attention to the chain of circumstances in which the Métis are born, is important, and which, being multiplied, cannot but excuse them for faults with which they are reproached nor be surprised that they are even as they are.

"I could cite more than one tourist who, by their writings, have contributed to make them be regarded in Canada and other places as a barbarous and savage people, incapable of culture or civilisation, and who have left among the Métis and the Indians themselves a very sad idea of the morality of civilised people.

"No, Sir, the Métis are not such as they would wish to make them appear—a barbarous people, incapable of culture. I think, on the contrary, that they merit all the sympathy of a good Government. Let it give them some encouragement and it will see if there is nothing to hope from them.

"I therefore venture, Sir, to pray you to take in hand the cause of these poor Métis, and that the Government will be good enough to do something to encourage farming among them, at least, to those who exhibit such a willingness. Everything is scarce and so difficult to get in this country that not only the Métis, but strangers themselves can only vegetate.

"We have boasted of our Territory being called the garden of the north, and the fertile belt. This does not prevent those who inhabit it from suffering, and those who will come from suffering still more.

"To encourage agriculture, it is not only necessary to procure farming implements at a low rate, but as soon as possible to have easy ways of transport for the actual necessities of life.

"In June, 1873, taking advantage of a trip to Europe, I passed through Ottawa, and had the honor of an interview with the right hon. John Macdonald and H. Langevin on the affairs of our country. In the month of September following I addressed a letter directly to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada. On my return from Europe I found at St. Albert a letter, which His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, of Manitoba had caused to be written to me. According to that letter I had every reason to hope that my requests would be complied with.

"To advance civilisation of our population, all Métis and Indians, everyone is aware that schools are of the last importance. I was convinced that, under the Government of Canada, the encouragement of schools would be one of its first boons—till now I have hoped in vain.

"Besides the schools, we have also orphan asylums. I have the advantage of having three in my diocese, where fifty children have been brought up, both Métis and Indian.

"They speak of civilising the Indians by making them cultivate. It may arise that the missionaries, by working with them, ploughing and making them plough their lands, may, in the course of time, reach some results; but they will be slow and unappreciable. Fifteen years' experience does not allow me doubt that we can succeed in bringing up the little children. Many, doubtless, will not be able to receive a thorough education; but at least they can speak their Indian tongue; and getting accustomed to work, their savage life will be no longer possible. They can rank and mix with the Métis, with whom we marry them without much difficulty; and they will end, I doubt not, in forming good families, who will have no traces of the Indian but the blood. If, then, instead of three asylums for orphans, I had a certain number wherein I could admit all the little Indians they would give me, we would advance civilisation.

"As regards those who are Indians, if the Government will make reserves in their favor, I venture to beg that Your Honor will ensure that these reserves be composed of cultivable lands and situated near fishing lakes. In this way, besides cultivation, which will not amount to much, they will have two other means of living—hunting and fishing.

"I ask pardon, Sir, for abusing your patience so long, but I still rest on what the brave Col. Jarvis told me of your indulgence.

"I have shown you my mode of procedure to elevate the position of the inhabitants of this country. More than twenty years of experience among them makes me believe that my plans are not bad.

"I venture then, Sir, to reiterate my requests, and to earnestly pray Your Honor to use all your influence to procure them for me:

"1st. Before all, I ask some encouragement for the settlers. The Catholic missionaries have done almost impossible things in this direction. They have at different places three mills. For the third time we have tried to erect one in the colony of St. Albert—behold more than £900 stg. which we have sacrificed for it; and we are still uncertain whether we shall succeed. That the Government may, on their part, deign to do something to encourage agriculture.

"2nd. Aid for a hospital—at least to construct it, and put it in a condition to receive the sick.

"3rd. Aid for schools. The Government makes large outlay for education in all Canada. Is our North-West to be alone withheld assistance? It cannot be said that we require help less than other parts of the country.

"4th. Aid for our orphan asylums, that we may increase these establishments, so as to be able to take in a greater number of little savages.

"5th. Concession of land for each orphan asylum or model farm.

"6th. Reserve, of land for the children thus brought up, and aid to help them on to a little farm once they are married.

"7th. And lastly, that the reserves to be made over to the Indians be of arable land, and situated near fishing lakes.

"I am really ashamed, Sir, of the length of my letter, which I have been obliged to write in haste, because I was sure of the opportunity which offered of its reaching you.

"I wrote the lines close, and tried to economise my paper, so as to conceal my prattling.

"I have only succeeded in making it more apparent.

"Your Honor knows what babblers the Indians are—it is not surprising if I should resemble them, after living twenty-one years amongst them.

"This letter, coming to you, as it were, from a poor Indian, will, such as it is, be received and read by you indulgently. You will also, I am sure, take it into consideration, and constitute yourself our advocate.

"Receive, in advance, the assurance of my consideration, and be good enough to believe me,

"Sir, Your Honor's humble and respectful servant,

"(Signed) + VITAL, J.,

"Bishop of St. Albert, O.M.I.

"To His Honor

"The Very Honorable D. LAIRD,  
"Minister of the Interior, Ottawa."

Here is the answer of the Minister of Interior:

"To the Right Reverend J. VITAL GRANDIN,  
Bishop of St. Albert, North-West Territory.

OTTAWA, 31st July, 1875.

"MY LORD,—I have the honor, by the desire of the Superintendent General, to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's letter of the 5th of April last, calling his attention to the condition of the settlers in your diocese in the North-West.

"2. The Superintendent General desires me to say that he has read with much interest your valuable communication, which reached him some days ago.

"3. He wishes me to assure Your Lordship that he and his colleagues in the Government have the most earnest desire to promote the well-being of all the inhabitants of the North-West, whether Indians or half-breeds, and that it will afford the Government sincere pleasure to cooperate, so far as is in his power, in your praiseworthy efforts to elevate their condition.

"4. The Superintendent General is gratified to receive from Your Lordship the assurance of the great benefits to the cause of law and order in the Territories which have already resulted from the action of the Government in sending the Mounted Police into the country. He regrets to learn, however, from your letter, that a large number of the Métis has contemplated abandoning the Province and settling in the United States, but is gratified to find that through Your Lordship's judicious intervention they were induced to remain in Canada.

"5. The Superintendent General is surprised and grieved at the statement in your letter that the Métis in your diocese regard the Dominion Government with feelings of uneasiness and distrust, and point to the occurrences in connection with the troubles at Red River as an evidence of the want of friendly feeling of the Government towards them.

"6. The Superintendent General thinks that a calm review of all the facts connected with those unhappy occurrences ought to convince any candid and thoughtful person that the Government has acted throughout towards the Métis who were compromised therein in a spirit of kindness; and Your Lordship can assure the settlers in your diocese who continue peaceable and law-abiding that the Government will be prepared to deal with them in a spirit of generous consideration. The Superintendent General hopes, therefore, that Your Lordship will be able to disabuse the minds of the Métis of the Saskatchewan of the erroneous impressions they would seem to labor under with regard to the feelings entertained toward them by the Dominion Government.

"7. The Superintendent General has read with especial interest your remarks upon the subject of schools for the Indians and Métis, believing, as he does, that it is to the education of the rising generation of Indians we must look for any permanent elevation of the red man.

"8. I shall now proceed to notice *seriatim* the several heads under which you ask the Government to aid the settlers in the North-West. You ask for:

- "1. Encouragement for the settlers in agriculture.
- "2. Aid for hospitals.
- "3. Aid for schools.
- "4. Aid for orphan asylums.
- "5. Concessions of land for orphan asylums and model farms.
- "6. Reserves of land for the children, and aid to help them in farming; and
- "7. And lastly; reserves for the Indians of arable land situate near fishing lakes.

"As to the first, namely the encouragement of agriculture among the settlers, the Superintendent General cannot but congratulate Your Lordship upon the efforts made by the mission, especially by the establishment of mills to enable the settlers to utilise the grain raised in your diocese.

"The Superintendent General wishes to remind you that this is a subject which will properly come within the province of the Local Government soon to be inaugurated in the North-West. He thinks, however, that it is obvious that the measures now being taken by the Dominion Government to carry a railroad and telegraph line through the Territories must have the effect of opening up the country and of facilitating transfer through it, and in this way cannot fail to give an impetus to the agricultural interest of the Territory.

"The 2nd, 3rd and 4th heads referred to by you, are all matters which come especially within the province of the Local Legislature.

"With regard to the third head, I may remark that the Dominion Lands Act makes provision by a liberal land grant to aid general educational purposes in the Territories, and so far as the Indians are concerned, the Dominion Government will, no doubt, be prepared, when the Territory is surrendered, to make the same provisions there as elsewhere by treaty for Indian schools. In the meantime, I am directed by the Minister to transmit to Your Lordship an official cheque for the sum of \$300 in aid of the school at St. Albert, authorised by Order in Council of the 22nd October, 1873. As is assumed from Your Lordship's report, that the average attendance of Indian children at this school is not less than the number required by the Order in Council, viz. 25, any one of the other schools which Your Lordship may think proper to select will be entitled to a similar one for the current year, provided, of course, the average attendance of Indian children throughout the year is not less than 25.

"As to the fifth head, namely, concessions of land for orphan asylums and model farms, the Superintendent General is not prepared at present to make any definite pledge on behalf of the Government. On this point the Superintendent General will be able to speak more definitely after a treaty has been made, and when the question of the extent of land asked for for the purposes above mentioned is more accurately known.

"The sixth head refers to large question of public policy, on what it would be manifestly too premature at present to pronounce an opinion. The settlers of the North-West have good grounds for believing that the Dominion Government will deal liberally with them. There is a sufficiency of land in the Territory for all of them and their children, and it is earnestly to be hoped that they will cultivate as much of it as possible, and secure for themselves comfortable homes in the country to which they belong.

Mr. GIBOUARD.

"As regards the seventh head, namely, the reserves for the Indians. This matter has hitherto been fully provided for, and all treaties made with the Indians, by which assistance in money and agricultural implements has always been secured to them, and there can be no reason to doubt that these matters will be dealt with in a similar spirit of liberality in future treaties.

"The reservation secured to the Indians will, no doubt, have a fair proportion of arable land, and will include, when it is practicable, any fishing lakes which the Indians may desire to avail themselves of.

"In this connection. Your Lordship will bear in mind that in all cases Indian reserves are selected after conference with the tribes interested, and in this way every reasonable precaution to guard the interest and meet the wishes of the Indians.

"I have the honor to be, Your Lordship's most obedient servant,  
(Signed.) DAVID LAIRD."

It will be noticed that when this answer to Bishop Grandin was sent, on 31st July, 1875, the North-West council was not organized. Here is the opinion of a very high authority, perhaps the best in that country, in regard to the habits, characters and qualities of the Indians. Bishop Grandin recommends to the Government that Indian children should be educated; and what is the answer he received? In the month of July, 1875, His Lordship is sent to the North-West council. And it must be remarked that at that time the council was not in existence. There was a provision passed during the Session, a few months before that letter was written, in 1875, providing for the creation of a North-West council as it exists to-day, and undoubtedly giving the members of that council jurisdiction over school matters; but that council was not really organized until the month of October, 1876. The law was not put in operation, and that is the answer which the late Government gave to Bishop Grandin, to go to the North-West Council, which was not then in existence. We may well imagine the difference between the policy of the present Government and that of the last one, when we are informed (as we are, in the report of Indian Affairs for last year) that the Government now maintains or subsidised 53 schools among the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West, at an expense of \$12,241.74, or about \$240 per annum for each school. Among these teachers, 10 are French, or French Canadians: Sisters Lemay, Paquette, Langelier and Blanchet, and Fathers Dupont, Allard, Marchand, Paquette, Fafard, Méraire, Lestance and Mr. Tabouret. The Government having seriously undertaken to settle the Indians to civilised life, went further than establishing elementary schools among them. In 1883 they asked for a vote of \$14,000 to establish industrial schools, with a view of forming one on the High River, near Calgary, for the benefit of the Blackfeet under Father Lacombe; one at Battleford, under the direction of the Rev. Thomas Clarke, of the Church of England, for the benefit of the Crees and other Indians of the Saskatchewan district; one at Fort Qu'Appelle, under Father Huguenard. These schools cost about \$12,000 each, and are large enough to receive 30 boys and the High River and Qu'Appelle schools can also accommodate 10 or 12 girls, which are placed under the care of the nuns. Besides these establishments entirely maintained by the Government, the Government granted, in 1883, \$1,500 to the Indian School of Bishop Grandin at St. Albert. The Minister of Indian Affairs, in his last official report, thus speaks of the working of these schools so far:

"Adverting to the improvement, intellectually, of the Indians of the North-West Territories, I am pleased to be able to inform your Excellency that the industrial schools at Battleford, Qu'Appelle and High River, which were referred to in my report of last year, as then in contemplation, have been since established, and are now in operation. That at Battleford commenced its work quite early in the year, under the Rev. Thos. Clarke as principal; and the institutions at Qu'Appelle and High River at a later date, under the control, the former of the Rev. Mr. Huguenard, and the latter of the Rev. Mr. Lacombe. Trades have not as yet been introduced among the attainments to be required by the pupils; but it is hoped that during the ensuing year the progress of the children will admit of the same being done. The original proposal was that these institutions should be devoted exclusively to the education of Indian boys, but it would be a proper subject for the consideration of

Parliament at its ensuing Session, whether a sufficient amount should not be voted to admit of the buildings being enlarged, and a staff of female teachers employed for the education and industrial training of Indian girls; the same being, in my opinion, of as much importance as a factor in the civilisation and advancement of the Indian race as the education of the male portion of the community. The appreciation in which the Indians hold this effort of the Government to improve their intellectual and industrial condition is shown by the fact that at the institution at Battleford little or no difficulty was experienced in obtaining pupils; and for that at High River, more boys were offered than could be accommodated. It would, in my opinion, be advisable to establish two industrial institutions in the Manitoba superintendency, in order to afford the rising generation of Saulteaux, Swampy Cree, and Cree Indians of the districts embraced in that superintendency, similar advantages to those granted the Cree and Blackfoot Indians of the North-West Territories.

"Before leaving the district embraced in the Edmonton agency, I feel it to be incumbent upon me, as well as a pleasure, to refer to the excellent industrial institution which is conducted under the direction of His Lordship the Bishop of St. Albert at that place. The Indian pupils at this establishment, besides being instructed in the ordinary branches of education, have imparted to them, so far as the boys are concerned, a knowledge of farm work; and the girls are taught sewing, knitting and other household duties. The value of the service rendered to the Indian race by such institutions as the school at St. Albert, and that at Morleyville, which is of a similar type, is incalculable, and His Lordship, the energetic patron of the former establishment, and his able assistants, and the Rev. John McDougall, the able principal of the latter institution, are deserving of every praise for the efforts put forth by them for the elevation of these poor children of the prairie and of the forest."

We may fairly assume that the scheme is a move in the right direction from the fact that Bishop Grandin had already and successfully made the experiment and that His Grace Archbishop Taché went to Montreal, in 1884, for the purpose of providing for more industrial schools among the Indians throughout Manitoba and the North-West. *Le Manitoba*, of the 10th July, 1884, thus refers to the policy of industrial schools among Indians:

"L'établissement d'écoles industrielles pour les enfants sauvages que vient de décréter le gouvernement est une mesure de la plus grande prévoyance et qui est appelée à rendre des services les plus signalés. Le but est de recueillir l'enfant sauvage, de l'instruire, de le brieiser à une discipline et de l'accoutumer au travail suivant le progrès de ses forces.

The Government has adopted not only the system of industrial schools, but has also introduced practical farming among the Indians. That nothing was done by the late Government in this respect clearly results from the following extract of a letter of the 11th November, 1878, from Mr. Laird, published with the Sessional Papers of 1879:—

"In regard to your enquiries respecting the method of teaching the Indians farming, I am decidedly of opinion that the best plan is to have a permanent agricultural instructor with the bands. Where reserves are grouped together one instructor might take charge of, say, three or four bands. The number which would be necessary might be, for Treaty No. 4, five instructors; for Treaty No. 6, eight; Treaty No. 7, two. Each instructor, for salary and perquisites, would cost at least \$1,000, or \$1,500 in all, per annum, for say, ten years. If such instructors were appointed, I would advise dispensing with ordinary Indian sub-agents. Agents to go round and make the annual payments, and oversee the instructors to some extent, would still be required, as, in my opinion, it is injudicious to let money get into many hands. If the Indians were instructed in farming I think most of the bands would soon save their seed from their own crops. But, for a few years it would be of little avail to give them instructions unless they were allowed seed and provisions for two or three weeks while planting. In the spring they are generally absolutely destitute of food, and can do but little at farming, unless provisions are supplied to them."

Acting upon this report, the Conservative Government, as early as 1880, asked for an appropriation for the purpose of establishing farms on Indian reserves. Seventeen were established during that year, and there are now twenty-six in operation, and more particularly among the Indians of the Saskatchewan district. The total cost of the maintenance of these farms was \$44,023. To give you an instance of the results of these farms, let us look at the return from the Indian agency of Carlton for 1884:

"The returns received show the number of Indians resident upon the reserves, and the area of land ploughed, and the quantities of produce raised last season on the reserves belonging to these Indians, to have been as follows:—

Resident Indians .....	1,791 souls.
Land broken .....	5,625 acres.
Roots grown .....	8,960 bushels.
Grain do .....	4,910 do
Hay cut .....	705 tons.

*Battleford Agency—(Report for 1884).*

"The ten bands and six reserves, last described, are under the superintendence of an Indian agent, who is stationed at Battleford. The following is a statement of the number of resident Indians, and the quantity of land ploughed, and of the quantities of produce gathered on these reserves last season:—

Resident Indians .....	2,423 souls.
Land ploughed and fenced.....	6,153 acres.
Roots grown.....	2,881 bushels.
Grain do .....	1,100 do
Hay saved .....	804 tons.

It will not be without interest to show the treatment by the Government of Poundmaker, who had connection with the recent rebellion. Poundmaker belongs to this agency, and last summer had a farm on his reserve, under the direction of Mr. Jefferson, as instructor; and here is the report of Mr. Dewdney, for 1884:

"It is estimated that this band had in crop this year two hundred acres, viz:—twenty-five of wheat, five of oats, one hundred and fifty of barley, eight of potatoes, seven of turnips, three of carrots and two acres in gardens. The grain will yield scarcely anything, on account of the drought and the frost. The computed yield of potatoes is three hundred bushels, and two hundred and fifty bushels of turnips. They have twenty-five dwellings and eight stables. They put up this year two hundred waggon loads of hay. The band has quite a herd of cattle, consisting of nineteen oxen, twelve cows, seven bulls, three steers, four heifers, six bull and six heifer calves; total fifty seven head and, for Northern Crees, they are rich in horses, having fifty-eight head. I did not observe much fall ploughing. They have plastered, repaired and banked up their houses for the winter. Upon enquiring what became of the crop of 1883, I was informed that a threshing machine was sent to the reserve shortly after the harvest, but the Indians, influenced by the chief, would not render the labor required to work it; consequently, no threshing was done with the machine. During the winter they treshed a little from day to day by hand, and were so careless that more than half the grain was wasted. I find it, therefore, impossible to give you any further particulars."

Among the papers which have recently been returned, I find a report of Mr. Jefferson, the instructor of Poundmaker, dated February, 1885, in which he says:

"All seem to look forward to spring work eagerly, the fact of their getting cash for produce having given a great impulse to the cultivation of the soil"

The Government was so anxious to help Poundmaker and to induce him to farm, that it appears it had the intention of moving the Battleford agency to his reserve, which caused a strong protest from the Saskatchewan *Herald*, the local paper published at Battleford. In an article of the 27th of February, 1885, it said:

"We heard a long time ago that the Indian Department had decided to build the agency, storehouse and several other buildings on Poundmaker's reserve, about 40 miles above Battleford, but the thing seemed to us so preposterous that we did not take any notice of it at that time, thinking that it was only a rumor. It appears, however, that we have been mistaken; that it is well and finally decided that the patriotic Poundmaker will have all these public buildings at his own door, as reward for his rebellion last summer. If we knew the evil genius that suggested such a mad step to the Department, we should certainly present him with a leather medal and exhibit him through this part of the country as a great curiosity. We defy him, whoever he may be, to give a single reasonable argument in favor of such a move to any man acquainted with the locality and the situation of the different Indian reserves around Battleford."

Now, let us look at the report for last year of the Frog Lake agency, to which Big Bear belongs:

Indians resident on reserves.....	1,190 souls.
Land ploughed and fenced.....	1,260 acres.
Roots grown .....	4,050 bushels.
Grain do .....	4,670 do
Hay saved.....	485 tons.

This is what the Indian agent, A. Macdonald, said of him, on the 9th December, 1882:

"FORT WALSH, 9th December, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor to enclose Big Bear's adhesion to Treaty No. 6.

"This chief is a Cree, from the vicinity of Fort Pitt, and was present at the signing of the treaty there by the other chiefs, but on account of having but a few followers with him (the other members of his band being on the plains), and also owing to his great objection to hangings, as a punishment for murder, he withheld from the signing of the treaty. From the fall of 1876 to the present time he and his followers have made

Fort Walsh their headquarters, from time to time following the buffalo, south, even across the Missouri River."

This is the report for 1884 :

"Big Bear, who is now getting old, and who is ruled by the bad spirits in his band, has made repeated promises that he would go to a reserve, and as often broken them. He has been lately joined by an old follower of his, named 'Little Poplar,' who, a few years ago, married into the Cree band of Indians. It is difficult to say what the result of his influence might lead to; he has already made several threats, but he will be closely watched, and any attempt to create a disturbance will at once be met with firm action."

Knowing the character of Big Bear, and knowing also that Poundmaker was not exactly very well situated on the reserve, during the Session of 1884 the Government asked Parliament to vote \$6,500 to assist in the erection of grist mills at Battleford, Carlton and Frog Lake. In fact, in January last, Messrs. Gowanlock & Laurie were building one at Frog Lake, with the aid of a portion of that bonus. The Government thought that the mill would induce the Indians to farm and support themselves more quickly. Concerning Big Bear, the Saskatchewan *Herald*, of 3rd July, 1884, says :

"This chief, whose name has for a long time occupied an undue prominence in the annals of the day, has entered on a new career, and one which is likely to prove more useful to all concerned than the unsettled one he has so long followed. At an interview with Major Crozier and Indian Agent Rae a few days ago, he announced it as his intention to select his reserve at once and to move on to it. He pleaded in extenuation of his former course that he was laboring under a false impression, and did not understand things as they really were, and had consequently allowed himself to be too much influenced by his young men. He could now see that the Government had done more for them than they were required to do by the treaty. He was ready to go on to a reserve with such of his people as would follow him. He said they were all very ignorant of farming and the modes of settled life, and begged that the Government would send a man to teach them, who would have some patience with their ignorance, and not get angry and abuse them because they could not do things at once. He spoke most reasonably and with apparent candor throughout, and concluded by asking for provisions to keep him while he gathered his men together and went to Pitt. If he went there, as he agreed, the agent would know that he was in earnest, and then he would ask for something else when he had got to work. He got what he asked, in the way of provisions, and left town, and there is every reason to believe he is in earnest, and that with his settlement on his reserve one of the few disturbing elements in the Indian question will be quieted."

But instead of going to his reserve he went down to the east, on the 23rd of July, after he had that interview with Major Crozier and the Indian Agent Ray, to confer with Riel; and there is no doubt that must be the principal cause of Big Bear taking arms against the authorities of the North-West. Finally, Big Bear moved to Frog Lake on the 8th November, 1884. I find among the papers which have been recently brought down, a letter from Governor Dewdney, dated 31st of December, 1884, concerning Big Bear :

"I have the honor to state that after receiving Mr. Ballandine's report on the condition of the Indians in the Carlton district, I thought it advisable to instruct Mr. Agent Rae to visit the reserves and make arrangements to relieve the distress which existed principally on the reserve north of the river, occupied by Mestowasis and Ahtahkakoop.

"The visit of Mr. Rae, as appears from his report, a copy of which is herewith enclosed, has satisfied the Indians, and I am in hopes it will be found, when spring opens, that these Indians, instead of listening to the discontented and obstructive, will be found anxious to go to work, and that we shall thus be enabled to counteract the movement which was intended, viz., of having a large gathering in the Carlton neighborhood next summer.

"As you are aware, Mr. Rae wanted 800 sacks of flour and 12,000 pounds bacon as a further supply of provisions to be sent in; but as 200 sacks are due under contract at the end of this month, I thought that by authorising the purchase of 150 sacks he could get along until the delivery was made. In addition to this 50 sacks, flour had already been purchased, under the circumstances stated in Voucher No. 10111.

"With regard to the bacon, as you know, 8,000 pounds were ordered from the Hudson Bay Company some little time ago, and on receipt of Mr. Rae's letter I requested that it might be sent in immediately, which has been done. It may be that some further supply may be necessary, but if so you shall be at once advised."

On the 12th January, 1885, Mr. Francis Dickens, the inspector at Fort Pitt, wrote :

"I have the honor to report that Big Bear Indians are working, being engaged in drawing logs, cutting wood, etc. As long as they work they will receive rations. All quiet at present."

Mr. GIBOUARD.

This letter shows that on the 12th January Big Bear was employed by the Indian agent of the Government at Frog Lake, and that he was receiving rations. On the 20th February, 1885, I find a letter from John Delaney, farm instructor, Frog Lake. He writes as follows:—

"I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 832, dated the 27th ult., and to inform you that I am sure that Big Bear and band will take their reserve this spring. I have had the chief here to-day, and he took my hand saying: 'Believe me I am going to take my reserve this spring; do not doubt me; I cannot see anything else to make a living, only to go on a reserve.' Ever since I offered to let Indians from his band join other bands in the district, they are stirring themselves about a reserve. The chief asked me not to try and break up his band by allowing them to join other bands, because I will go on a reserve, so I have told those who wish to leave him to wait.

"Monthly report of farm 15, for February, 1885.—The Indians around here have done very well this month; they have made and have drawn out a lot of timber for building, also a quantity of rails for the different reserves. Big Bear's band have cut 390 cords of wood, and are still cutting. The Long Lake Indians are doing well; they have taken out timber for several buildings; also, the old chief has been very sick the most part of the winter, but he is getting all right again.

"I think the Indians on all the reserves around here are well contented."

Mr. Quinn writes, on the 13th March, 1885, from the Indian office, Frog Lake :

"I beg to inform you that Mr. Peter Ballandine arrived here on the 7th inst., and immediately upon his arrival we called Big Bear's band together, to impress upon them the importance of taking their reserve, but the chief being away on a hunt, we could not come to any understanding; therefore, I advised Mr. Ballandine to go and find Big Bear and bring him in; which he did on the 10th, and we called them together daily, with no results, until to-day, when he picked upon a spot at the mouth of Dog Rump Creek, on the eastern side. Their reserve, therefore, will be some 30 miles from here.

I must not omit to mention Big Bear's son 'I-am-e-sees' who stood by me and helped me to impress upon his father the importance of selecting a reserve. In fact, seeing his father hesitating, he called all the young men of the band together, and they informed the chief that if he did not take his reserve he and most of the young men would leave the band, as they were tired of waiting and starving, and I think this made the chief give in at last, as the chief was for holding out till spring. Mr. Ballandine gave them a few pounds of tea and some beef which I beg to recommend to be paid by voucher."

Big Bear seemed to be so anxious to go on his reserve that he requested Mr. Ballandine to write to Mr. Dewdney to give him an instructor in the spring, and he even informed him that he wished to have Mr. Delaney as the instructor. He asked that as late as the 14th March, 1885, a few days only, in fact, before Mr. Delaney was massacred by Big Bear's band. This kind treatment of the Indians brought these remarks from the Saskatchewan *Herald*, of the 23rd April last. I may be excused for quoting this paper. So far, I have always refrained to quote any paper which has been published since the commencement of this rebellion. I have done so intentionally. I do not wish to form my opinion from articles which have been written and printed under the influence of the events that were taking place. I do not wish to take my information from articles in newspapers which have been written under the strong influence either of sympathy or antipathy. I take all my information from the reports of the Department, from the *Debates* of the House of Commons, from newspaper articles also, but only those published before the rebellion. I may be excused, however, for making a quotation from this article, from the mere fact that we can hardly believe that, upon a question of this kind, this paper will be influenced by a feeling either of sympathy or antipathy. The Saskatchewan *Herald*, of the 2nd April, 1885, says :

"The petted Indians are the bad ones. The Stonies have been treated as being of a superior race, and are the first to shed the blood of their benefactors. Poundmaker has been petted and pampered, and stands in the front rank as a raider. Little Pine, bribed to come north and kept in comfort, hastens to the carnage. Big Bear, who has for years enjoyed the privilege of eating of the bread of idleness, shows his gratitude by killing his priests and his best friends in cold blood. Little Poplar, a non-treaty Indian, has been liberally supplied with provisions and other necessaries, and thus enabled to spend all his time in travelling up and down the land, plotting mischief and preparing for this season's carnival of ruin. The petted Indians have proved the bad ones, and this gives weight to the old adage, 'that the only good Indians are the dead ones.'"

Such has been the treatment of the Indians by the Administration, and it must be admitted that they have no reason to complain. The policy of the Government has been most liberal to them, outside of treaty obligations. They have been supplied with the necessaries of life; they have been given the means of educating themselves to civilised life, for the sole purpose of enabling the Indians to make their living out of the soil, when they could no longer make it out of hunting. In every manner possible they have been aided, in schools, industrial schools and in farming. The wisdom of this policy has been recognised by many, and among others, by the Saskatchewan *Herald*, of the 26th July, 1884, which, in an article headed "Our Indian Policy," says:

"That there have been mistakes in the past is well enough known, and by no one better than by the heads of the Department, for changes have been made from year to year as experience dictated, until the system has been brought to combine the maximum of efficiency with the minimum of expense. It is now practically the plan inaugurated by Hon. David Laird, when he was commissioner at Coté's reserve, Fort Pelly, and which would at that time have been made general but for the crankiness and penuriousness of Hon. Mr. Mills, then head of the Indian Department. He thought he knew all about the management of Indians, when he really knew nothing, and refused to take advice. 'There is no appropriation for it,' was his curt way of dismissing suggestions offered by the practical men of the Department."

The following figures will better illustrate the policy of the Government than all the speeches that can be made. Here is the Indian expenditure from the beginning:

1872	\$ 35,834
1873	57,455
1874	92,040
1875	134,339
1876	203,295
1877	253,036
1878	377,144
1879	694,512
1880	805,097
1881	1,083,411
1882	1,106,961
1883	1,099,796
1884	1,025,675

Detailed expenditure:—

	1884.	1882.
By Annuities.....	\$170,749 00	\$ 222,007 00
Agricultural implements.....	22,172 00	8,572 00
Tools.....	3,589 00	2,506 00
Cattle.....	15,469 00	19,210 00
Seed grain.....	10,786 00	22,957 00
Ammunition and twine.....	7,770 00	7,280 00
Provisions for use during annuity payments.....	48,269 00	44,083 00
Provisions for destitute Indians.....	499,325 00	563,451 00
Clothing.....	4,906 00	2,507 00
Schools.....	12,133 00	5,592 00
Surveys.....	19,443 00	20,624 00
Farm wages.....	44,023 00	47,786 00
Farm maintenance.....	27,107 00	37,288 00
Sioux.....	459 00	2,741 00
General expenses.....	117,314 00	89,921 00
Commissioner's house and office.....	10,135 00	.....
Industrial schools.....	12,018 00	.....
Grist Mills.....	.....	3,293 30
Total expenditure.....	1,025,675 00	1,099,796 90

In Manitoba Superintendency.

	1878.	1877.
For Annuities—Treaties Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5....	\$54,308 00	\$55,725 00
Agricultural Implements, Cattle, &c.—		
Treaties Nos. 1 and 2.....	4,986 34	5,243 52
do Treaty No. 3.....	5,127 38	5,874 02
do do No. 5.....	1,528 30	942 35
Sioux.....	7,955 62	2,799 54
Provisions.....	33,038 32	25,157 02
General expenses of the Superintendency	.....	29,759 38
Total.....	106,943 96	125,501 38

In North-West Superintendency.

For Annuities—Treaties Nos. 4 and 6.....	95,402 00	31,253 00
Agricultural Implements, Cattle, &c.—		
Treaty No. 4.....	3,942 81	4,806 02
do do No. 6.....	15,682 00	.....
Provisions.....	40,633 47	8,952 92

Probable cost of new Treaties .....	72,916 65	74,317 12
Sioux at Qu'Appelle .....	388 88	.....
General expenses of the Superintendency	18,637 28	8,205 61
Total.....	247,623 09	127,534 61
<i>In both Superintendencies.</i>		
For Surveys .....	21,938 81	.....
Transfer of this amount to the credit of "Indian Fund" having been received for cordwood sold.....	39 00	.....
Total .....	377,144 86	253,036 05

The Indians have, therefore, received in money and provisions:

	1883.	1883.	1884.
Money.....	\$222,070	\$184,169	\$170,749
Provisions during payments.....	44,083	50,817	48,269
do for destitute Indians....	563,451	480,163	499,325
Total.....	\$829,304	715,149	\$618,343

or a total of \$2,162,796, for three years, divided among the population of about 34,000, it will give \$21 per head per annum or \$105 per annum for a family of five, which the Indians receive from the Government in money and provisions, without talking of cattle, seed, grain, clothing, etc. Before going any further, it may not be out of place here to say a word or two about certain reports which have been circulated of late, that the Indians did not get what the Government paid for, in other words, that the supplies were deficient both in quality and quantity. It is very remarkable indeed that in all the local papers that I have read I did not find a single complaint about this; and can it be doubted that if deception and fraud had been practised on a large scale, and had been the system followed by the contractors and the officials, it would have reached the local press in one shape or another. As to the reports of the Indian agents for 1884, they all admit that the Indians have no reason to complain, and, in fact, no complaint is mentioned. Mr. Pether, Indian agent for Keewatin, in his report of August, 1884, says:

"The supplies for the various bands on this agency were delivered in good condition and according to samples."

Mr. McIntyre, in his report of the same month:

"The supplies were up to the samples and were quite satisfactory to the Indians."

Mr. Wadsworth, Inspector of Indian Agencies, in his report of the 25th October, 1884, speaking of the Piegan reserve:

"The flour and other supplies were of good quality, and put up according to the terms of the contract. I took an accurate inventory of the flour, bacon, tea, beef, agricultural implements, tools, live stock, etc., and audited the books."

Mr. Wadsworth, same report, from the Blood reserve—

"The flour and other supplies were of good quality. I audited the books, and found them well kept. The receipts shown therein agreed with the quantities charged against the reserve of the agency. I took an inventory of all departmental property upon the reserve."

"Indian Office, Fort McLeod.

"I audited the books, took an inventory of the supplies, agricultural implements, tools, etc., on hand, and examined into their quality and condition. I found everything generally satisfactory, and the books have been well and regularly kept since Mr. Lash was appointed clerk, in December last.

"I found the issue of flour here somewhat less per head than at the Blood reserve, and there was some discontent regarding it. The chief, Crowfoot, wished also that those of his men who assisted in issuing the rations should be paid the same wages (\$13 per month) as those who perform similar duty upon the Blood reserve."

"Battleford District.

"I took stock of the flour and bacon, which proved satisfactory."

"Battleford Industrial School.

"The food supplies, cloth, blankets, linen, etc., sent here this year, are fully equal to contract samples, excepting the flour, which is dark; it, however, appears to be very wholesome."

*" Qu'Appelle Industrial School.*

" 20th Nov. 1884.—A correspondant of *Le Manitoba* says that the supplies are 'de première qualité.'

*" Poundmaker's Band.*

" I took an inventory of the flour, bacon and other supplies on hand. The flour was of inferior quality, and weighed only ninety-eight pounds per sack. Upon enquiry the agent informed me that, running short of flour, he was obliged to borrow some from Mahaffy & Clinkskill, Battleford, and this was the only kind they had. Amongst the bacon I found five hundred and seventeen pounds "long clear."

Some discussion took place during last Session (1884) as to some delay or deficiency in the delivery of seed grain and agricultural implements, but not only did they not apply to the provisions, but were explained to have been due to difficulties of transportation. The only report of any consequence I have been able to find, in which mention is made of bad supplies, has reference to the last year of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is signed by Mr. Vankoughnet, and is dated 31st December, 1878, and applies to the whole of Manitoba and the North-West:

" The payment of the annuities to the Indians within the North-West Indian superintendency were, I am happy to say, made at the dates previously fixed upon at the several points of meeting, and the supplies of food, implements and cattle were delivered for the most part on time.

" I regret to report, however, that complaints have been made of the bad quality of the flour and beef furnished at some of the points of payment, and also that the cattle purchased for these Indians were too wild to be handled."

I have also heard complaints that the Government had given contracts to foreigners for supplies. Especially some complaint has been made with regard to the contracts given to the firm of I. G. Baker & Co., of Benton, Montana. There was a debate, in 1883, upon this point, and it will be seen that if I. G. Baker & Co. are employed to-day to furnish the greatest portions of the supplies in the North-West, the initiative came from hon. gentlemen opposite. I will read an extract from that debate:

" Mr. CHARLTON. I notice, amongst the expenditures in the Public Accounts for the year ending 30th June last, that one firm, Baker & Co., obtained a very large sum. Where is that firm located?

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At Fort Benton, Montana.

" Mr. CHARLTON. I believe they are Americans?

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

" Mr. CHARLTON. The other night, when I referred to the system of surveys in the North-West, I asked why the hon. gentleman had not adopted the American system in its entirety, and it was said, in reply, that I drew all my inspirations from Washington. Where does the hon. gentleman draw his inspiration from, in permitting a Yankee firm to obtain \$462,000 for supplies, which could have been obtained from our own dealers?

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspiration from which I drew those supplies, through Baker & Co., was the greatest of all monarchs, the monarch of necessity. There was nobody else to supply the food on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains for the Blackfeet and the Bloods. There were no means of getting supplies, except from Montana. I may say, though the members of the firm are Americans, they are most satisfactory contractors—fair, honest, liberal and trustworthy. They have fairly competed with other traders, because these contracts have always been put up to public competition, but nobody could tender for the supplies in the extreme west. The Hudson Bay Company tendered for a good deal. Other parties, Capt. Howard, who is known, perhaps, to Mr. Watson, tendered, and is the lowest for some contracts this year."

It will be noticed that in 1884 that contracts were given to Baker & Co.; but they were given after public tenders being asked. Did hon. gentlemen opposite pursue the same course? Hon. gentlemen opposite first gave contracts to Baker & Co., in 1876, and they did so without calling for public tenders. They asked Baker & Co., to supply the Indians in the North-West, and they even sent an agent to Chicago to obtain a portion of those supplies. Mr. Schultz attacked the Government in this House on the question. Here is the explanation given by Mr. Blake:

" The first detachment of police (about 150) was sent to Manitoba upon very short notice, in September, 1873, and during the winter of 1873-74, was supplied from the Hudson Bay Company's stores, I believe, at rates similar to those charged the militia. When the force was recruited to its full extent for the journey to the Rocky Mountains (May,

Mr. GIBOUARD.

1874), an agent was sent to Chicago to St. Paul to purchase such articles of provision as was considered be purchasable in the States at cheaper rates than in Canada. The bacon required was obtained at St. Paul, Min., at 12½ cents per pound, American currency. Twenty-five barrels of pork were also purchased there, at \$19.50 per barrel, American currency. The pork (bacon) required for the force on its return from the expedition, in 1874, was obtained in Winnipeg, Manitoba—tenders were called for by public advertisement. On 16th April, 1875, Mr. Nixon was instructed to communicate with the commissioners and purchase, amongst other things, sufficient bacon for two divisions (100 men) for six months. He had represented that he could purchase them cheaper than at a later date. The bacon for 1876-77 was included with other articles for which tenders were called, but owing to complaints as to the quality of the pork purchased in Manitoba, a supply was obtained in Ontario—Ingersoll; with the addition of re-freight charges to Manitoba, this bacon cost about 2 cents per pound more than the tenders for supply at Winnipeg. Small quantities have, at various times, been purchased from storekeepers in Manitoba, but the above mentioned include all large quantities. The bacon required for the force, in the southern parts of the Territories, has been supplied by Baker & Co., of Fort Benton, Montana, either under contract or at prices certified by the assistant commissioner of the force. It will require some time to obtain a statement of all the prices and quantities."

You can hardly imagine that this liberal policy of the Administration met with the approbation of hon. gentlemen opposite. Every year after they left office, it became more necessary to come to the assistance of the Indians, and the Indian expenditure increased, and hon. gentlemen opposite complained of this. Mr. Mills, in 1882, said:

" Mr. MILLS. I called the attention of the hon. Minister last year to the largeness of the sum for annuities, and to the fact that when you collected the payments made of the annuities due for different years it was pretty clear, from the Public Accounts, that we had not an accurate return of the number of Indians of the various bands, and that through Indian dishonesty a considerable number were paid twice, or even a third time. The sums paid last year and this year are very much larger than four or five years ago."

During the debate, in 1883, on Indian supplies, Mr. Casgrain said:

" I lay down, as a principle which cannot be controverted, that this race is becoming rapidly extinct, and we are wasting an enormous expenditure to attain an object which will never be attained—that is, to civilise these Indians. I have seen myself, at Garden River, the experiment tried by Catholic and Protestant missionaries. A small plot had been cultivated and set out in garden lots, and small houses had been built near them for the Indians, but instead of living in these houses, they built themselves, in front of the houses, small bark wigwams, and there they lived.

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those were their country houses.

" Mr. CASGRAIN. As to their plots, there was not a root to be found in any of them.

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You might find some briar roots.

" Mr. CASGRAIN. I give this as an instance of the inaptitude of the Indians to enter into civilised life. Now, Sir, I will make an exception in favor of the British Columbia Indians. They are a self-sustaining race, because they have not had large fields in which to hunt buffalo, and have been obliged to resort to fishing, in order to supply themselves with the necessaries of life. This gave them sedentary habits and led them to cultivate the soil. But as to Indians of the North-West Territories, they are a doomed race, and it is only a question of how soon they will disappear. This race is extremely jealous, and they do not look to the Government employees, that are bound to aid them, but, as they say, they look to the Great Mother on the other side to protect them."

Even if this race is going to become extinct some day, but I doubt that the prediction of the hon. member for L'Islet will be realised, it becomes important to consider what we are going to do with them in the meantime. Even if they are going to become extinct, Poundmaker and Big Bear are not dead to-day. Something must be done for them, in order to keep them quiet; otherwise they will plunder and murder. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be very different from that which was plainly advocated by the *Winnipeg Free Press*, one of their organs, on 8th September, 1884. It said:

" It must be apparent to both the American and Canadian Government that their present methods of dealing with the Indians are doomed to failure. They should either make up their mind to provide sufficient food for them, or else, in earnest, set to the work of making them self-supporting."

Notwithstanding the opinion of the hon. member for L'Islet, there can be no doubt that the policy of the Government was the correct one. I will quote the authority of one who is very familiar with the Indian question. I refer to Hon. Mr. Laird. In an interview with a reporter of the *Montreal Daily Witness* the following appears in the issue of that paper on 19th June. Mr. Laird says:

"It is hardly my place to give the Government an Indian policy; but the only course, in my opinion, that can be adopted, is to patiently go on instructing and encouraging them to be farmers. In ten years many of them have made greater progress towards civilisation than any of the Indians on the reserves in Ontario have in a hundred; and in 1882, when I retired from office, the settled bands were, by their crops, reducing the cost of supporting them at least one-half. If in one generation, or even in two, you raise men from the level of savages to civilisation you are doing more than has ever been done in any other country. Many of the older men can never, I fear, be taught to work steadily or make provision for future needs, but the young men, who have never been on the war path or on the buffalo hunt, soon learn to look to their crops and take care of them. To the old Indians it is almost an impossibility to wait three months for a crop to grow. For instance, we had a good deal of difficulty in preventing them from digging up the potatoes as soon as the young plants show above the ground. On the whole, they made wonderful progress, from 1878 onward—well worth all the labor it cost."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have closed with the Indian question. I believe I have said enough to show that the policy of the Government in the treatment of the Indians in the North-West and Manitoba has been most liberal, and has produced good results. Now, let us see where are the complaints of the half-breeds, of which so much has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not intend to enter into that question at very great length. I will take them exactly as they appear from the last meetings of the half-breeds and the white settlers in the North-West. Let us take in the first place the grievances of the half-breeds as laid down in the Bill of Rights, which was adopted at the meeting at Prince Albert, on the 5th of September, 1884. I have not been able to obtain an English copy of it, but I find the original published in *Le Manitoba*. The first demand which they asked for is "the inauguration of responsible government." Now, I ask if the members for the other Provinces to-day are willing to create new Provinces in the North-West. I say that under the constitution of the North-west council they enjoy virtually all the liberties and privileges of responsible government. In 1870—I am speaking as a member from the Province of Quebec—we had a great deal to do with the establishment of the Province of Manitoba. Then the question was only one of paying \$43,600, to give the population of that country the privileges of popular government. Well, where are we now? The subsidy to the Province of Manitoba amounts to something like \$440,000, and if we are going to give Provinces to the North-West, then we must make up our minds to allow those new Provinces a few hundred thousand dollars more each. Sir, I do not believe that the people of the old Provinces are willing that they should be taxed to that extent, especially when no good result can be obtained. I ask, if you give them Provinces, will they be in any better position than they will be when a North-West council will be established for the different districts? I say no. A Legislature sitting in Regina will not be in any better position to know the wants of that Territory than the North-West council sitting to-day. When the time will come when a change in the constitution in the North-West will be necessary, when the council will have twenty-one members, when they will be entitled to become *ipso facto* Provinces, with an Assembly, then will be the time to consider the constitution of the whole North-West, and instead of giving them the expensive machinery of a Legislature, give them a council, for each district, such as they have to-day, which will be more beneficial to that country and more satisfactory to the older Provinces. I say that the desire for responsible government and a Legislature, as enjoyed by the older Provinces, is not shared in by all the

people of the North-West. The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 23rd of August, 1884, says:

"It cannot be long before Assiniboia will have the population necessary to set it up as a Province, and then the opportunity will be afforded of modernising the constitution of the remaining Territories."

The next grievance of the half-breeds is, that they want "the same guarantees to be allowed to the old settlers of the Territories as were allowed in 1870 to the settlers of Manitoba; that a certain area of land, to-day in the possession of the half-breeds, should be left to them, and that on application patents should be granted to them; that the half-breeds of the North-West shall receive each 240 acres of the land, as the half-breeds of Manitoba received; that 2,000,000 acres of land should be set aside by the Government for the benefit of half-breeds, Protestants and Catholics; that the Government should sell these lands, deposit the money in the bank, and that the interest of that money should be used for the maintenance of schools of instruction, industrial schools and hospitals, and for the purpose of procuring ploughs for the half-breeds, at least every spring, to enable them to sow their lands; that about 100 townships be taken, of the swamp lands of the North-West, which do not appear to be open for settlement for a long time; that these lands be set apart by the Government, and that they be distributed by the Government, every 18 years, among the children of the half-breed population. They say that the Province of Manitoba has been enlarged since 1870, and that the rights of the Métis to the titles of these lands have not been recognised. They, therefore, ask that these titles should be extinguished in favor of the half-breed children at the time of the transfer, and of such children as may be born for four generations." With regard to these lands and the grievances of the half-breeds, there is one point worthy of remark. A great deal has been said by the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) about the lots at St. Laurent, on the river, not being divided into river lots of 10 chains by 2 miles. It is strange, indeed, that at this meeting, which took place on the 5th of September, 1884, there is not a single complaint about that—no complaint that the lands of the half-breeds have been badly surveyed or divided; that anyone has been evicted, or that even an attempt at eviction has been made. There are some items in these resolutions which are most unreasonable—some things which have not been demanded even by the half-breeds of Manitoba. There are some, however, which require a little explanation. As to the demand that lands should be set apart for educational purposes, it is well known that by the Dominion Lands Act two sections in each township are set apart to provide for the education of children; and, indeed, the half-breed and white population of the North-West have no reason to complain of being neglected by the present Government so far as schools are concerned. The number of schools in the North-West receiving Government aid was 19 in 1883 and 28 in 1884—17 Protestant and 11 Roman Catholic. With regard to the half-breed claims to the Indian title, I have already shown what the late Government have done. The Minister of the Interior said the half-breeds were not entitled to anything more than the white settlers, that is to say, a free homestead. The present Government, as I have also mentioned, immediately after they came into office, in 1879, changed that policy, and went back to their policy of 1870, with regard to the half-breeds of Manitoba, and asked this Parliament to give them power to deal with the half-breed claims as they might deem expedient. But it is said: Although you declared your policy, although you intended, evidently, to satisfy the claims of the half-breeds to the Indian title, you have done nothing since 1879. Well, as the hon. Premier explained last night, the Government had to face a great many difficulties. In the first place, on the one hand, Archbishop Taché, no doubt, having before

him the experience of 1870, and following years, in Manitoba, had made representations that he wished these new free grants to extinguish the Indian title in the North-West to be entailed for three generations. There were, besides, representations of the Anglican Bishop, who also wished them to be entailed, but only for ten years. Then there were the representations of the Premier of Manitoba, who had also a great deal of experience in these matters, and who also desired these lands to be entailed, but for a shorter period. On the other hand, the North-West council recommended that free grants should be given to the half-breeds, just as they were given to the half-breeds of Manitoba in 1870. Those grants were made without any condition—160 acres to the heads of families and 240 acres to the children. What was the consequence? The scrip were sold immediately, almost before they reached the hands of the half-breeds; and no doubt Archbishop Taché, Mr. Norquay and the bishop of the Church of England had very good reasons for recommending the Government to change their policy towards the half-breeds. But matters were pressing. The half-breeds, no doubt, pushed by speculators, were asking, not that their lands should be entailed, but they were asking for a title which could be disposed of immediately. At the meeting which took place in September, 1884, at Prince Albert, the half-breeds expressed their wish for such a title to those lands as they might dispose of as they chose. There was a little delay, no doubt. From 1879 to to-day those claims have not all been settled; their settlement only commenced within the last few months; but you will admit, and the public will admit, that the Government have labored under serious difficulties, having, on the one hand, to contend with the representations—in my opinion, the very reasonable representations—of Archbishop Taché and the other gentlemen of experience in the North-West, and, on the other hand, with the demands of the half-breeds, supported by the North-West council. In the issuing of patents for lands there was another difficulty—the difficulty of finding lands which were surveyed. When hon. gentlemen opposite left office, in 1878, they had hardly done anything in this respect in the North-West. I will give you a complete table of the surveys, as they were made, from the beginning until to-day both in Manitoba and the North-West:

	Acres.	No. of Farms of 160 acres each.
Previous to June, 1873.....	4,792,292	29,952
In 1874.....	4,237,864	26,487
1875.....	665,000	4,156
1876.....	420,507	2,628
1877.....	231,691	1,448
1878, N.W.....	306,936	1,918
1879.....	1,130,482	7,066
1880.....	4,472,000	27,950
1881.....	9,147,000	50,919
1882.....	9,460,000	55,125
1883.....	27,000,000	168,750
1884.....	6,400,000	40,000
Totals.....	67,255,770	420,399

The agricultural population these lands would sustain, on the basis of three souls to a homestead, would be 1,261,197. The land surveyed up to 1873 were 9,999,000; from 1874 to 1875, 1,797,120; from 1884, 55,618,500. The survey, in the vicinity of Prince Albert and also in the vicinity of St. Laurent were made in 1878. Surveys were made subsequently in the old settlements on the North Saskatchewan, Edmonton and St. Albert. The lands between Carlton and Fort Pitt, and between Edmonton and Calgary, were surveyed in 1884. During the season of 1883, 120 land surveyors were employed, 35 among them French Canadians. In 1884, 61 surveyors were employed, of whom 22 were French Canadians. The surveys in 1883, alone, cost \$750,000. With the surveys, land offices were opened. The first was opened at Prince Albert in 1878, Mr. Duck, agent, appointed by Mr. GIBOUARD.

the late administration, the very same officer who was nominated long before the office was opened and ready. The second office was in Regina (Troy, for a short time). In 1884, four land offices were opened at Calgary, Edmonton, Touchwood and Coteau, and finally this spring at Swift Current. The first registry office was opened in 1876 at Battleford and three more later, Prince Albert, Regina and Calgary. In 1883, during the debate which took place in this House on a motion of Mr. Blake, in moving for copies of all correspondence and memorials relating to the claims of the inhabitants of Prince Albert and the neighboring districts in the North-West, with respect to the lands which they occupy, and other matters affecting their condition, I find the following statement made by Mr. Royal, the hon. member for Provencher:—

“I suppose you are aware that delegates have been sent here by a certain portion of the population of the North-West Territories, respecting the subject which is just now engaging the attention of this House, and is more especially under the notice of the Government. These delegates have laid their grievances—it grievances they are—before some of the hon. Ministers. Their object is to have the title to the lands occupied, owned and improved by some of these people for over 20 years recognised and confirmed by the Government. Their claims are nothing but just. These lands belong mostly to half-breed people and pioneers from Ontario, who went west from the Province of Manitoba some five, ten or fifteen years ago. These pioneers of Canadian civilisation have formed groups throughout the Territories, which will, no doubt, be the nucleus of a large population. There is a very important group at Duck Lake, Prince Albert, another at Edmonton, another at St. Albert, and so on. Last year surveyors were sent out to carry on the surveys of the Dominion in that part of the country. These surveyors had no instructions to stop wherever they would meet any of the old settlements, and their continuing the lines aroused, of course, the suspicion of the old settlers, who held a meeting, and represented to the Government the justice of respecting their property in farm improvements. Their claims have been fully recognised, and orders have been sent to the surveyors to respect those settlements. The object of this delegation is to have the Government cause the lines of the Dominion surveys to front on the limits of their settlements. The delegates have already had an interview with some members of the Government, and were assured, in every case, the rights of ownership of those old settlers would be fully recognised. These settlers are not to be classed with squatters. The squatter is, generally speaking, a man who goes off the survey and squats on the piece of land he thinks best suited for farming. In some cases, unfortunately, he is sent there by somebody else, or goes on his own impulse, to select the best spot, on which he will make a slight improvement, in order that he may be able to sell it to some company or individual. The settlers to whom I refer went as far as Prince Albert, some few miles west of Edmonton, and lived there on their farms for over thirty years. Of course, it was quite natural they should suspect something was wrong when they saw the surveyors continuing their lines of survey; but there is no more reason for fear on that ground. The delegates have also another object in view, namely, to have the Government recognise and confirm the titles of these settlers. No doubt, to a certain extent, they have been squatters, but their rights are clear, and of course they are anxious the Government should confirm them and issue Crown patents to them, in order that their property should be classed the same as any other in the Dominion. In that respect, also, I am happy to state their wants have been fully met with, and they have been assured the Government will fully recognise their titles, and issue, in due time, the letters patent. They have also demanded from the Government that a land agent should be appointed in their own district. The nearest land agent is about 300 or 400 miles distant from Prince Albert, and the hon. Minister has assured them that as soon as the plans of survey would be recognised and confirmed by the Government a Dominion land office would be opened there, and everything made ready for the interests of the new settlers. It is well known, I believe, in Manitoba and the rest of the Dominion, that that part of the North-West Territories which lies on the North Saskatchewan, and extends from Prince Albert to Edmonton, will certainly, before many years, contain a very large population. That district is composed of the most fertile lands in that part of the country, where running waters, forests and vast arable lands are to be found in large quantities. Already the pioneers have gone in advance of the surveys, and formed groups of population, which are now among the most important groups in the North-West. On behalf of these delegates I must recognise the fact that the Government have dealt with them in a most open and liberal manner.”

I know, as a fact, that a land office has been opened at Edmonton last year, and that Mr. Gauvreau was transferred from Prince Albert to Edmonton, in order to give more facilities to the French half-breeds of that district. At the same time, last year Louis Schmidt, French half-breed, was appointed assistant to the land office of Prince Albert for the same purpose. In 1883 I believe the Government, with a view of giving greater facilities to white settlers and claimants in the North-West, and also in Man-

itoba, to make out their claims and have them investigated established a land board in Winnipeg, with more extensive powers than the ordinary powers of a land office, with Mr. Walsh as commissioner. Mr. Walsh has investigated many of these claims. It will be noticed that the policy of the present and the last Government is very different in this respect. What was the reply of the late Government? Representations were made by Mr. Matthew Ryan, that the half-breeds were very pressing for the recognition of their rights—I refer to the half-breeds who were entitled to scrip in consequence of being residents in Manitoba at the time of the transfer, and who emigrated afterwards to the North-West. Mr. Ryan made strong representations to the late Administration that he should be empowered to examine the claims of those half-breeds who were entitled to scrips in Manitoba, but who happened then to be in the North-West Territories. On the 24th June, 1878, Mr. Laird wrote from Battleford to Col. Dennis, as follows:—

"Observe Mr. Ryan's authority; time to investigate half-breed claims under Order 14th June, 1876 lapsed; recommend time be extended one year. He is now here. Applicants waiting answer."

Mr. Denis replied:

"Will consult Minister on his return; expected this week *in re* half-breed claims, and advise you forthwith."

Now, what is the answer of the Minister of the Interior? We find on a margin of a report made by Mr. Codd, dated 16th March, 1877, the following note:—

"It is not necessary to look up parties who have claims. If they care for their interests they will themselves come forward and establish their claims."

The present Government did not act upon the same principle. They thought that these half-breeds in the North-West and Manitoba should have some easy means of establishing their claims, and that is the reason why the land bureau was established in Winnipeg, and Mr. Walsh appointed as commissioner. This land bureau of Manitoba went to work, and, from the report of 1884, it will be seen that they have done a great deal of work. The Government land board reported on 711 claims of squatters in 1884, including those of old settlers. Here is the report of the Minister of the Interior for that year:

"At the time the offices of Deputy Head and Surveyor General were separated, and Mr. Lindsay Russell was charged with the duties appertaining to the latter position, it was provided that he should also investigate and settle the claims to land by virtue of long occupation advanced by the old settlers along the North Saskatchewan. When it was found that Mr. Russell's health did not admit of his visiting the settlements, an Order in Council was passed, remitting this portion of his work to the land board. Accordingly, early in the year, Mr. Pearce went to Prince Albert, and from thence to Battleford, Edmonton and St. Albert, and made a careful personal enquiry into all the claims of this class at those places, with the result that all, with one or two exceptions, at Battleford and Edmonton, have been finally and satisfactorily disposed of. The only claims of old settlers remaining unsettled are at Lac la Biche, Victoria and Battle River. The necessary investigation at the two latter places will be made early next spring, but the claims at Lac la Biche cannot be properly adjusted until the surveys reach that point."

Mr. Pearce was sent to the Saskatchewan at the beginning of last year, and here is his report:

"The question of the claims of the old settlers on the Saskatchewan is one of long standing; but, with the exception of the claims in the immediate vicinity of Prince Albert, nothing could be done in the matter until the surveys were completed. These surveys were not finished until this summer, and could not have been completed at an earlier date; for, had these been prosecuted in any other way than the one adopted, it would have been at a great sacrifice of both accuracy and economy."

"Very full reports accompanied the evidence forwarded to the Minister so soon as the investigations were completed. The claims of Prince Albert have been finally disposed of. Those at the other points may reasonably be expected to be settled within a few weeks."

"The most liberal construction possible under the circumstances was put upon all the claims; and, judging by the result at Prince Albert, it is confidently anticipated that the percentage of claimants who will be dissatisfied therewith will be very small—probably not 5 per cent.—and of these more than one-half will be only on the grounds that their claims have not had as liberal treatment as the claims of others. It may be said of these claimants—upwards of seven hundred in number—that, as a class, the 'land shark' formed a very small number."

"The difficulty of obtaining explicit evidence has been referred to in the special reports; and in this it need only be mentioned that this difficulty did not arise from unwillingness, but from inability."

"It is somewhat remarkable that, out of the large number of cases investigated, but few were advanced through a residence on and peaceable possession of the land on the 15th July, 1870; the only points at which such were preferred being Prince Albert and St. Albert—some half dozen at the former, and about forty at the latter. This would go to demonstrate that it has been only within the past few years that any idea of making a livelihood by husbandry has occurred to the inhabitants of the district; and when this fact is considered, the progress they have made is really wonderful. Such facts encourage the hope of a fairly successful fruition of the policy adopted in teaching the rising generation of Indians habits of industry, with a view to make them a self-sustaining people."

"The claims at St. Laurent, on the south branch of the Saskatchewan, were not personally investigated by me, as the greater portion of the claimants spoke only French, and I would have required an interpreter."

"With the approval of the Minister, Mr. Duck, Dominion land agent, who speaks the French language, was instructed to obtain the evidence of these claimants. This was revised by me, and recommendations made in each case by the land board."

"I would particularly wish to refer to the aid extended to me by the Rev. Père Le Duc, when investigating the claims at St. Albert."

"Most of the claimants could only speak Cree, and the Rev. Father acted as interpreter, and did all he could to make the investigation run smoothly and pleasantly."

"The only claims now remaining are at Lac la Biche, Victoria and Battle River. Those at the latter two points can be disposed of so soon as the surveys are adjusted; probably early next spring. At the former point some delay, probably a year, must ensue, in getting the surveys carried to that point, owing to its isolated position; also the survey on the ground of an Indian reserve."

"There are a few other isolated cases remaining, chiefly in the vicinity of Fort McLeod; and they can be readily dealt with when the townships in which they are situated are open for entry."

The Saskatchewan *Herald*, of the 23rd August, 1884, speaks in very favorable terms of Mr. Pearce's investigation:

"But, of course (this paper adds) it is not likely that he has acquired the art of pleasing everybody, or of giving to each of two or three claimants the whole of the parcel of land in dispute."

When Mr. Pearce was making this investigation, or a short time after that, Mr. Riel came to the country, and, on the 26th July, the Saskatchewan *Herald* says:

"Louis Riel is visiting all the settlements at Prince Albert and the south branch, but, so far, has given no public utterances of his intentions. Rumor, however, has his work cut and dried for him, and telegrams from Prince Albert to the east give as one ground for the agitation, that the Government refuses to recognise the claims of the early settlers to the land taken up by them long ago, and that, in surveying the country, all their rights have been ignored. So far from this being the case, the Government has put a blot on the general system of survey, by laying out their claims in narrow frontages, as the settlers desired."

This shows that the Government has not been inactive. They proceeded last year with the examination of the claims of the old settlers; they sent someone to investigate the claims; a report was made, and, more than that, they commenced to examine the claims of the half-breeds to scrips; and on the 28th January, 1885, an Order in Council was passed, which has been read before. Whether that Order in Council has been cancelled later on or not, it shows that, at that period, nearly two months before the commencement of the rebellion, the Government was in earnest, with a view to meet the claims of the half-breeds. Now, in presence of all these facts, how can it be pretended that the Government has done nothing within the last few years for the half-breeds? The country has been surveyed to the extent of several millions of acres. Land offices and registry offices have been opened; agents have been appointed, and in most districts where the French population is to be found, an agent has been named who speaks French. We can easily imagine the difficulties the Department must have met with in dealing with this matter. Let us see what the late Administration has done towards the settlement of the half-breed claims in Manitoba. The rights of the half-breeds were declared by an Act of 1870, and 1,400,000 acres of land were given by the Manitoba Act. Commissions were appointed by the Government for the purpose of finding out the number of half-breeds entitled to that free grant. When they left office, in 1878, the work was far from being done. Hon. gentlemen opposite went to work and appointed com-

mission after commission. I do not want to blame them for it. I think it would be hardly fair to blame an Administration when they have to deal with such a vast territory as this. I would like to know, however, if hon. gentlemen opposite will tell me whether in 1878, eight years after the rights of the half-breeds had been declared by Act of Parliament—not seven years, as the hon. member for Quebec East stated, with respect to the half-breeds in the North-West Territories—but after eight years of investigation on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite and their predecessors, they had left half-breed claims in Manitoba unsettled, and how many claims did they leave unsettled? I do not wish to be hard with them, but at the same time they ought to know the difficulties of the situation; that really it is not an easy task for any Administration to deal with the half-breed question in the North-West. I say that notwithstanding all these commissions the present Government, after coming into office in 1881, had to appoint another commission, composed, Judges Miller and Dubuc, of the Superior Court, for the sole purpose of making a new enumeration and completing the list of claims which had to be examined in Manitoba; but notwithstanding this commission, another Order in Council had to be passed, with a view of giving full justice to the half-breeds who had no other title to their land but occupation, and on the 25th February, 1881, an Order in Council was passed by this Government, with a view of coming to the relief of those half-breeds of Manitoba who had not obtained justice. Yet the hon. gentleman had five years to do that after all the work which had been done by their predecessors. But, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, even if these half-breeds had some complaints, even if the scrip came too late, even if the patents to their lands also came too late, I say that was no reason why they should resort to arms. They should have done like the rest of the population in this country. Are hon. gentlemen going to tell me that during the whole of their administration the people of this Dominion were satisfied? There was a cry from one end of the country to the other that the National Policy should be introduced into this country. But they would not do it; and the consequence was, that poverty was becoming general, from one end of the Dominion to the other, but still the people did not resort to arms. They appealed to the Government, and when an election came around they took the remedy into their own hands. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to allude to the commission of Messrs. Street, Goulet and Forget, which was appointed a few days after the uprising in the North-West, and which, if we are to judge from the account of *Le Manitoba*, is giving so much satisfaction. The leader of the Opposition the other day quoted the conclusion of that article of *Le Manitoba*, stating that it was a great pity that this commission was not appointed a long time ago. Well, I will not take my authority from a newspaper article written since the rebellion began, but I take my authority from public documents, which show that the Government have really acted for the best. Now, I pass to the other articles of the Bill of Rights of the half-breeds, at their meeting at Prince Albert, in September last. Article 8 says:

“Contracts for Government works should be, as far as possible, given to the people in the Territory, in order to encourage them and to increase the circulation of money among them.”

What just complaints can they have in this respect? The contracts for work are given in the North-West Territories, as everywhere else in the Dominion, by public tenders, and there is no reason why the Government should change its policy in that respect. If the people residing in a locality cannot tender successfully with the residents of the older Provinces, the Government cannot be blamed for that.

“Article 9. That the Canadian Government should feed the Indians, and not offer to the christian world the spectacle of a people dying of starvation. If the civilisation of our century does permit it, and if the Province wishes it, the Government should make the Indians work about  
Mr. GIROUARD.

as much as Pharoah did the Jews; but, at all events, they should not leave them a victim of hallucination and in the delirium of starvation. They do not wish the people to talk with the Indians, but the Indians are all the time around the half-breed establishments. The half-breeds and other settlers spend more for the Indians than the Government does, and the people are going to be prevented from mentioning this state of things. It is not just that the Federal Government should administer Indian affairs.”

It is perfectly plain, after the exposure I have made of the policy of the Government towards the Indians, after everything the Government has done for them, after the millions of money we have spent to feed them and instruct them, it is plain that whoever framed this article of the Bill of Rights did not know what the Government had done for the Indians. It must be remembered there is no complaint in this article of the Bill of Rights that the Indians have not received their supplies, that the quality was bad and that they were hardly used by the officials. The 10th article of the Bill of Rights contains a demand for educational institutions. The answer to this is, that to-day there is a complete organisation in the North-West for the education of the youth. At the time Bishop Grandin applied to Minister of Interior for a grant there was no such organisation. But since 1876 there has been a board of education, comprised of six Protestants and six Roman Catholics, and the Government, on their representation, have granted such aid as in their opinion might be necessary. Therefore, the matter referred to in this article will be dealt with as it is in the older Provinces, under the constitution of the North-West. Article 12th of the Bill of Rights demands the erection of the districts in the North-West into so many Provinces. They claim that they should become Provinces when they obtain the same population as Manitoba possessed at the time of its entry into Confederation, and besides that this erection of districts into Provinces should be accompanied by all the advantages of responsible government and the administration of the Crown lands. I have already alluded to this matter while dealing with other portions of the Bill of Rights. That is a portion of the articles of the Bill of Rights which is most unreasonable. Not only do they want the North-West to be erected into Provinces, but the half-breeds want to have as many Provinces as there are districts. We have to-day five districts, Keewatin, Alberta, Assiniboia, Athabaska and Saskatchewan. Therefore, there would be five new Provinces to be established. We are, therefore, asked to increase the burden of taxation on the older Provinces to the extent of \$400,000 or \$500,000. And, what is more, the half-breeds want to keep all the lands in the North-West to themselves. We have constructed a Canadian Pacific Railway round Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, with a view to opening up that immense Territory, embracing a couple of billion acres of lands, and now that the railway is practically built, the people of the North-West, and among others, the French half-breeds, say: “We want all the districts to be turned into Provinces; we want subsidies from the old Provinces; we have got railways and land offices, and you are going to take care of the Indians, and we are going to take the last possible assets which the country can possess, and that is the land.” A pretention of that kind is simply absurd. I have passed over every article of the Bill of Rights as adopted by the half-breeds at a meeting at Prince Albert in September last, and hon. gentlemen opposite will notice that it does not contain a complaint about surveys, in regard to which subject so much capital has been made. There is not a complaint in regard to surveys from the half-breeds along the river, where it is said great tyranny has been committed by the present Administration, so much so, that the half-breeds at that time had sufficient reason to resort to arms. Is it not astonishing that during their last protests, their last declaration of rights, detailing their list of grievances, there is nothing said about the surveys of the river lots? I might perhaps stop at this stage

of the discussion; but it will be as well to consider what the white settlers were demanding. Meetings were held, not only at Prince Albert, but all over the North-West Territory. There was a meeting of the inhabitants of the Province of Alberta. I find the resolutions published in *Le Manitoba*. I have not been able to get an English copy, so I will translate them. It will be sufficient to mention the pretended grievances, the articles of the Bill of Rights of the white settlers of Alberta, to show that most of them are unfounded:

"The undersigned have the honor to represent that questions of the greatest importance, and worthy of the special attention of the Government, arise from that portion of the North-West, and more particularly from the district of Alberta. The undersigned hope that the Government will give all these questions the most serious consideration:

"1. There is not sufficient police stipendiary magistrates in the North-West; the judicial districts are too large, and, consequently, do not provide sufficient tribunals. This evil has been increased by the fact that under the Act respecting the North-West Territories cases appealed must be laid before the sitting judge, and decided by the same judge."

Suppose there were not enough stipendiary magistrates, the Government have this Session introduced a Bill to give an additional magistrate to the North-West.

"2. The people are of the opinion that you must remove from the officers of the Mounted Police every judicial power, and that resident judges shall be named for all the principal towns and cities in the North-West."

That is more as regards the administration of justice than is provided for the older Provinces—a judge resident in every principal centre of the North-West Territory. I do not believe that the people of the older Provinces would be willing that we should tax ourselves in order to concede this extraordinary demand, and have a judge resident in every principal centre of the North-West Territory.

"3. We know that it has been decided that the stipendiary magistrates have no power to issue a writ of *habeas corpus*, and, therefore, in this district we are deprived of one of the greatest safeguards of British liberty."

I am sure that whoever drew up this Bill of Rights of the population of the Province of Alberta was not a lawyer. Whether there is a statute declaring that a writ of *habeas corpus* may be issued in the North-West Territories or not—I believe there is one, but suppose there is not—by the common law of England every British subject deprived of his liberty on British soil has a right to a writ of *habeas corpus*. That is too elementary a principle of law to be open to any doubt.

"4. In cases of intoxicating liquors, the fact of one-half of the penalty being given to the informer has a bad effect. A man may be imprisoned on the oath of that sole informant, and this state of things has been the cause of numerous and grave acts of injustice. There have been many perjuries committed in this respect. This abuse exists among the constables of the Mounted Police, as one of them had made two hundred dollars in a day as informer—one-half of the penalty imposed on two persons. However, the defence denied to the accusation brought against them by the informer, and the two were condemned, although respectable.

"5. The police have abused their right to make inquisition as to the use of liquor; and no police officer should have the right to enter a private house for the purpose of ascertaining whether there are intoxicating liquors in it or not, unless there has been a sworn information previously made to that effect."

Well, this law is based upon the principle of penalty laws in the old Provinces. In all the old Provinces the policy of this Government, sanctioned for years and years, has been that one-half of the penalty, even in cases brought for the infraction of the liquor laws, should go to the informer, and the other half should go to the Crown.

"6. The stealing of horses is very common here, and there is very little effort made to pursue the guilty parties. The thieves go south by McLeod's road, and there the police cannot reach them before they go to the United States. A telegraphic line, as far as Fort McLeod, would prevent a good deal of the stealing of horses, and would also be of great use to the Mounted Police."

The telegraph line has been built since that time.

"7. The settlers of the neighboring districts are asking for their patents, and they complain when they would make their homestead

entries for townships 23 and 24, range 1, west of the 5th principal meridian, and in these districts there are a large number of settlers. The natural consequence is that the neighboring country is *in statu quo*, and will remain in that condition as long as these townships are not open to settlers."

These lands were surveyed only last year, and, necessarily, a few months must elapse before the land office is ready for entry, but I believe it is ready now.

"8. We believe that a court of appeal should be established in the North-West Territories, and that an extension of the powers of the court of first resort, held by the stipendiary magistrates, should be made, and more facility given for appeals from the magistrate's to the court of appeals in all cases where the contract exceeds \$200."

Now, here is another demand which is unreasonable. Under the constitution of the North-West, passed in 1875, a court of appeals was established for the North-West Territories, not sitting in the North-West Territories, but sitting in Winnipeg. There is a court of appeal for Manitoba, and with a view of saving expense, considering the large amount which the country had to spend in developing that vast country, this Parliament thought proper to give the right of appeal, in cases in the North-West Territories, to the court of appeals of Manitoba; and in every case where there is a question affecting real estate, or in any case for damages or torts for \$500, or in all cases in which there is \$1,000 in dispute, there is appeal to the court at Winnipeg. Considering that the means of communication are so easy to-day, from every portion of the North-West Territories, and especially from Calgary, from which this complaint comes, it seems to me that this complaint is without foundation.

"9. In the interests of justice, we believe that a prison and court house ought to be erected in Calgary. The building now used as a prison is altogether unfit for that purpose, and there is no place for the detention of criminals. Furthermore, we have been informed that the North-West council has refused to pass ordinances to arrest any one about to leave the country, and that because there is no jail, in order to detain the fleeing debtor or criminal. Last year the building which served as a prison was almost constantly full of prisoners, and as Calgary is the centre of the district, and near the Rockies, where the works of the Canadian Pacific Railway are proceeding, and where mining is being pursued with activity, the construction of a prison is an immediate want. In Calgary, also, there is need for a court house building, wherein to hold the sittings of the court."

There is also a jail and court house built by the Government at Regina, the capital of the North-West Territories. Under the constitution of the North-West council, the council has the right to order the erection of any prison which may be required in any portion of any district; and if the people of Calgary want a jail they should build one themselves, and ask the council for the proper authority.

"10. We also demand that the settlers should have the right to cut hay upon the lands which they occupy, and unoccupied lands, without being subject to pay \$1 a ton. The cutting can only improve the quality; and if it is not cut it will be entirely lost. This payment of \$1 per ton, although a small payment, has been a burden for the poor settlers, and is the source of a very small revenue for the Government."

Now, if we look at the regulations of the Department regarding the cutting of hay, it is very plain that this charge or due cannot be a burden for the poor settler. This article of the bill of grievances is altogether untrue; the Government do not charge \$1 a ton for cutting hay. According to the regulations, they charge, for any amount up to 20 tons, 10 cents per ton; for from 20 to 50 tons, 25 cents per ton; for from 50 to 100 tons, 50 cents per ton; and for 100 tons and over, \$1 per ton. Besides that, every settler is allowed to take all the hay he wants for his own use free. To show that this grievance has really no foundation whatever, let us look at the report for 1884. The amount collected by the Department for all the hay permits in the North-West during the year, amounted to the large sum of \$120,200.

"11. We demand the liberty to cut large quantities of wood, because to-day we cannot get enough in order to build even a good stable, and a settler who has no considerable resources is unable to procure one."

These are the regulations of the Department for cutting wood:

"Any occupant of a homestead quarter section having no timber of his own, may, upon application, obtain a permit to cut such quantity of building timber, fencing timber or fuel, as he may require for use on his homestead, not exceeding the following:—1,800 lineal feet of house timber, no log to be over 12 inches at the small end; 400 roof rails, 30 cords of dry wood, 2,000 fence rails."

Then, there are permits subject to dues, in order to preserve the forests. The rates are as follows:—

Cordwood, per cord.....	25 cents.
Fence posts, 8 ft. 6 in. long.....each	1 cent.
Telegraph poles, 22 ft. long.....each	5 cents.
Each lineal foot over 22 feet long.....	1 cent.
Railroad ties, 8 ft. long.....	3 cents.
Rails, 12 ft. long.....	\$2.00 per M.
Stakes, 8 ft. long.....	\$2.00 per M.
Shingles.....	0.60 per M.
Square timber and saw logs of oak, elm, ash or maple.....	\$3.00 per M., B. M.
Pine, spruce, tamarac, cedar, and all other woods, with the exception of poplar....	\$2.50 per M., B. M.
Poplar.....	\$2.00 per M., B. M.
All other products of the forest, not enumerated.....	10 p. c. <i>ad valorem</i> .

The timber dues collected by the Government last year amounted to \$193,196.86; and we may almost say that, with the exception of the revenues collected by the Department from the sale of lands and Customs Dues, this constitutes about the whole of the assets. Finally, the last article of the bill of grievances says:

"We demand that the territories of the North-West be represented in Parliament before the erection of the Provinces, as is the case with regard to the territories of the United States."

It has been observed that the half-breeds do not demand representation in this Parliament. But I believe it has been recognised for some time that this demand is reasonable, and that steps have already been taken by the Government—in fact, were taken before the rebellion broke out—with the view of giving the North-West Territories representation in the Dominion Parliament. A bill was introduced, providing for the taking of the census of the North-West Territories; and, of course, we must wait till that census is made, in order to learn the exact number of members to which the North-West Territories are entitled. There is also another difficulty. We know that in 1871 doubts were expressed as to the power of the Government of the Parliament of Canada to erect territories similar to those in the United States, and an Act was introduced into the Imperial Parliament to give that power in expressed terms. That Imperial statute also gives the Dominion Parliament power to give representation to the Provinces which may be erected out of the territories in the North-West; but there is no power given by it to the Dominion Parliament to grant representation to the Territories so long as they remain Territories. Therefore, some steps must be taken to have the constitution amended by the Imperial Parliament in that respect; and I hope that between now and the next Session of the Imperial Parliament, while our officers will be proceeding with the census of the North-West, this Government will take initiatory steps towards having our constitution amended, so as to permit us to give the North-West Territories representation in this Parliament, according to their population. Now, I have mentioned the grievances of the half-breeds and of the white population of the district of Alberta. Now, let us see what are the grievances of the district of Assiniboia. A meeting took place at Moosomin, at which the following resolutions were adopted, which I find reported in the *Saskatchewan Herald* of the 9th of January, 1885:

"That large tracts of land have been allotted to colonisation companies, subject to certain duties and conditions, and which would be of advantage to the country if carried out in good faith. This meeting is of opinion that the principle of allowing individuals or companies to control large tracts of public land is prejudicial; they would therefore urge strongly that where such conditions and duties are not being carried out faithfully the grants should be promptly cancelled."

Mr. GIROUARD.

The principle of colonisation companies in good faith is here admitted, and the Government has taken steps, a few years ago, to see that these companies were kept within their obligations, and I believe an inspector, Mr. Stephenson, a former member of this House, was appointed for that purpose. I know, of course, in consequence of the hard times several colonisation companies could not comply with the terms, and have been forced to give up their charter. If any cannot comply with the terms of their agreement they should be forced to do so.

"That the policy of the Government in building the Canadian Pacific Railway as a national work, and assisting it to an early completion, meets with our hearty approval, and will, we believe, be of incalculable benefit to the Dominion; that the policy of making free grants of land to branch lines in the interests of the North-West; but as these assisted lines run mainly east and west, this meeting strongly urges upon the Government the absolute necessity, in the interests of the various large settlements north and south of the Canadian Pacific, that the same liberal policy should be adopted towards lines judiciously located running north and south.

"That this meeting recognises the fact that the practicability of the navigation of Hudson's Bay and Straits has been amply proved. That the construction of a railway to some point on the shores of Hudson's Bay, to meet the ocean traffic there, would give an outlet and inlet for exports and imports between this country and the European markets, which would not only enable the settlers here to procure a better price for their products and obtain their necessities at a cheaper rate, but which is an absolute necessity, to enable this country to take her place in the first rank of wheat-producing countries in the markets of the world.

"That this meeting urges upon Parliament the justice and necessity of giving representation in the Parliament and Senate of Canada to the people of the North-West Territories; that we believe there are not less than 125,000 people in the North-West Territories, 95,000 of which are in the provisional district of Assiniboia; that in order to an effectual and just representation, four members should be given to Assiniboia and at least two members each to Alberta and Saskatchewan, and that provision for such representation should be made at the coming Session of Parliament.

"That we are not in favor, in the meantime, of a division of the Territories into Provinces, for purposes of Government, but one Local Government for the whole of the North-West Territories will, in our opinion, best suit the requirements of the people; and that no alteration should be made in the eastern boundary of Assiniboia.

"That the timber regulations should be amended, so as to give homesteaders absolute control of all dead and dry timber upon their homesteads, and the people generally free permission to use the dead and dry wood found on Dominion lands.

"That the Government should promptly recognise the claims of half-breeds, as was done in the Province of Manitoba, and thus determine a question calculated to disturb the present development of the country."

These are the grievances that were complained of by the whole population of the North-West, half-breeds as well as white. I have read in the newspapers of other complaints. I have read of railway monopolies, complaints against land regulations. On the 24th November, 1883, the *Globe* thus commented on a letter which appeared in it the day previous:

"Our correspondent, whose letter we published yesterday, states once more the grievances of which the settlers in the North-West complain. They are burdened with monopolies, burdened with enormous taxation, harassed and worried by land regulations, which are as absurd, in some respects, as they are unjust in others, and rendered almost desperate by misgovernment. From some districts it is almost impossible to get the wheat to a market. Those who do reach a market find that, owing to railway monopoly and to an elevator monopoly which has lately been added to all the other grievances, they can get no more than 60 cents, instead of the 90 cents which it should now be worth. The complaints of settlers, while they came from individuals, were unheeded at Ottawa."

All these grievances which have been repeated for week after week and day after day in the *Globe* and the Grit press of Ontario, are not to be found expressed at the meetings which took place, either at Alberta or the Assiniboia or Saskatchewan districts, and the reason is, that they have no foundation whatever. I wish to be sure upon this point, and I hope it will be sufficient for me to quote the *Minneapolis Canadian American*:

"Canadians, who are in such a dreadful stew over the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, would perhaps be a little more moderate in their criticisms if they were aware of the freight charges of the Northern Pacific. It is a fact that Union Pacific rates for the same distances are 15 to 30 per cent. higher than those of the Canadian line.

"In charging extortion upon the north-western railways, a great deal of recklessness is displayed by the public. The operating expenses of such roads as the Union Pacific, Canadian Pacific Railway, and St. Paul, Minneapolis and Minnesota, are at least 75 per cent. higher than those of eastern lines

"They have not a concentrated traffic, such as the Grand Trunk or roads between Minneapolis and Chicago have, to command, and, moreover, their traffic may be said to be all one way, as the cars which carry their wheat east return to them empty, a fact that increases the cost of transportation."

Now, as to the land regulations, perhaps it would not be necessary I should say anything on this point, because really there were no complaints at all these meetings. To show how affairs of the land regulations are managed across the line. I may, however, quote from Senator Plumb's speech of the 7th April, 1884, in the Senate. He said :

"Mr. Macfarland, the United States commissioner of the land office, published his report in October last. He stated that one of the well-grounded complaints made against their management of land affairs was that patents are not issued promptly, and the evil had grown to such enormous magnitude in the United States that he was obliged to ask Congress to give him a hundred extra clerks to bring up the arrears.

"A comparison between the homestead policy of Canada and the United States will show which is most favorable to settlers :

#### "CANADA.

"The head of the family, or any male person not less than 18 years of age, is entitled to a homestead entry.

"Such entry may be for any quantity not exceeding 160 acres in any land open therefor, the even-numbered sections, on about eighty millions of the most fertile lands, being free for selection until the first of January, 1885. The settler will have the right of pre-emption of an adjoining tract of the same extent as his homestead, which he can purchase at the end of three years at Government prices. He obtains a patent at the end of three years' residence and cultivation. He may have a second homestead entry, and a third and fourth. He may commute, by purchase, after one year's residence."

Now, I will close these quotations as to the land regulations of our Canadian Government in our North-West by an extract of a recent interview which a well known gentleman, occupying at one time a high office in the United States, had with a reporter of the *Montreal Herald*. This gentleman is the hon. N. G. Ordway, of Concord, N. H., ex-Governor of Dakota. Here is the report of the interview, and, as this opinion is expressed by an American, I think it will not be without interest to quote it in full :

"I left Boston six weeks ago, on business connected with the New Hampshire Land Company, who have in view the purchase of a large tract of land in the North-West for cattle raising and breeding. The company are already large owners in Nebraska and Dakota of lands purchased by myself three years ago. To say that I was astonished at the fertility of the country I visited in Manitoba would be putting it mildly. In common with many Americans, I had always entertained the opinion that the lands were situated too far to the north to be of very much use to the agriculturist. I find myself very much mistaken. The wheat belt of the North-West is in every respect equal to that of Minnesota, Dakota or Iowa. There is one advantage which the Dominion possesses over the United States, and that is in respect to their homestead laws. Another cause which contributes to the advantage of the Dominion, and tends to injure the United States in the eyes of intending emigrants, is the Alien Land Law, passed at the last session of Congress. The passage of this law was, to my mind, a grievous error, as it will tend more than any other dozen causes to retard emigration to the States. No one can question the fact that the Canadian North-West is a great country, both in extent and as regards its possibilities. It has a glorious future before it. With its great through line—the Canadian Pacific Railway—reaching from ocean to ocean, an extent of country and trade has been opened up which will be almost without limit. This great railway is one of which all Canadians should be proud. Certainly no other country can claim an enterprise of equal magnitude. I found the road much better built than I anticipated it could have been, when one considers the disadvantages the company is said to have labored under. The roadbed is admirable and the construction throughout excellent. As an American, I, as is perfectly natural, think that within the borders of my own country is to be found the finest land the sun ever shown upon, but I am not blind to the fact that in the opening up of the Canadian North-West

an area of country has been presented to the intending emigrant and settler which is equal to anything I have ever yet seen, and which possesses many advantages to the settler which we, south of the border, can no longer offer."

This opinion was expressed only a few days ago. I have said, in the course of my remarks, that I would quote the opinion of the local press, as expressed before the rebellion, to show that the Government had no reason to expect anything like the uprising which took place in the month of March. *Le Manitoba*, of the 22nd June, 1884, speaking of the arrival of Father Lacombe with the nuns in his charge en route for the High River Mission, said :

"Whatever the sensational press may say, the most perfect security reigns in the prairies, and nothing could disturb it. The settler has more security there than in any station of the American railway."

On the 10th of July, 1884, a correspondent from St. Laurent to *Le Manitoba* says :

"All is quiet here, and the large clouds which appeared on the political horizon have about disappeared. It is the result of the meeting held at Batoche, in the month of May last, by the Hon. Lieutenant Governor Dewdney."

*Le Manitoba*, of the 19th March, 1885—a few days before the rebellion took place—I think the first news we had of the uprising, was on the 23rd March—said :

#### MR. RIEL AND THE HALF-BREEDS.

"Despatches transmitted from Prince Albert to the newspapers of Manitoba bring us the sensational news that Mr. Riel, at the head of the half-breeds of that district, is preparing for an uprising, in which, it is said, the Indians would take part. The English population, it is said, asks arms for its defence, in case of an attack.

"If this news were not of a nature to cause an immense damage to our country, in leading to believe that we are in a constant state of rebellion, we would not give it any attention ; but as the foreign newspapers, always eager for sensational news, will hasten to reproduce the above, we believe it to be our duty to say : That no trouble is to be apprehended from the half-breeds in the North-West. It is true that discontent exists among them, which are in most cases based on legitimate reasons, but the cause of their grievances is seriously engaging the attention of the Government, and they promise to remedy them as soon as possible.

"Now, that there is some agitation, some meetings, even too violent, speeches, it is possible. Certain individuals think that justice cannot be obtained without grumbling, complaining or lamenting. It is their way of acting. But from that to a rebellion there is a great distance. The thing, moreover, would be so ridiculous that it is impossible for us to believe that our friends from that district would have the least idea to compromise themselves to that extent, even if they were so advised by those who ought to know better."

The *Saskatchewan Herald* of the 12th July, 1884, says :

"That Riel has come in, on the invitation of his friends, to be their leader, is freely admitted ; but no declaration has lately been made as to what they want. It is a suspicious circumstance, however, that immediately following his arrival in the country threats of armed rebellion should be indulged in, and that stories of the co-operation of Indians should be put in circulation, as they now are. We do not believe these rumors will lead to anything. The people are under no disabilities that cannot be redressed by constitutional means. To incite the Indians to acts of violence for purposes of revenge for real or fancied wrongs is a thing that will not be permitted by the Government or the settlers."

Now, let us take the representation of the North-West council at its sitting of the 21st of July, 1884. Mr. Dewdney, in his opening speech said :

"As we now have members from almost every district in the Territories who must be thoroughly conversant with the feeling on this most important question, I shall ask you to assist me with your advice and experience, in making representations to the Federal Government. I should not have touched on this question, which is one solely within the province of the Dominion Government, had I not felt it was one of paramount importance. From what I have seen myself, during my travels in the spring, and from what I gather from the correspondence which reached me as Indian commissioner, I can confidently say that our Indians generally are more contented than they were since the treaty was made, and the progress they are making in agriculture is most gratifying. It cannot be expected that with a population of some twenty thousand Indians scattered on reserves, in bands all over the Territories, we can escape without a little trouble, and, at times, excitement ; and this is inevitable when Indians fresh from the plains are first brought on their reserves and come in contact with white settlers. It has been so with those who are now comparatively well off, and will be so until the new arrivals recognise the facts that they must settle down and work and make a living ; but that there is any cause of alarm, I deny. I am sure the general feeling is one of security, and the exaggerated reports which have been circulated are to be regretted.

" You will have learned that the representations made by you to the Dominion Government have received attention, and many of the requests made acted upon, while others are under consideration. I am quite sure that should you feel the necessity of making further representations during the present Session, they will receive the same consideration at the hands of the Dominion Government."

Now, if grievances had existed of such a magnitude as to create a rebellion, would not some of the distinguished visitors to the North-West last summer have made some mention of it? In the first place, Manitoba and the North-West were visited by the Minister of Public Works. The *Free Press*, of Winnipeg, and *Le Manitoba*, of the 11th September of the same year, contain a statement that:

" The Minister of Public Works had come, with the sanction of the Government, to know the wants and feelings of the people and their grievances, if grievances they had. They might be sure that their grievances would be well weighed at Ottawa and that justice would be done."

Only one interview was mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, which some of the half-breeds had with the Minister of Public Works, and what answer did they get? Did they get an answer that they would be treated like white settlers? The Minister of Public Works answered that their claims would receive favorable consideration as soon as he will reach Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, upon this invitation of the Minister of Public Works, the *Free Press* made some remarks. It pointed out to the Minister some grievances, and asked him to visit south-western Manitoba, where he would hear of some complaints. But no allusion is made to the grievances which existed, if any existed, in the North-West Territory. Manitoba and the North-West were also visited by Sir Richard Cartwright, the member for South Huron, and by the hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the member for East York, at the same time. A banquet was offered to Mr. Mackenzie, at Winnipeg, and an address was read to him by the Liberals of that part of the country. This address is dated on the 2nd of September, 1884, and says, among other things:

" We have a country unsurpassed in climate, fertility of soil and other natural advantages, but its development is retarded by a fiscal policy unjust to this portion of the Dominion. We feel that in this matter, and in the policy of the Dominion, with regard to our public lands and our provincial railway legislation, we have been treated without a fair regard to our peculiar position and our rights to an equality with the other Provinces of Canada. We wish to draw attention to the necessity for such assistance to our railway enterprises as will promptly develop this great country, and for such an increase in the representation of Manitoba and the North-West in the Parliament of Canada as will insure greater consideration for our interests."

Now, Mr. Speaker, these Reformers of Manitoba and the North-West complain of the National Policy, but the half-breeds of St. Laurent and the white settlers of the North-West did not make any such complaints. Do we hear anything of the grievances of the half-breeds, or even of the white settlers, which have been mentioned at their meetings? Not a word. The Hon. Mr. McDougall also visited Winnipeg about the same time. Some of his admirers also gave him a banquet. The whole subject of the conversation and the speeches turned upon Manitoba and the North-West. I have seen the reports of the speeches which were delivered on that occasion, and not a single reference is made to the grievances of the white settlers, or of the half-breeds of the North-West, laid down by the meetings which I have mentioned. But there is more. Mr. Dewdney visited St. Albert on the 16th October, 1884. The report of his visit is given in *Le Manitoba*, of the 7th of November of that year: Several addresses were presented to him by the citizens, and Monseigneur Grandin, in the name of the clergy, containing sentiments of loyalty to the Canadian Government and Canadian institutions. A banquet was even tendered to him at the Bishop's Palace. A committee of citizens, with Mr. E. Maloney at their head, met the Lieutenant Governor, in order to make certain requests of him in the public interest. They asked, first, the purchase of a bridge on the Red River, and to make it a free bridge.

Mr. GIROUARD.

They also ask that those portions of the supplies intended for the Indians should be bought in the district, where they could be supplied more advantageously than in any other place. They said His Honor promised to take into consideration their demands, and do everything he could to satisfy them. Not a word was said during that meeting, held only a few months before the rebellion, against the Government; nothing but praise and admiration for the policy of the Government. Something was said last night by the leader of the Government of the action which the white settlers in the North-West have taken in this rebellion. I believe that the white settlers, I do not say the whole of them, but some of them, and they include parties acting on behalf of American colonisation companies, had more to do with this rebellion, of the spring of 1885, than the half-breeds and Indians. Let me read to you an article from the *Globe*, of 21st November, I will not say 1884, but 1883, and this article is only a sample of numerous inflammatory articles which, from time to time, have been published by that newspaper. It is as follows:—

" The American press is already holding out to our distressed brethren active sympathy and promise of help. In one day's exchanges we find nearly a dozen of the most influential papers of the Union telling the people of Manitoba they must break with the Dominion, which is treating them scandalously. Let there be no more of ostrich-like tucking of the head in the sand and refusing to see what is patent to every body. The organisation movement of Manitoba means business. It means that justice must be done. Ottawa methods must be revolutionized, and that quickly."

A letter from a special correspondent of the *Globe* at Winnipeg is headed " Manitoba troubles. Discontent coming to a head in the prairie Province. Result of a series of blunders. The farmers will have their rights by some means. Down with monopoly. Threatening to burn elevators and tear up railways. The situation very serious." The correspondent says:

" All through the controversy which has been raging in regard to the Government of this country no newspaper has displayed a fuller knowledge of the requirements of this country than the *Globe*, nor has it gone beyond the mark in predicting that, unless good government be at once vouchsafed to us, our position in Confederation will every day become more a matter of form, and that finally we will shake ourselves loose from the monotonous burden and seek some more congenial government. There is no doubt that the Canadians are a loyal people; they love their institutions and their traditions, but they are common-sense people as well, and will not allow their generous sentiments to be used against them, to compel them to sit still while other loyal people are steadily accomplishing their ruin."

" The day has gone by when, by a peculiar perversion, forms of government were worshipped for themselves, and every Canadian, at any rate, has learned that Governments are made for the conveniences of men, and not men for the glory of Governments. The day has come when the lumbering blue mould appendages of Government must be scattered to the four winds, and when a system of government is chosen like a particular kind of reaping machine—because it is the best for the purposes for which it is required, and for no mysterious or awful reason whatever. This is especially the case in Manitoba and the North-West. The country is young; the population is made up of all nationalities; people have come here to make money. We are independent of the eastern Provinces. We are not independent of the United States."

I shall now close these very long remarks, which have been much longer than I should have liked to have made them. I am not in the habit, as every member knows, of making long speeches. In fact, I very seldom trouble the House with speeches or remarks. I have been long on this occasion, it is true, but everyone will admit that the subject is important, everyone will admit, moreover, that it is new. I have not been as long as the leader of the Opposition, who spent seven hours, and did not touch the Indian question, an important element in the examination of the whole case. I cannot close these remarks without making an appeal to the Government, which, I hope, will receive their favorable consideration: it is to exercise its clemency in favor of the prisoners now confined at Regina. I have just pointed out that those poor half-breeds and Indians are not, after all, so much to blame as the great organ of the Liberal party in this Dominion. I do not want to make any reference to any special case. I have carefully

refrained from making any remarks with respect to Riel which might injure his position. I do not make any special appeal, but on behalf of all those prisoners I ask that the Government should exercise clemency. We have a good example of clemency in a Government which has not so well treated the Indians as has the Canadian Government or the British Government. Some few years ago, when Sitting Bull was induced to return with his warriors to his reserve in the United States territory, what was done? A Métis—Jean Louis Légaré—for it is always known that half-breeds have great influence over all Indians—was charged by the United States Government to bring back the Sioux Indians who had committed so many depredations, murders, assassinations and massacres; and not only were the members of Sitting Bull's band pardoned, but Sitting Bull himself was pardoned, without any condition. And to-day he is on his reserve in American territory, an Indian just as peaceful as any citizen in the American Union. To sum up the facts of this case: We are asked to vote non-confidence in this Government in regard to its policy in the North West. We are asked to vote that hon. gentlemen opposite shall come to this side of the House and manage the affairs of the country. In other words, we are asked to condemn the policy of the Government in its treatment of the Indians. We are also asked to condemn the Government and its policy with regard to the half-breeds and the white settlers. Mr. Speaker, I cannot give my vote in favor of that motion. I believe the Government deserves great praise for having established law and order in such a large Territory, which only fifteen years ago was almost a wilderness. They deserve the thanks of the country for having achieved such a great result without shedding a drop of blood. The events of the last few months, which we all deplore, should not alarm us. The rebellion has been confined to a small portion of the French half-breeds and of the Indians; it has been limited to a small area, some 20 or 25 square miles. The rebels have been subdued after great loss of property and life, it is true, but law and order have been re-established, and I would say to the Government: Continue your policy of instructing the Indians of the North-West; continue to give them farm instructors, common schools and industrial schools. But I would venture, in that respect, to make one suggestion. I think it is of the greatest importance that all those instructors should have something in common with the Indians who are confided to their charge, and therefore I would say, if it is at all possible to find farm instructors or school teachers who speak the language of the Indians who are placed under them, preference should be given to them. I would go further. I would take the advice given by the First Minister in 1883, when he said:

"Well, I think I may almost ask the hon. gentleman to look into the report on these schools, where he will find their success more or less alluded to. I believe, however, that these schools are fairly successful, especially those under the charge of religious bodies, Catholic or Protestant. These are, I believe, more successful than the merely secular schools, where the schoolmasters, who are honest men and who do their duty, are actuated, of course, by a desire to support themselves and their families. The moral restraints of the clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, are greater. They are actuated by higher motives than any secular instructor can pretend to. Secular education is a good thing among white men, but among Indians the first object is to make them better men, and, if possible, good christian men, by applying proper moral restraints, and appealing to the instinct for worship which is to be found in all nations, whether civilised or uncivilised."

I hope that the commission which is just now sitting in the North-West, entrusted with the work of satisfying the half-breed claims as to land, will not only satisfy these claims, but will also examine into the amount of indemnity which is to be paid to the settlers who have suffered in consequence of the rebellion, and ascertain the amount of damages which has been sustained by the white population, so that it may be

known next Session, and a vote of Parliament given next Session. Further, I would say that I do not quite agree with the view that the half-breed must be considered either as an Indian or a white man. I believe that he should be considered as he is, as the connecting link between the Indian and the white; and therefore I hope the Government will see fit to give to these half-breeds some of the advantages which have been given to the Indians—some of the grain and seeds and agricultural implements which they require, in order to become familiar with agriculture. Now, I have only one more remark to make. It may be said that the half-breed families in the distressed districts are not worthy of consideration. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are many half-breeds in that district who were loyal to the Dominion Government and to Dominion institutions; but I say, whether they were or not, I hope the Government will not forget the women and children who are homeless in that district, but will do something to save them from actual starvation. A letter has just been published in the *Mail*, by Father André, who says:

"What a sad sight met my eyes the other day, when I visited this same parish of St. Antoine! The cottages which I had admired so much last year were most of them burned down to the ground; those standing were nothing but a wreck, with windows and doors broken. The fields and gardens lay waste and uncultivated; cattle and horses were gone; a few only remained, as the taking of them away was not worth the trouble. Everywhere I went I met with fearful evidence of wretchedness and poverty. It was a hard trial for me to bear. A good many houses were tenantless; the owners were dead or gone away; and as I saw all the ruins about me, I could not stop my tears, so heavy was my heart with grief. Who could help not to be moved with compassion in seeing those poor and unfortunate women, surrounded by their children, coming to meet me and to shake hands with me? They formed a perfect picture of squalor and desolation, in tatters, and broken hearted. The little children did not present a less pitiable appearance. They were there standing before me, crying to their full heart, and telling me all the sad misfortunes which had befallen them. They had lost all their clothes at the sack of Batoche's, and when they came back home they found all their furniture smashed in pieces and their dwellings left with the bare walls. There they were, destitute, and starvation staring them in the face, unless help be near at hand. Add to this that these poor women were most of them mourning for their dead sons or husbands, or for husbands and sons lying in prison at Regina, waiting for trial, and you can conceive how much these unfortunate people deserve our compassion."

Now, I have only to state what appears to me to be a necessity in the North-West. The Mounted Police force have shown its usefulness; no doubt a guard of some kind is necessary for the protection of the white settlers against the attacks of the Indians; but I question whether we could not really form a better body of men than the Mounted Police force, composed of picked men from the Mounted Police, the militia of the country, and, I would also add, from the half-breeds. In a recent correspondence to the *Mail* newspaper from St. Boniface, I read:

"What a pity it is that the Dominion Government cannot see its way to forming a corps of Métis for service as police on the plains! General Middleton can bear testimony to their valor and endurance; and I am sure the gallant troops also will give them a just measure of praise. At Edmonton a small force of loyal half-breeds, organised under the direction of Bishop Grandin, is doing splendid work, the men being unequalled as scouts. A division or two of Métis would greatly strengthen the North-West Mounted Police, and help to restore the prestige of that body among the Indians. The question is certainly worth the consideration of the Government. Father Dugast, of this archdiocese, has collected, in book form, many admirable stories about the Métis, which the Ottawa officials in charge of the police should read. They would convince them, if, after recent experience, they need convincing, that there is no better raw material for a mounted infantry man than the half-breed."

Now, I would ask the white settlers to have a little patience. They should not forget all the sacrifices the old Provinces have been making for them; they should not forget that for the last ten years all the resources of the country have been devoted to the development of that country; they should not forget that we have spent millions and millions for the purpose of building the Pacific Railway, for carrying on surveys throughout that vast territory, and for opening up registry offices and land offices; they should not forget that we have suspended the great public works

of the old Provinces on this account, for instance, the enlargement of our canals. No doubt they have some grievances, we have some in the old Provinces; but before long they will enjoy all the luxuries of civilisation, and with a little patience and forbearance, this country will be so developed as to be a happy home for everybody, not only in the old Provinces, but also in Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). At this late hour of the night, at this late period of the Session, and in about the middle of the dog days, I have too much respect for the ease and comfort of the members of this House, and too much regard for my own ease and comfort, to spend six hours and twenty minutes in delivering, like the preceding speaker, a long wordy speech, nineteen-twentieths of which had about as much connection with the subject under discussion as Barnum's woolly horse had with Barnum's Circassian princess. The hon. gentleman told us, at the beginning of his speech, that he knew nothing about the North-West, about the half-breeds, their claims, their condition, their grievances or their interests. He undertook to study the question, and his sympathies, he told us, were entirely with the half-breeds until he did so. He devoted two or three months to the investigation of the North-West question and the claims of the half-breeds, and we have had the result of that investigation in the speech to-night. The hon. gentleman justified the course pursued by the Government on the ground that the late Government had not dealt with the claims of the half-breeds with that promptitude which, in his judgment, they ought to have been dealt with. The hon. gentleman's argument is this: because a man of the name of Mackenzie, some seven or eight years ago, committed some act of negligence, long since condoned, therefore, a man of the name of Macdonald, who, for seven years, has persistently refused to investigate the claims of the half-breeds, and, as a consequence, human life has been lost and human blood has been spilt, is to go unwhipped of justice. The hon. gentleman told us that the buffalo was rapidly disappearing from the plains of the west; that the disappearance of that source of supply, on which the half-breeds and the Indians were largely dependent, had caused the rebellion; that the late Government caused the buffalo to disappear, and that, therefore, the late Government is responsible for the recent uprising in the North-West Territories. That is the line of argument of the hon. gentleman, and it is just about as logical as all the answers made to the charges levelled against the Government by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). The hon. gentleman says we have no reason to complain against this Government. He asks us what has the Government not done? He replies, just see what they have done. They have opened registry offices and appointed registrars; they have opened land offices and appointed agents; they have created the offices of farm instructors, and filled them with farm instructors. That is just the difficulty; they have created many offices, and have taken good care to fill them; but there is one thing they did not do: they did not consider the claims of the half-breeds, or redress their wrongs, and it is no satisfaction to them to be told: Your wrongs are not redressed, it is true; your grievances are not considered, but we have appointed registrars, farm instructors, school teachers, land agents, sub-agents, and sub-sub-agents in the North-West, and, therefore, you ought to be satisfied. That is the line of argument hon. gentlemen opposite pursue. The hon. gentleman gave an interesting sketch of the admission of the great North-West into this Confederation; but it strikes me that the half-breeds of the North-West, whose friend, I suppose, the hon. gentleman is, would be much more interested in getting some relief and redress in the position in which they are now placed by reason of the negligence and misconduct of this Adminis-

MR. GIROUARD.

tration. The hon. gentleman gave us very correctly, no doubt, the area of each provisional District in the North-West. But what the half-breeds want is the area of their holdings, not the area of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman told us something about the Indian title in the North-West. What the half-breed wants is the title to his own land. What cares he about the Indian title, whether it is extinguished or not. What he wants is that this Government should give him the title to the land that he has been in possession of for the last twenty years, and, in some cases, that his father before him was in possession of, and the title to which is, to this hour, vested in the Crown. The hon. gentleman sought to arouse a feeling of animosity against the Liberal party by pointing out that the unfortunate Riel and the other half-breeds who are now in custody in the North-West were deprived of the right of trial by a mixed jury, and he charged that upon the late Administration. Why, I have in my hand the law under which these men are to be tried, passed in the year 1880, under this Administration, while the hon. gentleman was a member of this House and supporting that administration; and if the half-breeds of the North-West are deprived of the right, which is given by the law of the land to certain classes in the community, of being tried before a mixed jury, the fault, the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite, and those friends of the half-breeds, such as the hon. gentleman who are members of this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Girouard) in his opening remarks gave the case away. He admitted that the half-breeds had grievances, but, he said, they had no such grievances as would justify rebellion. Who said they had? Who made that statement? Did any hon. gentlemen on this side?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No; no man on this side made any such statement as that the half-breeds had grievances that would justify rebellion. But the hon. gentleman admits they had grievances unredressed, and that is what my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), in the motion he has submitted, complains of. These men have had grievances of long standing unredressed. You, gentlemen on the Treasury benches, by your apathy, by your neglect, by your criminal misconduct, in refusing to redress these grievances, are responsible for the consequences. When the hon. gentleman who has just sat down stood up, on a wager that he would make a speech of six hours and twenty-five minutes, hon. gentlemen opposite did not call him an obstructionist. They charged us with obstruction when we were endeavoring to show their iniquitous measure of the franchise in its true light, but when, upon a wager of a dozen of champagne, an hon. gentleman on their side takes up six hours and twenty-five minutes of the time of the House, in order to win this bet, they have not a word to say about obstruction. What we say is, that the half-breeds, the Indians and the white inhabitants of the North-West, but notably the half-breeds, have had for years grievances which ought to have been investigated, wrongs which ought to have been redressed, and that this Government is guilty in not having investigated these grievances and redressed those wrongs and are responsible for all the consequences which have resulted from their misconduct, mismanagement and incapacity; and we say nothing more. I listened with the attention that befitted the occasion and the man to the speech of the First Minister. I knew that the First Minister was on his trial before the Parliament of his country, and I was curious to know—knowing something of the position of this case, of the claims and the wrongs of the half-breeds—what defense the hon. gentleman would make to the formidable indictment that was presented against him by my hon. friend from the west riding, and I must say that I never listened to a more inconsequential and

illogical defense than the hon. gentleman made. I have defended many prisoners in my day; and will honestly say that if called on to offer such a defence as the hon. gentleman has made, I would have thrown up the brief at once, and I would have done as the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has done, advised him to plead guilty to the charge preferred against him. What did the First Minister say? He said that the rebellion was caused by the disaffection of the half-breeds to Canadian rule; and, in the second place, that the white men, for their own sordid and selfish purposes, incited the half-breeds to rebel. In the third place, that the half-breeds were incited to rebel by the Grits of the Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, Sir. I say they were incited to rebel by the Tories; the Tories stole everything that could be stolen in the North West, from a timber limit down to a little, petty gravel pit, and they were not satisfied with their stealings in the days gone by. If anybody incited the half-breeds to rebellion it was the Tories, who sold their hay for feeding the horses of the troops at \$400 a ton, and who, from the president of a land company down to the humblest follower of the First Minister, charged \$10 a day for the hire of their horses. If anybody fattened upon the misfortunes of the country it was the Tory party. The hon. gentleman told us that the half-breeds had no grievances worthy of the name, and therefore should not have rebelled; that the half-breeds were the slaves of the whites of Prince Albert District, and that it would not do to give them their lands or scrip, because they would be wasted and squandered in a very short time. He forgot to tell us that after human life was lost, after human blood was spilt, and ruin, desolation and death scattered abroad, commissioners were sent out by the First Minister to investigate the claims of the half-breeds, and not only to give them land and scrip, but to give them more than they ever asked for before. He told us no half-breed in the North-West was disturbed or oppressed; that the half-breeds had their homes and their lands, and that was all they wanted; but he forgot to tell us that some of the colonisation companies, the creation of his own mad folly, to suit his own political purposes, had notified the half-breeds to abandon their holdings. He forgot to tell us that these half-breeds had not their lands and houses, and that was just what they were complaining of. They were mere tenants at will; they were there at the will of the Government, or of the colonisation company which was fortunate enough to secure a grant of their land from this liberal Government, liberal as regards its followers. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) boldly and openly charged the First Minister and his colleagues with the consequences of this terrible rebellion, and he charged upon this Administration the results of their own inaction and misconduct. How, I say, did the hon. gentleman answer the charge? Did he make any answer at all? Did he submit a logical answer? Why, I defy any man who listened to the First Minister to say exactly upon what ground the First Minister justified the position he took. The answer was: I charge the Grit party, I charge the Liberal party in Parliament and out of Parliament, with the whole consequences of this rebellion, with having incited and directed and induced the half-breeds of the North-West Territories to take up arms against the sovereign power of this Dominion. But he forgot to tell us that, for seven long years, as my hon. friend from West Durham has pointed out, these people have been pressing their claims upon and demanding a rectification of their wrongs from the Government, and have been unable to obtain justice up to this hour. I think this, without drawing upon one's imagination, is reason enough, in the mind and the temper, and the disposition, and the peculiarity of the half-breeds, to induce them to take up

arms against this Government. The hon. gentleman stated that the whole of the consequences of the rebellion were at the door of the Liberal party. But the hon. gentleman did not tell us the political complexion of those who were actively engaged in that terrible contest that fortunately has just drawn to a successful conclusion? Did he tell us the political complexion of Mr. Louis Schmidt, a man after his own heart, a man in whom he had such unbounded faith that he appointed him to an office of emolument in the gift of the Crown, a man who I believe still holds that office, and, while he was the paid official of this Tory Government, was private secretary and Secretary of State to Mr. Louis Riel, the controller of affairs in the great North-West. The First Minister forgot to tell us what were the politics of Mr. Dumas, another man whom he appointed to an office of emolument in the gift of the Crown and in the service of the Government in the North-West Territories, and who, at the same time, was one of Riel's councillors. The hon. gentleman forgot to tell us the political complexion of Mr. Isbister. I do not know; I do not care what his politics were; I know he was one of the men who induced Louis Riel to leave his home in Montana and engage in this contest to secure the rights of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories; but the First Minister forgot to tell us that he had offered him a position, an office of emolument in the gift of the Crown. He also forgot to tell us the political complexion of Mr. Gabriel Dumont, the commander-in-chief of the rebel army in the North-West, and a man for whom I, for one, entertain a profound respect, no matter what his politics may be, a man who would not be bought, but who believed his countrymen were wronged, and, believing that, was prepared to sacrifice his life in defence of his countrymen. This man has obtained favors from this Government. He is the lessee of the ferry across the Saskatchewan at his own place. More than that: he was a constant reader of *La Minerve*, and the editor of the *Minerve* has boasted that Gabriel Dumont was a contributor to his paper, and paid for it for years; and I know that no sound Grit reads the *Minerve*. You may place Mr. Dumont among followers of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then, the First Minister, who says the rebellion was caused by the Grit party, that it was instigated by the Grit party, forgot to tell us who was the leader of the rebellion in the North-West, he forgot to say anything about Mr. Louis Riel, the bosom friend and companion of the hon. gentleman, the political friend and ally for fifteen years of the First Minister, his co-worker in the Conservative field, a man who had conferred favors on the Government in the days gone by, and had received favors at the hands of the Government of this country in return. Who was it, twelve years ago, when a colleague of the First Minister was defeated in his own constituency, abandoned his contest for the county of Provencher, in order that the First Minister's colleague might get a seat in the Parliament of Canada? Mr. Louis Riel. And he got it through the instrumentality of Mr. Louis Riel. And when he was elected, who were they who sent a congratulatory telegram, addressed to the First Minister's Colleague on that subject? Mr. Louis Riel, Mr. A. Lepine, and Mr. Joseph Royal signed that telegram. There were more favors that passed between these high contracting parties. For whom did the First Minister, in days of old, plunge his hand right up to the elbow in the public purse of this country and extract therefrom \$1,000 of the people's money, and send that money, through a venerable dignitary of the church, to this traitor, conspirator and redhanded murderer, that he might fly the offended justice of his country and escape the bloodhounds of the law then upon his track? The First Minister sent that to Louis Riel, and yet they say—

Mr. SPROULE. How about the amnesty?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes; about the amnesty. It shows how little the hon. gentlemen knows about it. Did not the venerable Archbishop of St. Boniface, under his oath, declare—

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes; declare, under his oath, that he was promised by the Government that preceded Mr. Mackenzie's that the offenders in the North-West Territories should be amnestied? There was the evidence submitted to the investigating committee, that the First Minister and his colleagues, including the Minister of Public Works, had promised an amnesty to these traitors and rebels in the North-West, and yet the hon. gentleman talks about the amnesty, as if promised by the late Government. If the hon. gentleman would only take the trouble to read the documents, he would find who it was that promised the amnesty. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) boldly charges the First Minister with neglect, with delay, in not investigating the demands of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories. How are we answered? We were answered by the production of a despatch sent by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to the proper authority in the North-West, in which it was indicated that, for certain things, the half-breeds should be precisely in the same position as the white man. I have no hesitation in saying, from a careful examination of the demands of the half-breeds for a long series of years that, if this had been conceded seven years ago by this indolent and incapable Government, the half-breeds of the North-West would have been perfectly satisfied. My hon. friend from West Durham charged the First Minister with gross dereliction of duty in not recognising the claims of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories at an earlier period. What answer did the First Minister make to that charge? The answer was: The hon. member for West Huron has sent a letter to the public departments, notifying them not to issue patents for certain pieces of land until a claim he has against the land is discharged. The First Minister wanted to convey a wrong impression; he wished to convey the impression to the House that I, in some way, was speculating in the claims of the half-breeds; that I had got some of those claims into my possession, and had notified the Department not to grant the patents until those claims were settled. If the hon. gentleman had been honest, he would have stated the facts. He knew the facts. He knew that there were two young men who left my county in 1882 and settled upon the Moose Jaw lands. He knew that these young men had for several years been endeavoring, but in vain, to get from this Government, from the First Minister and his officials, a recognition of their rights to the land upon which they had settled. He knew that in 1883, in one of my visits to the North-West, I saw these young men, whom I had known for years. They expressed their determination to abandon a country where they could get no satisfaction from the Government, but upon my advice they remained there. The First Minister knew all that, because last Session, when I brought this question to the attention of Parliament, the First Minister commended the conduct that I pursued with respect to the settlers in the Moose Jaw region. Because I knew these young men, and did not desire that they should leave the country and the land upon which they had settled, and in order to induce them to remain, I advanced them a considerable sum of money to erect houses upon their locations, to buy horses, oxen, waggons and the implements to carry on farming operations. Through my instrumentality these young men remained in the country, and to secure myself for the money advanced I took a lien upon the land. Was there any harm in that? No. Yet the First Minister wants to make this Parliament believe that there was something wrong in what I did in

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

that respect. I say that if the conduct of the Government in dealing with the settlers in the North-West had been as clean-handed as my conduct was with respect to those young men, there would have been no rebellion. My hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) pointed out that owing to the gross carelessness and the misconduct of this Administration, in not redressing the grievances of the people in the North-West, the half-breeds become dissatisfied, uneasy, discontented, and broke out into rebellion. He was answered by the First Minister producing, with a flourish of trumpets, and with all the indications of having discovered a mare's nest, a letter written by my hon. friend to a person of the name of Brown. Well, what about it, if he did write a letter to a person by the name of Brown? Every body knows that for four months my hon. friend was attempting to drag out of the hon. gentleman's possession papers that would throw light upon the transactions of this Government with the half-breeds in the North-West Territories, and that for four months my hon. friend had signally failed to induce the First Minister to submit these papers to Parliament. My hon. friend was promised and refused, he was refused and promised, and ultimately they were brought down in a mutilated condition, while some of the valuable papers were not brought down at all. One of these papers that the First Minister refused to bring before Parliament he had with him last night, and he read an extract from it in his place in Parliament. He refused to bring that document before the House, that the House might see it, but he was willing to use that paper for the purpose of building up his own argument. This man Brown, knowing that my hon. friend was persisting in his efforts to procure information, wrote to my hon. friend that he had been in the North-West and was conversant with the affairs of that country, and knew of the difficulties there. My hon. friend replied to him, and Brown wrote again, asking a pass to come to Ottawa, and stating that he desired employment, and did not wish that his name should be known until he had got that employment. My hon. friend answered that he could not give him the pass, and, of course, could not give him employment, but that he would not let his name be known until he got employment, whatever it was. He did not send him the pass. Brown was here. Who brought him here? Is it not a fact that one of the whips of the Government procured a pass and brought him here? He was here, and that is the answer the hon. gentleman makes to this charge of my hon. friend from West Durham. What became of the letter? How did the First Minister get that letter? What was the price paid for that letter? How much did the First Minister pay to Brown to get that letter? Sir, has it come to this? Has the Government of this Dominion descended so low and become so degraded that they have to adopt the rôle of the spy and detective, and to enroll themselves as members of the spittoon brigade, and pick up scraps of papers and letters, and retail their contents on the floor of Parliament, in answer to charges of gross misconduct? Sir, I say again: How did the hon. gentleman get hold of that letter? What price did he pay for it? Did this Government again betray the trust reposed in them, and barter the public service of this country as the price of that letter? Has Brown been given employment? If he has not, has he been promised employment as the price of delivering that letter to the Administration? Do they think that a fair and honorable, and justifiable warfare—using private letters, written by private parties, to an individual outside of Parliament, and the public service of this country being bartered for the purpose of getting possession of that letter. Sir, I wish the hon. gentleman joy of his letter. It shows nothing; it proves nothing. Now, Sir, this question of the North-West insurrection is an important question. It is a grave question. It is rarely in the his-

tory of any country that we find the Government of that country impeached as the Government of this country are now. They are charged with the gravest offences that can be committed by any Government. In my judgment, this is the most important question that ever was submitted to this or any other Parliament. The motion of my hon. friend from West Durham challenges, in the clearest terms, the policy of this Government in dealing with the affairs of the North-West Territories. The motion of my friend challenges the conduct of the First Minister of this Dominion, who was the Minister of Interior in days gone by, and the conduct of the officials appointed by this Administration, in the management of the affairs of the North-West Territories. It censures, it is true, in mild and temperate language, but all the same it censures the conduct and the actions of the gentlemen upon the Treasury benches, with respect to their conduct in managing the affairs of this country in the North-West Territories. It charges them with being responsible for the recent outbreak, and it holds them directly responsible to the people of this country, to the Parliament of this country, for the loss of life and the spilling of blood. I venture to say now, in all calmness, that there is no man who will sit down and deliberately consider all the evidence, all the facts that have been submitted by my hon. friend from West Durham and my hon. friend from East Quebec, and the facts that I propose to submit to Parliament, but who will hold the Government responsible. Now, it is a singular fact, that in the history of this country two rebellions have taken place under the administration of the First Minister. History, we know, Mr. Speaker, repeats itself. Like causes produce like effects. I say that the rebellion of 1869 was the result of apathy, carelessness, indifference, misconduct, mal-administration on the part of the First Minister and his then colleagues. I say, Sir, that the recent rebellion has been the direct outcome of neglect, misconduct, mal-administration, refusal to deal with grievances and to investigate wrongs; and I say that the evidence sustains my assertion beyond peradventure. Now, the questions we have to grapple with at the very threshold of this discussion are: Had the half-breeds of the North-West Territories who took up arms against the sovereign power of this Dominion, had the white settlers who sympathised with the half-breeds, to some extent, had the Indians, who ultimately joined the half-breeds in the rebellion, complaints, grievances, wrongs, that remained unredressed by the Government of the country, after presenting those grievances to the Government, after directing the attention of the authorities to those grievances and wrongs, and after presenting them as earnestly and vigorously as, under the circumstances of the case, they were warranted and justified in doing? First, then, had the half-breeds grievances? That they had grievances is admitted. The hon. gentleman who preceded me admitted it. The First Minister, in the early part of this Session, stated that the half-breeds of the North-West made many complaints, some of which were well founded. If the half-breeds had grievances, and they remained unremedied, who is responsible for the rebellion that was the result of the refusal to consider those grievances and rectify those wrongs? I say it is not a very difficult matter to fix that responsibility. It can be fixed on no one except the Administration of the day, which has been guilty of that carelessness and indifference. It is true the organs of hon. gentleman opposite have sought to fix the responsibility, as the First Minister has done, on the Liberal party, in Parliament and out of Parliament. I say they have done so in order to draw public attention away from the real culprits. When the rebellion first broke out there was no hint or suggestion in the Conservative press as to the Liberal party being responsible, and it was only a second

thought, when hon. gentlemen opposite found they were on dangerous ground, that the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite sought to fix the responsibility of the outbreak on the shoulders of the Liberal party. No one pays very much attention to what some of the organs, the subsidised organs of hon. gentleman opposite say on this question, such as the *Mail*, the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Ottawa Citizen*. They are the paid organs of the Government, and are bound to earn their reward. But when the First Minister, perhaps in a moment of weakness, perhaps in a moment of excitement, adopts the same ignoble role and attempts to shift the responsibility for his own neglect and the neglect of his colleagues, his own maladministration and the maladministration of his colleagues, and attempts to fix that responsibility upon the shoulders of the Liberal party, the hon. gentleman does what neither the facts nor the circumstances warrant the hon. gentleman in doing. We have, on more than one occasion, challenged the First Minister and his followers to point to a single sentence in the Liberal press, to a single word uttered by Liberal members of Parliament, that could be distorted into offering the slightest encouragement to armed insurrection. As representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, with high and important duties to discharge, we have, upon many occasions, pointed out to the First Minister that the policy to which he committed the Parliament of Canada and the people of this country was a policy calculated to create uneasiness, dissatisfaction, discontent and turbulence in the North-West Territories. How were we answered? By the hon. gentleman calmly reconsidering that policy—a policy which was sure to end in dissatisfaction and discontent, if not in rebellion. No, Sir, we were assured that the settlers had no ground of complaint; that they were satisfied and contented, and, in any event, they need not expect to be spoon-fed. We protested against that policy, we warned hon. gentlemen opposite against that policy, we pointed out the fatal results that were sure to follow that policy. How were we answered? By calmly and deliberately considering the condition of affairs in the North-West, and ascertaining whether there were grievances uninvestigated and wrongs unredressed? No; we were assured that no one complained, all were satisfied. The history of the past taught hon. gentlemen no lessons, the warnings of the present were wholly unavailing and so, I say, if their wilful neglect ended in rebellion, upon the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite must rest the responsibility for that rebellion. What were those grievances, what did the half-breeds complain of? Their complaints were made openly and boldly; they were not concealed; they were made in the broad light of day and in every way known to the people of a country when protesting against the wrong-doing of the Government of that country. They were grievances of long standing, grievances that spread over a period of seven long weary years and during all those years they were constantly pressed on the attention of the Government at Ottawa. Their prompt settlement was a matter of vital importance to the peace, the growth and prosperity of that country. They were pressed upon the attention of the Government by letters, by memorials, by petitions, by remonstrances, by resolutions passed at public meetings and by delegations all the way from the North-West to interview the Government. They were pressed on the attention of the Government, in 1883, by the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who then pointed out the necessity of considering at once those grievances. They were pressed at the attention of the Government by myself, in 1884, in the most solemn way known to Parliament, by a motion on going into Supply, on which occasion I pointed out some of the grievances complained of by the people of the North-West and warned hon. gentlemen opposite against the fatal conse-

quences of refusing to deal promptly with those grievances. I was answered, by the ex-Minister of Railways, that there were no grievances and no complaints; that everybody was satisfied and contented, and everybody was prospering. We see the result of that negligence to-day. Let me consider for a moment what those grievances were. They have been referred to by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). I direct attention to them for a moment or two. The half-breeds complained of the system of surveys adopted by this Government. They desired that the North-West Territories should be divided into Provinces. They requested that the half-breeds of the North West should receive the same considerations and the same advantages as the half-breeds of Manitoba had received. Are not those reasonable claims? Why were they not conceded? There were other complaints, perhaps not of the same importance, but still of considerable importance, in the interests of the peace and prosperity of the North-West Territory. There was a universal demand throughout those Territories for representation in this Parliament. To meet that demand, in the Session of 1884 I introduced a Bill to give representation to the people of the North-West Territories. On moving for leave to introduce that Bill, I pointed out the necessity for it, and the danger of refusing it. How was I answered? I was answered with silent indifference—with supreme contempt. Still thoroughly alive to the necessity of giving representation to those people, I introduced the Bill this Session, and, on moving the second reading, I pointed out again the fairness, the reasonableness of the demands made by the people of the North-West for representation in this Parliament, where they could meet face to face the representatives of the people of this country, and ventilate their grievances, point out their wrongs, and demand from Parliament redress for those wrongs. How was I answered? Was this reasonable demand assented to? No; my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, moved the adjournment of the debate, knowing quite well that, at that period of the Session, when the Government had taken possession of nearly every working day of the week, it was impossible to reach the discussion during the present Session, and again the reasonable demands of the settlers of the North-West were refused by the Government. There were other demands. They claimed that their rights as settlers were not recognised by the Government; that the Government had given to colonisation companies, to land companies, to mining and ranching companies, vast portions of the Territories of the North-West, which had been occupied by the half-breeds for years. Now, I say in all sincerity, let any man sit down and calmly and honestly consider these claims of the half-breeds, and I say he will rise from their consideration thoroughly impressed with their fairness. I do not mean to say that these grievances, uninvestigated, these wrongs, unredressed, would justify an armed insurrection; but I do say, that if anything would justify an armed insurrection to rectify wrongs and redress grievances, it would be just such grievances uninvestigated, just such wrongs unredressed by this Government for seven long years. I venture to say, that now when human life has been lost and human blood has been spilt, and houses and homes have been ruined; when all over Canada wives have been made widows and children orphans; I venture to say now that four-fifths of these demands of the half-breeds will be conceded by this Government. Why, Sir, we know that the very moment that these half-breeds took up arms against the Government, this incompetent, this incapable, this imbecile Government, white with terror at the results of their own misconduct in the past, hurriedly set to work to investigate those grievances, and redress the wrongs which, for seven long years, they refused to redress. The fact, Sir, that grievances existed has been shown by my hon.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

friend the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). The fact can be shown by a mass of testimony that is simply startling. It can be shown by the independent press, by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, by the official records of Parliament, by the returns which have been brought down to the House by order of the House; and I say, when all these fix the responsibility on the shoulders of the Government, there is no shirking that responsibility. Let us see what the independent press of this country has said as to the responsibility of Ministers. The *Winnipeg Sun* says:

"There has been too much of this carpet-bagging business in the North-West, and to incompetent administration and delusive reports much of the present difficulty may be ascribed. Had the representatives of the Government in the North-West fully informed it, or taken the trouble to inform themselves of the real state of feeling there, measures for an enquiry into alleged wrongs would long ere this have been instituted, and preparations to meet an outbreak, which has been threatened for months back, would not have been deferred until the uprising took place."

The *Montreal Post* says, speaking of the Bill of Rights presented by the half-breeds:

"This Bill was presented to the Government at Ottawa, but it appears no action was taken upon it. This indifference to their demands has caused discontent to ripen into open revolt."

And then the *Montreal Herald*, the organ of the Independent party, with strong leanings towards the Government, says:

"If the Department of the Interior is not to remain a scandal to the Government, the Premier will find a new head for this, one of the most important branches of the Government operations. But this mismanagement does not justify the half-breed troubles; if it did, the whole country would be in revolt, and not a handful of half-breeds only, but several millions of people, would rise in rebellion."

The *Montreal Post* further says:

"It is for all these reasons that we hold that the interests of law and order should be tempered by an acknowledgment of acquired rights, and by a clemency compatible with the guarantees of the peace of the country in the future. Even at this late hour we believe that the Métis would lay down their arms, without any recourse to violence being necessary, if they could be persuaded that their claims would be honestly and fully investigated by an impartial commission, and granted wherever found legitimate. It is to the interests of the Confederation that this insurrection be brought to an end, without any fighting, if possible. We want no baptism of blood, as some of our warlike orators have yearned for, especially when it would be made to flow from the veins of our own people."

And then, Sir, let us see what the Conservative press, supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, the press that never wavers in its support, except, perhaps, when the life and the vitality of the nation are concerned. The *Toronto Mail*, before it was instructed to shift its ground, and place the responsibility, if possible, on the shoulders of the Liberal party, said:

"The half-breeds in the St. Laurent district complain that the Dominion has treated them badly and we think it has—"

Mr. MACKINTOSH. What was the date?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the hon. gentleman is curious on the subject, he will find it there.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Was it correspondence?

Mr. CAMERON. No. The date is the 24th March, 1885.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Editorial?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not sure; but I suppose the *Mail* is responsible for what appears in its columns. It is an editorial, if that will gratify the hon. gentleman; I believe it is—in fact, I know it is.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You have just said you did not know.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Last March the *Mail* said that "the half-breeds of the St. Laurent district complain that the Dominion has treated them badly, and we think it has." Why did the Dominion Government treat them badly? What was the cause of it? What was the ground

of complaint? What were their grievances? Sir, if they had grievances, which were not rectified, the *Mail* was justified in saying that they were treated badly. There is a paper called *La Minerve*, edited, I understand, by a distinguished member of Parliament, not a supporter of the Opposition, not in sympathy with the Opposition, a trusted friend of the Government. Let us see what the editor of that paper says upon this question:

"If their grievances have not been redressed before this, fault lies with the Interior Department, and especially with certain autocrats of small dimensions, such as are always found in this Department. The Department of the Interior, against whom they rise, is, to speak frankly, the cause of these disturbances. It depended upon it to have had all these difficulties arranged long ago. It has preferred to treat the Métis like pariahs, preferring even Mennonites to those who were the first settlers of the country. Let the Department of the Interior bear the responsibility of its own actions."

When we find this devoted friend and supporter of the Government, as late as last March, pointing out to the Government in the strongest possible language, that half-breeds who had taken up arms, against this Government, were not to blame, that the blame and the responsibility for the insurrection rested with the Department of the Interior, and certain autocrats of small dimensions in that Department, is there any difficulty in fixing the responsibility for this outbreak upon the proper shoulders? The *Winnipeg Times*, as far back as August, 1884, said:

"Among a small band of half-breeds in the Prince Arthur settlement there is a feeling of dissatisfaction with the conditions offered them by the Government agents with regard to homesteads."

The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 9th February last, before the insurrection broke out, said:

"That the Government should promptly recognise the claims of half-breeds, as was done in the Province of Manitoba, and thus determine a question calculated to disturb the present development of the country."

That paper is taken in the office of the Department of the Interior, and the head and the officials of that Department must have been conversant with it. Another paper I quote from is called *La Presse*. I am told it is an organ of a prominent member of the Administration—that it lives and moves and has its being by the smiles and support and the aid of the hon. Secretary of State. Let us see what this Minister has to say in this question:

"In the first place, we must have a Minister of the Interior who has the vigor necessary for the discharge of the duties of his office, and not, as we have had for a year past a valetudinarian, who believes that he has done his duty by adjourning the settlement of every difficulty."

That is the opinion of the organ of the hon. Secretary of State, speaking of one of his own colleagues. Another paper, which I believe is also controlled and inspired by the same worthy official, *L'Événement*, says:

"We have no wish for recrimination; far less have we the least desire to justify rebellion. On the contrary, we demand that order be re-established by the most vigorous measures of which the resources of Canada will admit. But we should, at the same time, fail in our duty if we did not express our wish to see Sir John very soon inviting a younger and more active element to take part in the management of public affairs. On this point the sentiment of the country is all but unanimous, and the Premier will take account of this if he show his ordinary adroitness. At this moment the vital energies of the Conservative party are inactive, to the certain injury of that party as well as of Canada."

Such are the opinions of the press controlled by a member of the Government. This paper declare that sir John A. Macdonald, the First Minister of this Dominion, is surrounded by officials who, are unfit for their places, and the interests of the Conservative party are suffering in consequence. Not a word about the interests of the unfortunate half-breeds of the North-West Territories. Let us see what the paper controlled by the junior member for the city of Ottawa says on this subject:

"We must take into consideration the impatience and soreness of these poor people, so long neglected, forgotten, despised and scoffed at. The Department of the Interior, against whom they rise, is, to speak frankly, the cause of these disturbances. It depended upon it to have all these difficulties arranged long ago. It has preferred to treat the Métis like pariahs, preferring even the Mennonites to those who were the first

settlers of the country. Let the Department of the Interior bear the responsibility of its own actions."

And yet, Sir, the hon. First Minister of this Dominion sits in this House, and declares that the half-breeds have no grievances and that he has no responsibility, while his own organs, written for or inspired by his own supporters, to his right, to his left, and behind him, declare in the face of day, that if there has been an insurrection in the North-West Territories, and life has been lost and blood spilt, upon the shoulders of the Administration of the day must rest the responsibility. Let us see what the *Mail* newspaper says on this subject:

"Of course, it must be obvious that men do not take up arms, and fight and kill, and risk being hanged and shot, like Riel and his followers, without, at least, a conviction that they have grievances. These grievances will have to be heard some day, and the sooner the public understands them the better."

So say I. So says every man in Canada to-day, who looks over the western horizon and sees the difficulties, the trials, the hardships, the blood and the death of these half-breeds. Had hon. gentlemen been alive to the gravity of the situation, and investigated those grievances and redressed those wrongs, there would have been no rebellion. The *Mail* newspaper truly says that men do not take up arms and risk being shot or hanged for nothing. Where there is smoke you may rest pretty well assured there is same fire, where there is a rebellion you may rest pretty well assured there is something to provoke a rebellion. The *Winnipeg Times*, speaking on the same subject, on the 27th of March last, says:

"The half-breeds will be well satisfied, however, if they obtain the patents for the farms which they have been cultivating all these years, with grants of 240 acres for those among them who have not taken up lands. M. Ouseigneur Grandin, the Roman Catholic Bishop of that region, supports the Bill of Rights to that extent, and so do the vast majority of the English-speaking settlers."

Up to the very eve of the breaking out of the rebellion this Government remained inactive, never moved. Had they only conceded to the half-breeds what they are prepared to concede to them now, the half-breeds would at once have laid down their arms. Let us see what *L'Étendard*, another organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, says on this subject:

"But still we must look for the causes of the rising \* \* \* Their attitude may not be justifiable, but may yet be excusable, at least, in a measure. It is always permissible, and sometimes it is a matter of equity, and even a duty, to plead extenuating circumstances. Their cause may be a much better one than it looks at first sight. They are, perhaps, hated for their French origin and their Catholic faith. It is not impossible that they have been persecuted for our sakes. These are two reasons that should make it a duty of honor and loyalty for us to accept a share of fellowship in their situation."

The correspondent of the *Mail*, writing from Batoche, the scene of the recent engagement, on the 23rd June, with the facts before his eyes, writes as follows, with respect to the negligence of the Government:—

"I am not trying to excuse the Government's procrastination and delay in appointing the commission, but simply stating the fact, well known to every loyalist here, that the real authors of the insurrection were intelligent white men, possessed, to an inordinate degree, by the evil spirit of partisanship."

So clear was the negligence, the misconduct of the Administration, that even the correspondent of the *Mail* would not undertake to justify the delay of the Government in appointing the commission, and the *Mail* correspondent, on the same day, again says:

"Non issue of scrip to half-breeds. I have no hesitation in saying that the half-breeds of the North-West are equally entitled to scrip as were those in Manitoba; and it was unfortunate that the Government commission was so long delayed."

*La Minerve* further says:

"We condemn the behavior and actions of Riel and his companions. But on the other hand we must not exaggerate their range, while it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that the grievances of the Métis are serious. If their grievances have not been redressed before this, the fault lies with Messieurs of the Department of the Interior, and especially with certain autocrats of small dimensions, such as are always found in this Department."

And then *La Minerve* quotes from the *Mail* newspaper, in which it is acknowledged that, from the treatment the Indians received, it was not to be wondered at if they should become turbulent. *La Minerve* goes on to say :

"In reference to the claims discussed at the end of the last paragraph, our *confère* adds that 'the Department of the Interior is busy arranging these, but this takes times.' It would undoubtedly have taken a good deal less time if it had concerned the Icelanders, the Russian Menonites, and the other hordes imported at a great expense, at our expense, into the Canadian North-West, that North-West discovered, founded, colonised and peopled by the ancestors of those very rebels whom these people now wish to treat in such a high-handed fashion.

"Our Toronto *confère* (the *Mail*), as we have seen, is far from thinking the claims of the Métis unjust or unreasonable. Quite the contrary. It explains, and explains perfectly, the legitimate grievances. All the mischief, however, it thinks, has arisen from this, that these poor people, so ill-treated, driven to desperation, 'losing patience,' to use the phrase of the *Mail*—losing patience after having waited so long in the expectation of getting justice—have overpassed legal limits. But, again we repeat, they have not been the only offenders, and the Department of the Interior would be better employed in crying *mea culpa* than in counselling the despatch of troops to massacre the rebels.

"We are not in the Soudan, thank God, and they are in the wrong who wish to treat the Métis as if they were the disciples of the Mahdi."

The correspondent of the *Mail* at Batoche, on the 22nd of June, 1885, says :

"The Métis were in the gloomy frame of mind I have tried to depict, and the Interior Department exasperated them still more by neglecting to comply with their legitimate demand for scrip or homesteads."

The *Mail* newspaper correspondent here published to the world that the Department exasperated these men by the refusal to consider their claims or to give them the scrip they were entitled to—by refusing to deal with them fairly and justly. Such are the opinions of the independent press of the country, with respect to the condition of the half-breeds in the North-West, and such are the opinions expressed by the press of hon. gentlemen, with respect to these grievances, and the action of the Government in relation thereto. What did the Government do, with regard to these complaints of the half-breeds? Did the Government investigate them? or settle them? Did the Government rectify the wrongs? adjust the grievances? No, Sir; they did nothing of the kind. It was only when uneasiness, dissatisfaction and discontent assumed the most threatening attitude; it was only when the half-breeds were on the eve of breaking out into open rebellion; it was only when the half-breeds, unable to secure redress for their grievances, sought the aid of Riel, their old commander and leader; it was only when Riel, traitor as he was, was induced by the half-breeds to leave the United States and lead them—it was only when all these things occurred that this incompetent Government aroused itself and then only partially, to a true sense of the danger of the situation. What did the Government do? Instead of appointing a man competent to adjust these claims and redress these wrongs, they appointed a man who, as the First Minister admitted the other day, though he might be a good man, in many respects, was utterly unfit for the position. He could not speak a word of French or Cree, and yet he was sent to make an enquiry into the grievances of the French half-breeds of the North-West Territories. He reported, 21st October:

"The claims at St. Laurent, on the south branch of the Saskatchewan, were not personally investigated by me, as the greater portion of the claimants spoke only French, and I would have required an interpreter."

This was an extraordinary thing for the First Minister to do. If the First Minister desired to have these grievances investigated, honestly and promptly, he ought not to have appointed a man to investigate them who could not speak a word of Cree or French. Mr. Pearce, more honest than those who employed him, admitted his incompetency. What did the Government do? They did nothing. What the Government ought to have done, what men of judgment would have done, was to have sent to investigate

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

these claims a Frenchman, or a half-breed, a man who understood the temper, the peculiarities and the prejudices of the half-breeds. A man who could conciliate the half-breeds, a man in whom the half-breeds had confidence could have settled these claims in a week. But the golden moment was lost. Mr. Pearce made a report on the 21st October. Even then the First Minister did nothing. From the 21st October to the 19th March, when the rebellion broke out, the Government did not take the first step to enquire into the truth of the report, or take the first steps to investigate these grievances and redress these wrongs. It was only after the rebellion broke out, it was only after human life had been lost and human blood spilt, that they acted, by appointing a commission. But it was too late. Life was lost, blood was spilt; and in the words of the venerable Archbishop of St. Boniface: it was too late, too late, too late.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman who leads the Government to-night, should consent to an adjournment of the debate, as the the hour is late, and my hon. friend has still a good deal to say on the subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman had better go on and finish his speech.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am prepared to go on with my speech, but at this late hour I think we ought to adjourn, and I have no doubt that in any case the debate will be concluded to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that there are other members besides the hon. member for Huron who are to speak on this question, and we have no guarantee at all that we will finish to-morrow.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is unreasonable to attempt to force on the discussion to-night. I think three days is not too much to give to such an important question.

Mr. MILLS. The proposition for an adjournment is reasonable. This is a motion of censure upon the conduct of the Administration, and surely the latter do not want to force it on at this time of the morning. I do not know that there are many to speak on this side.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government do not desire to choke off discussion, but are anxious to have the decision of the House; and I think it is only fair that the hon. member should be allowed to finish his speech now.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not want to finish it now. I will undertake to be as brief as possible to-morrow. I will not take half or quarter of six hours, but I feel it is unjust to force me to go on now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not want to be unreasonable, but the Session has been so protracted that we must be careful not to lose time. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman will see, with us, that the discussion will be completed to-morrow night?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). For myself, as a humble member of the Opposition, my whole desire is that it should, and I believe it will, from what I have heard.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that can be done, on the understanding that the speeches on the Government side should be of moderate length. In that case, I have no doubt that we can close the debate to-morrow. I agree entirely with the hon. member that it is very desirable the Session should come to a close, but I do not think myself that we could very fairly say that three days for the discussion of this question were too much.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think, if it were understood on both sides of the House that the discussion should be brought to a close to-morrow night, we might agree to adjourn. I think that is fair. Therefore, whether the hon. gentleman finishes his speech this evening or not, it will not make much difference, if he finishes it to-morrow. Therefore, we will say that to-morrow this discussion shall come to a close, and we will take a vote and go into committee.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed, to and the House adjourned at 1:30 a.m., Wednesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. GIROUARD. I rise to a question of privilege. In the report in the *Montreal Times* of the debate of last night, it is stated:

"Mr. Girouard followed, speaking for six hours. He said nothing in particular, and it was said his speech was made in consequence of a wager that he could speak as long as Mr. Blake."

When the hon. member for West Huron spoke last evening I happened to be absent at the time he made this statement. The statement is altogether untrue, and upon its face it has the appearance of falsehood. I am astonished the hon. gentleman should have started that statement. I have nothing to add.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not stated a question of privilege, as he should have done. All questions of privilege should, strictly speaking, be concluded with a motion. The hon. gentleman has not stated what the question of privilege is.

Mr. GIROUARD. It may not be a question of privilege, but it is a personal explanation.

Mr. BLAKE. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I never made the statement.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. If the hon. gentleman wishes to correct any statement the hon. member for West Huron has made, so soon as that hon. gentleman has concluded his speech the hon. member will be in a position to do it.

Mr. BOWELL. When the Orders of the Day are called every member has a right to call attention to any inaccuracy or misstatements which may have been made. I am not surprised that the leader of the Opposition should try, in a case of this kind, to prevent a member from correcting a statement which has gone forth to the world, that the hon. gentleman made a bet that he would make a speech longer than the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Girouard) cannot now correct the statement made by the hon. member for West Huron. He should wait until the hon. gentleman

has concluded his speech. It is not a question of privilege to rise, on the Orders of the Day being called, and proceed to correct a statement made by an hon. member, but on the conclusion of the hon. gentleman's speech the hon. gentleman can make a personal explanation.

Mr. GIROUARD. The statement has already gone to the press, and that is the reason why I made the explanation.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot allow the statement of the Minister of Customs to pass without replying to it. I have in no way endeavored to prevent the hon. gentleman making a statement. I declared his statement was out of order, and that such an explanation could only be made when the hon. member for West Huron had concluded his speech; and therefore, so far from seeking to prevent the hon. gentleman making an explanation at the proper time, I was pointing out the proper time to make it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman has no right to reply.

Mr. ORTON. I rise to a question of privilege. I feel, as a private member of this House, that I have a serious grievance to complain of, in regard to the very subject brought up just now. I maintain that the course pursued by the leader of the Opposition, not only on this but on other occasions, and followed also by other hon. members, of reading extracts from newspapers, from country newspapers, whose opinions are of no importance to this House, which course is a gross breach of privilege—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. ORTON. If I am not in order, I will move the adjournment of the House, in order to speak on this question. It is a matter of the greatest importance. The representatives of the people are not sent here to remain on the back benches and listen to long extracts read by members of the House. It is a gross breach of the privileges of the House when such a course is pursued. It has been pursued, not only by the leader of the Opposition, in one instance, but on many occasions. We have seen the hon. gentleman read whole speeches. Not only has the example of the leader of the Opposition been followed by members on his own side, but I regret to say that the same course has been followed, in some instances, by members sitting on this side. I do not refer more to members on one side than on the other side, except that the grievance complained of has occurred more from the Opposition benches than from this side of the House. I was not present during the discussion on the Franchise Bill; but from the proceedings which I read in *Hansard*, I find that the business of the House was obstructed by reading from books, by members getting books out of the Library and reading them for a length of time. I maintain that on such a question as this, relating to the North-West troubles, it is important to have the views of members who are, perhaps, more intimately connected with the North-West than is the leader of the Government or other members who have spoken. But they are debarred, and will not have an opportunity of speaking. The member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) said that all the time he would occupy was one quarter of that occupied by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). But after speaking one hour and a-half he moved the adjournment of the House, in order that he might commence again. If we can judge from the large bundle of documents I have seen him dragging round the House to-day, we must expect to have to submit—if he is allowed to go on—to hearing extracts read again for three or four hours. I maintain this is a gross wrong on Parliament. The Marquis of Salisbury, the other day, in making a state-

ment in regard to the foreign policy of the British Empire, occupied only half an hour. It is a well known fact that in the British House of Commons it is not usual for the leader of the Government to make long speeches, or even for the leader of the Opposition to make outrageously long speeches. If members cannot say all they desire to say in one hour, they have a very bad case. If it requires seven hours for the leader of the Opposition to prove charges of wrong-doing against the Government, it is the strongest evidence that his case was a bad one, and required no end of subtle logic to give even the appearance of wrong-doing on the part of the Government. I desire to say something upon this question; and as I shall never have another opportunity, I intend to seize the opportunity thus afforded to speak on the question of the North-West troubles. I know, if I do not speak now —

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is in order to interrupt a speech which is going on. The member for Centre Wellington said he was going to move the adjournment of the House, otherwise his remarks would not have been in order.

Mr. ORTON. I move the adjournment of the House, seconded by Mr. Hesson.

Mr. GIROUARD. I only wish to add one word upon this motion. As I was out of order it appears, a moment ago, I rise for the sole purpose of stating that what the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) said yesterday, and what the newspapers have said, that I had made a bet to speak as long as Mr. Blake, is untrue and absurd.

Motion lost.

Mr. DAWSON. I beg leave to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the *Port Arthur Herald* of the 27th of June, affecting two members of this House, and as it is short, I shall read it:

"We publish below a letter just received from Mr. Macmaster, the representative of Glengarry, and the gentleman who had so much to say the other day in the discussion on the Franchise Bill, about the Highlanders of Scotland. It will be seen that even he, Tory as he is, is trying to get justice done us by the Dominion Government. It seems that Mr. Dawson who has been sent to represent us in the councils of this Dominion, has very little to say or do for us.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA, 19th June, 1885.

'JAMES CONNIE, Esq., Port Arthur, Ont.

"MY DEAR CONNIE.—Your favor of the 8th instant has been duly received. As you seemed very urgent, I immediately saw Mr. Dawson, and after discussing with him for some time on the prospects of the late disputed territory, touching upon the question of the Thunder Bay Railway you mentioned, at which Mr. Dawson rather laughed. He appeared to be free in the discussion, and when asked what were the prospects of its being built, shook his head and remarked that money was too scarce for any more railway building for a number of years. I asked him why the Dominion Government was not asked to grant aid. To this he said it is useless to expect anything while they are so oppressed with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the late rebellion in the North West. I asked him also if he had discussed the matter with the Minister of Railways, Mr. Pope. He evaded the question, remarking that there was not much use talking to the Dominion Ministers about provincial matters, and expressed himself as though he thought that the only source from which aid would be given would be the Province, as that was the proper source from which to receive it, it being a provincial road. He appeared to regret the action of our Government in passing the Act of 1883. This, I think, gives you an idea as you requested, of Mr. Dawson's position as regards your little railway, and I will add myself, that he is utterly powerless to assist in obtaining money or credit for a road, at Ottawa.

"I am pleased to hear of your entrance into politics, but I am sorry to find you in the Grit camp, as I was always under the impression that you were strictly neutral, or had Conservative leanings. However, it will not destroy the old friendship that has existed between us so long.

"I am exceedingly anxious to get away home, this Session seems interminable.

"Yours very truly,

"L. McMASTER."

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this letter, I have simply to say that no such conversation as therein indicated ever occurred between the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McMaster) and myself. The hon. member for Glengarry is now in his place, and he will be able to explain what the character of the letter is.

Mr. MACMASTER. Mr. Speaker, this letter is entirely a novelty to me. The only portion with which I am in entire sympathy is: "I am exceedingly anxious to go home, this Session seems interminable. I may say that this letter was not written by me. I had no conversation

Mr. ORTON.

with the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) or with the Hon. Mr. Pope, respecting the subject matters of this letter, and it is, indeed, a combination of fiction, falsehood and forgery, from beginning to end.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The *Ottawa Free Press* of yesterday has the following:—

"Two of the Cabinet members are related to men who obtained an Order in Council granting to them the very lands to which the half-breeds sealed their belief in their just claims, by shedding their life's blood. The names of the promoters of the Prince Albert colonisation company and the Cabinet Minister who passed the Order in Council granting them the half-breeds lands with the right of ejection, will go down to all time as fit terms for the hissing and reproach of posterity."

In the first place, let me just say that so far as the Prince Albert Colonisation Company is concerned, the names of the parties connected with the company are all in the Order in Council. The company obtained the lands some three years ago. They gave the Government, I think, 20,000 and some odd dollars. The land, when they got it, was not surveyed; they did not take possession of the land, but they sent in an agent there. They knew nothing about the settlers being on the lands, until Mr. Stephenson, the Government inspector of colonisation companies, went up there and made a report to the Government, that there were some thirty settlers on the land. As soon as the company learned that, they called their members together, and they appointed a committee to wait on the Minister, which was done. That committee was composed of Mr. Hugh Sutherland, President of the company; N. B. Falkner, barrister, Belleville; Mr. David Gilmore of Trenton, and myself. We had nothing whatever to do with negotiating with any of the persons there; we were willing to leave that entirely in the hands of the Government. The company said: We are so earnest in this matter that we will take back our money without interest, or we will take lands in some other section of the country at a fair price. That was the statement made to the Minister. There has been nothing done in regard to those settlers; and I say there is no half-breed, or Indian, or Englishman, or Irishman, or Scotchman—there is no living man can say that the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, directly or indirectly, insulted them or put them off, or interfered with them in any way. So far as I am personally concerned, I can wait until Mr. Sutherland the Member for Selkirk, is here, when he can make a statement publicly of my connection with the company, and then hon. gentlemen will see that we have done nothing, directly or indirectly, that is unfair or unjust to the House of Commons, to the Government, to the country, or to the parties in that section of the country. I make this statement, and I hope it will satisfy the leader of the Opposition. I am quite willing to wait and risk my reputation for the next 12 months that Mr. Sutherland will endorse it if he is, at the end of that time, a member of the House. The men who sent me here know me, and I leave all to them; and I hope that any gentleman who doubts my statement will go over to the Department and ascertain for himself whether it is correct or not. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to make this statement.

Mr. McLELAN. May I be allowed, on behalf of the Cabinet Minister who is charged with instructing the Company to eject persons from lands held by colonisation companies, to deny that charge, and to say that no such authority has ever been given either to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, or to any other colonisation company, either by the Minister of the Interior or by any other Cabinet Minister, or by the Cabinet as a Whole. The instructions are the very reverse, that people must not be disturbed when they are found settled on colonisation companies' lands.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I desire to rise to a question of privilege. I find the following article in the *Ottawa Citizen* of this morning:

"Mr. James Somerville, M.P., is never happy unless when playing the sneak and the spy in the hope of injuring his brother journalists. In the House of Commons the other day he took up the question of Government printing, which he dealt with in his characteristically disingenuous way. Among the journals that received attention at his hands was the *Hamilton Spectator*. He charged that the *Spectator* had been paid for work it never performed, and with receiving double prices for presswork. The *Spectator* replies under the heading, 'A Common Slanderer':

"Somerville says what he knows to be false. Double prices were not paid for presswork. The *Spectator* was paid at prices fixed by the Mackenzie Government. The *Spectator* was not paid for presswork never performed; and Somerville does not believe or think it was. Ten cents is not the price paid for any presswork under any Government contract whatever; and Somerville knows it is not. The man is a deliberate falsifier; and only hopes to commend himself to the Grits of Auncaster by libelling respectable people."

Now, if these statements were true, I think you will agree with me that they would be sufficient to discredit anything I might say in this House at any future time; but I wish to show, in as few words as possible, that there is not one word of truth in the statement made by the *Hamilton Spectator*. I will just analyse the paragraph as shortly as possible. In the first place—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman's word will be taken by the House. I think this is not a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman will see that it will open up a debate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I have the contract here, and I shall quote just one line.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can do that on a motion for adjournment, or on some motion before the House; but the hon. gentleman's statement is quite sufficient for the House, and will be accepted by the House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I will take another opportunity to do so.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. That motion cannot be put; it has just been put. The hon. gentleman may bring up the matter to-night when the motion for adjournment is made. It will be in order then.

Mr. BOWELL. It was not my intention to pay the slightest attention to the reference made by the leader of the Opposition to myself in connection with this matter of the Prince Albert colonisation company had not my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White) brought it under the notice of the House. I desire, however, to put the hon. gentleman right so far as Mr. Jamieson and myself are concerned. I wish it to be distinctly understood, at the same time, that I do not desire the House to think that the statement made by the hon. gentleman was from his own knowledge, but upon information which is not correct. I understand the disingenuous way in which Mr. Jamieson's name was introduced, as well as that of the Minister of Customs. I desire to say on behalf of Mr. Jamieson that he had nothing to do with the selecting of the land. After the Order in Council was obtained, he paid \$500 in cash to a gentleman who was interested in the company for whatever rights he had. When the company was organised, I spoke to him in reference to the matter, and having some interest in the young gentleman, I advised him by all means to get out of the company as fast as he could, and if he could get his money out, the sooner he did it the better for himself pecuniarily. That is my connection with that company, and if it was a crime for me to advise one in whom I took some interest not to have anything to do with the colonisation company, I am quite willing to bear all the odium attached either to the formation of the company or the advice I gave to Mr. Jamieson. I am not prepared to deny that I did not know that the company was being organised. I necessarily knew that, having been a member of the Government when the order was passed.

#### TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Customs whether the view expressed by the Premier the other day with respect to the effect of the recent regulation published by the American authorities, has been confirmed; or has he any other information on the subject?

Mr. BOWELL. I have been making enquiry with reference to the effect of that order on the trade of the country. I telegraphed to Washington for a correct copy of the order, which has not yet been received; but from the information we can obtain, the telegraphic despatch has no other bearing on the trade of the country than that which the leader of the Government stated, that is, that it repeals, so far as we can understand it, that portion of the Washington Treaty, which gave the right to shippers in vessels from American ports in the west, to tranship their cargo at the west end of the Welland Canal, and have it reshipped to the east on board vessels for American ports. Under the old regulations, and under the coasting law, that action was considered by the American authorities to be a breach of the coasting law; but under the Washington Treaty special provision was given for the benefit of this trade to be carried on from the west to the eastern ports of the United States. I hope, however, to be able to-morrow, or next day, to give a positive answer to the question.

Mr. BLAKE. I doubt whether that is done under the Washington Treaty; I think it was an executive regulation of the United States after the Washington Treaty had been made. I suppose it was a spontaneous manifestation of good will by the American Government after the treaty was made, as I suppose the withdrawing of the regulation is an expression of the same good will. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he will be prepared to-day to lay on the Table all the correspondence with the Newfoundland Government on the subject of the recent interruption in our trade relations, which has taken place partly by our action and partly by their action. It seems to me it is very important we should have that correspondence at the earliest possible date. The subject has been in agitation, more or less, for several months; in fact, ever since our legislation which created this reciprocal hostile legislation. I cannot conceive there should not have been some communications earlier than July or June, and at any rate there has been, within the last few days, correspondence resulting in the effort, by the suspension of the duty which our Government has imposed, to restore friendly trade relations. We should have all the papers before us, so that we may have an opportunity of looking at them before the Session closes. I hope also we will have no further delay in the presentation of papers concerning the fisheries. It was stated that His Excellency would return to-day, and I trust the delay, which has been very great in the production of the papers, will not be protracted one instant more than necessary.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say when I will be able to lay on the Table correspondence between the Newfoundland and this Government. I believe there has been no correspondence other than that by telegraph. In reference to the fishery papers, I will call the First Minister's attention to the matter. They will be laid on the Table as soon as possible, according to the promise made by the First Minister.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—NORTH-WEST INSURRECTION

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Bowell to go into Committee on Ways and Means, and motion of Mr. Blake in amendment thereto.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before the adjournment I pointed out that the half-breeds of the North-West

Territory had grievances which existed for years, grievances which the Government of this country had over and over again neglected to redress; grievances which the Government knew had existed for at least seven long weary years; grievances which the Government had promised, over and over again, to redress, until hope deferred had made the heart of the half-breed sick, until, despairing of getting redress at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, the half-breeds took up arms against the sovereign power of the Dominion; grievances which the Government neglected to investigate until that neglected culminated in open rebellion. It is true the hon. the Secretary of State, in his letter of the 6th of June last, addressed to the Frenchmen of Fall River, in the State of Massachusetts, contained this declaration:

"If the half-breeds had serious grievances against the Canadian Government the ordinary channel of petition was open to them as to all free citizens. They did not avail themselves of it. If their petitions were not listened to by the Government, they had the right, as free citizens, to enter upon a constitutional agitation, and to induce their friends in Parliament to make known their grievances, their abandonment, their protestation. They did not do this. They knew they had devoted friends in the Privy Council, in the House, in the press; they did not appear to apply to them, nor for their support."

In this letter the Secretary of State exhibits an extraordinary—an unpardonable amount of ignorance, with respect to the condition of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories, with respect to their claims, with respect to their grievances, with respect to their long and persistent efforts to induce the Government to investigate their grievances and to redress their wrongs. The Secretary of State is steeped to the very lips in ignorance on this subject, in ignorance as to the countless petitions, remonstrances and memorials that the half-breeds of the North-West Territories had, for the period of seven years, presented, year in and year out, in season and out of season, to the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman, in his letter, part of which I have just read, poses as a friend of the half-breeds. He said that in the Privy Council there are friends of the half-breeds, that he himself is a friend of the half-breeds; and yet that hon. gentleman, up to the 6th of June last, knew absolutely nothing of the condition of the half-breeds, his own friends, knew absolutely nothing of the grievances of the half-breeds, his own friends, knew absolutely nothing of the demands of the half-breeds, his own friends, knew absolutely nothing of their claims, petitions and memorials, many of which have been submitted to Parliament, and all of which are teeming with petitions unanswered, memorials treated with contempt remonstrances unheeded wrongs unredressed. This friend of the half-breeds, this hon. gentleman, high in the council of his Sovereign, who ought to know something of the condition of public affairs, and who was bound to listen to the complaints and the grievances of his friends the half-breeds, knows absolutely nothing about their condition. He says there were no petitions, no memorials, no agitation. This young, aspiring, ambitious, Minister of the Crown, who abandoned the politics of his own native Province to obtain a seat in the Parliament of Canada and a seat at Her Majesty's Privy Council Board in the Dominion, was too careless, too neglectful of the interest of his friends to examine the mass of documents, petitions, memorials and remonstrances which were to be found in the office of his own chief in order to make himself conversant with the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories; he was too careless, too neglectful, too indifferent to their claims, to master the mass of documents dealing with this question which have been submitted to Parliament by the First Minister. When we find this trusted friend of the half-breeds so ignorant as to their claims and grievances; when we find him so reckless and careless as to their wrongs, need we be at all surprised that the half-breed should have taken up arms against the constituted authorities of the Dominion. As I pointed out the half-breeds of the North-West Territories had grievances which ought to have been considered and

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

redressed. The hon. member for Jacques-Cartier, in his 6½ hours speech, admitted in the opening sentences, that the half-breeds had grievances; the leader of the Government admitted that they made many complaints, some of which were well founded. It has been established, as a fact, by a mass of testimony simply startling, that the half-breeds had grievances, the redress of which they have been persistently demanding and demanding in vain for seven long years. Passing from the half-breeds, I say that the white settlers had grievances which remained unredressed, and many of which were similar to the grievances of the half-breeds. They complained that their rights as settlers were not recognised by the Government; secondly, that settlement and improvements made prior to 1881, when the land office was opened in Prince Albert district, were not recognised by the Government; thirdly, they complained that for years, after all the settlements duties far in excess of the requirements of the law had been performed by the settlers, they could not get their patents; fourth, that their petitions and remonstrances and demands for redress were treated with indifference and silent contempt; fifth, they complained of the uncertain and vacillating and extraordinary policy pursued by the Department with reference to the claims of the settlers. Let us see what those claims were. I regret that I cannot gratify the hon. member for Centre Wellington; it is necessary, in the discussion of a case of this kind, to read extracts. I propose to read but few, taken from the public documents submitted to Parliament. I find, with respect to the claims of the white settlers in the Prince Albert district, in the Saskatchewan Valley and the neighboring districts, that the following facts exist. Prior to 1876, a large number of immigrants had settled on the lands in the Prince Albert district. Mr. Pearce, one of the Land Commissioners for the North-West, estimates the number at 300 settlers. Many of these settlers, if not all of them, settled upon their land in 1876, and between 1876 and the opening of the land office at Prince Albert in the middle of 1881. According to law, these settlers were entitled to have their claims recognised and their patents issued to them three years after they had occupied the land as actual and *bona fide* settlers. On the 29th November, 1879, Mr. Lindsay Russell, the Surveyor General, wrote to George Duck, the land agent at Prince Albert, directing him to post up a notice that squatting on land and improvements made on land should not precede entry in the land office, and that such squatting would not be recognised—in other words, that entry in the land office only would constitute a claim that the Government were bound to recognise. On the 12th September, 1881, two years after this order was posted up by Mr. Duck at Prince Albert, Mr. Burgess, now Deputy Minister of the Interior, wrote to Mr. Duck that the notice of the 28th November, 1879, was a mistake, and ought not to have been issued. It appears, on some incomprehensible reason known to no man, the law on the subject was misread and misunderstood in the Department of the Interior, and hence the issuing of the Order of the 29th November, 1879. This notice of the 12th September, 1881, that is the notice countermanding the notice of the 29th November, 1879, never reached the agent, or, if it did reach him, it was mislaid, and therefore he was not in a position to countermand the notice issued two years before. On the 25th October, 1882, exactly three years after the notice prohibiting settlement was posted up, the agent wrote to the Minister of the Interior that no settler had made application to him for a patent, because he would not be entitled to a patent under the Order of the 29th November, 1879, under which occupation only counted from the day upon which the entry was made. Under these absurd orders issued by the Department, no settler could obtain a patent for his

land except at the expiration of three years from the day of his entry in the land office. The land might have been occupied for 20 years, improvements far in excess of those required by law might have been made, valuable improvements and valuable erections might have been made, and yet the settler, though living on the land for a period far in excess of the period required by law was not entitled to get his patent. I say this absurd order was not the fault of the settler. It was the fault of the Government; it was the fault of the Department of the Interior. These men remained upon their land, many of them, from 1876 down to 1881, when the office was opened. Some of them remain on their land up to this hour. But up to 1884, not one of these white settlers in the Prince Albert district could obtain from the Government a patent for the land. The incomprehensible policy which ruled the Department, the vacillating and uncertain action of the Minister, the changing and wholly inconsistent orders that issued from the Department, puzzled the agent at Prince Albert, and worried, harassed, and annoyed the actual settlers. In 1882, those outraged and aggrieved settlers petitioned the Government and complained that the land office was not opened at Prince Albert until the middle of 1881 and on that account entries could not be made; that a large number of settlers had located lands then surveyed; that these settlers had been then living on and cultivating these lands for years before the office opened; that they could not get their claims as settlers recognised and could not get their patents for 3 years after 1881 and praying for redress. They got no redress. For years their claims were treated with indifference and contempt by the Government of this country. On the 27th February, 1883, the agent at Prince Albert again drew the attention of the Government to the fact that these settlers could not get their patents owing to the notice of the 29th November, 1879, that settlement prior to entry did not count. Mr. Pearce, the land inspector, who appears to have been making some investigation on the subject, on the 12th September, 1883, presented a report to Mr. Walsh, the Chief Land Commissioner for the North-West, and in that report he states that there were about 300 settlers at Prince Albert whose occupation was prior to the opening of the land office, that these men could not get their titles on account of the notice of the 29th November, 1879, and he recommends that their claims should be recognised. He also pointed out that it was of the greatest possible importance to the settlers of that district, and in fact to the Government, to the peace and prosperity of the country, that these claims should be recognised. This report was transmitted to the Minister of the Interior by Mr. Walsh, on the 12th September, 1883, so that, at that early period, the Government had abundant notice of these claims. That they had this notice is manifest because, on the 18th October, 1883, the Secretary of the Department acknowledged the receipt of the letter and intimated that the notice of the 29th November, 1879, was all wrong, that the settlers were misled, and that on proof of settlement they were entitled to the issue of their patents. But nothing was done. The Government never moved or took the first step except to give that intimation. That the Government had abundant notice of these grievances of the early settlers at Prince Albert is shown by the fact that, on the 3rd October, 1881, the *Saskatchewan Herald* called the attention of the Government to those grievances. On the 8th October, 1881, a meeting of the settlers was held in which resolutions were passed setting forth the grievances, and these resolutions were transmitted to the Government. On the 9th October, 1883, the North-West Council complained that titles to land occupied over three years by actual settlers were not recognised by the Government. On the 21st January, 1884, a meeting of the settlers of Prince Albert was held to discuss the grievances. A petition was

signed at that meeting and handed to Mr. Pearce, and was no doubt sent by him to the Government. In February, 1884, a meeting of settlers was held at Colleston's School House, and the proceedings were transmitted to the Government. But again I say that, through the incomprehensible policy which has guided the Department of the Interior, the claims of these white settlers were practically ignored. A correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette*, dealing with this subject says:

"The parties who have been on the lands for years have been unable, it is said to procure patents, and speculators and others who have given fees to persons who have influence have obtained deeds, and in many cases taken the lands over the heads of the first settlers, who had improved them for 15 or 18 years, and that was the real cause of the trouble."

My hon. friend from West Durham, pointed out as a typical case the case of Mr. Thomas Miller. It is a case of gross hardship. I think, if that is a typical case, one of 300, one need not be surprised if difficulty, uneasiness, dissatisfaction, turbulence and ultimately something more than turbulence did occur. I do not propose to discuss this point, because my hon. friend has referred to it at length so that the House understands it. Now, Sir, the *Mail* newspaper declared, not very long ago, that people do not take up arms without cause, that there must be some cause for an armed insurrection. People do not complain without cause; and you know, Mr. Speaker, in the words of a great French statesman, that whenever the people complain, the people are always in the right. Now, Sir, the fact that the people of the North-West Territories have been persistently, for the last seven or eight years, complaining of the inaction of this Government with reference to their condition proves pretty conclusively that the people of the North-West Territories have ground of complaint, and that those complaints are not of recent origin. I say that you cannot, upon the spur of the moment, in an instant of time, induce an intelligent class of settlers in any country to become turbulent, rebellious, and ultimately to take up arms against the constituted authorities. Now, we find that just about the time of the outbreak in the North-West Territories, the white settlers in the Calgary district, a district which is a very considerable distance from the scene of the late unfortunate disaster, held a public meeting complaining of the inaction of the Government of Canada in dealing with the complaints of the settlers. That meeting was held at the house of John Glen, eight miles from Calgary, and at that meeting an association was formed, called:

"The Alberta Rights Association, with the following as officers:—President, Samuel Livingstone; Vice-President, John Glenn; Secretary, S. W. Shaw. It was decided to demand from the Government the immediate settlement of land claims, the granting of representation, and the allowance of half-breed claims. The following telegram was sent to Sir John A. Macdonald:

"A meeting of settlers of this district was held to-day, at John Glen's. The meeting was called by private invitation. At such meeting the following resolution was passed unanimously: 'That whereas a number of townships about Calgary are not open for settlement which are now largely settled, and many of the settlers have resided on such lands over three years, and have made more than sufficient improvements to entitle them to patents, and have made repeated demands at the land office for entry, which has been refused; and, whereas leases cover a large tract of land, near Calgary, fit for settlement, and a number of settlers have settled on these leases; and, whereas a number of leases have been granted, and no cattle or sheep were put on them; and whereas it is absolutely necessary that this country be represented at Ottawa, without delay, as we are now governed by agents who are interested in misgoverning this country; and, whereas settlers cannot bring cattle in without paying duty, and leaseholders can do so without tax; be it resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting, it is necessary that all the townships about Calgary be immediately thrown open for homesteads and settlement, and that parties who have complied with the terms of the Dominion Lands Act as to residence and improvements have their patents granted immediately, and that all leases, the terms and conditions of which have not been complied with, be cancelled, and the land thrown open for homestead entry; and that all the lands suitable for agricultural purposes or leases now granted be thrown open for entry and settlement; also that the settlers importing cattle into the country be put on the same footing as leaseholders, and also, that this meeting regrets that the Bill introduced to give representation to the North-West Territory in the Dominion Parliament has been defeated, and would strongly impress upon the Government the absolute necessity of a Government measure being introduced and passed this present Session, having that object in view as the only means of quieting the present discontent among the settlers in the Territories, and of properly governing them, and that the Government, without taking a census, has sufficient information to warrant a measure for representation, and this meeting would press immediate action in this regard to prevent a repetition of the trouble which now unhappily exists in these Territories; and

It is further resolved, that the half-breeds in these Territories are entitled to, and should receive the same privileges as regards lands as have already been conceded to their brethren in Manitoba."

"I send this by the request of the meeting. A memorandum of grievances goes forward by next mail, with over two hundred signatures. In case of refusal of the demands, the question of resorting to arms and joining the half-breeds was moved. One speaker said that if we are refused we will get behind our Winchesters. The President said the only difference between a settler and a wild animal in this country was that the wild animal had a close season, whereas the settler was hunted at all seasons, either by the police, Government officials, or ranchmen. The half-breeds are greatly pleased with the resolutions, and intend to join the association. A manifesto is to follow the telegram to Sir John. This feeling has been maturing for some time, and it is believed to be more serious than it seems."

Sir, following up the proceedings of that meeting, a petition was prepared and transmitted to the Government at Ottawa, wherein it is urged by the petitioners :

"1. That we, Her Majesty's loyal subjects, residing in the North-West Territories of Canada, are entitled to the same rights and privileges as freemen, both in regard to the tenure of the soil, and representative institutions, as are enjoyed by our brethren in the other colonies of the empire.

"2. That these rights and privileges have hitherto been denied to us for, as we consider, very insufficient reasons.

"3. That some of us have been residing upon our homesteads, and have made improvements thereon, for a much longer period than that required by the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act, and have conformed to all the conditions thereof, but have as yet been unable to procure our patents, the result of which has been that settlers have been debarr'd and discouraged from making on their uncertain holdings the improvements necessary for their comfort and success, and we wish to impress in the most forcible manner upon the Government the irritating and mischievous result of this most unreasonable and unaccountable delay in giving legal ownership to those peaceable settlers who, by their assiduous compliance with the conditions of settlement, are entitled to the same. We require, therefore, from the Government, that patents for these lands be at once issued to those entitled to receive them.

"4. That large tracts of land in the district of Alberta are now nominally under lease (a considerable quantity of which is fit for agricultural purposes) the terms and conditions of which leases have not been complied with. We require that these leases be immediately cancelled, and the lands included in them, and also in all other leases already granted, upon which settlers may wish to locate, should be opened for entry and settlement.

"5. We are of opinion that the half-breeds of the North-West Territories are entitled to the same rights and privileges as have already been conceded to their brethren in Manitoba. And we most earnestly impress upon the Government the necessity of granting these privileges as the only way of removing the present discontent, and of quieting the disturbances which have already unhappily arisen in these Territories.

"6. We have heard with great regret of the rejection of a measure introduced into the Dominion Parliament providing for the representation of these Territories in that body, and we would wish strongly to impress upon the Government the fact that nothing short of immediate representation in Parliament will satisfy the people of these Territories.

Now, Sir, I say that the proceedings at this public meeting, held by British subjects, living under the British flag under the protection which the Government of this country are bound to afford them, are entitled to every consideration at the hands of this Government. So far as appears by the papers brought down, they have received no consideration at the hands of this Government. The Government have been inactive, they have not moved, they have done nothing, they have allowed these grievances to go uninvestigated and these wrongs to remain unredressed. I find that the correspondence of the *Mail* newspaper of the 17th April, 1885, which states :

"By far the most serious complaint, however, is based upon the idea that in some way or other the settler "has no show" with outsiders, who obtain possession of lands which he, as a squatter, has improved and built upon. This, I take it, is the core of all the discontent and disaffection among whites and half-breeds alike; but of the truth or falsity of it I am not in a position to speak from any personal knowledge."

The *Toronto Telegram* says :

"But we may be sure that all those who are discontented in the North-West are not half-breeds with fraudulent claims. Even white settlers have complained that they could not get their land patents, so many officials having fallen victims to the land fever."

Sir, it is quite clear from these papers, and from the statements I have read that the half-breeds in the North-West Territories have grievances that have remained unredressed, that settlers have had for a long series of years, grievances of the most important character, that the Government of the country failed to recognise or consider. I now proceed to discuss for a few moments another class of the population in the North-West Territories deserving the careful consideration of the Parliament of Canada—I refer to the Indians. I would not have entered at length upon the discussion of this question had not the hon. member who pre-

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

ceded me declared in his place in Parliament, that the Indians of the North-West Territories had been treated with the utmost consideration by the Government of this country, that they had no claims, no grievances, nothing to complain of, no wrongs to redress. Sir, I propose to make it abundantly clear that the Indians in the North-West Territories had a cause of complaint, that they did complain to this Government, and that the public press of the North-West Territories, writing in the interests of our common humanity, complained to this Government, that the Indians in many cases were starved to death, and in many cases, frozen to death through the negligence of this Government; that the Indian was neglected, robbed, and cheated, that he was swindled by the employes of this Government appointed to administer the affairs of this country in the North-West Territories, and that this misconduct was connived at by the Government. Sir, on the 14th March, 1884, the *Moose Jaw News*, writing of the condition of the Indians in that neighborhood says :

"In this connection the case of several Indian families in this vicinity may be cited. A friend driving by one, a few days ago, was given to understand that death had been in their midst. On entering the tepee a pitiable sight was discovered. Starvation was visible in their countenances, and a glance sufficed to show the cause of the warrior's death. One can hardly imagine how they had lived at all. The canvas of the tent was old and torn. Not a vestige of anything edible was to be seen, but a few rabbit-skins lying around showed what had composed their last meal. Everything in the way of blankets was under or over the dead braves. Around a cheerless fire were huddled an Indian and three or four squaws. They stated that they had been without food for two days, and appearances would go to prove the truth of their assertion. Can we in this enlightened age, allow scenes like this to take place in our midst without uttering an indignant protest to the proper authorities? Would these Indians have left their reserves, and run the risk of starvation if they were sure of being supplied with the necessities of life there?"

The *Quebec Mercury* says :

"Could this rising of the Indians in the North-West have been prevented? There is, at this early hour of the rebellion, a difference of opinion on the subject; but it does not prevent some from thinking that the Department of Interior at Ottawa, who have charge of the Indian reserves, must have been dreadfully dilatory in their attention to Indian and half-breed matters. \* \* \* In this city there is a feeling among the English and French that the Indians had a grievance, and it should have been settled."

The *Moose Jaw News*, on the 13th June, 1884, discussing the injury inflicted by this Government on Chief Piapot in compelling him to remain on a swampy and unhealthy reserve and declining to change it for one of a more healthy character says :

"But even this will be utterly insufficient to wipe out the past. Its record will remain a foul blot in our history. The sufferings of the Indians in the Assiniboia reserves during the past winter are a burning shame to us, a lasting reproach to our Government. What would be thought of us in England, or in any other christian country, were it clearly understood that for weeks large bands of Indians, the wards of the nation, poor, wretched creatures, whose primitive sources of supply had been cut off by our invasion, and whom we were bound by solemn treaty, as well as by every consideration of justice and humanity, to feed and care for, were dying by scores, partly from semi-starvation and partly from disease resulting from the bad quality of the food supplied by the agents! It is no excuse to say that the facts were not known. Why were they not known? Were there not high officials whose first duty it was to know the facts? If it should prove that the want of knowledge, or to the fearful ravages of scurvy, were due in any degree to a petty economy which dispensed with the services of a competent medical inspector in order to save his fees, this would be an aggravation of the guilt of those responsible for it.

"We write thus strongly because we feel strongly on this subject. It is a subject on which every Canadian and every settler in the North-West in particular, is in duty bound to feel strongly. As we have before pointed out, the gravest issues, involving not only the paramount claims of humanity and right, but also the security of life and property, are wrapped up in the maintenance of friendly relations and good faith with the aborigines.

"We do not remember to have met with a settler from the neighborhood in which those events occurred, who has not sympathized with Piapot and admitted that, however wrong-headed and cantankerous the chief may have shown himself on other occasions, he is, in this instance, the injured party. We have returned to the matter because it is of the first importance that the record of last winter's treatment of the Indians should be thoroughly examined, and such measures taken as will render the recurrence of such scenes impossible."

Let anyone take up the Public Accounts, the report of Indian Affairs and the Mounted Police reports and he will see how those Indians were treated, whom the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Girouard) declared last night were well treated and had no ground of complaint, what will he find? He will find that the Indians were to get beef, for which the Government contracted with responsible men in the

North-West at 13½ cents per lb., that the Government through their officials in the North-West supplied them with pork at 23 cents a lb. The Indians were to obtain beef which was contracted for at 13½ cents per lb., and yet because some friend of the Government had pork in the North-West which he wished to get rid of, the Government sanctioned the purchase of his pork for the Indians at 23 cents a lb. Yet we are told the Indians had nothing to complain of. The policy of starvation was the policy of the First Minister of the Dominion. He declared his policy was that the Indians should be reduced to submission by starvation. Four years ago in his place in Parliament the First Minister, with all the responsibilities of his high position resting on his shoulders, declared that the policy of his Government was one of reducing the Indians of the North-West to a state of submission by a state of starvation. I quote from the discussion on the Estimates, in 1880, the hon. gentleman's words:

"I must say, however, that it was a dangerous thing to commence the system of feeding the Indians."

It was not a dangerous thing to induce the Indians to surrender their possessory rights in the North-West, but it was a dangerous thing to continue to feed the Indians.

"So long as they know they can rely, or believe they can rely, on any source whatever for their food, they make no effort to support themselves. We have to guard against that, and the only way to guard against it is by being rigid, even stingy, in the distribution of food, and require absolute proof of starvation before distributing it."

That was the policy announced by the First Minister four years ago—that before food is distributed to Indians the Government must have positive proof that the Indians are in a condition verging on starvation. That indeed is the policy declared by the First Minister in his place in Parliament not long ago. The hon. gentleman said:

"When Louis Riel was sent for last summer, he was sent for by these poor people, suffering from hunger; because, while we went to a large expenditure in keeping them, we did not give them such a quantity of food as would make them hang around the different stations and become habitual beggars. We kept them on short rations, on short allowances, and we tried to force them—I am speaking now of the Indians—and we have forced them upon their reserves."

That was the policy. I say it is clear from the reports of the Department of Indian Affairs, by the Mounted Police reports and other official papers, as well as from the press, that the Indians have been systematically robbed and swindled by the officers and middlemen who furnished the supplies to the Indians. This fact has for years been well known to the Government, and no steps have been taken to remedy the wrong. As a general rule, the Indian is easily controlled, easily managed by those in whom he has confidence. Those who keep faith with the Indian can rely on him. But the moment you break faith with the Indian he becomes faithless, turbulent, treacherous, and rebellious, as we have seen in the recent outbreak. The Government have broken faith with the Indian. They induced him to surrender to the Crown his possessory rights to the North-West on the faith of certain promises made. Those promises have been violated. The Government agents have deceived the Indian, broken faith with him and lied to him, and in the recent outbreak we have seen the terrible results. The First Minister, the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, has been aware of this condition of things for years. The Government have been warned of the Indian discontent by officials, by the public press and in every possible way by residents of the North-West, and yet the Government did nothing to avert disaster and death to the whites surrounded by roving bands of uncivilised Indians. Take up the reports of the Indian Department and Mounted Police reports, and you will find abundant evidence of violated promises, breach of faith and gross fraud. And now, Sir, I will quote from the public reports brought to Parliament by hon. gentlemen opposite—from official sources, and I say if these reports can be relied upon, the condition of affairs in the North-West Territories with respect to the Indians, is a condition of affairs which would not be tolerated in any christian

country. C. E. Denney, Indian agent, in his report for 1882, speaking of one Grant, an agent over the Sarcees and Stoneys at Calgary, says:

"I was obliged to discharge Mr. Grant, who has been in charge of that agency, owing to grave irregularities."

In other words, this man who was entrusted by this Government to deal fairly and honestly with the Indians, broke faith with them, violated this duty, misled them, defrauded them, and he was dismissed and nothing more. It was only the Indians who were defrauded, and Grant was simply dismissed without investigation and without punishment, although the matter was drawn to the attention of the First Minister through his own agent. T. P. Wadsworth, superintendent of Indian agencies, in his report for 1882—speaking of the Rivière du Barre Indians, says:

"That the flour and bacon received as supplies was bad and that the flour received by the Indians at Battleford, had become lumpy."

Mr. Wadsworth in his report for 1883, speaking of the Indians in Sekaskoots reserve, says:

"I could get no account of the supplies sent in by the contractors or the Government."

He further says:

"That the flour received by those Indians only average 83 pounds per sack."

And again speaking in the same report of Poundmaker's band, he says:

"That the flour was inferior and of light weight."

Here we have positive evidences of fraud. The Indians were supplied with flour which was light in weight and inferior in quality, and yet the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs never took the first step to redress these wrongs, or bring the guilty to justice. We must recollect that we are under treaty obligations with these Indians, to supply them with certain articles at a given time, of a given quality and quantity. We failed in discharging our duty in that respect, and the consequences were serious. A. McKay, the Indian agent at Grand Rapids, in his report for 1882, speaking of the Island Band, says:

"That the inspector of Indian agencies promised to supply them with all they might require and that they were urged by that agent to make their demands on the Department for the same." That they did do but the supplies were not sent.

Mr. E. McColl, inspector of agencies, in his report for 1882, speaking of the Swan Lake Band, says:

"That waggons, etc. were promised these Indians and that he was apprehensive of serious consequences unless their claims were recognised."

Mr. A. McDonald, the Indian agent under Treaty No. 4, in his report in 1882, publishes a letter from Poundmaker to Dewdney in which Poundmaker says:

"It is Poundmaker who takes the liberty of sending you a few lines. He entreats your Honor to send him the grist mill with horse power you so kindly promised him at Cypress. We expected it last summer but in vain."

This letter was written in November, 1882, and two years before that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs had promised these supplies to the old chief, but he had neglected to give them. He had deceived him, and lied to him, and the result was that the Indians had lost all confidence in the Indian Commissioner. J. McRae, the Indian agent at Carlton, in his report for 1882, speaking of Okenasis' Band, says:

"The chief says, and Mr. Tompkins corroborates his statement, that Mr. Wadsworth, the inspector, promised him a large lumber wagon last fall, and broke his promise."

L. W. Herchmer, in his report for 1883, speaking of the Sioux at Bird Tail Creek, says:

"A great deal of sickness has visited them lately, caused by the want of fresh meat."

W. Pocklington, in his report for 1883, speaking of the Stoneys, says,

"During last winter there was a great deal of distress among them for want of clothing, many of them not having a blanket to cover their nakedness."

T. P. Wadsworth, in his report for 1883, speaking of Day Star's Band, says:

"That the chief complained that he could not get his treaty pigs and that he wanted more oxen, a tool chest and milk pans."

He also reports:

"That Mistowasis' Band and Ah-tah-ka-Koops band did not get their treaty pigs and he recommends that they do get them."

He further reports that:

"Bobtail's Band complained that there was still due them under the treaty a cow and bull."

He further reports that:

"Ermine Skins Band complained that there was due them under the treaty a mower and some carts."

Now recollect that all these articles were articles which we were bound to supply the Indians under treaty obligation, and that the officials of the Government criminally neglected to supply them, and they neglected to do so with the full knowledge and connivance of this Administration. I say it is no wonder that the Indians should become dissatisfied, discontented and turbulent; Commissioner McLeod, in 1879, says:

"I have experienced great difficulty, (with the distress and suffering from hunger) applications for relief being constantly made to me by the starving bands of Indians."

Again:

"A Stoney Indian and his family had been without food for many days."

Superintendent Walsh, in 1880, says of the Sioux:

"Hunger and suffering prevailed. In some places persons became so reduced as to be unable to help themselves. The want of food, followed by disease, caused an epidemic—which marked its results by the many graves now to be seen in Wood Mountain."

The breach of faith, the violated promises, the broken pledges of this Government to the Indians, the fraud, the misconduct, the robbing, and the cheating, are all marked by the graves of the Indians in the mountains of the West. And this is the condition of affairs which the First Minister of this country considers the proper condition of affairs with respect to the Indians. Inspector Dickens says in January, 1884.

"Gladstone said he never saw Indians in such a state before."

Commissioner Irvine, in his report in 1882, says:

"For a considerable time they made no demand for aid from the Government, but as the cold weather came on, being very poorly clad, and insufficiently supplied with food, they experienced much hardship from exposure and starvation."

Why, Sir, the First Minister is carrying out his policy of reducing the Indians to submission by absolute starvation. Again, Mr. Irvine reports:

"A report of the acute sufferings of these Indians was embodied in a report by Surgeon Jukes, forwarded to you in October last."

Again, in 1882:

"I would call your attention to the fact that, in a letter of the 20th May last, I impressed upon the Government the importance of the Indians being well received in the north, also the fulfilment of all treaty obligations."

On the 17th October, 1884, Inspector Dickens writes the officer commanding Mounted Police, Battleford:

"That Little Poplar insisted on the dismissal of the Indian agents, and good men appointed in their place. That Big Bear complained that the Government had broken faith with the Indians; that they were not paid enough, and were starved."

I say, Sir, if these reports are correct—and we have no reason to doubt their correctness—if these uncivilised wards of the nation—these Indians with whom you have broken faith, whom you were bound to feed, but whom you permit to be starved—if they became turbulent and rebellious, if they were easily led to take up arms against the Government and the people of this Dominion, we need

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

not be surprised. These poor helpless wards of the nation, these roaming bands of barbarians, are entitled to every consideration at the hands of the people of this country. In their case the strong arm of the law has reduced them to subjection. In their case justice must be tempered with mercy. The real culprits are the men who committed the wrongs, who were guilty of the misconduct, the fraud, the cheating, and the swindling of the Indians; and the Government of this country who for years have connived at all these crimes. The people of this country, I say, must deal with these men in a spirit of justice, but that justice must be tempered with mercy. But what should we say of the Government who have tolerated such things? They deserve at the hands of the people of this country the very severest condemnation. Now, I have pointed out that not only were these Indians—if the reports are to be believed—robbed, cheated, and defrauded, but by reason of this cheating and defrauding, they became discontented, dissatisfied and turbulent, and were thus very easily led to take up arms against the sovereign power of this country. I propose to prove now, from the reports brought down to Parliament, that such was the case. I make the statement openly, boldly and without fear of successful contradiction—and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to contradict it—that for the last four years, by reason of the scandalous treatment of the Indians at the hands of the Government, they became uneasy, dissatisfied, discontented, and turbulent, and ready at any moment to break out into open rebellion against the Government of this country. In his own report for 1882 the First Minister says:

"In the Battleford district, some of the Indians have proved very obstructive."

A. McKay, one of the agents, speaking of the Berin's River Indians, says:

"They complain of a want of supplies. They further complain because they received no grain from the Department in 1882."

Mr. McColl, inspector of Indian agencies, in his report in 1882, speaking of the Indians at Swan Lake, says:

"The agent there was apprehensive of serious consequences, unless their claims to their former possessions were immediately recognised by the Government."

C. E. Denney, Indian agent at Fort McLeod, in his report for 1882, speaking of the Blackfeet Indians, says:

"The Blackfeet are in a most troublesome mood."

And again:

"I found the Blackfeet willing to work had they received assistance, but they have been badly neglected, and in consequence are very wild and unsettled."

Who treated them badly? The white settlers in the North-West? There is no such complaint; it was the officials appointed by this Government. The Government were notified of this fact by one of their own agents three years ago, and the documents submitted to Parliament do not show that the First Minister, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, ever raised a finger to redress these wrongs. T. P. Wadsworth, in his report for 1882, speaking of the Eagle Hills Indians, says:

"They are restless now."

A. McDonald, the Indian agent, under Treaty No. 4, publishes in his report for 1882, a letter from Chief Poundmaker to Chief Commissioner Dewdney, in which Poundmaker says:

"There is to day a great distress in my band; their rations are suspended now for 41 days, and of course everybody is busy roving about and hunting."

And then the proud old chief pathetically says:

"It is impossible to work on our empty stomachs."

Sir, why should they work on an empty stomach. The Parliament of Canada has dealt liberally by the Indians. We have voted over a \$1,000,000 a year for the purpose of supplying them with the necessaries of life. That was more than enough to keep them in comfort if these supplies had honestly reached their destination; but they have not; there is the clearest possible proof that the middlemen and agents in the North-West have defrauded and cheated the Indians without a word of complaint from the Government of this Dominion. The First Minister, in his report for 1883, says:

"The Indians in the Edmonton district are dissatisfied, because an error was committed in not furnishing them with the necessary number of implements and cattle."

Who committed the error? Why was the error committed? Why should these wild men of the plain, who are entitled to every consideration at our hands, and whom we are bound to protect, be deprived of the supplies to which they are entitled under the treaties we have made with them? The First Minister further reports respecting the Cree Band at Bird Tail Creek:

"This band has shown an indisposition to work, and have become violent."

L. W. Herchmer, an Indian agent, in his report for 1883, speaking of Way-way-se, Cappo and Gamble's Bands, says:

"They have become particularly independent, and have undertaken to compel me to give them what they require. Gambler's Band was also very independent. However, both these bands can get work if they require it; and a little starvation will do them good."

Such is the report of the hon. gentleman's agent—these ignorant, uncivilised, untamed barbarians of the plains, with whom we have broken faith, and whom we have allowed to be robbed, will improve by starvation. This is the treatment the agents of this Government mete out to the Indians, and the treatment the Agent General of Indian Affairs thinks the proper treatment, and with such treatment we expect the Indians to submit to us and respect us. W. Anderson, Indian agent at Edmonton, speaking in his report for 1883, of the Indians in that locality, says:

"As a general rule, the Indians of this locality have been quiet and soberly, although I perceived a feeling of discontent at different times."

W. Pocklington, Indian sub-agent at Blackfoot Crossing, in his report for 1883, says:

"Nearly all last winter they gave me constant trouble, by interfering with white men, and wounding horses. Bulls Head and his band are again in trouble. The Sarcee Indians are the most troublesome in my district."

J. A. McRae, Indian agent, says of John Smith's Band:

"They are in a chronic state of discontent."

I find that the Calgary *Herald*, speaking of the Indians, makes use of the following words:—

"In regard to the Indians, it cannot be supposed that agrarian troubles agitate them much, nor is it probable that a desire for territorial acquisition is a very powerful motive for casting in their lot with the half-breeds. It may seem a paltry reason, but if the agitating cause amongst the breeds is the approximation of "hard times," it will not be considered surprising by those who know anything about the Indians, if a lack of Government tobacco and tea were not the agitating cause with them."

Then, if you refer to the Report of the Mounted Police, you will find the following condition of affairs reported. Col. Macleod says, in 1879:

"In March complaints were made to me by cattle drivers that the Indians were killing their cattle; from that time until the annual payments, in October, similar reports and complaints were almost daily coming in."

Again, Mr. Macleod reports:

"During the year many sensational reports were in circulation of intended risings of the Indians in rebellion."

Again, he says:

"The Sioux, who numbered about 200 lodges, were at first quite excited, and a few of them purposed to attack the fort."

Superintendent Walker says, in his report of 1879:

"In February last I received intelligence that Chief Beardy of Duck Lake and his band of Indians had threatened several times to break into Stobar, Eden & Co.'s store, and help themselves to the Indian stores there."

Commissioner Irvine, in his report for 1880, says:

"This Indian population, too, will, irrespective of the aid received from Government, be a starving race, a dangerous class, requiring nerve as well as care in handling."

This report was made in 1880. I am not aware that the Government took the first step to see that those Indians who were said to be in a starving condition, and required most careful supervision were properly looked after. Again, Superintendent Walker says, speaking of the Indians at Battleford and the Saskatchewan:

"This district embraces a vast section of country, which, in some places, is becoming settled; and is inhabited by say, 2,000 Indians of different tribes, many of whom have, at various times, given much trouble and been the cause of great anxiety."

And again, speaking of the Sarcees, he says:

"During the past month some difficulty was experienced with the Sarcee Indians at Fort Calgary. It appears that they threatened to help themselves to Government rations."

Superintendent Winder, in his report for 1880, says of the Blackfeet:

"About the middle of June, Patterson, the man in charge of the Indians at Blackfoot Crossing, reported to Mr. McLeod, the agent, that he was having considerable difficulty with them."

Commissioner Irvine, in his report for 1881, says:

"Considerable difficulty was experienced in inducing the Indians at Fort Walsh to accept their treaty survey. They conducted themselves in a disorderly manner."

Again, in 1881, he says:

"You will have learnt that during the present winter considerable trouble was experienced on the Blackfeet reservation at the Blackfoot Crossing."

Again, in 1882, he says, speaking of Wood Mountain Indians and some disputes they had with one Legarrie:

"During the night, Mr. Legarrie heard the Indians in council arranging to kill him. But the arrangements were changed and it was decided to allow Legarrie and his party to eat once more before killing them. Legarrie expected every moment to be killed. The noise was fearful, some crying for the scalps of the whole party, others only wishing to kill the Teton Sioux."

Commissioner Irvine, in his report for 1883, says:

"In the month of July, the Indian Agent at Edmonton communicated with the officer commanding our post in that district, informing him of the exorbitant demands made by the Indians in a most overbearing manner."

Again, in 1883, the same commissioner reports:

"Reports had reached His Honor to the effect that the Indians on the reserves in that vicinity (Fort Pitt) were likely to give serious trouble."

Such was the condition of the Indians in the North-West Territories for the last four or five years—robbed, swindled, half-starved, frozen, although enough money had been voted by Parliament to keep them in comparative ease and comfort, had the supplies only honestly reached them. I say the Indian has been deprived of his rights, has not been properly treated, and that the Government is responsible for not having taken steps to see that he was properly treated. Under these circumstances is it to be wondered at that the Indian became rebellious? Another ground for complaint is the class of officials sent by the Government to administer the affairs of this country in the North-West Territories. Until the advent of the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, there were no complaints of wrong-doing, of cheating, and of fraud; there were no complaints of middle men capturing the supplies voted for the Indian, before they reached the Indians. The supplies voted by Parliament, I believe, honestly reached the Indian, and there were no complaints. But there is a different story to tell now. The Indians have no faith in the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; he has broken faith with them too often. He is domineering, arrogant, tyrannical, brusque in his manner towards them. His reputation is such that it has become proverbial in the North-West Territories, where he is known among the Indians as "the man with four tongues," as "the old to-morrow of the North-West." His unpopularity can be easily understood, when one considers his mode of dealing with the Indians. In 1882, commissioner had a conference with Pie-a-pot and his band, and at that conference, an extraordinary state of affairs was exhibited, in so far as

the commissioner was concerned. I have clipped from a newspaper an account of the meeting, and am going to trouble the House with it:

"In the summer of 1882, one of the most influential and powerful of the Cree chiefs, Pie-a-Pot was brought with his band at a very considerable expense from Cyprus Mountain to Fort Qu'Appelle with the expectation that he would go upon a reserve selected for him in that part of the country, as it was thought very desirable that he should be removed from close proximity to the United States frontier. Before going upon his reserve he bethought him of certain promises which had been made to him, but which had not up to that time been fulfilled, and he determined to have an interview with the Lieutenant Governor before committing himself further. There were many white men present at the interview which grew out of this resolve on the part of Pie-a-pot, and all must have been impressed with the very brusque and disrespectful manner in which the great chief was received by Her Majesty's representative. Pie-a-pot was repeatedly accused of lying, and that in a most offensive manner, but in each instance the weight of evidence appeared to be quite as much in his favor as in the Lieutenant Governor's. At length the chief said, 'I was promised a horse and buckboard, and I have not seen them yet.'

"Who promised you that?" brusquely demanded Mr. Dewdney.

"The man who is speaking to me," replied Pie-a-pot sneeringly.

"Not quite understanding the meaning of his answer, Mr. Dewdney repeated the question, upon which Pie-a-pot answered with very deliberate emphasis, pointing with his finger as he spoke, 'You made me that promise, and there is your own interpreter who heard you.'

"The interpreter, on being referred to, confirmed Pie-a-pot's statement, when the Lieutenant Governor, reddening, as well he might, made matters worse by saying:

"Well, if I made you that promise, it was on condition that you should do something for me."

"Yes," answered Pie-a-pot, "it was on condition that I would get Little Pine and Lucky Man to take the treaty, and perhaps you remember whether they did or not."

Now, be it remembered that when this pitiable exhibition of the veracity of the Lieutenant Governor was being made, a large number of the Qu'Appelle Indians were present, and it may well be guessed that such a circumstance did not go far toward strengthening their respect for the Government and its institutions.

I say that statement is absolutely correct, and yet this man is allowed to fill the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Not long ago I called the attention of the Government to the unfitness of Mr. Dewdney for the high position he holds, I was told by the First Minister that he was a reader of character, that he had known Mr. Dewdney for many long years and was satisfied that he had the right man in the right place. The hon. gentleman was not prepared to take the advice of anybody, but was determined to keep Mr. Dewdney in the position he now occupies, the responsible duties of which he is unfitted to exercise. His self-seeking, his brusque and uncourteous manner, his business transactions and relations in the North-West—all render him a man exceedingly dangerous to be kept in such an important position as that of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories and Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Government have been made aware of this over and over again; the press published in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite have frequently drawn attention to it. Let me read you what the *Winnipeg Times*, the favored organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, on the 5th January, 1883, said:

"But the cross of gold is not Mr. Dewdney's god. He is eminently a philanthropist. His delight is to advance the interests of the savage and promote the welfare of the more wretched white man under his sceptre. For example, when Long Lodge, chief of the Assiniboines, who were camping last summer near Indian Head, complained that the contractor's bacon, costing the Canadian taxpayers nineteen cents per pound, was not suitable to the Indian palate, the Indians feeding always on buffalo meat; when Long Lodge offered to accept half a pound of steer beef costing a York shilling a pound dead weight, in place of a pound of bacon costing nineteen cents; when Long Lodge said the bacon was 'hurting his people because it was not their food'—Mr. Dewdney said 'the Indians should eat the bacon or die, and be d—d to them.' This was not said in haste but at his honor's leisure. He did not say it because his friend the contractor, who happened to be in a land syndicate with him, had 90,000 pounds of that bacon to dispose of, but because he wished to indoctrinate the savage with the tastes of the average white man. Mr. Dewdney, let Piapot witness, is the Indian's friend. To the white man also he sets a noble example. He teaches the raw settler a new code of morals. He shows him by precept and example that in these degenerated days it is not necessary for a man holding a trust not to abuse it. He illustrates in his own walk and life the modern principle that every man should fight for his own wallet. He is, in this great country, the most signal exemplar of the science of how to get along regardless of the means or methods of locomotion. Mr. Dewdney, therefore, deserves well at our hands and at the hands of the Indians of these Territories. It would hardly be appropriate to present him with a home-stead, for he has several, also pre-emptions in abundance. Money would also be out of place, inasmuch as while Sir Leonard has a surplus and Sir John remains in power, he will not want. Could anything be more appropriate than to present him with a petition to leave, to get out, to go elsewhere and teach other Indians and other white men the ethics of grab, greed, and shamelessness which he has introduced here?"

This is an article from the press supporting hon. gentlemen, and, notwithstanding this warning, and in defiance of the Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

protests of the friends of the Government, this man has been retained in his place. Notwithstanding these solemn protests, these warnings, these direct and specific charges against Governor and Indian Commissioner Dewdney, he continues in office. The consequences have been serious to the country. What services has this man rendered to the Government of the country that the peace, the progress, the prosperity of the North-West, and the lives of the white settlers in the North-West should be jeopardised in order that Governor Dewdney might fill two offices and draw two salaries. It cannot be on account of his courage, because everyone who knows anything about the North-West knows that it has passed into a proverb in that country that, the moment there is anything like Indian discontent, Governor Dewdney is found in the city of Winnipeg. Let us see what the *Minerve* says, not of Governor Dewdney, but of the head of this Department:

"If their grievances have not been redressed before, the fault lies with the Interior Department. \* \* \* The Department of the Interior, against whom they rise, is, to speak frankly, the cause of these disturbances. \* \* \* Let the Department of the Interior bear the responsibility of its own actions."

*La Presse*, the organ of the Secretary of State, dealing with this question of responsibility for the rebellion and who ought to be condemned, convicted and executed, declares that:

"After having avenged our national honor and restored peace, it will remain for us to study the line of conduct to be followed to prevent a repetition of similar catastrophes. In the first place we want a Minister of the Interior with sufficient strength to fulfil his duties."

A correspondent of the *Globe* of the 13th April, 1885, writing from the scene of action, says:

"The Indians were unfairly treated, and beginning to murmur, but he thought his personal popularity would be sufficient to protect him. While his own relations with Mr. Dewdney were cordial and pleasant he was almost alone in this respect. Mr. Dewdney was altogether too high and mighty for the settler. The settler had no grievances which he (the Lieutenant Governor) need trouble himself with, and so there was no getting near the seat of power. Still, all these disadvantages would be remedied in time, and the people felt if they were only permitted to live there they would persevere and things would right themselves ultimately."

The *Winnipeg Sun* says:

"The following resolution was put before a meeting held at Wolseley last week, called to form a home guard. It was moved by a leading Conservative: 'That it is the opinion of the meeting that it is now time for the Government to take decisive action, and that their first shall be that orders be issued to hang Riel to the first tree when he is caught, but if there must be delay that it shall only be long enough to capture Dewdney, and hang the two together.' The chairman refused to put the motion, but as it was seconded he was forced to do so, and it was carried."

Mr. John Stinson says:

"I left Qu'Appelle in December last, and this rebellion was quite an expected long before that time. Riel was back in the country in July last, and it was well known that he was agitating and organising for some mischief of this kind. But the authorities both in the North-West and at Ottawa disregarded all warnings and made no effort to stop the rebellion, as they should have done, before it assumed an organised form. If the half-breeds and Indians had received anything like just treatment there would have been nothing of this rebellion. But the powers that be by their action towards those people invited the rebellion. Governor Dewdney made promises to them which he did not fulfil. This is the reason that the Indians call Governor Dewdney and Sir John 'Old To-morrow,' the idea being that they never do anything they promise. They took more stock of truth than of any other virtue, hence to make them a promise and then break it wrecks their confidence. All the Indians and half-breeds and most of the whites dislike Governor Dewdney, and harmony cannot be attained without his removal."

Now I have shown you, I think, very clearly from public documents and other sources that the Indians of the North-West Territories have been badly treated. I have shown that, by reason of that treatment, they became dissatisfied, discontented and rebellious. I now propose for a few minutes to deal with another question. I say that it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentlemen opposite to say that this outbreak in the North-West Territory was unexpected, that it was without cause, that it was without warning, that it was an outbreak of which hon. gentleman had no notice, an outbreak wholly unpremeditated. I have shown you that the grievances complained of by the half-breeds of the North-West Territories and the Indians were grave and serious, they were of the first possible consequence to the parties interested, their prompt settlement was of the first possible consequence to the peace, good order, pro-

gress and prosperity of that country. Those grievances were drawn to the attention of this Government over and over again. In every way known to the people of any country, by petitions, by memorials, by remonstrances, by delegations, by resolutions passed at public meetings convened for the purpose of considering these grievances; and they were unheeded. What was the result? Those complaints, those grievances grappled with and settled? No, Sir, they were treated with indifference and contempt. Hon. gentlemen never moved, never took the first step, never paused to consider the dangerous condition in which the country was then placed, and so these unreasonable, these unjustifiable delays ended in bloodshed and loss of human life, neither of which would have happened had hon. gentleman been alive to the gravity of the situation, neither of which would have happened if hon. gentlemen had only paused to consider the brink upon which they were standing. The First Minister of this Dominion knew, or ought to have known, the temper, the peculiarities of the French half-breeds; the First Minister ought to have known the danger of trifling with the grievances of that element in our population; and the First Minister, knowing all this, recklessly, indifferently, and carelessly abstained from this investigation; and, if life has been lost and blood has been shed, upon the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite must rest the responsibility.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CAMERON. Hon. gentlemen howl and express their disapproval. We know that in ancient times when an ancient city was being reduced to ashes, the ruler of the country danced and fiddled. We know that on more than one occasion when the great interests of this country were being imperilled and voted away, they were imperilled and voted away amid the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite. And now, Sir, when we point out that hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for the terrible consequences that have succeeded their misconduct, they howl and cheer again. I propose to point out as shortly as I can, and chronologically, that this Government was thoroughly aware of the difficulties in the North-West Territories. In 1878, 122 half-breeds petitioned the North-West Council for a fair consideration of their grievances. They pointed out, among other things, that owing to the disappearance of the buffalo they had no means of subsistence, except a resort to tilling the soil. They pointed out that many of them were absent on the plains when the half-breeds of Manitoba were settled with, and that therefore they obtained no scrip entitling them to land; and praying for a redress of the wrongs complained of. On the 20th September, 1878, this petition was sent by Governor Laird to the Minister of the Interior. On the 20th November, the Deputy Minister of the Interior acknowledged the receipt of the document. In 1878 the half-breeds of St. Albert petitioned the Government for a survey of their lands according to their old holdings. I am not giving you the words of the petition, Mr. Speaker; I only give you the substance of these documents. On the 10th April, 1878, this petition was transmitted to the Minister of the Interior. In the same year the half-breeds of St. Laurent petitioned the Government to the same effect. On the 10th May, Mr. Mills, then Minister of the Interior, acknowledged the receipt of the petitions, and said they would receive consideration. Mr. Mills having resigned his office shortly afterwards, they could receive, of course, no consideration at the hands of the then Government. Upon the 2nd August, 1879, Mr. Ryan published a letter in a Winnipeg paper, pointing out clearly the grievances complained of by the half-breeds. On the 10th March, 1880, the Saskatchewan *Herald* pointed out to the Government the complaints made and the grievances complained of. On the 28th of February, 1880, the Saskatchewan *Herald*

published another article on the same subject. In the summer of 1881, the half-breeds of Qu'Appelle petitioned the Government that they should be treated in the same way as those of Manitoba had been. On the 20th September, Mr. Russell, Acting Surveyor General, acknowledged the receipt of that petition. In 1883, a delegation of half-breeds came all the way from the Saskatchewan Valley to visit the city of Ottawa and present their grievances and ask for redress at the hands of this Government. When the hon. member for West Durham drew the attention of the Government to the complaints of the settlers in the North-West Territories the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) said:

"We must remember that in 1870 nearly all the troubles that arose in the Red River settlement were due to the instructions or want of instructions given to surveyors who went out to survey the country, without taking into consideration that that country had been settled some five or six years before. Of course the population then became naturally suspicious as to what was taking place, and about the transfers of their lands, as well as the whole territory, to the Dominion Government without their being consulted. They naturally became excited over this bargain and stopped the surveyors. It is but natural that these half-breeds of the same stock, and sometimes of the same parentage, in the North-West, may have been a little suspicious about what was taking place during last summer in the Dominion surveys. But history is always of great assistance to Government, and in this case, I am happy to say, that the rights of these pioneers who have kept the country to Canada are being fully recognised by the Dominion Government."

Sir, for two years the Government of this Dominion did nothing to settle these claims. In June, 1884, Riel's letter acceding to the request of the half-breeds of Manitoba to place himself once more at their head, was published in a Winnipeg paper. In July, 1884, Mr. Isbister, a prominent and intelligent half-breed, published a letter, I think, in the *Winnipeg Sun*, pointing out the grievances of the half-breeds. On the 12th June, 1884, the Saskatchewan *Herald* pointedly drew the attention of the Government to the fact that Riel was again among the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan valley, and that there were breakers ahead. On the 9th August, 1884, the Saskatchewan *Herald* again discussed the claims of the half-breeds and the presence of Riel, and warned the Government of impending dangers. On the 22nd July, 1884, the Qu'Appelle *Vidette* pointed out that Riel was then among the half-breeds and that they would undoubtedly resort to arms unless their wrongs were promptly righted. On the 2nd June, 1885, Sir Alexander Campbell, in the Senate, admitted that between the 1st of January, 1879, and the 1st of March, 1885, Archbishop Taché, Bishop Grandin, and others in the North-West Territory, were in communication with the Government on the subject of these half-breed claims. On the 8th July, 1884, Captain Crozier telegraphed to the Controller of the Mounted Police at Ottawa, that Riel had arrived and was the leader of the half-breeds. On the 27th of July, 1884, Superintendent Crozier wrote to Colonel Irvine, who on the 2nd of August, 1884, sent this letter to the controller at Ottawa:

- "1. That meetings held by Riel at Battleford and Duck Lake, at which half-breeds and Indians were present.
- "2. That Riel told the Indians that they had rights as well as half-breeds.
- "3. That the Indians sympathised with half-breeds.
- "4. That precautionary measures should be taken by the Government as the Indians sympathised with the half-breeds, as was to be expected from their blood relationship.
- "5. That such precautionary measures should be such as would prevent these turbulent spirits from carrying their schemes to an extreme, but prevent both the Indians and half-breeds even making an attempt to resist authority or organise for illegal purposes.
- "6. That Big Bear and his followers would have remained on his reserve but for Riel."

On the 9th August, 1884, Crozier again wrote to the Controller that the Indians were in an uncertain condition, and this letter, on 21st August, was transmitted to the Department at Ottawa. On the 14th August, 1884, Crozier again writes:

"But there are a great many people through the country who have what they call grievances, and seem to agree with Riel."

On the 3rd July, 1884, the *Winnipeg Sun* pointed out to the Government that the Indians were becoming restless

and turbulent. On the 21st, 23rd and 24th June, 1884; and on the 22nd and 28th July, 1884, the *Times* discussed fully the condition of the Indians and pointed out their restless and discontented condition, and that danger might be apprehended. On the 2nd August, 1884, the *Edmonton Bulletin* also drew the attention of the Government to the condition of the Indians. On the 4th August, 1884, the *Times* declared that the half-breeds complained and not without cause. In September, 1884, the Bill of Rights embracing the claims of the half-breeds, was adopted at a public meeting of the half-breeds held at St. Laurent, and was transmitted to the Government. On the 21st of August, 1884, Sergeant Brooks writes to the officer commanding the North-West Mounted Police at Battleford:

"That Riel and Big Bear held a conference at Prince Albert a few days before this."

His letter was duly transmitted to Ottawa. On the 17th September, 1884, Sergt. Keenan wrote to the officer commanding the North-West Mounted Police at Battleford:

- "1. That on the 5th September, 1884, a meeting of half-breeds was held at St. Laurent.
- "2. That all the half-breeds in the surrounding settlement were there;
- "3. That the meeting was called to carry on the work and condemn the Government;
- "4. That Riel told him that the Ottawa Government had offered him seat in the North West Council or in the Dominion Senate."

On the 2nd October, 1884, this letter was transmitted by Captain Crozier to the controller of the police force at Ottawa. On the 26th September, 1884, Sergeant Keenan wrote to Captain Crozier at Battleford:

- "1. That Riel was holding frequent meetings among the half-breeds;
- "2. That at these meetings Riel's utterances were careful and cautious;
- "3. That at the private meetings of his committees very different language was used and different measures advocated;
- "4. That Charles Nolin, one of Riel's councillors, proposed that the half-breeds should make certain demands on the Government and that if these demands were not complied with they would take up arms once, and kill every white man they could find and incite the Indians to do the same."

On the 30th October, 1884, Captain Crozier wrote to the officer commanding the North-West Mounted Police at Regina:

"That Riel was drilling his men at St. Laurent and that a large meeting was held there at midnight on the 12th October, 1884.

This was sent to the Government at Ottawa. On the 31st December, 1884, Inspector Howe wrote to Captain Crozier:

"On the 9th December, 1884, there was a large meeting of the half-breeds held at St. Laurent for the purpose of again talking over the Bill of rights; that Riel proposed to McDowall, a member of the North-West Council, that he would leave the country if he got \$5,000."

This letter was transmitted to the Government at Ottawa. On the 2nd December, 1884, Superintendent Gagnon wrote to Crozier:

"That in the month of November, 1884, several meetings of half-breeds were held at St. Laurent and Batoche, at which petitions were prepared and signed by the half-breeds and sent to Ottawa, insisting on their Bill of rights."

On the 10th March, 1885, a telegram was sent from the police force at Regina to the Controller at Ottawa:

"Half-breeds excited. Move about more than usual. Preparing arms. Do not know cause or object of these preparations."

On the 11th March, 1885, Crozier telegraphs:

"Half-breeds greatly excited. Reported that they threaten attack on Carlton before 16th. Half-breeds to take freight or employment from the Government. Will stop all freight coming into the country after 16th of this month. Getting arms ready. Leader will not allow people to leave home, as they may be required."

In the Mounted Police reports brought down on 23rd June, 1885, Col. Irvine reports that the Blackfeet, Pi-a-Pot's Band, the Man-that-took-the-Coat's Band and Dry Lodges Band, were turbulent and hard to manage. That the Indians broke into the supply store; that 20 Mounted Police went to arrest the offenders; that they could not do it; that Pi-a-Pot's and other bands had to be overcome, and only succeeded in doing it with 57 Mounted Police and a 7-pounder. That horses were stolen and men killed, and that several of the bands were on the war-path. The reports of Department of Indian Affairs and Mounted Police from 1879 to Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

1885 are teeming with these uninvestigated grievances, these unredressed wrongs, the complaints of the half-breeds and Indians, the uneasy, dissatisfied condition of half-breeds and Indians, their threatening and dangerous attitude. And yet we are told that there were no grievances uninvestigated, no wrongs unredressed, no complaints and no causes of complaints, that the settlers, the half-breeds and the Indians were satisfied. The Government had abundant notice of the grievances of the half-breeds in the North-West. They had abundant notice of the complaints and grievances of white settlers in the North-West. Those notices were sent to them over and over again. They were repeated month after month, and year after year, as is manifested from the papers submitted to Parliament, to which the hon. member for West Durham has referred. I will not, therefore, repeat them, but I will only say this, that the hon. gentleman has on more than one occasion drawn the attention of the Government to the unsatisfactory condition of affairs in the North-West. I have pointed out over and over again to the Government that their policy of procrastination, of delay, of not promptly dealing with wrongs complained of would be fatal to the peace, progress and prosperity of the North-West and would ultimately end in bloodshed. The Government appeared to be wholly indifferent. In order to remedy some of the grievances, I introduced a Bill in this House giving settlers in the North-West Territories representation in the Parliament of Canada; and I failed in that respect. I say again, that the papers submitted to Parliament contain the clearest possible indications of the discontent existing in the North-West. I propose to give one or two short extracts from newspapers to indicate this condition of affairs. The *Saskatchewan Herald* on October 31st says:—

"That Little Poplar came from the South (i. e. the United States) in the hope being able to stir up trouble."

The *Mail*, editorially says:

"That dissatisfaction has existed among the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan country for years past is undeniable. They complain, as we have before explained, that while the Metis of Manitoba were given grants of 240 acres under the Act of 1870, their claims have been ignored; and they say, with equal truth, that the Government should at least give them free patents for the farms which they have been cultivating, and compensation for disturbance in cases where the Dominion surveyors may find it necessary to rearrange the shape of their holdings, the old French form of delimitation being at variance with the modern system. These claims the Interior Department is trying to adjust, but it takes time to deal with questions affecting the rights of property."

The *Saskatchewan Herald*, on the 12th July last, tells of the quiet and secret meetings progressing amongst the half-breeds at Duck lake, consequent upon the arrival of Louis Riel there, it says:

"But should Mr. Riel desire to establish a government on the Saskatchewan, he will find many of his former followers in his immediate neighborhood, and no doubt his former secretary, Louis Schmidt, will cheerfully resign the position he now occupies as assistant Dominion lands agent at Prince Arthur, to give his services to the country and his old master."

On January 22nd, the *Qu'Appelle Vidette* editorially made this alarming announcement:

"We are informed that Louis Riel and others are engaged in drafting a petition to the Dominion Government demanding certain concessions which they say have been promised to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories, and it is the expressed intention of the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan district that if these concessions are not granted, which are asked for to resort to arms to force a compliance with their demands, Mr. Vankoughnet's statement to the contrary notwithstanding."

A special correspondent of the *Mail*, writing from Fort Qu'Appelle said:

"The people of Eastern Canada must by this time have a tolerably good idea of the nature of the half-breed grievances. The grievances of the whites have been submitted in the form of resolutions to the North-West Council, and debated by that body; and have been laid before the Ottawa authorities so often, and with such urgency, that the Interior Department must by this time be quite familiar with them."

Of the complaints of whites and half-breeds, he wrote:—

"By far the most serious complaint, however, is based upon the idea that in some way or other the settler 'has no show' with outsiders, who obtain possession of lands which he, as a squatter, has improved and built upon. This, I take it, is the core of all the discontent and dissatisfaction among whites and half-breeds alike."

The *Winnipeg Times* said:

"The rebellion of 1869-70 was not without its lessons for Riel, and he has closely observed them. He saw more plainly after it was over than before what a desperate and determined leader could do, backed by a force of wary and devoted half-breeds, inured to hardships and familiar with the country. Before he made up his mind to raise the standard of a second insurrection he no doubt took stock of all the chances and prepared to meet them. We do not believe that he ventured on an open revolt so far in the interior as Carlton without having the most reliable assurances of support from a number of the Indian chiefs, whose minds he had been poisoning for months without the least interference."

The *Mail* correspondent, writing from Batoche, says:

"Without doubt it is necessary to assert authority, but as it is authority which is to blame, its duty is to assert itself in such a manner as to prove that it is able at least to recognise its wrongs."

I say again it is abundantly clear from the evidence submitted by the member for West Durham and the member for Quebec East and myself that the half-breeds had grounds for complaint, that the white settlers had grievances that they could not get redressed. I say that the Indians were robbed, cheated, swindled, and that the solemn promises made by the Government to the Indians were violated. I say that the Government had abundant evidence of all this. I say that with all these facts before the Government, the First Minister carelessly and negligently and with criminal apathy delayed the investigation of those grievances; he refused even to consider them until after the rebellion broke out. I say, this being the case, how does this incompetent, incapable, imbecile Government hope to escape the punishment that should follow wrongdoing; how does this Government expect to escape the indignation of a justly aroused and insensed people? By concealing from this Parliament and people of Canada as the First Minister has done, a mass of the evidence in his possession, and on which the people could form a clearer judgment as to the responsibility of Ministers? No; they cannot so escape. There is more than enough of convincing evidence of criminal neglect now before Parliament to condemn a dozen Administrations. Do they hope to escape by distorting the evidence and misrepresenting the facts, and by doing as the Secretary of State has done, denying that the half-breeds ever petitioned or memorialised the Government for a redress of their wrongs; and by doing, as the *Montreal Gazette*, the organ of the Government, has done, declaring that:

"There has been no neglect. Nearly every claim has been passed upon and adjusted long since; those upon which the pretext of the rebellion is based are not to be entertained for a moment."

or by doing as the Minister of the Interior in his place in the Senate, has done, by declaring that:

"The half-breeds had no grievance whatever in relation to their lands, or to any other matter. No half-breeds was ever disturbed or threatened with disturbance in the occupation of his land. Not in one solitary case. No half-breed delegation came to Ottawa to complain of ill-treatment or disturbance in relation to their lands, no complaint on behalf of the half-breeds was ever made on the floor of Parliament, no grievance existed, and that will be made manifest when the papers are brought down."

"Until Riel arrived in this country there was no disturbance, no threatened disturbance. Riel is an incendiary, and he had great influence with the half-breeds. From the moment he arrived in this country he was endeavoring, no doubt, to excite them to discontent, but there was not the slightest apprehension of that discontent taking any form more serious than words until the outbreak actually took place."

I say this Government cannot so escape the responsibility for their misconduct. The evidence is too strong, the guilt too clear, to permit of escape. Their own conduct, their own dealing with this whole question in recent months, is the clearest possible evidence of their criminal neglect to discharge the most important duties that could devolve on any Government. What did they do? They issued a commission to investigate these old grievances, that the Secretary of State, the Minister of the Interior, and the *Montreal Gazette* never heard of. The returns laid before Parliament show that on the 26th of January last Sir D. Macpherson reported to the Governor in Council that measures be taken to settle the claims of the half-breeds; that on the 28th an Order in Council, such as he asked for, was passed, and that proceeding deliberately he telegraphed to Mr. Dewdney on February 4th:

"The Government has decided to investigate the claims of the half-breeds, and with that view has directed an enumeration of those who

did not participate in the grant under the Manitoba Act. No representations received recently."

But his colleague, the Minister of Justice, when asked if any complaints had been presented from the half-breeds on the 2nd of June last, stated:

"Considering the gravity of the question, the House should not be surprised if he confined himself strictly to answering the question. The Government had received between the 1st of January, 1879, and the 1st of March, 1885, from various persons taking special interest in the North-West, and among others, Monseigneur Grandin, Bishop of St. Albert, and Monseigneur Pache, written representations respecting the position of the half-breeds of the North-West, and the best way of ameliorating it. There was no record of any written representations from Mr. Royal, and no records of verbal representations existed."

I say therefore, that the First Minister and his colleagues cannot so escape their personal responsibility, for their negligence and carelessness in the administration of affairs in the North-West. The *Mail* newspaper suggests another mode by which these hon. gentlemen can escape the responsibility that properly rests on their shoulders. The *Mail* says that delay was a sound policy; that time solves all difficulties, and that the First Minister was justified in not investigating these claims because time might help him. That policy—the policy of delay, the hon. gentleman has lived on for the last 25 years. It is a policy which has cost this country millions of money, a policy which has provoked two rebellions, a policy which has cost this country almost oceans of human blood and many human lives. The *Mail* says:

"There is such a thing as too much haste. Sir John Macdonald is right enough in his alleged belief that time settles a good many problems which men only muddle by rash action. It is possible to err in this direction, we may admit; but it is certain that undue haste in the North-West might have been disastrous. Delay has weakened Riel and strengthened General Middleton. Delay has enabled the officials to bring pressure to bear on the Indians."

Yes Sir, delay accomplishes many things; delay caused the rebellion; delay left the settlers unprotected, when the rebellion did break out; delay induced the half-breeds to fight at Duck Lake; delay gave opportunity to raise the Indians, excited by the news of the Duck Lake victory; delay caused the massacre at Frog Lake; delay caused all the sufferings and losses at Battleford and Fort Pitt; delay gave an opportunity for the destruction of hundreds of homesteads, of much property, and of many valuable lives; delay caused the battle at Fish Creek; delay caused the battle of Batoche; delay caused many Canadian homes to mourn; delay has caused the shedding of blood; delay has caused the loss of many human lives; delay has scattered desolation, ruin, death, among the peaceful homes of the half-breeds of the West, and this delay is justified by the Government and its organs. Now, Sir, there is still another proof, if that were wanting, of the guilt of hon. gentlemen opposite, of their gross misconduct and their criminal neglect in dealing with the claims of the half-breeds. After life was lost, after blood was spilt, after ruin was scattered abroad, this Government settled very nearly, if not altogether, 400 of these identical grievances of these identical half-breeds, which the Secretary of State, the Minister of Interior, the *Mail* and the *Gazette* never heard of; 400 of these grievances have, since the half-breeds took up arms to redress their wrongs, been recognised by the Government. This fact alone is enough to stamp this Administration as the most incompetent, the most reckless, the most imbecile, and the most criminal Administration that ever the country was cursed with. What have you gentlemen on the Treasury benches done south of Clarke's Crossing? You have, after life was lost and blood was spilt, after ruin, desolation and death to the half-breeds followed your tracks—you have recognised these claims, you have righted these wrongs, redressed these grievances which existed for years, and yielded to the half-breeds more than the half-breeds ever demanded. North of Clarke's Crossing what have you done? you have recognised the same identical claims, righted the same identical wrongs, and redressed the same

identical grievances of the same identical classes of half-breeds by powder and shot, by the rattle of your Snyders and the thunder of your artillery, and as a Tory paper said: by mowing down these half-breeds with your Gatling gun, commanded by an American officer, as grass falls before the scythe of the mower. What did the *Mail* newspaper say speaking of the family of one of these half-breeds?

"The writer states that Joseph Tourand moved three years ago with his wife and eight children from the parish of St. Francois Xavier to Fish Creek, where he built a beautiful residence, and where he resided until the beginning of last year, when his death occurred. One of his sons followed him shortly afterwards to the tomb, leaving Madame Tourand with a family composed of five boys and two girls, aged respectively 18 and 20 years. When General Middleton's army arrived the house was attacked with cannon, and the Tourand brothers, in the hope of saving their property, joined the little band of insurgents commanded by Dumont, and fought as best they could during this time. The two young girls, fearing for their lives, and yielding only to their fright, escaped with one Miss Gervais, carrying in their arms two young children, almost without clothing. They gained the woods and disappeared, to be found no more. Without doubt, they perished with cold and hunger. After the battle at Fish Creek the Tourands retreated to Batoche, where two sons fell upon the battlefield. The third was dangerously wounded, and the remaining two are now prisoners at Regina. The mother is now alone without a dwelling or means of subsistence, and without even the support of the children who survived so many misfortunes."

This has been your policy in the North-West; that is the policy by which you hope to colonise the North-West Territories. This is your justice to the people who complain of uninvestigated grievances and unredressed wrongs; this is your policy of Canadian justice; this you do in a British colony and under the British flag, and this you call Canadian justice; and your *Orange Sentinel* insists that these men, who protested against your gross injustice and your criminal neglect of their grievances with their lives, must be hanged by the neck or shot down in their tracks. Sir, there are some men to be tried, convicted and punished; but they are the men who negligently and criminally refused to investigate these wrongs, and to redress these grievances; and these men are sitting on the Treasury benches to-day. Now, I have shown you by the clearest possible evidence that the Government of this country had been informed that discontent, dissatisfaction and uneasiness prevailed among the half-breeds of the North-West Territories. I have shown you that the half-breeds of the North-West Territories memorialised this Government and complained to it over and over again. I have shown you that so keenly alive were the half-breeds of the North-West to the necessity of a peaceful solution of the difficulties that existed between them and the Government of this country that two years ago at their own expense they sent a delegation all the way from the valleys of the Saskatchewan to press their claims upon the attention of the Government at Ottawa. I have shown you that the Government had abundant notice of the nature and extent of these claims. I have shown you that the Government promised over and over again to promptly investigate these grievances and redress these wrongs. I have shown you that the Government of this country signally failed to discharge one of the most imperative duties that devolves on any Government—to remove all well-founded grievances, and to redress all well-founded wrongs. I have shown you that the Government persistently ignored these grievances, both of the white settlers and the half-breeds, for a long series of years. I have shown that the white settlers living in the neighborhood of Prince Albert and along the borders of the Saskatchewan complained to this Government of many and well-founded grievances, and complained in vain. I have shown that the Indians of the North-West Territories frequently complained, and presented their complaints to the Government of Canada. I have shown, from the reports of the Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Mounted Police, that these complaints were over and over again repeated to the Government of this country, and never received a response. I have shown that the solemn promises made by this Government to the Indians, and on the faith of

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

which they were induced to abandon a nomadic life and to settle on the reserves, have been violated. I have shown that the Indians have been systematically robbed, cheated and swindled by the agents of this Government, and that this has been connived at by this Government. I have shown that the Indians were starved and frozen, owing to the insufficiency of the supplies given to them. I have shown that many of the officials entrusted by the Government with the administration of affairs in the North-West have been arrogant, deceitful and dishonest in their dealings with the Indians. I have shown that the Lieutenant Governor and Indian Commissioner of the North-West Territories, according to the papers submitted to the Government, is wholly unfit for the position he occupies. I have shown that these grievances have been submitted to for at least seven years, and that the First Minister, the Agent General of Indian Affairs and Minister of the Interior, never raised a finger to remove these grievances, to redress these wrongs, or to bring the guilty to justice. I have shown that in consequence of this inaction, this bad treatment and this misconduct, on the part of the Government, the people became discontented, dissatisfied and uneasy. Now, I ask you, Sir, I ask this House, and I ask the people of this country what punishment ought to be inflicted upon a Government guilty of all these wrongs? Impeachment at the bar of this House? Impeachment before the high court of public opinion, the electors at the poll? Sir, there is no punishment known to the law of this land that is at all commensurate with the crimes these men have committed. The unfortunate results which have followed the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which they ought to have known would have succeeded their misconduct as surely as effect follows cause, or daylight succeeds darkness, are still more grave and serious. This criminal misconduct of the Government, in persistently refusing to promptly dispose of the grievances of the North-West half-breeds, the complaints of the Indians, and the wrongs of the white settlers, caused a reign of terror in the North-West, and this reign of terror culminated in rebellion. But recently we have had many hundreds of our best young men bearing the crosses and enduring untold hardships, imposed upon them by this negligent, this incompetent, this imbecile Government. But recently hundreds of men in the North-West Territories were fleeing for their lives from the savage and ferocious Indians, and scores of intelligent and refined ladies were fleeing for more than their lives—their virtue and honor—with no city of refuge to flee to—but recently for the second time under the administration of the First Minister, we have had a rebellion, in which Canadian was arrayed against Canadian in deadly conflict. To-day many a Canadian home is mourning the loss of loved ones whose presence will no more gladden the home circle. To-day many a pulse has ceased to beat, and many a manly heart has ceased to throb. To-day we have the broad prairies of the west crimsoned with the best blood of Canada: to-day sadness and sorrow wrings the heart and pierces the soul of many a Canadian mother, who like Rachel of old mourns for her children and will not be comforted because they are not. The bravest have fallen in this terrible conflict, victims of the incapacity, the carelessness, the delays, the criminal misconduct of this Administration. For my own part, I protest now, as for years I have protested, against the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite—against their procrastination, their delay, their wicked mismanagement and criminal neglect of long standing grievances. I shall vote for the motion of my hon. friend as an embodiment of these solemn protests, and I am willing to leave the issue of the personal responsibility to the people of Canada and the punishment of the guilty to the tender mercies of the electors at the polls.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I have no doubt that the temperate, judicious, patriotic and carefully considered speech delivered by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) will not only be read by the public with surprise, but will place his party in a position which they will have no reason to feel proud of. Sir, I yield to no man in my feeling of sympathy for those who have suffered in the North-West, and I yield to no man in my desire to vindicate the rights of the people, not only of the North-West, but of the entire Dominion. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman constitutes himself the champion of the people of the North-West, it behooves us to look into the record of his party, and not do as he demands—treat that record as a sealed book. Sir, we have heard the present Administration called ignorant, incompetent, and imbecile. His allegation recalls the happiest days of my life, those I spent in yon press gallery, when I witnessed the operations of an incompetent Administration in this House—an Administration which the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was virtually ashamed to remain in. The Administration in which Mr. Ross was Minister of Militia, in which Mr. Coffin was Receiver-General and in which Mr. Cauchon was President of the Council. Mr. Cauchon has gone, and with his record I shall not deal; but these were the pillars of the Administration of the State, the men who formulated legislation that a subservient majority was at all times willing to endorse. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think that we should close the book of the past, that we should wipe out their record, and discuss simply the question as to what is the position of this Government with regard to the North-West. I have always held, as a member of the Dominion Parliament, and as a member of the electorate of the Dominion, that we should have no issue among us as to origin, race, or nationality; but the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) last night, in discharging the first barrel of his gun, referred to a question which occasioned much heart burning in 1870, the murder of Scott in the North-West, and charged the Government of that day with having given money to Louis Riel to leave the country in order to escape the consequences of his crime. I did not desire to take up that subject, but it would not be fair to the party in power if I did not furnish such evidence as will prove to this House and the country that the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, from 1874 to 1878, had much more to do with the amnesty of Riel and the present difficulty in the North-West, than the Government which preceded or followed it. To do so I will have to refer to the record, and therefore must crave the indulgence of the House while reading a few extracts from the organ, then controlled by the Hon. George Brown, the recognised leader of the Opposition in those days, as bearing out the position I take. The very moment the Government of my right hon. friend, Sir John Macdonald, endeavored to take possession of the North-West Territories and Rupert's Land, the *Globe* was prepared to condemn every official the Government sent up there, to embitter the minds of the people in every possible way against the Government and do all it could to stir up feelings of antagonism in that new country. The *Globe* said, on the 31st August, 1869:

"If Mr. Macdougall is sent up to Fort Garry with a ready-made council composed of men utterly ignorant of the country and people, the strongest feelings of discontent will be aroused."

That was the olive branch sent to the North-West in 1869, and a message similar in intent, I am sorry to say, has been sent there from the same source in 1885. On 26th July, 1869 the *Globe* said:

"We are not surprised to hear, as we do, that the Government plan for governing the North-West is very distasteful to the people of that Territory. When the measure was before Parliament, we pointed out that its oligarchical feature could not fail to be unpopular with the people to be governed by it, and advices from the Territory confirm our anticipations."

Of the Red River Council, the same organ, on September 7th, 1869, said:

"At best, the Territory gets a miserably small boon when it is allowed 2 votes out of 8 or 9 in the management of its own Government; and there are many chances that practically, that small boon may be rendered nearly worthless. We pointed out the other day that the only possible reason for refusing to select the Local Executive Council of the territory from the residents thereof, was to be found in the desire of the members of the Dominion Government to have the patronage to distribute among their adherents in other part of the Dominion. Mr. Macdougall's little compact will be made up, in the main of strangers, and if they do not govern worse than the old Family Compact, it will be because of the difference in the times, we have the consolation of knowing, however, that the Red River compact will not last as long by many years as did the old Upper Canada one. The mere appointment of an irresponsible council of outsiders for the Red River country, will be the signal for an agitation there for a Legislature responsible to the people under Local Executive responsible to the Legislature. And that agitation will soon dispose of the oligarchy."

Again, the *Globe* said:

"The territory does not belong to Canada, the Hudson Bay Co. has ceased to reign, and Messrs. Bruce and Riel may hoist any flag they please, without special charge of disloyalty being raised against them. A portion of the people of Red River have committed grave errors, but the Ottawa Government were the first to do wrong, and ought to be the first to acknowledge it and make restitution."

But, Sir, the *Toronto Globe*—the organ of the Reform party, and the very journal that now eulogises Archbishop Taché and pretends to advocate the rights of the half-breeds—then said, on the 4th of April, 1870:—

"Governor McDougall returned and commissioners were sent up to treat with the rebels on behalf of the Government, and who were the commissioners?—a priest in full sympathy with a large section of the rebels; a French Canadian without talent or influence, and a Hudson Bay Company factor only careful to preserve the property of his employers. Can we wonder that the labors of these gentlemen seem rather to have strengthened Riel's power than weakened it; it is a fact that Mr. Donald A. Smith canvassed the settlers to secure their adhesion to Riel's Government."

This was the language used then, this the language which inspired and encouraged and approved of rebellion, and looking over the official records it will be found that a gentleman who was connected with the *Globe* revised the proof-sheets of Riel's manifesto. Lieutenant Governor McDougall, in a despatch to the Secretary of State, said:

"I enclose a printed paper (A) issued by the rebels at Fort Garry on the 6th instant. It was printed at the office of the *Nor'-Wester* by the rebels, who seized the office for the purpose, the proprietor and his employees refusing to have anything to do with it. The type was set by a Yankee in their ranks, and the proof corrected, as I am informed, by Mr. Ross, late of the *Globe* office, Toronto. This 'call' was enclosed in a letter under cover to the Postmaster at Pembina, which he delivered after some hesitation and stating that he would not in future deliver letters to me which might come under cover addressed to him."

And this was the document referred to:

("A.")

"PUBLIC NOTICE TO THE INHABITANTS OF RUPERT'S LAND.

"The president and representatives of the French-speaking population of Rupert's Land, in council (the invaders of our rights being now expelled), already aware of your sympathy, do extend the hand of friendship to you our friendly inhabitants, and, in doing so, invite you to send twelve representatives from the following places, viz:—  
St. John's, 1; St. Margaret's, 1; Headingley, 1; St. James, 1; St. Mary's, 1; Kildonan, 1; St. Paul's, 1; St. Andrew's, 1; St. Clement's, 1; St. Peter's, 1; town of Winnipeg, 2;—in order to form one body with the above council, consisting of twelve members, to consider the present political state of the country, and to adopt such measures as may be deemed best for the future welfare of the same.

A meeting of the above council will be held in the Court House, at Fort Garry, on Tuesday, the 16th day of November, at which the invited representatives will attend.

"By order of the president,

"LOUIS RIEL, Secretary.

"Winnipeg, November 6th, 1869."

Agitation was prompted in that country, and human blood was shed. Instead of regretting, the party of hon. gentlemen opposite then, as now, striving to reach the Treasury benches here and striving to control Ontario as well, were prepared to utilise that unfortunate tragedy for the purpose of advancing party interests. Take the evidence of the late Hon. Joseph Howe, when he returned from the North West as to the feeling existing in that Territory, excited by journalistic articles such as those referred to. I quote from official reports of *Debates* February 1870:—

"I do not desire to abuse the *Globe* or any other newspaper, because I am too old a journalist myself to take such a course. I will say this, however, that when I was in the house of Captain Kennedy and when the subjects of how the Territory was to be governed, and how Canada was to act, and what the instructions of Mr. Macdougall were, and what he would do when he came into the Territory were discussed, I did there as I did everywhere else—defended what was the policy of Canada in the most open and undisguised manner. And where I defended as I was bound to do, the incoming Governor, against the charges and insinuation and doubts and apprehensions thrown out against him,—when I did this—what was the answer? I was referred to Mr. George Brown's editorials as an evidence of the fact that he (Brown) had said that Canada would send men in there to ride rough shod over the country, that the

man who was sent was unfit on account of his political conduct, and was to bring with him instructions and men who would set at naught the rights and disregard the feelings of the people."

But, during the discussion last evening, the hon. gentleman challenged this side of the House to show any point in which the Liberal party or the present leader of the Opposition was instrumental in causing the trouble in the North-West, and challenged us further to show whether the Government which succeeded Sir John Macdonald was to blame because he had given \$1,000 to Mr. Riel. I propose, as the hon. gentleman's speech will go abroad, to quote from the records of the country as briefly as possible, and to invite any hon. gentleman to interrupt me if I mistake anything and challenge any hon. gentleman on that side to dispute what I shall say. I have referred to the death of Thos. Scott in March, 1870, and I am now prepared to show in what way the sad end of that unfortunate man was utilised in order to benefit a political party, that, while prating about patriotism, while prating about national feeling, while prating of desiring union between all the Provinces, with hearts to beat as one from ocean to ocean, they utilised it as they would to-day, as they would utilise this question if the people would allow them, in order to promote party interests. What was the first movement in regard to Riel? On the 4th April, 1870, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), then representing Lambton and leader of the Opposition, spoke in the House of Commons. He said:

"We have most painful accounts in public newspapers of an atrocious murder being committed by men—ruffians I might say—(hear, hear) who are at the head of forces there, that calls for most extraordinary exertions on the part of our Government, (hear, hear) and in order to know exactly what the House and country ought to do, the Government, I think, are bound to place in possession of this House all the information they have with regard to that murder. We know that other persons were held prisoners there besides the unfortunate gentleman who was murdered, and what security have we in this country that other of our fellow subjects shall not be murdered as well as poor Scott."

The question came up in the Provincial assembly of Ontario, and the hon. member for West Durham, then for South Bruce, was the leader of the Opposition. On the 2nd February, 1871, we find him moving:

"That the cold-blooded murder for his out-spoken loyalty to the Queen of Thomas Scott, lately a resident of this Province, and an emigrant thence to the North-West, has impressed this House with a deep feeling of sorrow and indignation, and in the opinion of this House every effort should be made to bring to trial the perpetrators of this great crime, who, as yet, go unwhipped of justice.

"That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, embodying the foregoing resolution, and praying him to take such steps as may be best calculated to further its views."

The hon. gentleman said:

"He (Riel) is receiving deputations from the people of that country, asking him to stand as a candidate for the Local Legislature and for the Parliament of Canada. Yes, for the Parliament of Canada! We find him declining, for the good of the country and from patriotic motives, to allow himself to be nominated. But, Sir, I say that unless this Province speaks out, it will not be long the case that he will act thus, and we may yet undergo the humiliation and disgrace of seeing the murderer of one of our people elected to the Parliament of Canada, and representatives from Ontario sitting in council on the affairs of the country with one guilty of murder. I warn this House and this Province that unless we act in this matter the murderer will go unpunished! This, Sir, is no ordinary murder. It was no murder for revenge, for money, or for any of those causes that usually provoke a great crime. The spot where poor Scott's ashes rest is unknown. Let his country write his epitaph in the records of her Assembly, and express a people's sorrow for his untimely death, and a people's stern resolve that that death shall be avenged!"

Sir, we all know how that death was avenged. In 1872 I find the hon. gentleman in West Toronto, after the defeat of Sanfield Macdonald's Government, saying on the hustings:

"Now, with regard to Scott, they had a good deal of talking, and now they were going to have action! (Cheers). The principles he had contended for in Opposition he would endeavor to carry out in practice. Office had no charms for him; he desired merely to carry out in power those things he advocated when out of power, and when they found him careless with reference to those things, then it would be their duty to withdraw their support from him."

Judging from the manner in which the hon. gentleman has succeeded since he entered public life and became a member of a Government and the leader of the Opposition, I think the people must really have found that he was a little careless in regard to consistency, and so have withdrawn their support from him. Then someone asked:

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

"What can the Ontario Government do about the Scott murder?"

"Mr. BLAKE. I shall show you what the Ontario Government can do about that."

The Provincial Secretary, Mr. Gow, said "it was a lamentable thing that any son of our country should be murdered in cold blood and not a single move made to bring the murderer to justice." The Local Legislature met in 1872, and a resolution was passed offering a reward of \$5,000 for bringing the murderers to trial. The following was the resolution: Sir John Macdonald's Government resigned in the fall of 1873, and in March, 1874, Louis Riel took the oath and subscribed to the members' roll of the Dominion House of Commons. I am not introducing these matters to create bickering or strife or recrimination, but wish to show to hon. members on both sides, to those who were in Parliament then and those who are here now, the line of hypocrisy and double dealing uniformly adopted by the party now in Opposition. I desire to show that in 1871, while the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier were maintaining the rights of the people, were proceeding under constitutional government and respecting constitutional privileges, the hon. gentlemen were fighting them step by step in a manner that they must to-day regret when looking back upon the record. Last night, the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) said that the amnesty was promised Riel by Sir John A. Macdonald, therefore the leader of the Opposition could not be held responsible, because he had to agree to it. I suppose some hon. gentlemen will endeavor to prove that an amnesty was promised. So far as the amnesty is concerned, I am prepared to prove that the hon. leader of the Opposition not only never mentioned Riel's name, because the elections of 1872 were then pending, when he became Premier of Ontario, but that he never replied in any affirmative way to applications made by those who said they could arrest Riel, and that in letters, and telegrams, and correspondence and documents, he carefully avoided mentioning Riel's name, refusing to recognise him as the murderer, because fearing that whatever he wrote might pass into the Province of Quebec, where he imagined the people were so weak, so narrow, so bigotted as to vote for him and defeat Sir John Macdonald's Government because he was professing to be the friend and protector of Louis Riel. I have said the hon. gentleman never mentioned Louis Riel's name in 1872. I find in the Sessional Papers, No. 38 of 1873, a telegram from Walter R. Brown:

"What amount will be paid on delivery of Louis Riel in Toronto? Answer at once."

The answer was:

"\$5,000 will be paid to the persons instrumental in bringing to trial before any competent court, one or more of the murderers of Thomas Scott.

"EDWARD BLAKE."

Mr. Walter R. Brown—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Bown.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It is spelled Brown in the returns—Bown wanted to know, if he delivered Riel at Toronto, whether he would get the reward. The hon. gentleman who led the Government said the \$5,000 would be paid on bringing to trial "one or more of the murderers." Then, the late Hon. John Hillyard Cameron also made an application for Mr. Woodington of Niagara. Mr. Woodington's application was:

"Will you let me know if warrants for the arrest of Riel and Lépin in the United States can be issued in Ontario, and whether they can be brought from there to Ontario under the extradition treaty, provided the charge of murder could be sworn against them? If so, I am prepared to charge Riel and Lépin with the above crime, and make affidavit of the same, as I was one of the prisoners held by the rebels when Scott was taken out and shot, and that I also saw both Riel and Lépin order the men to go out and shoot him. I think the expenses of the journey would not exceed \$200, and if that sum is advanced to me and the necessary papers furnished for their arrest, I promise that, within two or three weeks from the day of my leaving, I will land in Toronto either Riel or Lépin, or, perhaps, both. Mr. Woodington is residing at Niagara, and can be vouched for by several respectable persons."

Here is the answer, dated 2nd April, 1872 :

"I have your note with the extract from the letter of Mr. Henry Woodington. It appears Mr. Woodington desires funds to be provided, not exceeding \$3,000 for an effort which he proposes to make to procure the trial of some of the murderers of Scott. You will observe that a reward of \$5,000 has been offered to any person who is instrumental in accomplishing that result."

Then further down :

"In my private capacity I should be very glad."

Mr. BLAKE. Read it all.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It is rather long.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it is not long.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will do so, and can further show the hon. gentleman that under the judgment of Chief Justice Wood, he held that for any money that had been advanced, any work that had been done, the parties were to be recouped, and that that \$5,000 was to be given to every Tom, Dick and Harry, whichever happened to see Riel. I will also give him a list of the men to whom it was paid. The following is the remainder of the hon. gentleman's letter :

"It is presumed that the magnitude of the reward would induce those who are able to accomplish it to undertake the work. I have already stated to you that I have received applications from other persons who are desirous to obtain funds for the indicated purpose, and I have been obliged to answer these applications in the same way. I also pointed out to you the possible consequences of so disbursing the public money, inasmuch as it would be out of the question to ensure any result, and numerous applications might be made involving considerable expenses to no good purpose."

Then follows the paragraph that I commenced reading :

"In my private capacity I should be very glad to become a subscriber to any fund for the purpose of accomplishing the indicated object, but, as I have mentioned above, we have no public moneys which we are authorised to dispose of in that way."

Now, that is most of the correspondence that can be found with regard to parties who desired assistance in order to capture Riel; and that is the record of the hon. gentleman who promised action. It will be remembered that Archbishop Taché published a book in 1874, after the change of Government, in which he endeavored to prove that an amnesty was promised. The organ of the Liberal party, the *Globe* of the 19th March, 1874, said :

"The men who could speak with authority on the subject are still alive, and are still accessible; Lord Lisgar is not beyond reach. Why, if such a promise were given, has he never been referred to, and never asked to state what he knows of the subject? Lord Lisgar is a man of too lofty an integrity and too independent a position to shrink from stating what he knows on the subject. Yet no recourse has been had to him; and, so far as the public is aware, not the slightest effort made to secure his testimony. Sir Clinton Murdoch, whose name has been freely used in this connection, is also perfectly within reach. He is not a man to shrink from avowing what he has said or done. Has there been any attempt made to secure his version of the matter? If not, why not? And there is Sir John Macdonald himself. His late colleague in the Ministry, Governor Morris, has most solemnly declared that he, during all the time he held a portfolio, knew nothing of such a promise or such an amnesty. Why, then, not refer to Sir John himself? We are told that he is the soul of honor, and he is bound by no official oath to conceal such a transaction."

Then, after the Revd. gentlemen's pamphlet was issued, the *Globe*, on the 9th April, 1874, said :

"The reader cannot fail to have observed: (1.) That no direct proof of any kind can apparently be brought forward to prove the promise of amnesty. (2.) That four years having elapsed, and Archbishop Taché being well informed on the subject, is almost conclusive against the existence of any such proof. (3.) That the proof relied on is hearsay evidence of the most unreliable kind—documents anterior to the crucial circumstance, and inferences from conversations which so far as they are reported, makes against the amnesty theory. As we have said, the difficulty of proving it, the necessity of elaboration, and of having recourse to inadmissible evidence, furnish a strong presumptive case against the theory of a promise being made. How is it there is a record of everything else, and no reliable record of such a promise! The matter may be regarded now as settled, and Riel's friends must take up some other stand than that he is an amnestied man."

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman said last night that the venerable Archbishop Taché, upon his oath, swore that the amnesty was promised. Allow me to refer to the evidence given by that distinguished prelate before the North-West committee in 1874:—

"The only reason for delaying the granting of the amnesty promised by the proclamation of Sir John Young, that I am aware of, has been the excitement existing throughout the Dominion, and especially in the Province of Ontario. This is not merely my own opinion; it is also the opinion expressed to me by certain members of the late Government. The constant reply which I received when I spoke to them on the subject was, that the excitement was so great that the Government would not be sustained if the amnesty was given. I spoke first of all to Sir

George Cartier on the subject, I then spoke to Sir John A. Macdonald, and subsequently to Mr. Langevin. I also spoke on the subject to other members of the Government, but not so minutely, because I was not brought so closely in contact with them. The reply I have quoted was that given me by each member of the Government when I spoke to them."

"In the conversations I had with those gentlemen, I always understood that the amnesty was to be a full, complete and entire one. I never had any conversation on the subject of a partial Manitoba amnesty, under that proclamation. I have had a communication relative to a partial amnesty, but that was not until the year 1873. That communication was with Sir John A. Macdonald, and it was made verbally, not in writing."

Now with regard to the amnesty, a proclamation dated December, 1869, and signed by the Governor General, Sir John Young, was issued in this language :

"And I do lastly inform you that in case of your immediate and peaceable obedience and dispersion, I shall order that no legal proceedings be taken against any parties implicated in these unfortunate breaches of the law."

Added to this, permit me to read an extract from a letter written to Lieut.-Governor Archibald by Archbishop Taché in June, 1870 :

"ST. BONIFACE,  
"RED RIVER SETTLEMENT,  
"9th June, 1870.

"Hon. JOSEPH HOWE,  
"Secretary of State for the Provinces,  
"Ottawa, Canada.

"HONORABLE SIR,—I hasten to communicate to you, for the information of His Excellency in Council, a very important promise I have just made in the name of the Canadian Government. I feel all the responsibility I have incurred in taking such a step, while on another hand I am confident that His Excellency the Governor General and his Privy Council will not judge with too much severity an act accomplished in order to avoid great misfortunes and secure the welfare of the country."

Well, the hon. gentleman, as I have shown, has not proved and cannot prove that Archbishop Taché swore that an amnesty had been promised to Riel, after the murder of Thomas Scott was known. However, as a consensus of evidence generally prevails, I will now read the evidence upon that subject. Lord Lisgar wrote to Sir George Cartier early in 1873 :

"I have in recollection the interview which I had with the Reverend Abbé Ritchot upon your introduction and in your presence.

"He dwelt earnestly upon two points :

"First. The redress of the political grievances of the inhabitants of the Red River settlement, with a special reference, as I understood, to land grants."

"Second. On an assurance of the exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy to cover all offences."

"I promised to forward, without delay, the petition he speaks of as in preparation, and stated that I felt sure Her Majesty's Government would give full and serious consideration to any pleas which might be urged on behalf of the view he advocated."

"I am quite clear that neither on the occasion in question, nor on any other, did I give an assurance or promise of an amnesty to cover all the offences committed during the insurrection."

"LISGAR."

Here is another from Sir Clinton Murdoch, formerly of the Governor's staff :

"I have no recollection of any promise or expectation of an amnesty to Riel and his associates having been held out by Lord Lisgar, when Mr. Ritchot had an interview with him, in my presence, or at any other time. I scarcely think if such a promise had been made, I could have failed to notice it at the time or to collect it now. As regards Sir George Cartier, I do not remember having ever had any conversation with him on the subject, or being present at any interview when it was discussed between him and Lord Lisgar."

Sir George E. Cartier wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald on the 8th February, 1873 :

"The only thing I can do to-day is to acknowledge the receipt of your last, of the 22nd January, about "Riel" matter.

"I hear Lord Lisgar is to be here in a few days, and I will hasten to see him about what passed at the interview with Father Ritchot. To the best of my recollection nothing went beyond stating that he would transmit Ritchot's petition to the Queen, praying for an amnesty. Bear in mind that oath of us stated to Father Ritchot that the amnesty was a question for the Queen, not for our Government."

Then we have the testimony of Sir Hector Langevin, then Mr. Langevin, on this subject :

"The proclamation of amnesty, dated December 8th, 1869, was issued long before the death of Thomas Scott, and when so issued, it certainly did not contemplate anything else than the legal acts that had been committed up to the time of its issue."

"The causes that have delayed the granting of an amnesty in accordance with the proclamation were, first: that circumstances were altogether changed when the death of Thomas Scott occurred."

"I am not aware of any promise or any amnesty having been made by the Government of Canada further than that contained in the proclamation of 8th December, 1869, or of any promise by any member of the Government on behalf of the Government."

Sir John A. Macdonald also swore that no such amnesty was promised, and this is potently established by a letter.

from Archbishop Taché to hon. Mr. Howe, from which I read an extract:

Yet in face of these facts, hon. gentlemen opposite have, since 1871, endeavored to prejudice the electors throughout Ontario. I had some experience in the election of 1871, and remember that in many counties there were placards circulated—"Vote for the Conservative candidate and the murderer of Thomas Scott." They endeavored to appeal to people of a certain nationality and of a certain denomination throughout the Dominion, and endeavored to excite religious prejudices. But to-day we see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) rejoicing over the fact that he is here to fight and defend the half-breeds and champion their rights. Before passing on to that matter, I wish to show upon what grounds the amnesty was granted; upon what flimsy basis and evidence hon. gentlemen opposite were prepared to actually decide a question which they said was one of the most vital importance not only to Ontario, but to every man who lived under constitutional government. Amnesty was granted to Riel and Lépine in 1875, and hon. gentlemen opposite deliberately went to work to suppress in the citation, a large portion of the evidence. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) smiles; but he will have an opportunity of showing whether I am correct or not. In the records of Parliament, what do we find? When the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) introduced a resolution asking the then Government to put on record the evidence given before the committee, the Opposition voted in a body against the evidence being attached to the resolution. Let me read these documents from the evidence before the North-West Committee in 1874, Archbishop Taché stated that:

" \* \* \* On the 25th November the Hon. Mr. Letellier, in his office, said to Bishop Tache, 'I think (or I hope) that we shall be able to give the amnesty to our Lower Canadian friends as a New Year's gift.' That on the 30th November, Bishop Tache saw the Hon. Mr. D'Orion and the Hon. Mr. Letellier, and in his evidence said:—'I was led to believe that they themselves had some guarantees about it (the amnesty). They were not explicit, but I was led to believe it. It was something to the effect that there was an agreement with their colleagues as to the granting of the amnesty. The words as near as I can say were these: 'We cannot settle everything. It is so soon after the formation of the Government. We have hopes that the thing will be arranged in a favorable way according to your wishes; and we see ourselves the necessity of the amnesty.' I remember no further words."

Then followed further telegrams:

"FORT GARRY, 24th December, 1873.

"To the Hon. A. A. DORION, Ottawa.

"Anxious hearing from you. Is communication received. Lépine bailed yesterday.

"ARCHBISHOP TACHE."

"MONTREAL, December 25th, 1873.

"To ARCHBISHOP TACHE.

"I received the gratifying intelligence contained in your telegram. Matters here are progressing slowly but most satisfactorily. In a few days I will write result and about some important questions.

"A. A. DORION."

"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1874.

"General election immediate. Governor Morris will communicate with you. Of paramount importance for friends to comply with his request. Answer by telegraph.

"J. C. TACHE."

"OTTAWA, January 2nd, 1874.

"To ALEXANDER MORRIS, Fort Garry, Manitoba.

"Will you communicate confidentially to Bishop Tache that I am particularly desirous in the interest of his people, in order to avoid excitement, that Riel should not be a candidate.

"A. A. DORION."

It was well enough according to hon. gentleman, when order was restored, when the Crown was able to maintain its rights, when there were safeguards surrounding the constitution of that country for a Minister of Justice, in order to avoid excitement, and in the interest of peace and harmony, to amnesty Riel; but it was very wrong on the part of the right hon. gentleman who leads this

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

Government, and who led the Government at that time, in 1871, to take the advice of Archbishop Taché, who hon. gentlemen opposite now speak of as in every way reliable, and whose word should always be accepted. It was quite right that Mr. A. A. Dorion should have so acted, but it was a damnable crime, a fearful offence, on the part of the right hon. gentleman, when the North-West was in danger, when a Fenian invasion had just closed, when Governor Archibald did not know at what hour more trouble might arise, when such a long distance intervened between Ottawa and the North-West, and there was no ready means of communication, to have taken the advice of Archbishop Taché and have endeavored to get Riel and Lépine to leave the country for a time until order was restored. The right hon. gentleman has been charged in this connection with saying, "Would that I could catch Riel." Was there anything inconsistent in that expression?

Mr. BLAKE. He was in the country.

Mr. MILLS. He was paid to go out.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will reply to that point presently. Riel was supposed to be out of the country, and the right hon. gentleman said he would like to catch him. In what connection was that speech delivered? It was in reply to a speech made a few days before by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in which he had said that, thank God, the offer of the reward that had been made by the Local Government had been the means of chasing Riel out of the country. The right hon. gentleman's statement was simply this: that, "owing to the reward he had offered, Riel no longer polluted the soil of Canada by his presence." Now, with respect to this matter of Riel being out of the country, and paid to stay away during the elections; Riel was in the country in June, 1872. If the right hon. gentleman paid Riel and Lépine \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$4,000, part of it contributed by Hon. D. A. Smith and Governor Archibald to induce them to leave the country for any particular time, how was it that Archbishop Taché had an interview with Riel in June? He swore to this, and Archbishop Taché is a most distinguished prelate whose word would be accepted by anyone. Archbishop Taché said he had an interview with him. Riel and Lépine had received about \$3,200. I will now account for \$3,500. In the first place the leader of the Government had nothing whatever to do with the payment of that money; he did not know the money was being paid; he had no cognisance of Archbishop Taché having recommended its payment or that Hon. D. A. Smith had promised to help to pay it, he being anxious to protect the interests of the Hudson's Bay Company. We turn again to the records of the party opposite. We turn to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition and we there find the reason for the money being paid. I do not find that the hon. gentleman, from his place in this House, when he occupied a seat adjacent to where the First Minister now sits, condemned the payment of the money; for he said it would be a gross breach of faith if the interests of the country were not protected, and if any promise made in any way by an officer of the Crown holding a position like that occupied by Governor Archibald were in the least degree questioned. We find that the payment of £600 sterling was voted to D. A. Smith on 1st April, 1875, an appropriate date. Some hon. members objected to the item. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said, no doubt it was a very unpopular vote, but it was also a just one. The hon. gentleman was then in power.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I was not in office.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not mean that the hon. gentleman was a member of the Government, because it would be a difficult task to state precisely when he was or was not a member of the Government; but the hon. gentleman's party was in power, and he was virtually the Premier, the dictator; and perhaps he would have made a very good

dictator had members of his party allowed him to have his own way. The hon. gentleman said: "What the hon. member for South Leeds said was strictly true. Mr. Archibald, as Governor of that Territory, had apprehension for the safety of the country, and those apprehensions were shared by others qualified to judge of the danger. It was deemed proper in the public interest that this money should be advanced, and it was procured from the hon. member for Selkirk. The right hon. member for Kingston took the same view when the circumstances were stated to him, as would be seen by the evidence of that hon. gentleman before the North-West Committee." Yet we have heard hon. gentlemen charging the Conservative party throughout this country, through the *Toronto Globe*, and before the constituencies of Ontario, with degrading themselves and the country and the constitution because Hon. D. A. Smith, in protecting the Hudson's Bay Company's interests, advised by Governor Archibald, paid out a certain sum of money without the cognisance of the right hon. gentleman then at the head of the Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) said:

"It was deemed proper in the public interest that this money should be advanced, and it was procured from the hon. member for Selkirk. The right hon. member for Kingston took the same view when the circumstances were stated to him, as would be seen by the evidence of that hon. gentleman before the North-West Committee. No doubt Governor Archibald intimated to Mr. Smith that he had no authority to pay this money, but there was equally as little doubt that he pledged the faith of the country as far as he could, to its repayment to the hon. member for Selkirk. This House should respect that pledge and vote money. The hon. member for Kingston would have been unworthy of his position if he failed to respect that pledge, and this House would be equally unworthy, if it refused to repay the money."

Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman's friends—I do not include him, because I scarcely think he would be capable of it—throughout Ontario, have over and over again represented, since the troubles broke out in the North-West, that the right hon. gentleman paid out public money, paid out secret service money, to keep Riel out of the country during the general election, and this \$1,000 and the \$3,500 having been made one sum, he is represented as having degraded the constitution, and as having been the means of keeping Riel alive and bringing him into the country to-day. Now, I think I have shown—and I regret to have been obliged to bring the matter up, but we were challenged to do so by the hon. member for West Huron—that the agitation with regard to Riel and the murder of poor Scott, was introduced into the House of Commons by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); that he was followed with all the great power and ability which the hon. member for West Durham possesses, who carried it into the Local Legislature; spoke of it on the public hustings; offered a reward; refused in those telegrams of 1872 to say whether Riel was considered a murderer or not, and sent a promiscuous telegram, which would cover almost anybody except Riel, in consequence of the general election, and that, after coming into power, he voted that \$5,000 reward. Now, as to the disposal of the reward. Judge Wood reported in 1876 to the Ontario Government as follows:—

"In this sense, very many were instrumental in procuring the arrest of Lepine and Nault, and the outlawry of Riel and Donoghue. But I think the word "instrumental" means something more than counselling, approving of, and, when action was taken, supporting and defending those who took the responsibility of setting the law in motion, and of following it up as a private prosecutor until Lepine and Nault, two of the murderers of Scott were brought to trial before a court of competent jurisdiction, and on the trial appearing as prosecutor, and procuring and marshalling the evidence, and witnesses, which led to the conviction of Lepine, and should have secured and, eventually would have secured the conviction of Nault. The jury disagreed in the trial of Queen vs. Nault—tried at the same assizes as Lepine—and at the ensuing assizes, he was bailed in consequence of the amnesty resolutions passed in the House of Commons, and was finally, along with the other murderers of Scott, pardoned.

What became of the money? They made a general distribution, and there was a general grab. William A. Farmer, who served the warrant on Riel, got \$2,000; Francis A. Cornish, a very able lawyer, now dead, formerly mayor of London, and then living in Winnipeg, got \$400; C. B. Thibaudeau, \$400; Léon Dupont, \$330; John S. Ingram, \$330; Edward

Armstrong, (Sheriff), \$330; John A. Kerr, \$330; George M. Young, \$300; Thomas Hughes, \$290, and H. W. Smith, \$290. In fact one might imagine that almost the whole population of the Province at that time, received a portion of this money.

An hon. MEMBER. Probably they were all Grits.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not know whether they were all Grits or not, but I know if there was a distribution of money going on, and there were any Grits around, they would be likely to get a full share of it. I have traced what became of the money, I have shown how Riel was amnestied, I have shown who was responsible for that amnesty, and I have also shown, upon the statement made by gentlemen whose words would not be questioned in any intelligent body, and by the oaths of Ministers, that there was no promise of amnesty to Riel in 1872-3; that the amount of money paid at the suggestion of Archbishop Taché was first \$1,000, that Riel was not out of the country, during the election of 1872, and that furthermore, when the Reform party came into power, they paid \$3,600 due to Donald A. Smith, at the suggestion of Governor Archibald, and that throughout their whole career, there cannot be shown a weak point in the armour of the Conservative party on that question. People must measure the position in 1874 by a very different standard from that applied in 1870 and 1871, when there was hardly any constituted authority in Manitoba. The people having become enlightened upon these matters having read and judged, have changed their views materially, and they will change their views materially now, when they find the leader of the Opposition, who agitated Ontario from one end to the other, with regard to the outrageous conduct of red handed murderer Riel—to find the hon. gentleman espousing his cause, advocating that Riel's rights and grievances should be redressed—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman has no right to state that I have been advocating Riel's cause.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, he has.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman had better wait until he stops speaking.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I rise to order.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I certainly do not mean it in any offensive sense, and intended, had I not been interrupted, to have added, "as I will show by the evidence of Riel himself." Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to the delegation which waited on Riel at Clarke county, Montana. The hon. gentleman has read a number of extracts from that document, but I observe that he did not read them all, as in the case of many documents he reads official or otherwise. Although he claimed that some of the official documents were missing that should have been supplied by the department of Interior there were certainly some others which were missing, which were in the possession of the hon. gentleman himself, and which he did not read. Riel in reply to Dumont and others who waited on him, said:

"I doubt whether my advice given on this side of the boundary on matters relating to a foreign country can, when known among you, be of any value, but I will submit another consideration. The Canadian Government owe me 240 acres of land, in accordance with clause 31 of the Manitoba Act—

There is where the connection came in. The hon. gentleman being so proud to advocate the grievances of the half-breeds, must have been aware that he was advocating the cause of Riel, who now claims 240 acres of land.

"As well as five lots of a great value, on account of the hay and timber covering them, and of their situation on the river. These lots belong to me in accordance with the various sections of clause 32 of the above mentioned Act, and I have been deprived of them through the direct or indirect action of the Government."

Now, I think the hon. gentleman's amendment certainly covers that case:—

"Besides that, if the Government would only reflect for a moment, they would soon find that they also owe me something in addition to that."

The hon. member for West Huron said it was represented that if Riel was paid some small amount of money, he would leave the country and that if he had left, there would have been no rebellion; so that, in this case we find the hon. gentleman advocating the cause of Riel, advocating his remaining in the country and fighting the battles of the half-breeds, on the ground that coming from Montana he had a claim against the Government and something in addition. Suppose that addition was not paid; suppose the grievances were all settled, and each man got 240 acres, whether he was entitled to it or not; and suppose Riel had that great power and influence he is represented to have, would he be satisfied with 240 acres, or would he claim something else in addition? The hon. gentleman will see the dilemma in which he places himself, and the dilemma he puts me in with regard to voting for his amendment. Now, the hon. member for West Huron and others who have preceded him have said that the Government should have taken warning. I shall show that Riel came to the country a wolf in sheep's clothing, that he had no respect for his friends, that he had no reverence for the priests, that he did not care a snap of his fingers for the church, and that he went there, as ambitious and unprincipled a man in 1885, as he was in 1870; but with regard to Riel's visit being for war or bloodshed, no such construction could be put upon it at the time; in public he was diplomatic and prudent, while behind the curtain, he was working another and evidently far more dangerous game. Working too with the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite; those Indians of the North-West who have been so oppressed and abused, and malignod and starved. An address of welcome was presented to Mr. Riel on the 8th of July, and his answer to it, as some of the papers said, appeared to be more moderate than some of the agitators desired it to be. One of them, writing to *Le Manitoba*, on the 10th of July speaks of it in the following terms:—

"It cannot be denied that some of his hearers who expected from him a vigorous onslaught on the Government have been in a measure disappointed. But Mr. Riel is not a political man neither was his speech addressed to a political meeting."

Still we were told last night that he is a warm friend and supporter of the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government—

"He referred to the means which should be taken to obtain redress for their grievances, and stated that in order to obtain something from a Government, no threats should be used, but that their requests should be couched in terms of respect and confidence in the manner in which a respectful child speaks to a kind father."

My impression is that a good many kind fathers in this country would not care to have their children speak to them in the way Mr. Riel has spoken to the Government and people of this country. The result of this first interview was the convocation of a public meeting at Prince Albert on the 11th of July following; and the correspondent of *Le Manitoba* speaks of Riel as follows:

"It is admitted on all sides that the ex-president is a quiet, moderate and well informed man, appearing well worthy of the confidence his countrymen have placed in him."

Another meeting was held at Prince Albert, on the 19th of July, at which Riel spoke. The correspondent of *Le Manitoba* writes of his speech as follows:—

"He wishes to co-operate with all of them in harmony and in peace, in order to obtain from the Government that which is just. In order to succeed they must use none other than constitutional and pacific means."

Later on, he said:

"He spoke of the Indians and the half-breeds. He does not believe that they have as yet received sufficient compensation for the enormous extent of lands which have been taken away from them. They should not be trifled with or treated unfairly; otherwise, they may become dangerous."

Then, on the 29th of July, 1884, the *Le Manitoba* received a communication from Prince Albert, which said:

"Big Bear, a chief of the Crees, and a very intelligent person, who has always given much annoyance to the Government, and is now stationed  
Mr. MACKINTOSH,

In the neighborhood of Battleford, is on the way to St. Laurent, where he purposes to have an interview with Riel. It is certain that most of the Indian chiefs will try to confer with Riel, but he will only give them good advice, and whilst assuring them that he will do all in his power for their benefit, he will not bias their minds so as to render them intractable."

Then came his meeting with his Lordship Bishop Grandin on the 5th of September, which I need not now refer to, and a later meeting in January. Then we lose sight completely of Louis Riel, until the trouble broke out in March.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am quoting now from the document in my hand, that nothing more was heard of him until the rebellion broke out:

"This was the last heard of Riel, till it was announced that he had taken possession of the stores at Batoche, that he had made prisoners, that his soldiers, under the command of Dumont, had routed the Mounted Police at Duck Lake."

That is an extract from *Le Manitoba*. Then what do we find? We find not one of the Reform papers prepared to assist the Government by even sympathetic or patriotic advice, but rather proving recreant to their trust by the most ungenerous criticism and by such a course as promised to give infinite relief and encouragement to the rebels of the North-West. The very moment the trouble commenced, that very moment the *Globe* made the following remarks:—

"Sir John Macdonald admits that matters looked so serious last summer that it was thought prudent to have an additional force in the vicinity of Prince Albert, that Major Crozier and a 100 men were sent to Carlton, a Hudson Bay Company's post, the use of which was obtained for this purpose. He did nothing, however, but send these policemen to overawe the discontented. Masterly inactivity, perhaps, he imagined, would make the way easy out of this difficulty also. His favorite, Mr Dewdney, and the gang who form that potentate's court are not the men to trouble themselves about the grumbings and repining of a few half-breeds whom it would be so easy to crush if they dared to go too far. Their insolence, their swaggering, and hectoring and bullying, no doubt increased the irritation caused by the neglect of the Dominion Government."

Here, in 1885, we find precisely a repetition of the conduct of this paper and its party in 1869-70, glorying over the ruin of the North-West, glorying over trouble in Nova Scotia, glorying over trouble wherever it could be fomented, hoping, by exciting religious bickerings and sectional feelings, to secure a party advantage. I could quote further from the *Globe* in the same tone, but do not desire to unduly occupy the time of the House. But we find what the Yankees call the "whoop-la business" done by the organ of the Opposition in this city. On the 28th of March, when the report came that some of our unfortunate friends had died in the defence of Canada's rights and privileges, what do we find that paper saying?

"The responsibility for the dreadful massacre near Duck Lake—for it was a massacre—rests upon the present Dominion Government. The blood guiltiness lies with them."

Well, one could imagine during a heated time, when the passions of the people were aroused, a writer making a remark of this kind; but I can scarcely imagine, and I do not think any hon. gentleman could, had he not heard it last night, imagine that a member of this house would, in cold blood, charge this reckless, incompetent, extravagant and ignorant Government—

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). And imbecile.

Mr. MACKINTOSH—with the responsibility of shedding oceans of blood. The *Ottawa Free Press* further said:—

"The deplorable state of affairs there is the natural outcome of their infamous system of North-West administration, which wronged, oppressed and plundered the white and half-breed alike."

Here again was a message sent to the people of the North-West: You have shed the blood of your brothers; the Reform party will stand by you and defend you; and they are carrying out their pledge now. Go on; strike blow after blow at the constitution; take the lives of innocent men; kidnap women—perpetrate all these crimes, and our distinguished leader will rise in his place in Parliament a few weeks from now and say he rejoices over the fact that, not being of your race, he can all the better plead the cause of the poor half-breed. That message went out, the glad

tidings of sympathisers in the older Provinces were flashed across the wires, and rebels were made happy, hopeful and aggressive. Knowing these things, one turns involuntarily to a vacant chair in this House, at which none of us can look without moistened eyes; and all feel it and know it to be an insult to tell us we are responsible for sending out our brothers to the North-West to be murdered in cold blood or to die from the effect of war's hardships. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) knows, when the record comes to be written, it will not be the record he represents, but a constitutional record, written, I hope, by one who values his own position in politics and in public life, and who would therefore scorn to resort to such petty and ungenerous tactics. The hon. gentleman told us that the Government should have been on its guard, seeing there was so much trouble brewing, and should have done something to maintain the peace, honor and happiness of the North-West. Why, the very fact that the Department of Indian Affairs sent 100 policemen to Prince Albert was the signal, as shown in these documents, for the general uprising and the murder at Duck Lake. Had the Government hastily sent soldiers up there months ago, what would have been the cry? It would have been: "Oh! there is your policy; that is to save the ranchers and the colonisation companies." There would have been a howl against military expenditure, against the utilising the army of snobbery, as it was called in 1883, when the Minister of Militia undertook the re-organisation of the militia. The Government would have been charged with deliberately squandering the money of the country in order to save the colonisation companies, and the timber lands, and the rancho lands of their friends, and with oppressing and tyrannising over the poor half-breeds; and instead of the amendment now under discussion, we would have had to discuss an amendment of a very different character. The hon. gentleman last night deemed proper to insult the Government and the party of which I am an humble member by referring to the colonisation companies; and he insinuated that they had caused all the trouble. What do I find? Here is the prospectus of the Dominion Land Colonisation Co. (Limited), capital \$500,000; president, H. S. Howland, and solicitors, Messrs. Blake, Kerr and Cassels. Mr. Howland—a leading Reformer, and the solicitors—well the first name is enough. Does anyone in his senses say that a colonisation company, which had paid a large sum of money into the Government for land, was going deliberately to ruin its prospects by fomenting a rebellion. Yet that is what hon. gentlemen opposite charged the colonisation companies with. Would any one believe the leader of the Opposition would act for a colonisation company that had such hellish designs in view? The hon. gentleman talked too about timber limits having been given to supporters of the Government. As I have never been interested in one acre of land in the North-West—and I am happy now, to be able to say so—I can speak without prejudice; but I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that when his party was in power, this Reform party, which has such respect for the feelings and the instincts of the people, and such high regard for constitutional honor, it signalled its closing hours of office by a remarkable transaction. When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was Minister of the Interior in the Mackenzie Administration, of which the hon. member for West Huron was a warm supporter—though not quite so active as he is now, in Opposition—this gentleman, after the people had voted non-confidence in him and his leader, met his colleagues in council, and proceeded to encumber and hand over to a monopoly nearly all the timber lands in the valley of the Saskatchewan. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) shakes his head; but I have the Order in Council, passed on the 7th of October, 1878:

"The Minister of Interior reported on 4th October, representing that being of opinion that it would encourage and facilitate settlement in the valley of the Saskatchewan if facilities were afforded for obtaining lumber at a reasonable price, which he understands cannot be done at the present time—he recommends that a timber limit to the extent of 200 square miles on the Saskatchewan River and its tributaries in the North West Territories, be granted to Messrs. Cooke and Sutherland, the same to

be selected by them in blocks of not less than 20 square miles—the bonus payable on the said limit to be at the rate of \$15 per square mile."

Well, he found his friends were not quite satisfied, and he thought he ought to do something more to facilitate the progress and comfort of the people of the North-West and particularly of the Saskatchewan valley, and he added:

"That the applicants shall have a period of 3 years within which to make selection of limits."

The Government was then just going out; they had been beaten on the 17th of September, 1878, and the day before resigning they passed this Order in Council. One sees the injudiciousness of the proposition of the Crown. The proposition was to give control to a combination, over 200 square miles of timber lands throughout the Saskatchewan valley, to be picked out in lots of 20 square miles. The consequence would be, they would get all the good timber and have at least from 10 to 20 monopolies throughout that country—and that was to decrease the price of timber. It was to give the settlers cheap timber, but to put the timber into twelve monopolies instead of one, but that one controlling the twelve.

"That the applicants shall have a period of three years within which to make selections of the limit, which shall not interfere with any lands which may be set apart for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or for reserves for Indians or school lands, or with any other timber limits which may have been previously granted."

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." He knows that some of these timber limits were then in the hands of their friends and were under the control of these men. They changed the men, but not the object.

"The Committee submit the foregoing recommendation for Your Excellency's approval.

"W. A. HIMSWORTH,  
"Clerk Privy Council."

On the 26th December that order was cancelled by the Conservative Government, yet the gentleman who endeavoured to perpetrate this job call themselves the friends of the half-breeds and the would be saviours of the North-West. If the half-breeds merely want friends who are always professing to plead for them, the country can do no better than to keep these hon. gentlemen in Opposition, for certainly, from 1873 to 1878, it cannot be proved from the record that they ever lifted their hands to help the half-breeds, or the surveys either. The next thoughtful act of the member for Bothwell, as Minister of Interior, was to introduce a Colonisation Railway Bill in March, 1878.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I know there is no Bill that the hon. gentleman is prouder of, and perhaps the reasons are that he withdrew it, and it never became an Act. The hon. gentleman has said a great deal about settlers' rights, and we shall hear a good deal more from him presently on that subject, and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has talked about them, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has also talked about settlers' rights. In regard to this Bill, of which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is so proud, I ask the House to allow me to dissect a few paragraphs. The hon. gentleman was afraid of railway monopolies. After providing for the Pacific Railway, he proposed to give all the lands of the North-West to any number of companies, and to locate and allot that land so soon as the companies were formed, and put up a percentage on the stock it was necessary to subscribe. The hon. gentleman has his ideas in reference to the homestead settler. Listen to this:

"The Governor in Council may vary or entirely change the mode of disposal of Dominion lands lying within a certain distance of a railway constructed under this Act, as regards homesteads, pre-emptions, sales and bounty land entries from those contained in the Dominion Lands Act, by reducing the quantity of land which may be granted in free homesteads or by withdrawing the homestead right altogether on such lands, and may fix a price for such lands, and order that such lands may be sold exclusively for cash, with or without conditions of actual settlement, as may be deemed expedient."

Here the hon. gentleman who objects to the land regulations of this Government, under this clause of a colonisation Bill introduced the system of clothing the Governor in Council with power to fix the cash price, and, unless the poor settler paid the cash, he had to get off. Then the villages, the town sites, all these were pounced upon, and section 28 provided that:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed as binding the Government to acknowledge any right to land settled on, or for any improvements effected on and within the limits of any tract reserved for a village or town site along or upon the line of railway, after public notice shall have been given of such land being reserved for such purpose."

That is, if parties were on the land, if they had squatted on the land—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) shakes his head. He can shake his head now, but had this Act been in force, we would have hung his head regretfully instead of shaking it:

"And in case of any person having settled on land found to be necessary for villages or for town sites."

If any of the railway autocrats came along, and said to the Minister of Interior: I want that land; we are going to build a station there, or a church, or to locate a town there, or to lay the foundation of a large village, the settler would have to go off, no matter if he had his family around him, and if he had surrounded himself with all the sources of comfort. What was to take place?

"Although such settlement may have been effected previous to public notice as above."

Although no notice had been there to warn him that he was going on forbidden ground, yet that august gentleman, the Minister of the Interior, because Reform Ministers are all august, assumed autocratic power:

"the Minister of the Interior may resume possession of such lands,—"  
May come out in the character of bailiff, clothed with purple and fine linen, and may tell the settler that the land is wanted and he must go. But there was a compensation. What was it?

"and compensate such person, by allotting him other land in lieu thereof, and paying for his improvements."

That is, a man goes to Regina, takes his son with him, takes his family, surrounds them with comforts, and the Government tell him: There is no land there; it is given to a company that is going to build a railway. Well, he asks: I can go to Qu'Appelle? No; there is another railway company there. Where can I go? Well, you can go north of Fort Pitt. That is precisely the power the Government took to itself, and this is the policy the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has, since last night, been endeavoring to defend. The hon. member wanted to know something about half-breed claims and half-breed lands, and he shed a good many crocodile tears on the subject. He has asked us to rub the sponge over the slate and commence at 1879, but we cannot do that. The legacy left by the previous Government is what has worked much of the trouble in the North-West to-day and we cannot possibly trace that or prove it, or substantiate it, unless we go to that record and see the policy which they followed, the mistakes which they made, the wrongs they committed, and the entangled web which they left hon. gentlemen who succeeded them in office to unravel. That so called Reform Government was in power in November, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876; they were in power in 1877 and during a part of 1878, and the country breathed freely during the latter part of 1873, when they went out. They were in power in 1877, and what was the evidence recorded by their own friends at that time? During the Session of 1877 Mr. Ryan, of Marquette, who supported them most of the time they were in power, on a motion for correspondence in regard to half-breed lands in Manitoba, said:

"From the time the reserves were established, in 1872, nothing was done about the matter until 1875, although occasionally a good deal was said. During the latter Session he called the attention of the House and the Government to the fact that these reserves were blocking the path  
**Mr. MACKINTOSH.**

of provincial progress. The hon. Mr. Laird, at that time Minister of Interior, in reply to a question asked by him, stated that the delay in settling the matter had arisen from conflicting claims, called staked claims. At the same time, the hon. gentleman took occasion to assure him that a decision had been arrived at upon the question of staked claims, and that the Government were prepared at once to proceed to the distribution. He (Mr. Ryan) knew fully at the time, as he knew now, that the answer was neither full nor satisfactory. As in many reserves, amongst others, the reserves for the half-breeds of White Mud River, Portage la Prairie, High Bluff and Poplar Point, in the county of West Marquette, not a single case of staked claims had arisen, and, therefore, there was no reason for the delay in these parishes."

Although there were no stake claims, the Minister stated to his friend, in 1875, that it was on account of the stake claims in this particular district that the lands had not been allotted. I will show more than that:

"The year passed away, but the promise respecting the distribution of the reserves had not been fulfilled."

Now, if Mr. Ryan had known the hon. gentlemen opposite as we know them, and as the people of Ontario have known them since 1874, he would have known that never, during all their existence as a party, did they ever carry out in power what they had promised in Opposition. But Mr. Ryan was an innocent man, and he left the House disappointed, and, I believe, took a seat upon the bench a year or two after:—

"The year passed away, and again, during the course of last Session, he felt it to be his duty to remind the Minister of the Interior that his promise respecting the distribution of the reserves had not been fulfilled. Again he had received an assurance that the Government were going to abate the nuisance at once and to distribute the reserves. Another twelve months having expired, he found his half-breed constituents and the Province of Manitoba precisely in the same position they had occupied during the last five years."

Here were gentlemen who, for four years, had been making promises and making exaggerated statements of their duties in regard to the allotment of these lands, whereas the statements of the settlers show there were no stake claims. I will shortly prove that while they were telling the settlers about these stake claims, and holding them up as a raw head and bloody bones, they had already passed Orders in Council, in 1876, refusing to recognise in any way whatever with stake claims. Mr. Mills, in reply, stated:

"On assuming office, his attention was almost immediately directed to the subject. The hon. member for Marquette was, of course, aware that provision was made for the allotment of the land into half-breed settlements, and that before any action was taken claims were put forward on behalf of private parties to particular tracts of land within the district. On investigation, it was found that there were several hundreds of these claims. All possible information was obtained, in order that the claims might be disposed of at the earliest practicable day; and he trusted that this would be very soon. The Government were fully aware of the mischief which had resulted to Manitoba from no action being taken in allotting the land, and they had considered the injury occasioned by locking up lands by merely changing the form of reservation."

To-day the hon. gentlemen charge the Government with offences for which they themselves are responsible, by adopting their policy with regard to stake claims and refusing to admit settlers' claims. There were in the North-West men of influence, men of substance, men of industry, who were driven off their lands by the action of these hon. gentlemen. Some of the very disaffected parties who are now inciting trouble in the North-West are people who were driven out of Manitoba by the Orders in Council passed by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

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

### After Recess.

**Mr. MACKINTOSH.** I have shown that the party opposed to the present Government, from 1869 up to the present time, has on all occasions utilised any sectional or national troubles to benefit themselves and to promote their party's interest, irrespective of the effect it would have upon the country in general. I have shown that throughout their policy has been one for office and not for the promotion of the country's interests. When the House rose at recess I was referring to the settlement of the half-breeds' land in Manitoba, and the non-allotment of those lands in 1877. I showed that the then Minister of the Interior admitted that the dilatory policy of the Government worked mischief to Manitoba; I have shown that one of the representatives of Manitoba stated that the lack of attention to their duties

on the part of the Government was blocking the path of provincial progress. I have shown that during all that time nothing but promises, promises, promises, were given in return for the support of the country. I have shown that from November, 1873, to September, 1878, their policy was one of indifference and inaction. I have shown that the only effort they made to redeem themselves in the public estimation was on the 7th October, 1878, when they passed their infamous Orders in Council to give to Cook and Sutherland entire control of the timber limits of the North-West. Now, the hon. gentleman who preceded me dealt very strongly and, to a certain extent, very cogently—at any rate, very insultingly—with the policy of the Government led by the right hon. Premier in connection with lands and limits. I stated that I would show by the Orders in Council passed by the preceding Government in 1876, when the hon. member for Bothwell was Minister of the Interior, what their policy was with regard to stake claims. I find, in a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, a memorandum of the 20th April, 1876:

“On a memorandum, dated 29th January, 1876, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, reporting the existence of certain claims to land in Manitoba, which, he states, do not come clearly within those provided for under the law as it now stands.”

I will take No. 2 of the classification.

“2. Lands alleged to have been taken up, but which were not surveyed as above, or occupied, but merely marked out by the claimants, by stakes, prior to the 15th July, 1877.”

“The second class the Minister submits are not entitled to consideration.”

I have shown by this Order in Council that the policy adopted by the then Minister of the Interior resulted in a number of people leaving Manitoba and going to the North-West. I have stated that those who went there did so as men driven from the Province they had adopted, and, being driven out, became disaffected members of society in the Territories. I have stated further, that upon the Conservative Government coming into power they calmly deliberated the matter, and the result was that on 25th February, 1881, a report of the Committee of the Privy Council was adopted, in which it is stated:

“On a memorandum dated 23rd February, 1881, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, in reference to the Order in Council of the 20th April, 1876, on the subject of certain claims to land in Manitoba, and adopting a certain mode of dealing with the same.

“The Minister reports that exception has been taken by the persons interested in the operation of that Order, in respect of the particular class of claims set forth in paragraph No. 2 of the same, it being alleged that a settlement of their rights on the basis of the said order would result in injustice to the claimants.”

The Order in Council further stated:

“For convenience in dealing with the question, the Minister classifies the several claims as follows:—

“1. Those of such claims as have changed hands, the purchasers having in some cases gone into possession, and are living on the land at the present time.

“2. Those of the claims so staked out, which remain exactly as they were when it is alleged they were taken up, and are claimed by the persons who staked them out.

“3. Those claims which, since being staked out, have been bought up by other parties, for, it is said, speculative purposes, and are now held with that view, nothing having been done upon them in the way of cultivation or improvement.”

This is the second class dealt with by the Minister of the Interior in 1876:

“Respecting the second class, that the lands be offered to the claimants at the price of railway lands in the belt in which they are found to be situated, but should the claimant in any case prefer to do so, he may accept a homestead entry for 160 acres of the lot, and acquire the balance at the railway lands price, as before mentioned.”

Mr. MILLS. What is the date of that Order?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The date is the 23rd February, 1881. I have shown that whereas the present Government is charged with dilatoriness, that charge really lies at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have shown by evidence and I can show by further evidence—that hon. gentlemen opposite were absolutely indifferent to the claims of the half-breeds; that they never thought of the claims of the poor Indians, that they thought solely of their friends, and when they enlarged the boundaries of the allotments to

half-breeds to 240 acres, based upon a partial return, and done, many declare, to help those who had bought scrip from the poor half-breeds—they laid the foundation of what has caused half the trouble in the North-West. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) stated that the grievances of the people of the North-West were the result of inaction—inaction in regard to the surveys, indifference, proved by the small number of patents issued, and the non-settlement of claims. I will ask the House to allow me to draw a comparison between the number of patents issued by the present Government and those issued by the preceding Government. The total number of patents issued in Manitoba and the North-West Territories up to the 27th February, 1885, was 23,036. Issued from 5th May, 1873, to January, 1879, 6,500. Those patents were issued and claims settled by hon. gentlemen opposite at a time when they were promising, year after year, from 1873 to 1878, that they would make a final arrangement and have the trouble amicably settled. The number of patents issued from 1st January, 1879, to 27th February, 1885, was 16,537, as compared with 6,500 issued between 1873 and 1879. The hon. member for Bothwell, when Minister of the Interior, wrote to the Dominion land agent, at Winnipeg, as follows:—

“It is not necessary to look up parties who have claims. If they care for their interests they will themselves come forward and establish their claims.”

This letter was in reply to a communication from a gentleman living on the spot, who knew the feelings of the people, who understood the instincts of the people, and saw future trouble engendered from want of policy and want of tact. The Dominion land agent laid down a policy which, if adopted by the hon. gentleman, would have created more happiness and comfort than exists in the North-West and Manitoba to-day.

Mr. MILLS. That observation was made upon a memorandum to Mr. Codd, and Mr. Codd had already suggested exactly the same line.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am perfectly willing to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman; but it is very strange that the Dominion agent, if he desired to induce the Minister to adopt—

Mr. MILLS. It was not an Indian agent. It was Mr. Codd; and if the hon. gentleman will look at Mr. Codd's letter he will find that Mr. Codd presented exactly the same view.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Then the hon. member has only proved that not alone was he incompetent, but the Dominion agent as well. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) talked about surveys, and said what the half-breeds wanted was surveys. The other night the First Minister displayed a map which afforded very suggestive and significant proof of the lack of action on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. From that map I find that the land surveyed up to 1873, from the time that Canada became seized of the territory of Rupert's Land, and the North-West Territories, from the time that Manitoba got a constitution, amounted to 9,999,000 acres; and the progressive, brilliant, patriotic, statesmanlike, all-the-talents Government which came in in 1873, succeeded, in five years, by a remarkable effort and an energy almost unparalleled in the history of reform, in surveying 1,797,000 acres. I find that under the present incompetent, ignorant, imbecile Administration which I have the honor to support, and which the country endorsed, from the time they came into power, in 1879, down to 1884, there were 55,618,500 acres surveyed. And we are told that what the half-breeds want, and what the poor starving Indians want, are surveys. Well, Sir, I do not know what food could be extracted from a survey by a starving Indian; I do not know what particular pleasure would accrue to a half-breed by seeing surveys, from which he was deriving

no benefit. So far as the half-breeds are concerned, we are told that there has been an absolute want of action, and a non-settlement of claims on the part of the Government. Now, I find that in 1883 the land board met at Prince Albert, Mr. Pearce being the leading member of it, and they sat and adjusted a large number of claims. In 1884 Mr. Pearce went to Calgary, Edmonton and Battleford, contrary to the statements made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and which, despite the evidence I am now giving, will probably be repeated by the hon. member for Bothwell. He visited the South Saskatchewan and did a large amount of work, subsequently leaving to Mr. Duck, the agent at Prince Albert, the settlement of claims on the South Saskatchewan—the claims of men who had come there and taken up land and forcibly made settlers of themselves. I think I have shown that so far as patents issued are concerned, want of action and utter indifference were alone shown by the hon. member for Bothwell when he was Minister of the Interior. So far as the duties performed by Mr. Pearce and the land board are concerned, there was rapid and active work, and instead of condemning hon. gentlemen opposite, from their own records, should have been the first to have endorsed it. They appear to forget, too, that their negligence in surveys, in allotments and in locations, allowed years to elapse, thereby making it difficult to find the rightful owners or claimants, and that by annulling Governor Archibald's enumeration they lost several years and completely reversed the policy of their predecessors. But with that party blindness which drove them out of power, and which will keep them out of power for many years, these hon. gentlemen proceed, in the face of evidence that they cannot gainsay, to condemn the present Government as one wanting in action, one neglectful of its duties to the country. The hon. member for West Huron said, where is the Prime Minister, and why is he not present to hear my indictment? And what was the indictment? Was it one which a leading public man should bring against any Government? No, Sir; it was a series of extracts from newspapers, and a denial on the part of the hon. gentleman that he was actuated by any motive save the public interest. When the dates of these papers were asked he took it as a personal affront, and gave the date of only one extract from the *Toronto Mail* of March last. He alluded also to an extract from *La Minerve*. Why, Sir, had the hon. gentleman desired to do so, he could have found in *La Minerve* of the next day an article by the regular editor, manager and controller of that paper, stating that the article to which the hon. gentleman referred was smuggled into the editorial columns of that journal. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, instead of making that statement, omitted these facts. Do these hon. gentlemen imagine that the people of this country are not intelligent? The people had a Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a leading representative, in power from 1873 to 1878, and we know that so far as the Hon. Mr. Laird is concerned, who preceded the hon. member for Bothwell as Minister of the Interior, so soon as that gentleman was found incompetent, was found not to answer just exactly what the Reform party required, as Minister of Interior, he was sent up to formulate and regulate a policy for the great North-West. He was given control over the larger territory and the larger interest, and the hon. member for Bothwell took his place, and I think the hon. gentleman, in his inner consciousness, knows what state that Department was in when he entered it, and how much credit it reflected on his predecessor. If Mr. Laird was competent, if he was an able and brilliant statesman, why did they not keep him in the Government? But, no; they sent him to the North-West, to make treaties with the Indians, and I ask why it was, while he was there, that he did not in

Mr. MACKINTOSH,

those treaties arrange for the allotment and the settlement of those claims. And when the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) talks about the Indians having no rations, about their being badly treated, about their starving, I ask him if in any of the treaties they can find obligations entered into by the then Government, or by any Government controlling the interests of Canada, at that time, promises or engagements to ration those Indians? I ask hon. gentlemen who have moved an amendment in the interests of the half-breeds, and in the interest of their leader, M. Riel, the claimant of 240 acres of land, the claimant of five lots, who says he has many other additional claims to make—I ask if they knew what the policy of Riel was. If they did not know, they should not have introduced that resolution, because I think those gentlemen have read the records, they know the history of the uprising, and they have taken far more interest in knowing more of him and those connected with him than they have with regard to the interests of the Dominion at large. I find that Riel, writing to Bishop Grandin, at the time when he pretended to be acting in the interests of peace and harmony and constitutional government, treating this Government as a child should its father, said:

"Here is what we request for the present until Canada becomes able to pay each year the interest on the capital representing the value of our country, and until public opinion consents to recognise our rights to the land, to their full extent."

I ask hon. gentlemen to weigh this evidence, this statement, and see what it means. They know what they did for Riel in 1874. We know now what they are trying to do for him. They are trying to cloak the wrong-doing of that agitator by a vote of Parliament, though I do not assert they are doing it with a rebellious thought or feeling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes; they are.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. But I know that party passion has misled them, that it is carrying them to an extent they will much regret in the future, when they come to meet the people at the polls; and what has the result been? Does Riel say to that distinguished prelate of his church: Give us these rights; give us responsible government; give us our land, and we will be satisfied. No; he says we are willing to take that for the present only, until public opinion consents to recognise our rights to the land to the full extent. What does that mean? It means that any compromise with those people now would mean future trouble and misery in the North-West. Even with the heads of the Church, Riel was mysterious, as proved by Bishop Grandin's words at the meeting in September last, when that dignitary made a speech as follows:—

"The venerable prelate said that if for some time past the relations between the clergy and the half-breed population with regard to what had taken place appeared cold and unsympathetic, that reserve on the part of the clergy did not argue any diminution of affection or charity, but was simply actuated by the extreme prudence which the actual circumstances demanded on account of the mystery in which they (the half-breeds) had thought proper to envelop their proceedings up to that day—a mystery which not only left the clergy without sufficient knowledge on which to base a clear and well-founded judgement, but which, moreover, gave rise to serious suspicions, to fears and disquietudes that were absolutely painful. 'Only speak out honestly,' added his Lordship; 'only let us know distinctly what your desires and aims are, and we will give you our opinion and counsel. If justice is on your side, we will sustain you with all our strength and influence, as we have ever done in like circumstances in the past.'"

Louis Riel is no common man; he knows the instincts of his people; he knows what control he has over them; and he knew, when he wrote letters to different respectable people, that if he was paid a certain amount of money he would go out of the country and the trouble would cease, that at some future time he could come back, and bring misery and tribulation and depression upon the North-West. But we find hon. gentlemen opposite willing to endorse Riel's policy and Riel's duplicity. Now, the hon. gentle-

man has sneered at the land regulations introduced by this Government. I ask if, from his place in this House, he dare contrast the vacillating land regulations of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, in 1874, with the land regulations improved upon and adopted by the present Administration. I have shown that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in his colonisation Bill, proposed to sow the seeds of disunion and trouble for the struggling settler in the North-West—that he not only set apart the territory for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but did this also for different colonisation railway companies, thus allowing Americans to come in and control the trade of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, thus diverting that to the United States. Now, if the House will permit me, I wish to contrast the land regulations of the present Government with the land regulations of the former Government, and both with those of the United States, which have been so frequently eulogised by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Chariton), and other hon. gentlemen opposite. Under the regulations of the late Government, no homestead and pre-emption grants were allowed, no sale of lands for cash was permitted, except under the peculiar clause in the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell, in 1878, which allowed favored classes to come in and claim the land and pay cash for it; thus certain men who were making a living by traffic along the railways, and had very little money, were put into the hands of a lot of land grabbers and speculators. No one was allowed to have more than 340 acres; \$1 per acre, cash down, was demanded, and the balance was to be paid at whatever time and at whatever price the Government might fix; actual settlement was to begin within a year, on pain of forfeiture of all payments. The House is doubtless aware that there have been various changes made in the land regulations by the present Government, according as the progress and development of the country required them, as the reports of agents came in, and as the opinions of Ministers were ripened and matured by experience. Homesteads of 160 acres each may now be obtained, on all the even-numbered sections (not otherwise disposed of), upon the simple payment of \$10 of an office fee. In the mile belt, that is the land one mile in width on each side of the railway, the actual settler must begin residence within six months, and break up his homestead land at a certain number of acres. Outside of the mile belt the homesteader may begin occupation within six months, and live only six months per annum on his grant, cultivating it, of course. The homesteader may reside within a radius of two miles of his land for the three years succeeding his entry. This is a particularly liberal provision, as it enables the settler to board for two or three seasons, or half a dozen to club together and live in comfort while cultivating their land. A homesteader may purchase his grant outright, if he pleases, after he has lived on it a year and cultivated thirty acres. A pre-emption plot of 160 acres can be had at the same time as the homestead grant, at \$2.50 per acre, or, in some parts, for \$2 per acre. On payment of a fee of 50 cents, a settler may get a permit to cut 30 cords of wood, 1,800 lineal feet of logs, 2,000 cubic feet of rails, and 400 roof rails. Payments for lands may be in cash, scrip, or police or military bounty warrants. Now, having shown that the land policy of the present Government is infinitely superior to and more liberal than that of the preceding Government, I wish to refer to that which some hon. gentlemen laud as everything that is wise and just and progressive—the land policy of the United States. In Canada, the land regulation grants to every actual settler a free homestead, and a pre-emption adjoining. In the United States a homestead and pre-emption cannot adjoin, and cannot be held at the same time. In Canada, pre-emption is the right to purchase a lot adjoining a free grant,

when the homesteader is entitled to his free patent. In the United States, pre-emption means the right to purchase a homestead lot, after living on it and improving it for not less than twelve months. In Canada, a man can get two homesteads and pre-emptions. In the United States, only one can be obtained. In Canada, the condition of ownership is three years' settlement and cultivation. In the United States, the term is five years. In Canada, a youth of eighteen years of age has the right to a homestead and pre-emption. In the United States, he must be twenty-one years old. For young men, therefore, Canada is three years ahead of the United States. In the United States, no person who is owner of 320 acres in any State or Territory can obtain a homestead. In Canada, the only condition for securing homestead and pre-emption is, that the man shall actually reside on the land. He may own lands in other places, without that fact preventing him obtaining his free grant and pre-emption. Now, I submit to the House that comparison of the land system of Mr. Mackenzie's Government with the land system of the present Administration, and the existing system, as contrasted with that of the United States, shows that our regulations in Canada are far more liberal and progressive in all that contributes to promote the public welfare and the public interest. The hon. member for West Huron dealt at length with the Indian question. That question has been treated with force, ability, power and exhaustiveness by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard); I shall, therefore, not allude to it at any length, but would remind the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that he, as Minister of the Interior, must have realised that at some future period there would be trouble with the Indians in the North-West, even when he did not know that Riel was plotting, or that an incipient rebellion was threatening that country. In 1879, when a Bill was brought in to increase the Mounted Police force to 500 men, the hon. member for Bothwell said:

"He was strongly impressed with the idea that there was danger of difficulties with the aborigines at no very remote period. He believed the supply of buffalo would, at an early day, be exhausted, these buffalo being the principal means of support of the Indians; and unless something was done at an early day to induce them to engage in industrial pursuits, serious complications would arise, when their present means of subsistence failed."

"Sir John Macdonald said no doubt the danger the hon. gentleman mentioned must always be contemplated. The Government and Parliament must be prepared for an outbreak some time, when the Indians' means of subsistence failed or became scarce."

"Mr. Mills has no doubt, before the time of the present Parliament expired, serious troubles would be witnessed in the North-West."

That was in 1879. The hon. member for Bothwell was a little previous in his prophetic fears; but I ask the hon. member for West Huron how, in the face of the fact that millions of dollars have been expended, that intelligent instructors using every advantage that civilization could afford have been provided, he can assert that the Government have ill-treated the Indians. The hon. member for West Huron quoted from different books and reports. I observed that he dropped his voice at the dates, and very frequently I could not hear them. I do not now know what particular years he mentioned or what particular reports he quoted from; but as the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier has dealt with that question, with great ability and as his statements will go the country, I am willing to put his arguments against those of three or four gentlemen of the same calibre as the hon. member for West Huron. It may, however, in this connection be imagined that I am not doing justice to the ex-Minister of the Interior. I forgot that we then had a sanguinary Minister of Interior; I forgot that his policy was, that in order to assist the Indians and in order to promote peace and comfort in the North-West, the Indians should be furnished with Winchester rifles; and if we look at the Estimates under his regime we will find an appropriation for rifles to the Indians. I do not know whether he thought, with my hon. friends last night, that the only

Indian he could trust was a dead Indian, and was of the opinion that they would probably shoot one another; but I cannot think that, feeling in his heart there would be an uprising some day, he gave arms into the hands of these ignorant people for the purpose of slaughtering the white population. Before I close, I desire to add some further evidence which disproves the allegation that the uprising was due to maladministration on the part of the Government. I know that any statement favorable to the Government, will not be palatable to hon. gentleman opposite; I know that for over three months they have been studying the Blue Books, seeking to prejudice their own minds, seeking to convince themselves that they are right and the Government wrong. I do not blame them for, maddened by partisanship and ambition, they knew not, cared not, what they did; they are prejudiced, and when a man has strong prejudices it is difficult to remove them, particularly when he has an object in view in having them. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about starving Indians, about the want of surveys, and about the poor half-breeds. What does Louis Riel say now, when, being in prison, he professes give the true reason for the uprising. He says, in a letter dated June 15th inst, addressed to Mr. Fiset, formerly a member of this House:

"Times were hard in the Saskatchewan country especially. There was no work; there was no money. The crops had failed, as you may have seen by newspaper reports. Merchants were embarrassed, or half ruined, or brought to the verge of ruin, and knew not what to do. They plotted together to bring in all the Mounted Police they could."

Riel was the leader of that rebellion, the preacher of peace and harmony, who, going there in the interest of peace and harmony, saw his opportunity. He says there was considerable trouble in the North-West; but instead of trying amicably to settle the case, he went to the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, the starving Indians, and tried to mislead them, convincing Poundmaker and Big Bear that they were ill-treated in being deprived of their lands—lands on which they would not settle, and which they were not disposed to value, and a country becoming distasteful, because the buffalo had disappeared. The hon. gentleman knows that some years ago, in this House, hon. members from Manitoba brought before the Mackenzie Administration the fact that the buffalo were being slaughtered at the rate of 160,000 each season, and predicted trouble in the North-West in consequence. Did that Government take up this question and deal with it, as an honest, active Administration would have done? No; turning to the report of 1877, in the *Official Debates* of the House, we find that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and other members supporting him, held that the matter had better be left to the Local Government or the North-West council—that despised North-West council, that hon. gentlemen opposite have since scoffed at and defamed. To that irresponsible body, when in power, hon. gentlemen opposite were willing to leave every question of vital importance to the North-West. I have said I would be as brief as possible, but the statements made by Louis Riel led me to refer to the question I have just alluded to, and leads me now to ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether their policy with regard to Canada has not worked danger, tribulation and disaster to the North-West. Has one of them a good word to say for the North-West? They have thrown the challenge across the House, daring us to prove that they decry their country. I offered the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he challenged us to produce the proof—I offered it to him and asked him to insert it in his speech, so that the antidote should go with the poison; but he would not consent to the proposition, preferring party interests to patriotic honesty. I hold in my hand the proof, and propose to give it to the House. I firmly and sincerely believe that if hon. gentlemen opposite had been patriotic—and I do not use the word patriotic in its hackneyed sense—had these

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

hon. gentlemen, who were Ministers of the Crown at one time, not been convinced that this country had done them an injustice in driving them out of power, and endeavored to get even with the people, endeavored to be revenged on the country, and had they adopted a policy such as that which was followed by hon. gentlemen on this side, when in Opposition, and assisted the Government in developing this country, and founding on the continent a second empire, peopled by British subjects, German, English, Irish, Scotch and French, vieing with one another in allegiance to their country and fealty to one of the best women and the best queen the world has ever known, we would have seen an intelligent and happy people throughout the Dominion; we would not have seen the oceans of blood that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) speaks of, but many a happier household than is in Canada to-day. We would not have seen troops moving from Halifax, Winnipeg, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Quebec, brought together—for what object? The object of shooting down their brothers. There was the poison that, when circulated, worked misery to this country and jeopardised the union, which every man to-day, since that occurrence, would shed the last drop of his blood to maintain. Sir, the rebel thought is foster father to the rebel deed and those who, even silently on by insinuation, encourage or justify armed resistance to legal authority, do violence to constitutional principles and outrage the sacred rights of national autonomy. Mr. Speaker, demagogues promise, statesmen perform, and I leave to this House the duty of declaring which party professed and promised and which professed and performed. Not only in Canada, not only within the walls of this House, but throughout Great Britain, hon. gentlemen opposite and those who sympathise with them, and those who are their paid agents, those who receive money from the Ontario Government, have done their utmost to injure the country, to prevent capital flowing into the North West. I propose to establish, from the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, that there is a class of people in the country prepared, for the sake of office, to trample over the very ruins of their country and to wade through what the hon. member for West Huron calls oceans of blood, to the Treasury benches. I was in England two years ago, and the first man I met, a leading representative of an important institution, said: "You know it is very wrong for your public men to talk the way they do; they are infinitely damaging their country." I asked him what he referred to, and he said: "I can give you a pamphlet containing a lecture delivered by Mr. Fleming, the well known land agent for the Union Pacific Railway, and he there draws his conclusions, not from his own inner consciousness—there is no romance about it—and he says to the people, as he passes through the country: "I will not tell you what I think about it myself, because you might not believe me, you might think that I have some interest in it, but I will quote the Canadian papers to show you the desperate condition in which Canada is," and in consequence of which Canada is losing thousands and thousands of men who would go to that country, and who would represent millions of dollars. I procured one of those pamphlets. It is called "farming and stock-raising in America," and it commences with most thoughtful and kindly criticisms of Canada, but—there was always that "but" in the way—but what did the Canadian papers say? He then quotes, line by line, word by word, and sentence by sentence, from the *Toronto Globe*, to show that there is a vast exodus going on from this country.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. member says, "hear, hear." I undertake to say he cannot prove it. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite now, and I say I will prove by their

own arguments that their exodus is absolutely fallacious. I will prove it from the mouth of the hon. member for South Huron. I will take his own standard, and, going back to the record, will prove that there is not a single sentence uttered by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) on this subject, that cannot be disproved, and that the official records do not disprove, and I will measure the whole by the statistics which he applies to one decade and not to another. To proceed with my remarks—Mr. Fleming goes on to say :

“What the Americans think of Dakota may be judged of from the fact which, I presume, most of you who are in the habit of reading American newspapers, are already aware of, viz., that the farmers in Eastern States are leaving in hundreds for Dakota; and still more suggestive is the other fact, that the Canadian farmers are not only leaving their own farms in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but are actually leaving their own North-Western Territories, in large numbers, and settling in Dakota. I have here quite a pocketful of clippings from Canadian papers to substantiate that statement, but will not try your patience by reading them all. I will, however, read two or three extracts from the leading Canadian newspaper.

Now, I want, without occupying too much time, to show hon. gentlemen that, from the time the Canadian Pacific Railway became a fixed fact, nay, more, from the time, in 1879, that the vote of 1,000,000 acres of land was taken to build that road, hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs commenced decrying the country, and the dates I will give and the statements I quote, will establish the correctness and soundness of what I assert :

The *Toronto Globe* of March, in 1880, says :

“That on the preceding Tuesday an emigrant train left Ottawa (the capital of the Dominion) and by the time it reached Coburg there were 447 persons on board bound for Dakota, and only three for the Canadian North-West.

Again the same paper, 1st October, 1880, says :

“Surely the intelligent immigrant may be supposed to know what he wants and where he can best suit himself, and if he prefers Dakota to the Canadian North-West he must have some reason for doing so. All the thousands of Canadians who have this year settled in Dakota instead of the fertile belt north of the boundary are not born fools. In making a choice they must have been determined by either the character of the country or the conditions under which land can be procured.”

I have already shown the land regulations from 1874 to 1878 and from 1878 to 1884, and have compared those regulations with the system adopted and approved of in the United States, and I think I have also established by comparison that the land regulations of Canada are immensely superior—and if they are not, I have no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell will prove that I am incorrect—and, if there is a mistake on the part of this Government, I shall be glad to know that he will point out the mistake in the regulations now existing, and he will find that instead of this Government being the ignorant, incompetent, imbecile Government which has been depicted by the member for West Huron, it is an Administration abreast of the times and anxious to promote national welfare, hence prepared on every occasion to amend any regulations which may be defective. The *Globe* proceeds :

“What does it matter whether the absolute cost of land is greater or less to the immigrant in Canada than in Dakota? The only means of testing whether the regulations are suitable is the rapidity with which population comes in, and judged by this test, those now in force have this year failed most egregiously.”

Hon. gentlemen will see the design in this statement. This Mr. Fleming, travelling through the different cities of Ireland and Scotland, tells the people that even our Canadian papers admit that our land regulations are infinitely inferior to and far more onerous than the land regulations of the United States. The *Toronto Globe* proceeds to say that the only way of testing the relative character of the regulations is the rapidity with which population comes in, and then it states that 447 persons left for Dakota, and only three for the Canadian North-West, thus proving, by its own state-

ment, the animus and the design it had in making it. Again, I quote from the *Globe* of 1st April, 1881 :

“The exodus to the west and North-West from this section is large, and is likely to increase. Unfortunately, the major part go to Dakota and other western States, instead of our own North-West. Only the other day a party of ninety left the Grand Trunk station, eighty for Dakota, ten only for Manitoba, and this is about the proportion of other parties who have gone or are going. The other day an intelligent and close observer, just returned from Manitoba, who had, during the last summer, travelled largely in Manitoba, and especially in the Pembina Mountain and Turtle Mountain districts, reports large numbers leaving those districts for Dakota.”

And in the very next year we have articles from the Dakota newspapers, stating that farmers were sending their wheat to our own North-West, and selling it there, after paying the duty, and making 15 cents a bushel more than was paid in United States settlements; but we never find one word about that in the papers opposed to this Government. I sincerely hope that the leader of the Opposition does not endorse this policy; I do not believe he wishes to come into power in a ruined country; for, should his party outside of this House or in this House succeed in destroying the country, if he came in he would go out again, as his predecessor went out, disgraced and ruined in public life. I am sure he does not wish that, and, if so, then it is his bounden duty to denounce it. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite do not desire to hear these facts, because they have, time after time, asked us to prove that the country is decry'd, and I am here to-night to prove it, and I challenge them to show that one word I quote is not in the papers from which I have read. Now, having shown the result, on the other side of the water, of their efforts to decry and ruin this country, I ask hon. gentlemen to go back to the year 1882. At that time they were endeavoring to bring emigrants into this country, and I find the opinions expressed by the ex-Minister of Finance quoted over and over again in American papers and pamphlets, and commented upon in Europe. Sir Richard Cartwright stated, in 1852 (I quote from the *Official Debates*) :

“Immediately on the introduction of that policy, as every one acquainted with western Canada knows, there was a large and lamentable exodus of many of the best farmers of the western region, not, I am sorry to say, to our own North-West, but to Dakota, Minnesota and other portions of the United States.”

In the same debate he said :

“Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or other.”

I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, where is the tax-gatherer now? Where are the taxes they levied in 1874 and 1875, as compared with the taxes this Government levies? What is the condition of the poor man in this country now, as compared with his condition during the *régime* of hon. gentlemen opposite? Although they came into office with an immense surplus, in a few years they were driven from power, with a deficit of between six and seven million dollars, leaving to their successors works uncompleted, an empty treasury, a starving population and a hopeless and undone country. I ask hon. gentlemen to contrast the Canada of 1878 with the Canada of 1885, and say who were the demagogues and who were the statesmen. The hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) proceeded to say :

“If you want to find a true parallel to our Government in Canada, you will not find it in a country having free institutions, outside of Canada. You must search for it in some such state of things as existed in France in the days known as the Second Empire, which began with the massacre of December and wound up with the capitulation of Sedan.”

This is the way the hon. gentleman spoke of his country; this the picture he drew of it, to be sent across the Atlantic. This was his proclamation: “I will paint a Yankee picture, in Yankee colors, with a Yankee brush and send it across the ocean in a Yankee frame.” And thus he closed :

"Our condition is far worse, I am sorry to say, than the condition of the people of the United States to-day."

No wonder pamphlets had to be published as counter-irritants—these remarks made by the ex-Prime Minister have gone abroad, have been used to our detriment in foreign lands, have irritated the people of the newer territories, and done much to cause acrimony and ill feeling. Do we wonder, then, at the uprising in the North-West? Now, Sir, I find in the *Globe* of the 2nd of December, 1884:

"Sir Richard Cartwright, in his speech at Montreal, gave some statistics which are as startling as they are undeniable. He showed that in all that constitutes a progressive and prosperous people Canada has, for some time, been going back, and going back when, according to the ordinary course of things, she ought to have been advancing, and with leaps and bounds."

This is the statement of the ex-Finance Minister, while his successor in office goes to England a few months afterwards and makes the best loan this country has ever negotiated. Shrewd loan negotiators could put a proper value upon Canada's resources, but this was not the case with emigrants and land purchasers. On 11th December, 1884, the *Globe* says again:

"The American statistics of immigrants from Canada have been pronounced ridiculously false, but it is in evidence that they are being prepared with greater care now than in the years when Mr. Mackenzie was Premier, and in the main they are closely verified by the most accurate and trustworthy of Canadian statistics. The Province of Ontario has alone lost 260,000 of her sons during the four years, 1879-'83."

The hon. member for South Huron bases his calculation on the attendance at schools. What does the official report show? Between 1861 and 1871 the school population increased nearly 400,000, while applying that rule to the population, the decrease, according to the statement of the ex-Minister of Finance, was 400,000; and yet he argues that diminution in school population in 1879-1884, is proof of an exodus from Canada. Now, I shall not pursue that subject, but simply desire to give the ground of argument; I want to show that this continual decrying of our country is preventing people from coming hither from Europe. When hon. gentlemen were in office their cry was: We must people the North-West. Every effort was put forward. They expended at least \$13 per head, as compared with our \$4 per head, to bring emigrants into this country. The hon. gentleman now at the head of the Immigration Department gave them every assistance in his power, but they have not returned the compliment. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), said, a few nights ago: "We are spending too much money in the North-West, while the old Provinces are being neglected." At one time they say one thing, at another time they say another thing, each the diametrical opposite of the other, but applied as proof in the same case. When the present Government came into power the Ontario Government were paying a certain sum to bring people here, but they have withdrawn that assistance. How are they spending money now? Is it in the interests of the people of Ontario? No, Sir; but they are paying a man in Toronto, named D. J. O'Donoghue, between \$700 and \$800 a year to defame and slander our country. I find in the *Manchester Guardian* a letter written by this gentleman to a person named J. H. Scholes, a Trades Union man, in May last. That letter has been sent to me, and I shall submit it to this House, and, through this House, send it to the country, that the people may see what kind of men their money is used to support:

"TORONTO, 13th April, 1865.

"DEAR SIR,— \* \* \* The snow keeps coming down to date. The ice is solid on our inland waters, and has no even as yet shown any perceptible sign of loosening its frigid grasp on the harbor or Toronto, so that the opening of navigation in Canada is, so far, a thing of the future. The situation as respects business generally, and as respects the labor market in particular, shows but little, if any, change from that of the past winter, nor is there any likelihood of any material change for the better for some time to come. And, as if to add to the gravity of the situation, the present serious rebellion in our North-West has paralyzed the chances of that unfortunate country as a field for emigrants, either from the old Canada or Great Britain for years."

MR. MACKINTOSH.

Utilising national adversity, national anxiety, for the purpose of promoting the interests of—what? Of Mr. Mowat's Government and of hon. gentlemen opposite.

"When the Indians of Canada have gone so far as to murder those whom, in the long past, they have revered, in the persons of Roman Catholic priests, it lies not in the mouth of any person (even though he be a Government or a steamship agent, and such persons can elongate the truth considerably) to say that this trouble is not much more than serious. Bearing this in mind respecting this North-West, of long and lonely distances, without Railway communication of any extent"

This statement was published while our troops were passing over the line, and going north of Lake Superior, and marching on the enemy. There was no railway communication, he said, while Canada is expending millions to complete one of the greatest railways in the world. This is the gentleman who receives money from the Province of Ontario, who is the paid hireling of the Ontario Government, because he is in sympathy with the gentlemen opposite in this House.

"Sparse population, hostile half-breeds and Indians and semi-savages."

Those are the people whom the hon. member for West-Huron talked of. Have they proved themselves to be "semi-savages?" If you will look at the record of some of the half-breeds you will find that they are among the most industrious, active and intelligent people who live on any part of the American continent. And yet this man, who pretends to be a friend of the workmen of Canada and of Ontario, but who is only a friend to himself and his own pocket, and is the hireling of Mr. Mowat and his Government—this is the man who calls those people "semi-savages," and sends across the water the story that we, in Canada, are fighting "semi-savages," who murder their priests, and warns emigrants against coming to this country. The man is a worthy representative of those who abused the Minister of Interior for not going to the North-West; and when he was going last year subpoenaed him before a court in Toronto to prevent his visiting that country. And hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to wonder where our immigrants go. I remember when the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) stated in this House and in my hearing—I was not then a member—that every immigrant brought into this country was worth \$25—

MR. TROW. \$1,000.

MR. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman said we could afford to pay \$25 per head to bring immigrants here. What do we find Mr. Mowat's agent doing? We find Mr. Mowat's agent declaring that we are fighting savages, and at the same time hon. gentlemen opposite are obstructing the bold and progressive policy, the necessarily bold policy, inaugurated and maintained by the Minister of Agriculture, for the purpose of bringing the better class of settlers to the Dominion. He goes on to say:

"None other than the most gullible of innocent mortals will venture, under any pretence, to emigrate thereto at the present time, with the intent of making it a home."

This letter is signed, "D. J. O'Donoghue." This gentleman was formerly in the Local Legislature of Ontario. He became secretary of the Trades and Labor Union. He is one of the gentlemen sending petitions down here to the Minister of Agriculture, asking him to stop giving money to bring people to the country; while at the same time, with a duplicity which I deeply regret, he is writing letters to prevent people going to the North-West, and the Opposition, not knowing it, perhaps, have assisted him in his disloyal, unpatriotic and unjustifiable work. But I go further. I look at the Public Accounts of Ontario, and what do I find? Why, that D. J. O'Donoghue is the recipient, as a Seasonal writer and clerk for the Ontario Government, of a sum, annually, ranging from \$600 to \$800. And yet that gentleman, after writing that letter, a letter which has done an infinite amount of harm to Canada, is still kept in office by

Mr. Mowat—and if he is not kept there, he will be made a colonisation road inspector or a license inspector, and will receive promotion in the grand army of freedom and reform. Since recess I have been looking over some papers, and my attention has been called to an article published in a Manitoba journal, as showing that this party acrimony ceases not, that it has no limits. It is an article published by the *Winnipeg Times* from the *Winnipeg Free Press*. That paper is edited and controlled by a western Reformer, who lived in the county of Middlesex, who had been a strong politician there, although not an active one, and published a Reform newspaper at that time. He went to Winnipeg, still remained a member of the Reform party and supporter of the Reform cause—if they have any cause—at all events, he supported the “lost cause” and has done much towards promoting trouble and spreading dissatisfaction.” The *Free Press*, about the 2nd of July, says :

“Apparently, the old battle of responsible government will have to be fought all over again in this new western country. The people of the North-West may as well recognise the fact at once and prepare for the struggle. Surely another rebellion, accompanied by the loss of hundreds of more lives and millions of treasure, will not be necessary to bring the Government to their senses. The Opposition in and out of Parliament will aid them to the utmost.”

The declaration is, that in and out of Parliament the Opposition will aid the rebels to the utmost. They will not justify the rebellion, but they justify the rebels. It means that we have again to fight the battle as to whether we are to proceed on national or provincial lines, and whether we are going to be one people or not, or whether everything has to be sacrificed for the sake of office. Sir, the man who utilises a Provincial or sectional question of so serious a nature as that under discussion, for the purpose of promoting partisan interests, commits a crime against order and does violence to the constitution under which he lives. This the Opposition is now doing. The sober second thought of the people however is with us. We know that were we to-morrow to appeal to the country our candidates would be elected by vast majorities. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that this Government has shown incapacity, imbecility and ignorance. Let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite how many seats they have redeemed in Ontario since 1882? We have the honor of having the hon. member for Bothwell here, and I am sure if he would devote his great ability to defending his country and fighting for its interests he would occupy a much higher position before the people. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they have gained? The hon. member for West-Durham (Mr. Blake) went to Lennox; I was there. Instead of propounding a policy he undertook to abuse me. Sir, I may have erred in my private capacity, but I have made no mistake, as a member of Parliament, that I know of. I have fought the battle fairly. All I asked in Lennox was that I should have a fair field, for I did not ask any favor. But the hon. gentleman behind my back maligned me, and made statements which I have already disproved upon the floor of Parliament. Then we had a contest in West Northumberland a few weeks ago; what was the result? A larger majority than ever for the Conservative candidate. Again, hon. gentlemen opposite had another opening in Grenville. What was the result? They were defeated, horse, foot and artillery. The constituency returned by acclamation one who formerly held a seat in this House, an able and esteemed gentleman, who will be a strength to the Conservative party. This is the answer that has gone abroad, this is the answer that should be a warning to hon. gentlemen. They must understand that the good, sterling, honest, common sense of the people always prevails. The people are reading and thinking all the time. They know the motives of men; they know what politicians are; they make allowances for their weaknesses and admire their strength. When there is nothing but weakness on one side, and a small amount of weakness and great strength

on the other, the people will go where there is a small amount of weakness and a great amount of strength. I have shown, Sir, that throughout their administration of affairs, those who called themselves a Reform Government, by their inaction and indifference, laid the foundation of much of the trouble that has disturbed the North-West—So complicating matters that their successors in office found it difficult to adjust claims without lengthy and careful investigation. I have shown that gentlemen opposite have decried the country and thus prevented capital and immigration flowing in; that Louis Riel admits that hard times and no money prompted disaffection and led to the terrible outbreak of March last, and that instead of assisting the Government, the Opposition policy was a virtual expression of sympathy with the rebels. Sir, I am prepared to leave with this House and country the question of relative merits between the Opposition and Administration of the day. The facts are before them, the record of both parties is before them, and it will be for those who constitute the jury to render a verdict in accordance with the evidence. Mr. Speaker, I regret having occupied the time of the House so long; but I feel a deep, an almost overwhelming interest in this question, and that now and forever must the problem be solved as to whether this is going to be a united Dominion or a mere plaything for politicians and partisans. We have heard hon. members, in recent debates, here and in other places, endeavoring to stir up sectional ill-feeling. Why, Sir, the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), said :

“It will not do for the hon. gentleman to attempt to arouse the prejudices of the masses with respect to this matter.”

Who is arousing prejudices? Who moved the amendment? He has said that the Government was so guilty that those men were justified in making some show of resistance? I do not assert that these hon. gentlemen justify the rebellion; but I hold that they justify it in such a way and to such an extent that people of common sense will know that if they do as their papers did, in March and April last, condemn the Government for everything that has taken place, these people in the North-West will feel that, if at any time they rebel again and run up the black flag there will be found those who sympathise with them, in the Province of Ontario, at least. I know there are men on that side of the House who are as sincere and as true and loyal men, not only to their country, but to their Queen, as could possibly be found on this side; hence the great danger is, that by the bitterness with which we are conducting our political warfare, and the extremes to which we are carrying our political animosities, we will bring about the evils to which I have referred; and until we learn to subdue that bitterness of feeling, learn to stand unitedly for our country and our country's interest, when that country is in danger, we will jeopardise, every hour and every day, the interests, the institutions and the progress of the Dominion. The hon. Member for Quebec East, further said :

“There are prejudices in this country of many kinds. We are not so built up as nation as to forget our origin, and I say frankly that the people of my own Province, who have a community of origin, undoubtedly sympathise with Louis Riel, just as the sympathies of the people of Ontario go altogether in the other direction.”

Now, I feel that an hon. gentleman representing a city where a monument has been raised to the memory of those two great heroes and commanders, Wolfe and Montcalm, a sacred column, a memento of peace, harmony and union between the two great races—a gentleman representing that city could well have afforded to put aside the question of race and of origin. We know that every day the people of the Province of Quebec, both French and English, are becoming more and more welded into one; and we know that our interests in Ontario are to maintain the best spirit of harmony amongst all classes and races in the Province of Quebec, and jointly to work out the problem of laying deep

and strong the foundations of future greatness. The man is a traitor to his country, is jeopardising the interests of his country, who, for the sake of party interest, for the promotion of party gain, would stir up race against race, section against section, brother against brother. I know what party gain and party tactics mean, but that is quite another matter from setting Province against Province, race against race, and brother against brother; and when the rallying cry is: A united Dominion, and the flag of our nation is run up, we should find every true Canadian, whether of French, German, English, Scotch, Irish or Canadian origin, rallying round that flag, until the enemies of our country are driven from their strongholds. If I speak warmly, it is because I realise that a few mistakes may prove fatal to national autonomy. I have given plain facts and figures, and challenge any hon. gentleman to show that I have spoken beyond or outside of the records. Every statement I have made I am prepared to defend, for I feel that this is a question which should be discussed on its merits—not on the basis of Provinces or origin, but a question as to whether, when rebels raise the flag of rebellion in the North-West, or any other section of in this Dominion, led by an amnestied rebel and a virtual outlaw, the Parliament of Canada should tolerate an amendment which expresses illconcealed sympathy with the misguided men who instigated that rebellion. By expressing sympathy with those who claim they have grievances, we express sympathy with the men who went to Montana to induce Riel to come to the country, and sympathy for Riel, who returned to the North-West as a claimant of lands to which he cannot be entitled. Riel, who while that country was in trouble, while hard times were abroad in it boldly admits that he took advantage of the depression to countenance extreme measures. These men found among the Opposition, those who were decrying the country, who were preventing capital from coming in, who were opposing the completion of a great public work, the very element needful to accomplish their nefarious schemes, and the result is that we have had bloodshed, and our friends have fallen. But no great interest was ever established in any country, without loss of life, and those who fell at Duck Lake, at Batoche, at Fish Creek and other places, will be remembered as patriots who fought bravely the battles of their country; and while they have gone before, we know that we have soon to follow; and though we lost a brother member of this House, sad as that loss may be, it will, at least, teach us to love our country better, and we will be able to say that when the union was in peril English and French, Scotch and Irish, and Germans, all combined to fight the battles of the nation and to maintain the flag which I trust will always float over a country possessing one of the freest and best constitutions in the world, the future home of millions of prosperous people, hardy sons of the north whose hearts will ever throb responsive to national sentiment; millions worthy the race whence they sprung, true to the motherland, rejoicing when she rejoices and sympathising with and defending her should trial, tribulation or adversity at any time afflict or overtake the Empire.

Mr. MILLS. It is not my intention to devote much time to the consideration of the observations which the hon. member for this city has addressed to the House for the past two hours. I have failed altogether to see their relevancy to the proposition which is now before you for the consideration of the House. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had made the observations which he has addressed to the House some seven or eight years ago, they might have had more value. The hon. gentleman proposes to put on trial a Government that ceased to exist in October, 1878. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that from 1873 to 1878 the Government of the hon. member for East York was administering the affairs of the country; that the hon. gen-

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

lemen now sitting on the Treasury benches at that time occupied seats on this side of the House. It was part of their business, in the discharge of their public duties, to watch with care the administration of public affairs—to criticise the conduct of the Government, and point out the mistakes which that Government made. But now, Sir, seven years after that Government has left office, it is too late to begin to bring charges that those hon. gentlemen did not venture to bring when the Government were responsible for the conduct of affairs. I might, Sir, at some other time, be disposed to go into some detail in defence of the conduct of that Government, with regard to the various matters that have been passed in review the last few days. I shall but briefly allude to these charges, because I do not think that they are important for the consideration of the House at this moment. I do not intend to be drawn away from the important proposition submitted to the House by the hon. member for West Durham, by a discussion of what the Government did some eight or ten years ago. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has charged the Opposition with sympathising with Riel, with defending the rebels and with upholding the rebellion. I deny that charge. I say that we are not putting Riel on trial in this House. He is shortly to be tried before another tribunal, and I hope, when his trial takes place, that he will be judged according to the evidence there submitted, and not according to charges made on that side of the House or this. I am quite ready to repeat the words which are used on the trial of anyone for so serious an offence—that I trust he will have a fair trial by God and his countrymen. The hon. gentleman knows that in the estimation of a great many the Government committed mistakes in 1869 and 1870. Riel committed murder. The hon. gentleman knows that the feeling in the minds of a great many of the community is still a feeling of resentment for that crime, and he takes advantage of that feeling in order to shelter the Government for their misconduct during the last seven years. Sir, I do not intend to be drawn in that direction; I do not intend to say one word of the conduct of Mr. Riel, either by way of censure or by way of excuse. His case is in the hands of another tribunal, and I feel that it would be indecent, on my part, under the circumstances, to discuss it. Sir, the hon. gentleman says this resolution is a defence of Riel. Now, let me read the resolution. It is:

"That in the administration of North-West affairs by the present Government, prior to the recent outbreak, there have occurred grave instances of neglect, delay and mismanagement, in matters affecting the peace, welfare and good government of the country."

The question is, are the charges set forth in that resolution well founded. The question is not whether those who took arms against the Government had any cause, or whether the cause was sufficient to become an extenuating circumstance. It is the Government we have to try; not the parties who have been engaged in the rebellion in the North-West Territories. Their trial is vested in other hands, and it will be conducted according to other evidence than that which is submitted to the House for the purpose of either approving or disapproving of the conduct of the Administration. The hon. First Minister, in discussing this question the other evening, said that the Hudson Bay Company officials in the North-West Territories had always exhibited discontent, that they were disloyal, that they had been pushed by the Canadian Government from their throne, and had never become reconciled to their position; he said the half-breeds of the North-West had long been in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company—that they were their factors and hunters, and that they sympathised with the officers of the company; and he told us that Gabriel Dumont was a rebel in 1870, a rebel in 1874, and he was a rebel still. Well, Sir, I do not know how that may be, nor do I care. That is not the question before us now; but this much I will say, that I do not believe there is any

people in the world who ever exhibit disaffection towards a Government when they are justly and fairly dealt with, and I believe that wherever you find rebellion you will, at the same time, find misgovernment. I do not think there is any exception to that rule. We may go to other parts of the British Empire, where there may be a discontented people, and I venture to say that no one has ever yet enquired into the history of such people without being satisfied that they have been grossly misgoverned. Now, I am not going to say more on that subject at this moment. The hon. gentleman, setting the example to those who have since spoken in defence of the Administration, said that the Government which preceded his Government had failed to administer the affairs of Manitoba and the North-West Territories properly, as we had not dealt with the claims of the half-breeds. Why, he said Governor Archibald took the census in 1870, and yet, in order to give an opportunity to speculators, we appointed other parties, and had the census taken over again. Now, the hon. gentleman was in office three years after Governor Archibald's census of 1870 was taken, and how was it that he made no distribution of the half-breeds' grants during those three years? How was it he took no action? We took the census, because the census taken by Mr. Archibald was inaccurate. The hon. gentleman decided that grants should be made to the children of half-breeds, and the census taken by Mr. Archibald did not show how many were children and how many were parents; and so it was necessary to take a new census and base the distribution on that; and it was found that each half-breed was entitled, out of the 1,400,000 acres of land, not to 190 acres, but to 240 acres, and the distribution was made accordingly. Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago told the House that I had advised the officers of the Government not to look after those parties who had failed to make application, because if they were interested in putting forward their claims it was open to them to do so. Well, Sir, I did that; I did it at Mr. Codd's suggestion, not simply because he suggested, but because I concurred in that opinion, and for this reason: I told Mr. Codd that it was necessary to secure an early distribution of the half-breed lands, and as long as we left the question open; for the purpose of hunting up half breeds, it was impossible to make a distribution; and I felt that it was better, if there were any half-breeds who were not included, but who would afterwards establish their claims, to make an additional grant to them, than to keep the whole of the lands open, in order to make a distribution to a few more than would receive the lands, and that less trouble and expense would be incurred. That was done not to delay but to hasten the allotment. Then the hon. gentleman says we ought to have made the distribution at once. He forgot that when his Government was in the old settlers along the Red and Assiniboine Rivers claimed that they were entitled, not merely to two miles in depth, but to an additional two miles of hay privilege, and he and his colleagues conceded that; and when these additional two miles were taken on each side of the Red River and the Assiniboine River, it became necessary to make a further concession to the half-breed population, as this additional two miles was taken off the half-breeds reservation. Then, the hon. gentlemen seemed to forget that his officers, in making the treaty with the Indians east of Manitoba, dealt with a very considerable number of those who had been dealt with as half-breeds, and that they had come in under the treaty and had received their annuities. They subsequently, however, applied to be included as half-breeds, because they had been enumerated as half-breeds in the census that had been taken by Mr. Archibald. Then, Sir, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier alluded to the river surveys of the half-breed lands of the Saskatchewan and the Qu'Appelle Rivers, and said the demand of the half-breeds to be put on the same footing as those in Manitoba

had not originated after 1879, and that they had petitioned the Government of Mr. Mackenzie some years before. Well, Sir, that was true, and they were informed by Mr. Laird and Lieutenant Governor Morris that they would be protected in their holdings. They were content with that information, and we were not in a position to deal with them, because we had not pushed forward the special surveys in the regions where they were settled, and we could not make the river surveys until that was done. Well, I will say this: The petition came before me; I gave notice that the special survey in the vicinity of Touchwood should be pushed forward to Prince Albert settlement. This was done at the earliest opportunity, in 1877, and that was as much work as it was possible to accomplish then. The survey was for the purpose of fixing the latitude and longitude of the settlement, so that when an isolated survey was made it would fit in with the other portion of the general survey of the country. In 1878 that survey was made at Prince Albert, and special instructions were given to the surveyors, that in laying out the lands along the river they were to lay them out in ordinary river lots, so as to meet the wishes of the settlers. So far as the surveys were concerned, the Government did all that the population required, and all that was necessary, under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman complained that the buffalo had disappeared, but they have disappeared since our day. There were buffalo in that country since 1870, but the fact is, that the buffalo was almost extinct south of the border. The First Minister, not long since, in addressing the House, stated the fact that the American soldiers stationed near the frontier had driven the buffalo southward and kept them from crossing the frontier, for the purpose of keeping the Indians away from the border. It is well known they have done this for several years; and so far as I know, the hon. gentleman had not suggested any means by which the Canadian Government could have kept the buffalo north of the international boundary or have exercised any control over them, by Customs or other regulations, which would have prevented the extinction of that very important animal. Then the hon. gentleman who has just addressed us told the House that a very rascally Order in Council was passed, in October 1878, by which Cook and Sutherland were allowed 200 square miles of a timber limit on the Upper Saskatchewan. I need not say much about that. That subject was before the House last year, when the First Minister made a charge similar to that which the hon. gentleman has made to-night. When we came into office these hon. gentlemen, we found, had been in the habit of giving timber limits, contrary to the law; finding that it was impossible to secure the sale of timber limits in the ordinary way, we changed the law, so as to allow the Government to make a private contract with a party in reference to timber limits. That was done by hon. gentlemen opposite, contrary to law; we did it in accordance with the law, because it was the only way the people of Manitoba could get the necessary supply of lumber. When we came into office there was but one saw mill on the Saskatchewan, and lumber was sold to the settler at the rate of \$100 per 1,000 feet. I believed, then, and I believe still, it would be in the interest of the population to have competition. Those gentlemen proposed to erect a saw mill, and they had the necessary machinery carried to the district; they asked for a timber limit, and upon precisely the same terms as limits were granted to others who made application, we gave them a limit, having sufficient extent to enable them to run their mill for a reasonable time, as some parties had obtained timber limits from this Government since, and found they were not sufficient to keep the mill in operation for a year or two; and the extent granted was not greater than what was granted others in the Rainy River district by hon. gentlemen opposite, or than what would enable them to carry on their business for a reasonable length

of time. More than that: we provided that the grant should not interfere with the rights of others to obtain limits in the same district before the lots were selected, and we provided no lot would be granted less than twenty miles, so that where there were small areas of timber, three or four miles in extent, they had to be taken as twenty-mile lots before they could be obtained; we did this to preserve the small areas for the use of the settlers. I do not propose to say more on that subject. The hon. gentleman has referred to staked claims and to delays in the distribution of some of the half-breed grants in Manitoba. Let me say that the greater portion of those were distributed in 1877; and we find, when this Government came in, that further distribution was not made until 1881. He charged the late Government with dilatoriness in issuing patents. Hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt, issued more than were issued in our day, as there was a larger population in the country. Besides, when we were in office, three years were required before a patent could be issued to homestead lands, and it is perfectly clear that until the population was in the country for some time no patent could be issued. It was only those who were the original settlers of the country, the few who went in at the beginning of our administration, who were entitled to the patents at all. I need say no more on that subject. The hon. gentleman has referred, in great detail, as others have who spoke before him on that side, to the administration of affairs by us; but that is not the question which is before the House at this moment. What we have to consider is the conduct of the present Administration, and not that of the Government which retired from office seven years ago. It is important we should look with some care into the conduct of affairs in the North-West, and it is my purpose to bring under the attention of the House some of the grievances of the white settlers of Manitoba and the North-West, with a view to a more efficient administration of our public lands, and the prevention of further abuses. One of the most important functions of the House of Commons is to exercise a careful supervision over the administration of public affairs, so as to secure honest and prompt action, and so as to prevent a public Department being subordinated to the interest of the camp followers of a party. This, in a great and distant region like the North-West, is all the more necessary, because the settlers are without representatives on the floor of Parliament, and cannot, in the ordinary constitutional way, complain of any wrong which may have been done them. It would not be improper for me to briefly refer to the history of our attempts at colonisation in the North-West. With the acquisition of that country we began a new departure. Until then, we were ordinary colonies, possessed, it is true, of a constitutional system of government, similar in principle to that of the parent State; but with the acquisition of the North-West we set out on a new venture—we began, ourselves, the work of establishing colonies. The extension of the frontier settlements in the older colonies, was a work which proceeded without the interference of Government. All that was needed was that surveys should be made, the country set out for settlement, and a land office opened. But the acquisition of the North-West imposed upon us duties of a somewhat different character. It is true that no difficult problems were involved. It only required ordinary prudence and industry on the part of Ministers to have made the business of settling the North-West in the highest degree successful. We had no new problem to solve—we had the experience of England and of the United States before us. The Territories which, in 1869, were annexed to the Dominion, were Territories out of which all believed Provinces in time would be carved; that what was to-day a colony, must soon become a Province, incorporated into the federal family, and represented on the floor of Parliament. We had before us the plan of

Mr. MILLS,

the neighboring Republic. We saw how, for nearly a century, it had surveyed and set out for settlement its Territories. How it gave to the settlers of these Territories local self-government; and how, when the Territories had acquired a certain population, they were formed into States and admitted as members of the Union. We saw before us Crown colonies growing up into constitutionally governed Provinces. There was no difficulty in our way. There was no new question presenting itself for solution. Every political problem with which we were called upon to deal had already been solved. All that we needed was honesty of purpose and industry to do the work of to-day at the proper time, and not to defer until some more convenient season what ought at once to be undertaken. When we acquired the North-West Territories there was already a population of eight or ten thousand whites and half-breeds. These had been, for many years, under the jurisdiction of the Hudson Bay Company and their officers. They had been ruled with a niggardly hand. No Government could well have done less for a people than the Hudson Bay Company did for the dwellers in the Red River district. They had no love for the company's rule; they knew enough about representative institutions to know that they enjoyed fewer of the political rights of British freemen than any other people in the British North American dominions. They furnished a splendid nucleus with which to begin a loyal and contented colony; but the course adopted towards them was so unwise that, before the Canadian Government succeeded in establishing its authority in the country, it had made an enemy of nearly every man in the country. The Hudson Bay Company had there a governor, a council, and a judicial officer, none of whom were consulted with reference to the future government of the country. There was not a leading man among the settlers who was treated with more consideration. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says we did not find men in the North-West to put in the North-West council. But how was the first Government of Manitoba constituted, in 1869? The entire population were ignored. A system of arbitrary government was provided. No provision was made in the Act providing for the government of the settlement, for the election, by the people, of a single representative to the council. A Governor was appointed; a law officer was named; other parties were promised positions on the council; but not one of them was a resident of the country. If they had been a conquered population they could not have been more arbitrarily dealt with. Whatever could offend the susceptibilities of a free people was done. It is true they owed the Hudson Bay Company little. They had not enjoyed elective institutions under the régime of the company, but if their government was arbitrary, it was a government by men taken from among themselves, while the new Government established by Canada was one wholly from without. What they had seen of the Canadians was well calculated to excite alarm. The surveys, when begun, were upon a plan which so completely ignored the plan of settlement that it was not surprising that the population everywhere believed what they were told, that their occupation of the country and their improvements were not of a kind that could give them any claim to the lands of which they were in possession. They found the constituted authorities of the country scarcely less discontented than themselves, and it was not surprising that alarm and resentment culminated in rebellion and in bloodshed. I remember seeing a letter, which had been addressed by Sir Stafford Northcote to Governor McTavish, shortly after the terms of surrender had been agreed upon, in which he informed the Governor of what had been done; and he went on to say that those who had directed the affairs of the settlement under the company would continue to share in its government after the transfer was made. What a disappointment it must

have been to these men to find themselves completely ignored; and could any one have been surprised at the alarm and hatred of the population, which had been evoked by the arrogance and folly of Dominion officials, or that the old officials did nothing to allay the discontent? I need not speak of the rebellion which followed, or of the extraordinary concessions made to conciliate the population. From being a Crown colony, without a representative, they were changed to a full-blown Province, weighed down with powers and privileges which they had neither the wealth nor the numbers needed to exercise them with advantage; 1,400,000 acres of land, in the neighborhood of Winnipeg, were set aside for the children of the half-breed population. More than half these people were hunters of the plain, who, at that time, attached no value to the lands reserved to their use. Hundreds of them left the place. As the buffalo retreated further westward, they ceased to return to the Red River in the winter season. Their numbers could not be ascertained. The division of the land was, in consequence, delayed. The great majority of them were minors, whose interest in their allotments could not be utilised for settlement; and so the district which it was most necessary to occupy first was one from which white settlers were practically excluded. When the half-breed districts became known, and the adjacent lands were set out for settlement, many of those who first went into the country found it impossible to secure an entry for the lands which they desired to select. It was said that the first land agents were interested with other parties in land speculations, and they profited by the labors of those who explored the country, with a view to becoming settlers. Those desiring to obtain entry for lands could not obtain it for the lands which they had visited and selected. Hundreds of those who, in 1872 and 1873, went from the older Provinces to the Red River district, with the view to settlement, finding the obstacles in the way so serious, they withdrew, discouraged and disgusted, and settled south of the international boundary. They became the founders of rival settlements in the United States. The country along the Red River, from Fargo to Pembina, is occupied chiefly by Canadians, who went thither from Manitoba before 1874. The populous and prosperous settlement at the Grand Forks, is Canadian. The Government of Canada has spent not a little in advertising the country and in seeking to secure immigration from abroad. Recently the Minister of Agriculture, failing to secure Europeans, has undertaken to do what has never been done in the neighboring Republic—to send out immigration agents into the Provinces, with the view of securing settlers for the North-West. I am not going to enter into a criticism of this policy now, but it certainly discloses an extraordinary state of things, when the Government finds itself driven to such a proceeding. The people of Canada ought to be able to decide for themselves the question of settling in the North-West, without Government interference and without Government pressure. But we have already lost a fifth of our population. They reside on the American side of the border. When once any of our people resolve to look for new homes they are attracted to the neighborhood where their friends and acquaintances have gone before, whether it be in Dakota or in the North-West, if there are no words of discouragement and no events happening dissuading them against such a course. The people who first settled between Fargo and Pembina have been of far more consequence to Dakota in securing settlers from Canada than any number of pamphlets and immigration agents. These settlers were formerly residents of Ontario. They have drawn thither ten times their numbers. As they receive new accessions they become an attractive force of increasing power, so long as there are fertile lands to occupy. Now, what must not be forgotten is, that the whole of these people, with ordinary care and prudence on the part of the Government, might have been retained

or secured as settlers of Manitoba and the North-West. The original settlers went to Manitoba. They withdrew for the reasons which I have stated, and they have since attracted thousands of their friends and neighbors. It is a calumny to say these people were wanting in patriotism, or that they would not have preferred remaining in their own country, other things being equal. Now, Sir, it is all very well to talk about newspapers advising men to go abroad and about their decrying the country. Why, Sir, these hon. gentlemen decried the country from 1875 to 1878. What was the resolution proposed by the right hon. gentleman, and which was supported by his followers, when in Opposition, in 1878? Has the hon. member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), who spoke to-night about the unpatriotic conduct of the members of the Opposition, forgotten all about that resolution? Does he not remember that it said that thousands were leaving Canada every year for want of employment?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. What resolution does the hon. gentleman allude to?

Mr. MILLS. To the resolution which the right hon. gentleman proposed, introducing his National Policy, and in which he declared there was no employment for the people of Canada, and that there were thousands leaving Canada every year, for the want of employment?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Yes; I remember that. He said there was poison in the policy of the Government, and he propounded an antidote for it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman did not consider such statements unpatriotic just then. But there is this very important difference: that there is now, and has been for the last five years, a very large emigration from Canada, and there was not a very large emigration at that time. I simply state this, Mr. Speaker, by the way. Now, I contend that the first condition necessary to secure a brisk immigration into our North-West Territories is to satisfy the population that are already there. So long as they are discontented, just so long will the residents of the country be a repellent and not an attractive body. If the policy of the Government had been at all satisfactory it would not have been necessary to have sent out immigration agents through the Province of Quebec and into the other Provinces. The people who are already there would have been far more efficient for that purpose; and no more conclusive evidence could have been furnished of the failure of the Government than the confession of the Minister of Agriculture, that his agents were scouring the old Provinces, in order to secure settlers for the North-West. In the settlement of our North-West it was of great consequence that the first settlers should be satisfied with the rules and regulations adopted by the Government; for, if the views I have expressed are correct, it is by satisfying those who are the pioneers of every settlement that its future progress is to be best promoted. There is, too, a great advantage in continuous settlement—in the establishment of schools, in the building of churches, in the improvement of roads, in the construction of bridges, and in the establishment of markets. It is of great consequence to the population that large tracts of lands in private hands should not intervene; for, beside the disadvantages which I have indicated, there is a want of mutuality in the enhanced value given to property by labor; for the vacant land is increased in value by the industry of the settler, for which the settler receives nothing in return. It is also of consequence, in the colonisation of a country, that facilities should be given for egress and ingress. There must be either railway or water communication. The want of the one or the other makes it impossible to secure settlers. The products of the farm will not bear the expense of carriage by an ordinary vehicle for many miles,

and unless railway facilities are furnished to settlers in the inland districts but few settlers will be had. In fact, we have lost to the North-West already many thousands, from the want of the necessary railway facilities. I have before me a list containing the names of 111 settlers who had taken up lands within a radius of six miles from Rapid City, and who have abandoned them because they were wholly without railway facilities, and without access to markets. They went into that part of the Province of Manitoba at a time when it was supposed the Canadian Pacific would pass through the settlement. They were destined to disappointment, and they abandoned the country in consequence. They preferred to lose their labor, and begin a new home elsewhere, rather than be without the means of ingress and egress, and without a market for the products of their toil. The Administration of Mr. Mackenzie proposed to provide for the construction of colonisation roads. They believed that one line of railway through the extensive prairies of the North-West would be wholly inadequate to secure the settlement of the country. A railway has but little value to the farmer who is more than twenty miles away. The Pacific Railway may secure the settlement of the country for a short distance upon either side, but without radiating lines, from points well situated to become great commercial centres, the general settlement of a prairie country is not likely to take place. The progress of settlement in the State of Illinois furnishes a striking proof of the soundness of this view. The State was settled for many years along the banks of the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois and the Rock River, but the interior of the country remained unpeopled. Land one hundred miles south from Chicago had but little value. It was exceedingly fertile, and capable of producing immense harvests of corn and wheat; but it was inaccessible to any market. When the Illinois Central Railroad was built all this was changed. Thousands poured into the country. The railway became to the people of the interior all that the rivers had been to the earlier settlers upon their banks, and the population of Illinois received an accession of more than a half million within ten years. It is, in my opinion, greatly to be regretted that steps were not taken by Ministers to carry out, without delay, upon their accession to office, the colonisation railway policy of their predecessors. But, instead of doing so, the interests of the North-West have been sacrificed to the construction of a trans-continental railway in advance of the requirements of the country, and to the construction of which the well-being of the population of the North-West has been subordinated. Obstacles have been put in the way of necessary railway construction. Settlers have been harassed and ruined. Many of them have been driven out, and they have published abroad the wrongs which they were compelled to endure. Millions of acres, upon which some might have voluntarily gone, were put into the hands of land sharks and speculators—upon such terms as to enable them to make a profit. The toiler saw that these men had vast areas put at their disposal, into which he could not enter without their consent and upon their terms. These companies were more favored than the settlers; discontent was produced by contrast; and instead of settlement being promoted, it was retarded. What could a colonisation company do to promote the settlement of an extensive region of prairie? The man that had not the means to take him into the country, could not subsist after he got there. It was not because the North-West could not be reached that it was not more rapidly settled. It was because no market was to be found for the product of the settler's industry that so few have gone thither, up to the present moment. The colonisation companies, under whose control, three years ago, ten millions of acres were placed, have all signally failed. There is not one exception. There is not one which has not stood in the way of settlement.

Mr. MILLS.

There is to-day many a quarter-section in the North-West which would have been occupied and cultivated by a Canadian, who has become a land owner south of the border, had it not been under the control of a colonisation company. It would have been immeasurably better, in the interests of the country, had every acre in the North-West been burdened with a charge towards the construction of a colonisation railway within reach, rather than to have been subject to the policy pursued by Ministers. Settlers care but little for a charge of \$1 an acre upon their lands if these are made accessible to markets. It is a fact that the whole North-West has been practically given up for the construction of a road to secure the trade of Asia, which must always take another route. The Government have paid no heed to the interests of the settlers; they have turned away the currents of immigration, and they have produced a feeling of discontent over the whole North-West country that is not likely to be overcome, so long as the administration of affairs is in their hands. They have exasperated the population beyond measure, until they are as much distrusted by the settlers as the settlers are distrusted by them. Do we not see in the organs of the Government charges daily made against the white settlers of the North-West? But we are not left to draw inferences from the newspapers in the confidence of Ministers. We have but to look to the measures submitted by Ministers to Parliament. The people have their local representative body swamped by Government appointees—men who are strangers in the country—who know nothing about its local wants—who are ignorant of the views of the people—who are strangers to their grievances, are sent thither to make laws and ordinances for their government. Could such a course be pursued under a Democratic system of Government, if there was not a deep distrust in the minds of Ministers of the population? Then we had the Minister of Militia submitting to the House a measure for disarming the white population. In that distant part of our country there are numerous bands of savages, who have already imbrued their hands in the blood of the settlers. That these savages should be disarmed may be highly expedient, but what could induce a Ministry to propose the disarmament of their countrymen and kindred in the North-West? Was ever such a measure proposed by the Government of a free people before? What have our neighbors and friends who have gone to the Territories done, that they should be disarmed, in the presence of the savages who threaten their lives and their property? Is such a course likely to produce contentment? Are those who are disposed to leave these Provinces to seek their fortunes elsewhere likely to be drawn to our own Territories, rather than to Dakota, by such a measure? Does it not show that the Government know that they have produced in the minds of the settlers the feelings of the deepest indignation? Ministers failed to stifle the voice of the white population of the North-West by making the Indians voters. They propose now to disarm the white population, and to swamp their council by appointees of the Crown. But we have still other evidences of the feeling of Ministers towards the white settlers of the North-West. We have the disarmament of the volunteer corps. Does not every one see that the cheapest, the most efficient force that could be had for the maintenance of peace and the protection of life and property in the North-West Territories would be numerous and well-appointed companies of volunteers? Has the Government taken, as a measure of defence, that course, which plainly presents itself as the best, under the circumstances? Not at all. Ministers distrust the population. They double the number of police, and retain in the country the nucleus of a soldiery. Is there any reason for this, except the fact that they are more hostile to the white population than to the Indians.

Ministers know that they have well nigh ruined hundreds of those who, before they went into that country, were their political supporters and friends. If there has been a half-breed insurrection, if there has been Indian massacres, if men have been butchered, if settlers have been robbed, if their dwellings have been destroyed, if their wives have been ignominiously treated by savages, how came it about? Has it not been because that men have in vain prayed and petitioned and entreated the Government for years to listen to their complaints and to redress their grievances? There is not a life that has been lost, there is not a cow or a horse that has been driven away, there is not a dwelling that has been burned, that would have been molested had Ministers given attention to the duties that devolved upon them in connection with the administration of the affairs of the North-West Territories. We have heard a great deal of late about the white traitors of Prince Albert settlement, and not a little has been done by organs of the Government to turn away the indignation from the Ministers to the settlers of Prince Albert, whom they had wronged. Here are men who have for four years been imploring the Government to do them justice and to redress their grievances. They demanded no aid. They were asking for nothing that would cost the country a farthing. They simply called upon the Government to do its duty; and how was there request met? Let me narrate the facts connected with that settlement. Prince Albert settlement was begun by the establishment of a Presbyterian mission there in 1866. The residents were largely half-breeds and Indians at that time. In 1873 there were ten white settlers. In 1874 there was a further accession, some of whom came from Canada and some from the United Kingdom. It was supposed that the Pacific Railway would be constructed on the line surveyed by the Government, and this was regarded as a favorable district for settlement. In 1879 they asked to have their land surveyed. During that year the special survey was pushed on to the Prince Albert settlement, so as to make it possible to comply with their wishes, and in 1878 the survey was made. During that same year Mr. George Duck was appointed agent for Dominion lands, and he went from Winnipeg to Prince Albert in August, so as to be ready, without delay, to enter upon his duties. But it does not appear that anything was done for more than two years; for I find that it was not until the 8th October, 1880, that he received any instructions from this Government, and then he was directed to obtain evidence by statutory declaration of all claims based upon occupation before the transfer of the country to Canada. He is instructed to include in his inquiry all cases at Fort Carlton and at Fort à la Corne, as well as those at Prince Albert. The agent reported, on the 5th March, 1881, that there were twenty three lots in Prince Albert settlement that had been occupied before the transfer of the country, but there were none in the vicinity of Carlton, and he believed there were none at Fort à la Corne. The great majority of the settlers of Prince Albert came later. A large number of them came and chose their locations in 1879, returned east for their families, and took possession of their locations the following year. There were white settlers who were English, and half-breeds partly English and partly French. They did not enquire into the terms of the Dominion Lands Act. They believed the Government was only too anxious to secure the settlement of the country. They expected when it was set out for settlement they would obtain entry without difficulty, and that they would be allowed to date their occupation from the time they entered upon the lands. Many of them, especially among those who squatted before surveys were made, as they made improvements, sold to other comers, as they had opportunity and as they found it to their advantage. It never occurred to those who purchased that any

objection would be made to the acquisition of the improvements of those from whom the purchase was made. They did not doubt that if they could show possession, as well on account of prior occupants as on their own, that they would be allowed to count the aggregate time and obtain their patents without difficulty, where the time was sufficient. On the 12th February, 1877, Governor Laird wrote to the Minister of the Interior that it would seem, from the wording of the Dominion Lands Act, that the settlers who located before the lands were surveyed would require to wait three years after having made entry before they could get their patent; that this would seem to be harsh to those who had been many years in the country, and to meet this legislation was promised by the then Minister. On the 9th September, 1878, the Lieutenant Governor visited Prince Albert settlement. On the following day a deputation of settlers presented an address to him. In it they spoke of their progress in agriculture, of their churches and schools; and they expressed the opinion that, should no untoward accident turn aside immigration, they will always hold the first place among the settlements of the country. They had confidence in the future prosperity of the settlement; they hoped for steam communication by land or water to hasten their progress. They informed the Lieutenant Governor that they feared trouble from hungry Indians, and they urged the establishment of a small detachment of police at Prince Albert, for the purpose of maintaining peace. They spoke of the propriety of having a representative in the Government of the Territories. About sixty of them had signed this address. This address shows the state of public feeling at that time. They were still contented. They took a cheerful view of their future prospects. They desired communication with the outside world. They wished security for life and property, and they wanted representation in the North-West council. Mr. Laird told them that the subject of representation had been already considered. That the census of the settlements at Prince Albert, Duck Lake and St. Laurent would be taken, and if the requisite number of people were found they would be called upon to elect a representative. The chairman, Mr. Lawrence Clarke, assured Mr. Laird that the people had the utmost confidence in the Government of the Territories. So far, they were contented and hopeful, and relied upon the Government doing them justice without undue delay. In the *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 25th August, 1879, there is a report of the Lieutenant Governor and others having visited earlier in the month St. Albert and the settlements on the Upper Saskatchewan. The *Herald* says:

"The country between Edmonton and Prince Albert is settled, and the magnificent crops of wheat tell of the industry of the settlers and the fertility of the soil."

The same newspaper says that about a hundred people from Manitoba have located upon the South Saskatchewan and at Prince Albert early in the month. It says they are well off, and are well supplied with implements and live stock of all kinds. That numerous other small parties are on the road, on their way to the settlement. On the 30th November, 1878, Mr. Duck, the land agent at Prince Albert, writes to the Department as follows:—

"I have much pleasure in informing you that a large quantity of land outside the Prince Albert settlement survey has already been settled upon during the past season. There are, so far as I am aware, very few cases of disputed claims. The settlers are all anxious to make the necessary entries to secure themselves."

On the 22nd November, 1879, the Surveyor General writes Mr. Duck, that it has been brought to his notice that in cases where occupancy and improvements have preceded homesteading, the period of settlement has been counted from that date, and not from date of entry. This practice, the Surveyor General says, is contrary to the Dominion Lands Act, and cannot be allowed, and he advises the land agent

to post a notice of this in a prominent position. This was accordingly done, and may be said to be the beginning of the difficulties between the Government and the settlers in the Saskatchewan district. A false step was taken, which was not promptly retraced, although it was again and again brought under the attention of the Department. In May, 1880, a petition, signed by 102 of the settlers of Edmonton and Prince Albert, asking that steps might be taken to confirm titles to lands purchased from occupants of claims taken previously to the transfer of the Territories. On the 6th October, 1879, the *Saskatchewan Herald* says it is reported that Sir John Macdonald will not retain the post of Minister of the Interior. It approves of his retirement from the office, because it is believed that the individual attention of a Minister is required. The people are getting impatient. The surveys had been completed for more than a year. The agency was not yet formally opened. No entries could yet be made; and the regulations which the Department had adopted in July and in August were far from satisfactory. The *Herald* refers to the regulation forbidding any one to cut wood enough to build a camp fire, denounces it as absurd, and says it is more honored in its breach than in its observance. The Government were indifferent, but the progress of the country went forward. The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 7th June, says that the half-breeds have taken up locations—have fenced and planted gardens, and are taking the first steps towards establishing themselves as farmers. The *Herald*, of the 13th September, 1880, says the St. Albert mission is growing rapidly in population and importance. A continuous settlement, twelve or fourteen miles, extends along the river, both above and below the mission, and that 50,000 bushels of wheat will be harvested during the year within its limits. On the 31st October, 1880, an Order in Council was made, establishing a land board, consisting of a land commissioner and an inspector of agencies. The commissioner was to have general supervision of the business of the office. The inspector is to perform the duties indicated by his title. The Minister hoped that this would lead to a more speedy despatch of business and more correctness in decision. It is admitted that much inconvenience and delay had been experienced and much complaint had been made, and not unreasonably, by parties interested. Ministers altered the machinery of administration, but nothing was still done. The efforts of the Department of the Interior were like Mr. Bouncer's efforts at study. He shaved his head and did everything but apply himself to the work on hand. On the 31st January, 1881, the *Saskatchewan Herald* reports four new registration offices, one at Turtle Mountain, at the Little Saskatchewan, at Touchwood Hills, and at Prince Albert. Mr. Martin McDonald, of Nova Scotia, is appointed to the office at Turtle Mountain. G. A. Brisbois, of the Mounted Police, is appointed for the Little Saskatchewan, and Alexander Sproat, of Walkerton, Ontario, is appointed to the office at Prince Albert. The *Herald* says there are no lands to register at Touchwood Hills and none yet at Prince Albert, as no lands, up to that time, were yet opened for settlement. The correspondence in reference to the settlement began in 1878, with the inspection of Peter Hourie's claim. Hourie claimed several lots on the banks of the river. The Minister informed the agent that the lots would be surveyed ten chains wide and two miles deep, and the settlers would be entitled to one lot as a homestead and to a second as a pre-emption. On the 20th January, 1879, the Minister wrote to the agent at Prince Albert: "When your office is regularly established, and you have received the returns of the surveys, you will prepare to take entries." But it was not until the 2nd of August, 1881, that an Order was made to open the office, which was received by the agent on the 21st of September following. More than three years passed, from the

Mr. MILLS.

time when the surveys were made and the agent appointed, before instructions were given for the opening of the office. In the meantime, the people had become greatly discontented. On the 7th June, 1881, Mr. Lawrence Clarke, who represented the district of Lorne in the North-West council presented a memorial to the Lieutenant Governor and the council, representing that the district was rapidly filling with settlers, many of whom have well-cultivated farms; that a large portion of the district had been surveyed in 1877 and 1878; that a land agent had been appointed in 1878; that the surveying of the lands and the appointment of an agent had hastened the progress of the country and encouraged the people to improve their holdings. That disputes had arisen between neighbors, and there were no means to secure a judicial settlement, and early action on the part of the Government was asked. The Lieutenant Governor transmitted this memorial, and the memorial of Father André, as to the land entries in this district, and he adds:

"I am aware that serious disputes are arising in the Prince Albert and Duck Lake settlements, regarding claims to land, and I would therefore respectfully urge that, in so far as it may be consistent with the policy of the Dominion Government, the prayer of the memorialists may receive early consideration."

The head office instructed the agent to open the office for homesteading, pre-emptions and sale of lands in surveyed townships, which was done, as I have already stated, on the 21st September. The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 3rd October, 1881, says that the land office is open, but the people are far from happy, as the new regulations mix things badly. The people do not know where they are. The regulations forbid them to homestead odd numbers; points out the great hardship which has arisen from applying new regulations to those who have settled upon a different understanding. Great dissatisfaction was produced by the action of the Government. The people were first exasperated by the long delay. They were now still more indignant on account of the regulations which had been made. Accordingly, on the 8th of October, a meeting was called at Prince Albert. The meeting adopted a series of resolutions. They protested against the reservation of odd-numbered sections after they had been occupied and improved by the settlers, and after the homestead duties had been performed upon them. They protested against the price of pre-emption being other than what it was fixed at by the Order in Council in force at the time of settlement. They said that many of the claims were taken up prior to the survey. When the survey was made, some of the settlers were found to be upon lands which, by the law, were reserved for schools or allotted to the Hudson Bay Company, and they requested that these occupants should be secured in their holdings. They said that many persons had been settled upon lands in the district for three years and more, and had performed the homestead duties required by law. That many persons had bought land from such settlers, depending upon the good faith of the Government for the security of their holdings, and they resolved that the Minister be requested to grant patents to such persons, with as little delay as possible. They resolved not to make entries unless they are accepted in accordance with the Order in Council existing at the time the lands were taken up—and they decide that Mr. Lawrence Clarke, who represents their district in the North-West council, shall present a copy of their resolutions to the Minister of the Interior and receive his reply. Mr. Clarke, accordingly, did so, and the Minister replied, on the 22nd of November. The Minister agreed that, upon proper evidence, they should have their lands at the price fixed at the time of settlement. He agreed that lands taken up before survey, which proved to be school lands, should be secured to the occupants. But he affirmed that the terms of the Order in Council of the 9th of July, 1879,

was sufficiently well known, as it had been made public in the *Official Gazette*. And so a large number of settlers on odd sections received no satisfactory answer; so far as they were concerned, the Order in Council reserving the odd sections upon which they resided from being homesteaded, still remained in full force. The Minister said he had sufficiently answered their fourth resolution in his answers to the three that preceded it. But this was not so. The answers to the three preceding resolutions did not touch the case of the grievances set out in the fourth resolution of the Prince Albert meeting. The fourth resolution pointed out that many had resided upon their lands, and made improvements, such as are required for homesteading, but they did this before the land was surveyed, and before entry could be made, and they want the time of occupation before as well as after entry to count, and the Minister persistently refused to understand both their complaint and his own ruling. He haughtily tells the settlers that he "will cause enquiry to be made through his own officers, and take such action as may be in accordance with law." On the 25th January, 1882, Mr. Clarke writes the Minister that a meeting had been held on the 19th, and that he read to a large assembly of his constituents the Minister's letter. They were pleased with the concessions, but they expressed strong feelings of regret that the law debarred the pioneer settlers, who had performed all settlement duties prior to the opening of the local land office, from obtaining immediate patents for their lots, and are confident, on further consideration, the Minister would have the law amended, so as to allow of this grievance being redressed. On the 14th of April they are informed from the Department, that an amendment of the land law is before Parliament, indicating that their wishes were to be met, and the defect complained of repaired, but the subsequent conduct of the Government is strangely at variance with such an intention. In January, 1882, new instructions were issued from the Department, authorising entries to be made of odd-numbered sections, but they do not appear to have been sent to the agent at Prince Albert for several months. These instructions applied only to those who did settlement duties prior to 9th October, 1879. On the 12th September, 1882, the Deputy Minister writes Mr. Duck, "if the settler makes application to the land office for entry within three months after notice has been received at the head office, of land having been surveyed, and the survey having been confirmed and the settler has made proof to the local agent of the settlement and improvements at the time of filing such application, and has been allowed to enter his homestead, he will be entitled to his patent under clause 11, section 34, Dominion Lands Act, upon proof of residence and cultivation for three years next preceding the application;" but this notice did not at all meet the case of the people of Prince Albert, for although they had resided upon and cultivated their land for more than three years preceding their application they had not applied for entry for three months after the office had been opened, and they had not applied, because the Government had passed an Order in Council increasing the price of pre-emptions and withdrawing odd-numbered sections from settlement, and they feared they would, in some way, be assenting parties to these regulations, if they applied for leave to make entry after they became aware of the facts. On the 25th of October Mr. Duck acknowledged the letter of the 12th of September, and pointed out that no notice was made within three months, in consequence of the notice posted up by order of the Surveyor General, that the settlement duty began to run only from the day of entry, and asking for further instructions. To this letter Mr. Burgess replied on the 23rd November, informing the agent that as to receiving applications for patents that his circular superseded the letter of the Surveyor General, and requires to be construed together with the law and regula-

tions; but this statement left the agent as much in the dark as ever, for the Deputy Minister's circular only applied to those who ask to make entry within three months, and these people at Prince Albert had, for the reasons which I have stated, not applied to make entry until long after the three months had expired. To make the manner of dealing with the people of Prince Albert more clear, I will refer to Miller's case. Miller settled upon certain lots in June, 1876, and he applied and obtained entry in 1882. He was a settler in good faith, but the office was opened on the 21st September, 1881, and Miller did not obtain entry until seven months after the office had been opened. He applied for patent. Neither instructions nor regulations met his case. The agent reported it to the Department, and Mr. Andrew Russell, for the Surveyor-General, informed the agent that he was to deal with the case under departmental instructions: that if three years had passed since Miller obtained entry, the agent was directed to refer the land for patent, upon Miller paying \$1 per acre for his pre-emption. Mr. Burgess also wrote Mr. Duck, on the same day, informing him that on the 19th instant an Order in Council had been made to authorise the antedating of the entry to the time of the application, so as to cover the time, during enquiry, where the settler was found to be entitled, but was not allowed to make his entry at the time he applied; but this did not meet Miller's case, as it did not meet the case of scores of others. There had been no question with regard to Miller's right to obtain entry. There had been no delay at the office. The people in the settlement had resolved not to make entries until certain Orders on Council were modified. Miller had been on his lands more than six years. About that there could be no doubt. The difficulty was, that he had not been entered within three months of the opening of the office. Mr. Duck acknowledged Mr. Burgess' letter on the 25th November, informing him that his circular had no reference to Miller's case; that the land office had only been open fifteen months, and that he required further instructions. On the 1st February, 1883, Mr. Russell wrote Mr. Duck, in order to further instructions being given in Miller's case, asking him to send all available information. Mr. Duck complies on the 27th of February, and adds:

"I believe the said Miller's declaration to be true, and that he and many other settlers were prevented from applying for their patents for their homesteads within the time specified in sub-section 5, section 34, Dominion Lands Act, by the fact of the notice posted in this office, to the effect that residents prior to the date of entry could not be counted as settlement duty, and that notice of this ruling of the chief law officer of the Crown, with reference to sub-sections 5 and 11 of section 34, was not received at this office until after three months had elapsed, in which such application for homestead patents could be received."

On the 20th March, 1883, Mr. Andrew Russell writes Mr. Duck as follows:—

"As your appointment as Dominion land agent was in March, 1878, although lands in your agency were not opened for sale or homestead entry until 2nd August, 1881, if Miller or any other actual settler applied for entry between these dates, he should have the benefit of the Order in Council of the 19th of October, 1882, which authorises the circular of the 19th of that month."

So you see that Miller was as far off as ever from getting his patent. Now, in the beginning of 1883 the people of Prince Albert petitioned the House of Commons, complaining that no patents had yet been issued for their lands, that their claims had become valuable, that the owners and occupiers were unable to sell. Villages and towns were springing up, but building was impeded and business interfered with. On the 23rd April Mr. Lindsay Russell, the Deputy Minister, reported to the Minister that the progress of settlement, arising from projected railways, had led to urgent applications by settlers for an opportunity of getting their titles. On the 7th July the Minister transmitted Mr. Russell's report to the Council, and there was an Order in Council adopting the same. On the 11th September, 1883, Mr. Pearce writes to Mr. Walsh, and directs the Minister's

attention to the two classes of claims in Prince Albert district, in order that a decision may be reached at once. So you see that the surveys were not reported for three years, and the people were unable to secure entries. A man named Moore bought a lot of another party, who had improved over 100 acres and been in possession for seven years; yet he was unable to obtain his patent. Then Lawrence Clarke bought lands of Isbister, in 1877, and was subjected to similar annoyance. There were several other similar cases in Prince Albert, Battleford and Edmonton, which should be referred to the land board and adjusted without further delay. Mr. Pearce, in his communication to Mr. Walsh, says that: "Parties now claim that their claims should count prior to date of entry." The office at Prince Albert was opened on 21st September, 1881. The regulation requires that entry be made within three months from this date. Only five persons so entered. Between 200 and 300 were then settled within the limits so opened. The Dominion Lands Act, 1879, also 1880, makes it imperative that entries should be made within three months. Let me now give some of the reasons for this delay. I desire to call attention to these facts: that in the Birtle district two limits of each township had been defined, and most of the entire survey completed, though not open for entry; and that on 7th July, 1883, Mr. Walsh requests instruction in reference to farm instructors in the Souris district. On 13th September, 1883, Walsh sends Pearce's report to the Minister of the Interior. Pearce asks: "But when these parties fail to comply with the law as to entry within three months, there being nothing to prevent their doing so, and since the Act clearly states that entry must be made before application for patent can be received, should they not lose the time prior to entry? This, however, is to be taken into consideration in their case. As a class, they are very ignorant of the rules and regulations embodied in the Dominion Lands Act." This letter explicitly states entry must be made within three months, and evidence filed of prior residence and improvements. The Order in Council provides that entry may be antedated, so as to cover the time of investigation, and not the time land has been resided on and improved. The Prince Albert claims were not covered by the Order in Council; Miller's case was not within the rule. His entry was made on 12th April, 1882, seven months after the office was opened. If the three months' rule is overlooked, all, says Mr. Pearce, will claim they were ready to make entry three years ago, and are now entitled to be recommended for patents. I have called the attention of the House to an Order in Council of 19th October, 1882, and it must be remembered that the vast majority of the settlers did not make application within the three months allotted.

Mr. McLELAN. Why so?

Mr. MILLS. I have told the House the reason. The Government had demanded \$2 an acre for pre-emption lands, and that demand was made although the settlers had been on the lands adjoining and were entitled to the pre-emption at \$1. If the land office had been opened in proper time a large number of entries would have been made long before the Order in Council was passed increasing the value of the pre-emption lands.

Mr. McLELAN. What reason had they to expect to obtain the land at \$1 per acre?

Mr. MILLS. That had been the rule everywhere in the North-West.

Mr. McLELAN. Established by whom?

Mr. MILLS. Established by the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. Established by which Government?

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. MILLS. It was the rule when we were in office, and when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, down to July, 1879.

Mr. McLELAN. Is not that in the forty-mile belt, that you prohibited anyone from going into, and in which you prohibited homestead settlement, but in regard to which you finally said to the people: You may go in and settle, and pay \$1 per acre, cash, and such further sum as we may fix upon hereafter.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that the Government reported to the people of Prince Albert that they were not within the railway belt. The hon. gentleman knows that the regulations to which he refers had no reference to Prince Albert. The Order in Council to which the hon. gentleman refers only refers to settlers in the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway reserve within the limits of Manitoba, in the immediate vicinity of Selkirk. The hon. gentleman has but to look at it, in order to know precisely to what particular lands it refers. I have gone over the whole of the papers brought down by the Government. There is not, from the beginning to the end, any intimation that they are within the railway belt; on the contrary, they are informed that they are not, and that the regulations do not refer to them. The North-West council urged on the Government that immediate steps be taken to determine the question of title to land over three years in cultivation. A meeting of the Prince Albert settlement, reported in the Prince Albert *Times*, of the 17th of October, was held, of which Mr. Miller was chairman, and Mr. Fitzcochrane secretary. Let me call attention to what was said at that meeting. They complained of the grievances on account of the land policy; that the Government had failed to provide any machinery for the management of their internal affairs; that no attention had been paid to their remonstrances, prayers and memorials; that the so-called amendments of the Land Act had increased the injustice and the evils complained of by these settlers. It will be seen that up to this time no patents were issued. The lands were surveyed, a town was laid out, buildings were erected, of considerable value, and the settlers asked for the opportunity of mortgaging their property to raise money to carry on their business. But they could not get it, they could give no security, because the Government refused to issue patents. They insisted on the rule that the time should run from the date at which entry was made, and they refused to antedate the time for the improvements of these people, although some of them had been in possession for more than ten years. Now, Mr. Walsh, on the 9th of October, reports a number of other cases, and on the 10th of October, 1883, he writes to Mr. Duck, that the Surveyor General's letter was clearly a misinterpretation of the Act, but only in so far as having the residence prior to entry count as a part of the three years required. He also informed Mr. Duck that there was nothing in the Surveyor's letter forbidding or even deterring parties from making entry within three months after the land was open for entry, and furnishing evidence. This is perfectly true. They might have done so. But who could expect that ordinary settlers of the country, who were not lawyers, seeing a notice, that by law they had no right to antedate the entry, would contest the validity of the decision of the Department, and insist on the Dominion lands agent taking the evidence. And because they did not do so they are to be denied the opportunity of doing so when the Department admits that it was mistaken, and that the law had been misconstrued. Some months later information was communicated to the land office, that these cases might be antedated, and that the land agent might take evidence and enquire into the merits of the cases of those parties who were making application. But when application was

made, when it was proposed to deal with cases, it was found that all the papers in Miller's case, instead of being considered by the Department, and a report made and instructions given to the agent, were still lying in the Department, and, so far as I know, Mr. Miller received no patent for his land up to this moment. I need not go on with other cases. I have a large number of them here, but they are of a similar type of this one of Mr. Miller. The people complain of the reservations at Regina and in other parts of the country. They complain of the reservation of the one mile belt, and a good indication of the state of the country is shown by the fact that a newspaper, the *Prince Albert Times*, which generally supported the Government, as small papers in new districts usually do, had an article, when the rumor came, in November, 1883, that the First Minister had resigned, as Minister of Interior, expressing pleasure at the information, and hopes that the new Minister will devote himself to the discharge of his duties, and would be found to be the right man in the right place. In fact, the difficulties complained of by the people of Prince Albert, and the impediments standing in the way of granting their patents, were trifling in their character, though extremely injurious in their effects; they were such as might be remedied by any Minister in five minutes. There was no difficulty, no wrong being done by meeting the wishes of the settlers; on the contrary, it was carrying out the policy of the law to have given the people what they asked. Why was the period of three years' residence, before granting a homestead, required? Merely as an evidence of a *bond fide* intention to occupy the land. Well, if the party has occupied it three years before it is surveyed, and he asks, when it is surveyed, that the Government should give him his patent, what reason is there for withholding it? Are not the three years he has been on the land as good an evidence of his intention of remaining there as if the three years were put in at a later time? There were men who had been on their land for ten years. They were laying out villages and towns. They wanted capital, but the opportunity for obtaining it was denied them, because the Government refused to discharge their duties. I say, a more extraordinary case of—I will not say utter imbecility, but of utter neglect—I never knew in any public office. There is no justification for the treatment the people of Prince Albert and other places in that district received at the hands of the Administration. They were neglected; they were irritated; they had impediments put in the way of their improvements; their business was brought to stagnation by the failure of the Government to discharge the ordinary duties that devolved upon them. The state of things is easily traced. It began in the year 1879, with expressions of good-will towards the Government, in the newspapers. We find that complaints arose after a time—not loud nor very strongly put, but still complaints were made. We find that these complaints grew into exasperation; that public meetings were called; and that afterwards there were declarations of distress and discontent on the part of the population against the conduct of the Government. We find these people declaring that the impediments put in the way of settlement had driven away a large number of people and a large amount of capital, and we find the *Edmonton Bulletin*, a small newspaper in the North-West, which was edited by a member of the North-West Council, stating that there was rebellion in Canada, in 1837, to redress grievances, that there was a rebellion in Manitoba in 1870, before the rights of the people could be secured, that even murder had been committed, and that the Government must not be surprised if difficulties occurred in the North-West if this system of neglect and misconduct were continued. The *Prince Albert Times*, in commenting on the declaration of the *Edmonton Bulletin*, said that

"the above, coming from a member of the North-West council, has a ring of the true metal about it, which indicates the temper of the North-West." I say these complaints, these remonstrances, these petitions, these reports of public meetings, these newspaper articles, all came, from time to time, under the attention of the Government. They began in 1881, before the land office was open. It was by these complaints and remonstrances that the land office was opened at Prince Albert, three years after it ought to have been opened. From that hour until the rebellion occurred there have been remonstrances and complaints on the part of the people, and the grievances of which they complain have not been redressed. Their demands are reasonable; they show how very little it would have required on the part of the Government to satisfy those people; yet that little was not done, and the same misgovernment which drove the half-breeds into rebellion, which excited the Indians, has also produced discontent among the white population of the North-West. I do not deem it necessary to go into these details further. I could give a score of cases, in addition to this one case of Miller, if it were necessary; I take that as a type of all, and I say for this conduct there was no excuse; and if this House refuses to affirm the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham, it will be wanting in its duty to the North-West and to the electors who created this Parliament. I say that the cases I have brought under the attention of the House are cases of maladministration. I say that hon. gentlemen opposite have grossly mismanaged the public affairs of this country, and their conduct is properly characterised in the resolution before us. If hon. gentlemen vote against that resolution, they will declare that the white population of the North-West have had nothing to complain of; they will declare that the Government have dealt fairly and justly by the white population and by the half-breed population; they will declare that those people have no grounds of complaint. If they do so, they will vote contrary to the facts available to every member of the House in the papers laid before us.

Mr. ROYAL. A great deal has been said upon this question during the last two days; it has been considered from different points of view, and I believe it is proper for the members from the Province of Manitoba to offer some considerations on the causes, whether remote or immediate, that have led to the troubles which have just come to an end. In a new country, where institutions are new, those institutions are put to a supreme test when a portion of the people rise in arms to enforce some remedy for their grievances. Those grievances may be real or imaginary; but when there is a unanimous feeling among the different portions of the same community to rush to arms in defence of the majesty of the law and the institutions of the country, and to restore peace and order, I believe that in that country, however young it may be, the institutions are of a lasting nature. In this case, we have seen that the moment there was a call for the people of the old Dominion of Canada to support the majesty of the law, and to enforce the existing connection between all the members of this Dominion, that is to say, between all the Provinces having a common interest in supporting the existence of Canada, the way in which this call was responded to showed that every person and every family in the Dominion of Canada were ready to aid in maintaining the vitality of our institutions. When we have seen the call to arms responded to by the flower of our youth in all the Provinces of the Dominion, I believe that is an evidence that there is an enthusiasm to support the institutions of our country, which is essential to a nationality. And, Sir, from out of these troubles I believe this good will come: They have demonstrated that there is a national spirit in the whole Dominion of Canada. Now

that we have seen that some of our volunteers have shed their blood in support of law and the constitution of Canada, I believe it becomes the duty of this Parliament to investigate the causes of these troubles. This Parliament is the great enquirer into all the evils of the country, and into all public questions that may arise in the course of our political course; I believe that now is the proper time for this Parliament to investigate the causes of these troubles, and that we, who come from the Province of Manitoba, and who are supposed to know something about the people of the North-West and the causes which may have led to the recent outbreak, may properly be called upon to express our views on the subject. Well, Sir, I deem it my duty to-night to express an opinion on the subject. That opinion is based on some experience which I have gained during some fifteen or sixteen years spent amongst the population of that country. In the course of my residence there, from 1870 to the present time, circumstances have made me intimately acquainted with the feelings of the half-breed population, of which so much has been said in the course of this debate. My own opinion is, that there are causes which have brought about the recent troubles which are of a remote nature—causes over which no Government could have any control. Amongst these, I may cite, in the first place, the non-granting of the amnesty in 1870, and by amnesty I mean a complete amnesty for all that had taken place until the 15th July, 1870. Besides that, I say that the distance which separates that western country from old Canada had a great deal to do with our management of affairs in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. We know very well that at that time communications were very slow. We know that it used to take three or four weeks to reach Winnipeg from this part of Canada, and on that account no sufficient check could be exercised by the heads of the Departments over the subordinates sent to those distant parts to administer laws or see to the carrying out of the policy of the Dominion Government. Another cause, of a remote nature, and over which no Government could possibly have any control, was the insufficient knowledge of the character of the population in the North-West at the time of its transfer to Canada, in 1870. The population was considered of no importance whatever in the transfer; nor even when the whole North-West Territories were bought over by the Dominion of Canada was there any mention made, at least by the Hudson's Bay Company, of the existence of a fully organised population in the North-West, and this, I believe, is one of the causes which led, not only to the troubles in 1870, but the recent ones. I am going to treat this question in as a brief a manner, as this most important question permits. The importance of the question demands forsooth that it be fully discussed, and it is not to be wondered at, in view of its importance, that some of our colleagues should have spent five hours or six hours in discussing it. I intend to treat it from an independent point of view; something may be said by an independent member of the House which may not be said by a member of the Government. I am disposed to give full credit for what has been done for the people and the future prosperity of that distant part of the Dominion; while, at the same time, I am disposed to criticise, independently, the measures which have led to the present troubles. I must say that the policy of the present Administration has led: First, to the organisation of those distant Territories; second, it has induced immigrants to go in there, not only from the eastern Provinces but also from England and other portions of Europe; and thirdly, it has led to the consolidation of the Dominion. Upon these three points I say its policy has been successful. I have stated that the character of the population in the North-West had been ignored by Canada when negotiating for the transfer of

Mr. ROYAL.

those Territories to the Dominion. It was a prevalent idea among us that there were no people in the North-West, except the half-breeds, who were something like the Indians, with no idea of political institutions, no social existence, and no prospect in the future—a population, in fact, who could be ignored without causing the least inconvenience to them, or the Government, or the eastern Provinces. It is my object to-night to show there was a nationality established on the shores of the Red River and the Assiniboine at the time of the transfer of that Territory to Canada. If we look back to the first time these Territories had any political or commercial existence in the history of this part of North America, we see that in 1670 a charter was granted by King Charles II to a certain number of merchant adventurers, who wanted to trade on the shores of Hudson Bay. A monopoly was given them to trade over all that region whose waters flow into Hudson Bay; that trade was carried on successfully for a certain number of years. In 1731 Gauthier Varennes de la Vérandrye, a French Canadian, born in Three Rivers, under a license from the King of France of that day, went westward and discovered the plains lying west of Lake Superior and Red River. Gauthier Varennes de la Vérandrye was accompanied by his sons, and by some of his compatriots from the Province of Quebec, then La Nouvelle France. A few years afterwards, when he saw, and the Government saw, and the merchants saw, that there was a prospect of a highly prosperous trade being got up between those Indian tribes that had been communicated with by Varennes de la Verandrye and his associates, such a trade was established, which grew very prosperous indeed. In the course of events, in 1763, the treaty of Paris took place, by which the whole of the present Dominion of Canada, then La Nouvelle France, was ceded to the Crown of England. It did not stop the traffic that was then being carried on by the traders from the Province of Quebec in those distant Territories; but it was not until 1774 that the Hudson's Bay Company felt that the privileges that had been granted to them had been greatly interfered with by these traders from the Province of Quebec. So far, the Hudson's Bay Company's agents had been trying to get that trade from the tribes trading with them on the waters flowing into the Hudson's Bay. It seems that they had no idea of the possible commerce that might have been made with the tribes of Indians existing on the shores of some of the tributaries of the great rivers that were emptying into the Hudson's Bay; but, in that year 1774, according to the historians, the Hudson's Bay Company saw that they had to deal with a very serious question of competing traders, and, in consequence of the success of those traders in intercepting Indians on their way to the Hudson's Bay Company's factories, they thought it was their duty to protect their interest, by establishing forts inland, on the grounds on which their opponents had, until then, carried on their operations, comparatively undisturbed. This competition grew up into an actual war between them and those independent traders, supplied by merchants from Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec. In order to be more united and more powerful, these various traders agreed to form a company, which was called the North-West Company, and was organized in Montreal in 1783. To give you an idea of the important traffic that had grown up then, I may say that in that year the number of people that were trading in the interests of that North-West Company in the North-West Territories amounted to 5,000 individuals. We may have an idea of the importance of the trade which had grown up in opposition to the Hudson's Bay Company by this fact, that 5,000 men were employed in trading with the Indians westward of Lake Superior, and this is the most distant origin of the half-breed population. These people were mostly imported from the Province of Quebec, and they gave rise to the well-known class of trappers and

*coureurs des bois*, whose life has been made the subject of romances and novels, which, no doubt, some of the members of this House have read. Cooper, for instance, has given, in some of his novels, the most striking features of that life, romantic as well as pleasing to every adventurous man. It is natural to suppose that of these 5,000 people, some settled, or at least spent the best part of their life in those distant parts of the territories; no doubt they formed unions with the only women who were then to be seen in that part of the Territory, and from these unions sprung up the race of half-breeds. At that time the Red River forts and those established on the Assiniboine, as well as westward, became the headquarters of the inland trading posts of both companies. The posts on the Red River, especially, at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, became of the utmost importance, and from their isolated position, from the various circumstances in connection with that trade, they became one of the principal scenes of contention between the Hudson's Bay Company and the North-West Trading Company. Feelings of rivalry between these two companies ran so strong as to lead to bloodshed on more than one occasion. From that period of the history of the North-West Territories—and, when I say that, I include all the region situated westward of Lake Superior—we come to the first attempt that was made to plant a settlement of settlers in that distant part of Canada. That took place in 1811. It was attempted by Lord Selkirk. He was a shareholder in the Hudson's Bay Company, and I suppose, in his view, by planting a colony on the shores of the Red River, at that most important point, at the junction of the Assiniboine and the Red Rivers, he thought that the Hudson's Bay Company could get a ready supply of servants from that colony, in order to be able to better compete with the Canadian North-West Company. In that year Lord Selkirk brought out a certain number of families from the county of Sutherland, in Scotland. Now, Sir, all historians are unanimous on this point, that though it may have been in the interests of the Hudson Bay Company to have such a colony settled on their land, yet it led to hostility with the Indians, and also with the North-West Company. These settlers were regarded as invaders by the rival companies and the Indians. The Indians were exasperated because so much of their territory was taken up for agriculture. Matters grew worse, and property was destroyed. I suppose many members of this House have heard of the North-West Company. In the rivalry between this company and the natives, serious disturbances took place. Settlements were attacked, forts were taken, men were captured and lives were lost, troubles of which we heard during the debate on the boundary question. The title to the property of the half-breed population in the North-West Territories is connected with the establishment of that colony on the Red River. Lord Selkirk had to treat with the Indians, in order to get peaceable possession of territory upon which to establish his colony. The treaty that he then made with the Indians provided, besides mentioning certain geographical limits, that so much territory as could be seen between the legs of a horse, by looking under his belly, was to belong to him; so much of the territory was to be ceded by the Indians upon certain conditions. Here is what I find concerning this event in Morris' book, "The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and Keewatin":

"In the year 1817 the Earl of Selkirk visited his wide domain, and entered into negotiations with the Indian tribes, for the extinction of their title to a tract of land described as follows:—

"All that tract of land adjacent to Red River and Assiniboine River, beginning at the mouth of Red River and extending along the same as far as Great Forks at the mouth of Red Lake River and along Assiniboine River as far as the Musk Rat River, otherwise called Rivière des Champignons, and extending to the distance of six miles from Fort Douglas on every side, and likewise from Fort Doer, and also from the Great Forks and in other posts extending in breadth to the distance of two English statute miles back from the banks of the river."

"The Indians then inhabiting the region were described as being of the Chippewa or Saulteaux and Killistine or Cree nations. They were made to comprehend, the depth of the land they were surrendering, by being told, that it was the greatest distance at which a horse on the level prairie could be seen, or daylight seen under his belly between his legs. The consideration for the surrender was the payment of one hundred pounds of good merchantable tobacco, to each nation annually.

"The treaty was signed by Lord Selkirk and by five Indian chiefs, who affixed thereto drawings of the animals after which they were named, by way of signature, a *fac simile* of which will be found elsewhere. The surrender was to the Sovereign Lord, King George the Third. The treaty was accompanied by a map which shows that the tract surrendered extended to Grand Forks in what is now United States territory."

In 1836, the Hudson's Bay Company bought back the whole tract from the heirs of Lord Selkirk for the sum of £84,000, the rights of colonists who had purchased land between 1811 and 1836 being respected. Now, so far as we can judge from this and other historical accounts, that is the origin of the titles to the property which the half-breeds claimed from the Hudson's Bay Company, and which the Canadian Government undertook to guarantee to them by the Manitoba Act of 1870. In 1817 the forts of the Hudson's Bay Company were captured. The North-West Company of Montreal displayed great energy in order to overcome the competition of the Hudson's Bay Company, and some of the most troublous times in the history of that country belong to that period. In 1816 a battle was fought on the shores of Red River, a little below what is now the city of Winnipeg, in which Governor Semple, of the Hudson's Bay Company, and 26 of his men, were killed by the men employed by the North-West Company. It was then thought that the Hudson's Bay Company had lost their hold on the territory south and south-westward of Manitoba. But the year after Lord Selkirk came from Montreal, with part of the regiment of the Murons, and recaptured all the forts. During these troubles trade became demoralised in the rivalries of competition, and both companies came to the verge of bankruptcy; when, in 1821, there was a combination effected by which the two companies were united, and the North-West Company disappeared. I have alluded to that hostility between these two companies in order to show that the North-West Company of Montreal was accustomed to employ all its servants from the Province of Quebec. Numbers of those men in its employ settled in distant parts of the territory. The Hudson's Bay Company, on the other hand, brought nearly all its servants from Scotland or the Orkney Islands; and when the two companies were combined, of course a great number of these servants were thrown out of employment, and there you have the date of the first agricultural settlements in that region. The union between the servants of the North-West Company and the Indian women was the first origin of the half-breed people. It was about that time that Lord Selkirk, with the ideas of a statesman and the founder of a people—because, after all, he may be regarded as one of the founders of that country—Lord Selkirk, disregarding altogether his own religious ideas, applied to the Catholic bishop of Quebec for some priests, in order to establish French Canadian half-breed parishes in the settlements he had founded on the shores of the Red River and the Assiniboine. The Rev. Messrs. Provencher and Dumoulin were sent by the Catholic bishop of Quebec, in 1818, to that Territory. And, Sir, Lord Selkirk, when requested to do so, did not hesitate one moment to endow the Roman Catholic Church, that is to say, to give to those priests the means of endowing a church, the means of subsistence, and the means of extending their faith amongst the people of that country and assisting them to set up parishes alongside of the Scotch settlements which he had organised in that territory. It was only two years afterwards that Revd. Father Provencher visited the country. In 1822 St. Boniface became the nucleus of a large settlement. Lord Selkirk had brought with him, as I have stated, the remnant of the Murons regiment. That regiment was one of those foreign regi-

ments which had taken service under the Crown of England in the Continental wars of 1812. A part of the regiment had been sent over to Canada, and Lord Selkirk, with the permission of the authorities, hired some of them to go with him in order to retake possession of the forts which had been captured by the North-West Company. That regiment was composed mostly of Swiss and German soldiers. Some of them who accompanied Lord Selkirk took up land and settled in the parish of St. Boniface; that is to say, in the territory lying east and almost opposite Fort Douglass, which is now comprised in the limits of the city of Winnipeg, and those settlers formed the parish of St. Boniface. It was a matter of surprise to me to know how it happened that the title of St. Boniface was given to that diocese. Rev. Father Provencher, who afterwards became the first Catholic bishop of that territory, when he saw so many German and Swiss settled there, gave to that part of the territory the name of St. Boniface, which is that of a German saint. We know, also, that there is a small slough which runs east of St. Boniface and empties itself into Red River, which slough is known to this day as German Creek. Upon that creek and at that point is the site of a church, and that then formed a very flourishing and populous settlement and parish, and it was called by Bishop Provencher the diocese of St. Boniface. Unfortunately, those Swiss and German soldiers did not remain very long in the settlement. Some of them, the minority, married French-speaking half-breed women, and that union, up to the present day, has given rise to large families; but most of the soldiers went away, thinking that under the then circumstances of the country they could do better by going to the United States or back to Canada. At that period, 1822, we have a fixed population for the first time in the history of the territory. That population was comprised, first, of the Scotch who were brought over by Lord Selkirk from Scotland; second, the descendants and families of those Scots and the Germans of the Murons regiment; and, third, the half-breeds, who originated from the union of French Canadians and Indian women. Thus we had three elements in the population then existing in the North-West Territories. In his arrangement with the Hudson's Bay Company, Lord Selkirk stipulated that he would give so much to that company, and undertake to plant, I think, 1,000 families within a certain number of years, and at any time that company could resume possession of the lands, and then the colonists would look to the company for their titles. In 1783 there were 5,000 people employed in that prosperous and best paying trade of the North-West Company. In those times, the French Canadians especially, took to that life, and we see amongst the half-breeds, noble names, the names of the nobility of France. In fact, we have the blood of the French families of New France instilled in that growing colony in the North-West. Members of those families, who saw a colony planted on the shores of Red River, that there was a church established, and educational institutions organised, emigrated to that distant point in the west; and after they retired from the service of the Hudson Bay Company they returned with their families, and settled in the important parish of St. Boniface. That is the origin of the half-breed nation in the North-West Territory, and I say that nobler blood and better parentage could not have originated it. It became the duty of those priests, whom Lord Selkirk had obtained from the bishop of Quebec, to see to the educational institutions; and, in course of time, sisters of charity, and sisters devoted to educational work, were brought into that country by the clergymen from the Province of Quebec. Those half-breed families, whether Scotch, or whether the descendants of the Murons regiment, are half-breeds, and had, at a certain time, and as late as 1840, as good facilities as they could have had in the Province of Quebec, or any other Province of Canada. Now, Sir, after these people

Mr. ROYAL.

settled in parishes, those parishes commenced to grow, and gave rise to many others. After the parish of St. Boniface had grown, it expanded into the parishes of St. Vital, St. Norbert, St. Charles, St. François Xavier, St. Paul, and others, and we found them all growing and improving. The population being under the régime of the Hudson Bay Company, had their own peculiar existence. As you may well judge, these people gave themselves to agricultural pursuits, and as there was no market for their surplus produce, they took to hunting as well. Hunting the buffalo was a benefit to them, as it was to the Hudson Bay Company, and that company encouraged them in hunting as much as possible. There was no currency in the colony. The currency mainly consisted of promissory notes, issued by the Hudson Bay Company, redeemable by bills of exchange, granted at sixty days' sight, on the Governor, the Deputy Governor, and the commissioner of the Hudson Bay Company, in London. I have seen this paper currency which existed in the Territories in 1870. It seems that the smaller the denomination of the bill the greater its size. A bill for a shilling, the people called a blanket, on account of its large dimensions, and they grew less in proportion according to the amount represented. The £5 notes were very small, the size being about that of our present bank bills. As these people could only grow on their land what they could consume or sell, they had, to a large extent, to depend on hunting to supply them with meat, and you would see a part of those parishes, after the seed was sown, organising for the buffalo hunts on the plains. A priest, as a general rule, would accompany them, and they would form camps, numbering from 500 to 1,500 people. As might be expected, these pursuits had a great influence on the character of the people; their characteristics were largely derived from their pursuits. When these people would go to the plains they would return months afterwards with their carts laden with the best kind of meat, and after harvesting their crops and selling what they could sell, they would have all they could wish to depend upon for the fall and the winter. When they were on the plains, these people were, of course, among the Indian tribes, whom they would have to fight occasionally. In fact, Sir, in these times, and to a very recent period, the half-breeds were the terror of the Indian tribes on the plains, and we have an instance, amongst others, that occurred in 1852, on the Grand Coteau of the Missouri, in which 67 half-breeds defended themselves for two days against 2,000 Sioux; and when I went to Manitoba some 15 years ago, I used to enjoy very much the narration given to me of that encounter, from eye witnesses of the fight. On that occasion Bishop Lafèche, of Three Rivers, who was then a missionary in the North-West, was present. I believe he was one of the wounded, and that he is still lame from the wound he received in that engagement. From the habits of life of these people, from the constitution of the country, from the distance which lay between this isolated group of settlers and the rest of the world, we may well imagine the characteristics of that nation. A spirit of independence and self-reliance were amongst the characteristics of that nation. Everyone had to look after himself, and a half-breed with his family, on the plains, was just as independent, and just as secure from all the necessities of life, as any citizen of our own towns or cities. With his family, his gun and his horse, he could depend on himself for a living for himself and his family. They were isolated, as I have said, from the rest of the world. They were 500 miles from the nearest terminus of the American system of railways, at the latest times. They were sixty days' travel from the Province of Canada, and they had depended on themselves entirely for their means of subsistence. We have seen the origin of the half-breed people. We have seen the origin of their title to property, and from

1822, when the first settlements were formed on the banks of the Red River, down to 1858, when the trade monopoly of the Hudson Bay Company ceased to exist, there was witnessed the development of a nationality—for it was a distinct nationality, to all intents and purposes. From their fathers they inherited many of the virtues of the races from which they sprung, and from their alliances with the Indian women, their descendants had, of course, inherited many of the features of the Indian population. Well, Sir, it would be wrong for anyone to suppose that these people had no idea of political institutions. They were under the sway of the Hudson Bay Company, which was eminently and essentially a trading company; and the Hudson Bay Company was not the company to offer the colonists any part of the Territories which had been granted to it by Charles II. However, when that colony grew into existence, the same institutions were given; and what were they? The legislative as well as the executive power was vested in the Governor and the council for the colony of Assiniboia, as it was called, until 1870, when those Territories were annexed to Canada. The councillors were seventeen in number, although afterwards they became twenty-one. These councillors, as well as the Governor of the colony, were appointed by the committee of the Hudson Bay Company; and, mark you, representation was then a principal feature of the political institutions of the country. The councillors were taken as representing all the various classes in the settlement. Representative men were nominated by the directors of the Hudson Bay Company from the various elements of nationality then existing in the colony—from the Scotch, the French half-breeds, and some of the foreign elements; and the recorder or chief justice of the Territory, as well as the two bishops, the Catholic bishop and the Anglican bishop, representing the religious element then existing, were made councillors. Therefore, when we see it stated in the press, and when the idea has been spread amongst the population of Canada, that those people, in 1870, had no idea of political institutions, public opinion has been greatly deceived and misled. Representative institutions were given to them, because they had a strong sense of justice, and all their rights and privileges, their national features and instincts, were represented in that council. Therefore, we may well infer that they had some correct idea of political government and some idea that their political rights should be respected when the transfer of the country to Canada took place. Now, it seems quite a surprise to us that that population should have existed for 50 years without any organisation, either judicial or political. I have stated what the political institutions were: the judiciary was equally simple and rudimentary, and yet it was sufficient to meet the wants of that population. That population had strong religious ideas, and you know, Sir, that hard life engenders naturally high morals; and morality is found to exist among those people, whose life is moral and frugal, and not tainted with the luxuries which we, amongst ourselves, call civilisation. Their judiciary consisted of a recorder or chief justice, if you may call him so, and some petty magistrates, and these formed the courts in the settlement. The recorder was appointed by the Hudson Bay Company in London, and had a seat in the council, when he had to perform duties there similar to those of the Attorneys General in the old Provinces; in fact, the recorder was the legal adviser of that council. They had the full jury system; no person could be tried except by his peers; and we may see, by consulting the history of those times, that this was the case. It may be said that those people had not the idea of our high civilisation. Well, Sir, upon that point there may be some difference of opinion. However, by the by-laws or regulations issued by that council the sale of liquor was strictly prohibited amongst the Indians, and was punished with the utmost severity. The granting of licenses—and I am sure that this

will be a piece of very gratifying news to the prohibitionist members of this House—was also regulated, to the utmost extent, and it was surrounded with all possible safeguards. I believe we, in the eastern Provinces, may borrow from the regulations of that uncivilised council a good many features which would prove very satisfactory. In fact, after the organisation of the Province of Manitoba, the Government of that Province could not do anything better than embody in its own laws the very regulations that were issued by the council of Assiniboia. Under that political and social organisation, that people lived and increased for nearly forty years. There was no political strife amongst them; they had a paternal Government, which was sufficient for all their requirements, whether as leading an agricultural life or a hunting life on the prairie. They had no lawyers, no newspapers, no demagogues, no politicians, no grits.

Mr. HACKETT. The last was a blessing.

Mr. ROYAL. No doubt, a great blessing. They had no communication with the rest of the world; their complete isolation prevented them from enjoying the luxuries of our civilisation, but it made the population harmonious, united, sober, and fully convinced that liberty is only practicable with a corresponding sum of protection, and that to do justice to various interests requires a certain amount of representation from various classes, in a country obliged to protect themselves from the raids of the Indians. The public spirit of these people was dignified and self-confident. The country was deemed to be theirs, as they had to defend it unassisted, and it is a remarkable fact that those people, who numbered from 12,000 to 15,000, had to defend themselves against the incursions of the powerful warlike tribes in the west. The Hudson Bay Company had but one interest, that of making money and securing the most valuable export of furs from the Territory every year. The company had a renewal of the monopoly from 1838 to 1858, and such was then the condition of that people living in harmony together, having but few wants, and those wants fully satisfied. In fact, the existence of that people would be a most interesting study for any writer on political economy. They had no exports; their productions were consumed by the local market, and, besides, they had a circulation only of a certain character. In 1858 the extinction of that monopoly induced a certain number of American traders, and also some Canadian adventurers, to go through St. Paul to that Territory. The civilisation was not, perhaps, that which we are sometimes so proud of. It may have been a better one, if, by civilisation, we understand the greatest possible degree of order, and happiness in all the ranks of society; if by civilisation we understand a community so well regulated that law seems to touch lightly upon everyone, and is cheerfully obeyed by all; if by civilisation we understand, people in which the authority is respected, the family strong and united, the wants few, and all easily satisfied; if by civilisation we understand a community where all the individuals love their country, fight for its defence, revere its institutions, and do not cast an eye of envy upon other nations and other countries; if by civilisation we understand a people attached to its religion, a people whose manners, social enjoyments and amusements exhibit a high degree of morality, mutual benevolence and simplicity as well; if by civilisation we understand a nation which produces all the necessaries of life with the least degree of toil, hardships and hire of one free man to another, and where golden mediocrity is to be found in every man's home; the civilisation which was then flourishing on the shores of the Red River was certainly not one of fine public or private construction, of great activity of intelligence, of literature and arts, of steamboats, railways and telegraphs: but I dare say that the people to be found there were

most assuredly the happiest that were known then to exist. With regard to some of the feelings that civilised people seem to have a monopoly of, patriotism, for instance—I do not say it is one that peculiarly characterises the present Opposition, but I must say patriotism was and is still a characteristic of that population. I will ask the forbearance of the House while I quote from one of the writers in the history of those people, Mr. Hargrave. In his book on the Red River, he says :

“Patriotism is a virtue popularly supposed to flourish in mountainous and old countries, whose majestic scenery and associations of old time foster and perpetuate the pride and allegiance which their children feel for them. The inhabitants of the plain country of Red River, however, most assuredly evince an affection for the land of their nativity, closely allied to, if not identical with the patriotic emotions of the denizens of other countries, nor is it only to the dead natural scenery that their feelings cling, but the existing under an improved exterior, the romantic life, the custom, mode of thought and language of the Indians, retain their hold on the affections of their descendants to successive generations.”

Now, it has been the custom, unfortunately, of writers and speakers upon the half-breed population of the Red River, to represent them as a semi-savage population, devoid of all the feelings which we, styling ourselves civilised communities, are so proud of; but, as I have stated, that population had the idea of political institutions, of representative institutions; they had more, perhaps, than our own people, accustomed, as they are, to representative institutions, the idea of submission to law and authority, and, as to feelings of patriotism, it is shown by this writer, who certainly has no prejudices in their favor, that patriotism flourished as well in their bosoms as it flourishes, I expect and hope, in the bosoms of the Canadian people. In the history of that strange country you will find many examples—and I have stated some—of chivalric ideas of valor and patriotism. Now, from the commencement of that settlement of the Red River, it may be well to ask whether that population had any intercourse with any other population in the world. They were isolated, but they kept up correspondence with the population of the older Provinces, through the missionaries sent to them, through the sisters of charity, through the ministers of the Gospel sent them; there was an uninterrupted intercourse maintained between that population and the population of the Eastern Provinces, and, when I have stated that the extension of the trade monopoly in 1858 was the signal for some merchants from Canada to go amongst that people, and try to enjoy the benefits and profits of that measure, I must say that this coincides with the first arrival amongst that people of Canadians. In 1859, a paper was established, the very first newspaper established in that portion of British America. It was the *Nor'-Wester*, and in the very first number of that paper the editors showed a spirit of opposition to the Government of the colony. In fact, from the first, the aim and ambition of the founders of the paper were in hostility to the existing institutions of the Red River. The first step publicly taken to effect such a change was when a petition was sent to England, asking for troops to protect the colony against the Sioux, who were just coming from Minnesota, after the massacre of 1862. The petition was signed by 1,183 settlers, a majority of whom were French-speaking half-breeds of that colony. The *Nor'-Wester* and the party upon whose support it existed sent a counter petition, and for the first time, and to the great scandal of the colony, that petition, while asking also for troops, commented disparagingly on the manner in which the Hudson Bay Company exercised its jurisdiction. In 1862 these parties, composed of Canadians as well as Americans, availing themselves of the weakness of the institutions in that country, liberated one prisoner—in fact, gaol was broken, in that circumstance, as well as in the year after, 1863. In 1866 the same party of foreigners assumed a more decided opposition to the existing institutions

Mr. ROYAL.

of the country. They made a request to the council that, instead of having the appointment of one councillor made by the Hudson Bay Company, in London, they should make that appointment. Of course, the petition was refused. The answer that came from the council stated that the appointment rested, not with the council, but with the committee of directors of the Hudson Bay Company, in London. The *Nor'-Wester* said: “The people of Winnipeg are openly discussing the propriety of taking the Government from its present hands into their own.” In 1867 an attempt was made to organise a republic in Portage la Prairie. Portage la Prairie was then a settlement lying outside of the limits of the settlement of Assiniboia. The constitution of Assiniboia was limited to a certain territory, outside of which it had no jurisdiction at all. In the meantime, the Scotch colonists had developed, and some few parishes west of Baie St. Paul, which was then the last parish of the settlement, were organised, and Poplar Point and Portage la Prairie and another parish were formed, and these people wanted to have some authority amongst them to maintain peace. So, in 1867, there was an attempt to organise a Republic amongst them. Thos. Spence was the elected president; he organised his council, made some laws, imposed some import and export duty, and then wrote to the British authorities to ascertain whether his Republic had any legal existence or not. Of course, he got an answer that he had no right to organise such a Government, and that was the end of it. However, it shows that the population was increasing fast, and that there was need of a Government to maintain peace and order. I will quote from the *Globe*, in reference to the establishment of that Government. The *Globe* seems always to have taken a very watchful interest in the welfare of the people of those Territories, but I do not hesitate to say that it has been the chief instrumentality in spreading discontent and dissatisfaction among the people, and hatred to the Government of Canada. This is what the *Globe* said :

“The *Nor'-Wester* is advised that, under the misgovernment of the Hudson Bay Company, the people of Red River had risen in revolt, under the leadership of Spence, and organised a Republic on British soil.”

The *Nor'-Wester* was the only medium of communication that then existed between that Territory and the eastern Provinces. To show that there was very little echo among the people, a counter petition to that above mentioned, made by Canadians and Americans respecting the electoral principle was signed by 804 people, asking that the institutions then existing should be continued to be maintained. The half-breed people, who formed the majority in the settlement of Assiniboia, had some political ideas of what the system of future movement for their country may be, I will read one of the clauses of the petition :

“Changes are anticipated in this country. We cannot foresee the result of the negotiations pending between the Imperial Government and your honorable body, but we are confident that you will not lose sight of our condition; and we humbly entreat your honors to take measures in the said transactions to secure the welfare of the natives and inhabitants of this settlement, and to guard them against the preponderating and undue influence of newcomers.”

This shows that the spirit of these people was fully awakened to the changes that were talked of as being about to take place in the Territories. Well, Sir, the *Nor'-Wester* refused to publish a counter petition, signed by the majority of the people of that settlement. The Canadians who came to that country in 1858 were naturally looked upon by the natives as being hostile to the institutions under which they had lived contented and happy. They looked upon the Canadians as a dangerous sort of men, who wanted to seize hold of the Government and to administer it to suit themselves; and to this fact we must attribute the commencement of the ill-feeling which the people of that country exhibited against the Canadians. In 1868 a party of Canadians was sent to construct a road from the Lake of

the Woods to Fort Garry, under charge of a man named Snow, I suppose a civil engineer or surveyor. Amongst that party of Canadians there was, unfortunately, a poet. In fact, I believe this poet was his assistant, and had acquired some renown in the Canadian press as the author of verses of a some merit. Now, if that poet had confined himself to writing poems and reciting Shakespeare for his own amusement, no harm would have been done; but the very moment he set foot into the North-West Territories he began to write to his friends, and his letters were published in the *Globe*. Those letters gave a description of the country and of the people, which was simply a caricature, and was most unfair and unjust. The female part of the population got very angry at the reading of those letters. One lady pulled the nose of the poet, and another, in the store of her husband, used her hands rather freely about his ears. These facts show that when Canadians wrote about the features of the people and sought to caricature their mode of life and social institutions, the people became very sensitive, as they were justly proud of their condition. The uneasiness of that people assumed a different phase when, in February, 1868—and, mark you, that is a very important period in the history of the country—a disturbance occurred at Oak Point, in consequence of a report gaining credence among settlers in that locality that Canadians were purchasing from the Indians portions of land on which actual occupants had a pre-emption claim. In the lack of judgment displayed by those Canadian employees whom the Government sent there in 1868, we find the very seeds of discontent and hostility that afterwards matured in open revolt against the Canadian authorities. Of course, they were defending their own property, and these half-breeds, sensitive and proud, and feeling that Canadians were invaders of the Territory, felt the injustice of the proceedings. They knew very well that those people transacted business with the Indians in the Territory, which had been sold to Lord Selkirk, and upon which they had settled and made improvements and secured a pre-emptory claim. One of those parties was arrested and brought to Fort Garry, and the people submitted a prayer to the Governor that this man should be sent out of the Territory, because his presence was calculated to arouse misgivings and excitement among the people. In order to show what was the true state of the little party of Canadians and Americans who were then arousing opposition to existing institutions, the *Nor. Wester* published an article, in which it was stated that “while Sir George Cartier and William Macdougall were going to England, in order to unite the North-West to Canada, Senator Ramsay, of Minnesota, was submitting a series of resolutions at Washington, for the purpose of annexing the colony of Red River to the United States.” What was the patriotic winding up to that document? It was, that: “Whichever way the cat jumped the North-West was bound to be a great country.” It was not love of Canada that influenced them, but a feeling that they were bound to have some power, either political or in some other direction; and whether union occurred with the United States or Canada, it was a matter of indifference to them. I mean to state that matters connected with the remote causes of the present disturbances were beyond the control of any Government, whether Conservative or Liberal, and that in these the recent troubles had their rise and cause is quite evident. With respect to the influence of Canadians sent to the North-West, I will quote the testimony of a writer whose prejudices against the French-speaking half-breeds are well known:

“Had the Canadian party endeavored to lead the settlers to demand in a proper way annexation to Canada, without trying at the same time to blacken the character of the Hudson Bay Company, it is very probable that Canada would have found more friends than it did in Red River. There was no objection to a union with Canada amongst the people, but when men who represented themselves as champions of Canada defied the laws and endeavored to bring mob violence into existence, then the settlers took fright, and without waiting to judge properly, they

denounced all Canadians on account of the acts done by a few lawless men. The fact was, that the people of Red River felt that although the Hudson Bay Company government was weak and unsuitable to the wants of the country, still it was the only one in existence at the time in the North-West, and therefore the sole protection to life and property. They consequently had no desire to see it overthrown, until another and better one was substituted in its place. There was no anti-Canadian feeling dominant amongst the settlers; but there was a fear that if the generality of Canadians should prove to be like the party who put themselves forward as the representatives of Canada in Red River, they would not be a good or safe people to become allied to.”

Then, further on, the same author says:

“Other parties now commenced staking off land, until, at last the settlers finding out what was going on, interfered, and a great deal of ill-feeling was caused amongst the people on the subject. Indeed, this promiscuous claiming of land on the part of strangers did more to engender a feeling of discontent towards Canadian annexation than anything else. The idea became quite prevalent that the rights of settlers to their lands would not be respected, but that every Tom, Dick or Harry might come in and claim land wherever they found it. This selfish and unprincipled behavior on the part of such men did a great deal of harm, and sowed the seeds of future trouble in the settlement. In fact, it became generally believed amongst a large number of the settlers that they were to be ignored, and that strangers were to be allowed to come into the country and do as they pleased; and that Canada's whole aim in endeavoring to obtain possession of the country was to find a place of refuge for its surplus population, and that the interests of the Red River people were to suffer thereby. All this ignorance of the real intentions of the Canadian Government was caused by the actions of a few men.”

Now, Sir, you may well imagine with what feelings of uneasiness the arrival of Col. Dennis and his party of surveyors was welcomed in the summer of 1869, after the doings of the men under surveyor Snow, after their trying to buy lands from the Indians, without regard to the occupants of those lands. So great was that anxiety that when this officer commenced with his surveyors to survey some lands which had been occupied for a long time in the vicinity of St. Boniface, their work was put a stop to by the population. That was the commencement of open difficulties among the Red River people, a very important period in the history of that part of the Territory, in connection with Canadian doings. It is very important to make known the remote causes which led the population there to take fright at the attempt made by these people, the injudicious attempt, to survey lands which had been cultivated and improved for many years before.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman will excuse me, but it is so excessively hot, and members are so uncomfortable from sitting so long, that I believe the House will be delighted if the hon. gentleman would hand in the balance of his speech to the *Hansard* reporters. It would answer just as well.

Mr. ROYAL. I have no objection to moving the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. TROW. The balance would be published in *Hansard*.

Mr. ROYAL. Not at all. My speech is not written.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think we have shown a good deal of patience with other hon. gentlemen, and I think we might give the same courtesy to the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). Perhaps, if he was speaking in his own language, which he avoids out of courtesy to members who do not understand the French language, he might occupy less time.

Mr. ROYAL. I have no intention of wearying the House. It is not a source of pleasure to me to be obliged to speak in a foreign language. I do it, of course, as a matter of courtesy to this House, and to those who do not understand the French language. I would, no doubt, find great pleasure in addressing the House in French, but I do it in English with no little difficulty; and I know it must be very tiresome and unpleasant to some of the members here to listen to a member who addresses the House in a language which is not familiar to him. However, I believe the question is very important; but if the House is unanimous upon

this point, that the debate had better be adjourned, I have no hesitation to agreeing to that sentiment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROYAL. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest to some of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Of course, I do not expect the same courtesy from some of them, for various reasons, but I believe if my pleasure here had been studied, it would have been better for me to have handed a ready made speech to the *Hansard* reporters. I must say, in speaking upon the subject I have tried to impress this House with the importance of knowing the origin of the population which existed in the North-West Territories at the time of the transfer. I know that very little is known of that population and their history, from the very fact that hon. gentlemen opposite ignored that there was such a population as the half-breeds, and said that the population existing there were either Indians or white people. Well, Sir, that is not the case. That is contrary to history and facts, and I thought it was my duty to correct the idea which has gone aboard, that the population of that country was of no consequence whatever, that the number of that population was insignificant, that they had no political institutions, that they did not know anything about representative institutions, that whatever Government might be given to them they should accept, as a matter of course with the greatest grace possible. I feel it my duty to-night to vindicate the character of that population, and to show what history states about the origin and characteristics of that population. When it is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that that population must consist of either Indians or whites, I believe that statement is very incorrect. Those people had enjoyed their rights and their existence in that country for many years, and they had some reasons to claim from the Government of Canada the recognition of their existence as a separate and distinct people. Now, Sir, I come to the period of 1869-70. I have no intention to recite in detail the events of that period—the criminal rashness of Lt. Col. Dennis, his efforts to incite an Indian war by his mad proclamation, calling on the Indians to unite with the Canadian party to make war on the native population of the country; the meetings of the settlers, French and English, to discuss the proposed transfer of their country to Canada; the stern determination to resist all such action, until the people obtained the recognition of their existence and their rights as free men and British subjects; the decision of the French-speaking population to fight, even if left alone and unassisted, for the granting of such rights, not only to themselves, but to the whole community; the organisation of the convention, which delegates from all parts of the colony attended; the subsequent election of members to maintain peace and order in the settlement, by the establishment of a provisional Government; the election of Louis Riel as president; the maintenance of such power at great risk and cost for over eight months; the refusal to receive Lieutenant Governor Macdougall; the selection and sending of delegates to Ottawa, in 1870, to negotiate the terms and conditions on which the people of the colony of Assiniboia would consent to form part of the Dominion of Canada; the passing of the Manitoba Act, and the final transfer of the colony, on the 15th of July, 1870, to the Dominion of Canada. It is not my intention to deal at length with these facts. But the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) stated yesterday that the rights to the property were the only cause of the rising in Manitoba, or in the Territory which now constitutes the Province of Manitoba. I must dissent from that opinion. Those men felt that if their rights to property were being tampered with they had a perfect right to revolt and repel any attempts that might be made to interfere; but there were other rights, which were more sacred to

Mr. ROYAL.

them, and it was the recognition of those rights, which have been in existence in their political institutions from 1822 to 1870, that they desired; and to state that the rights to their property were the only cause of their resistance to Canadian institutions is not correct. For instance, under their institutions they had the liberty of education, they had the separate school system, they had the use of their language, they had their own laws, administered in their own way, and the people clung to those laws and those institutions as strongly as to their rights of property, which the Canadians, then in the country, attempted to interfere with. Were I, Sir, to go into the details of that eventful period, I would point out the efforts of the party opposite, in their press and elsewhere, to make political capital out of the resistance of the Red River people. We heard, this afternoon, a most pointed speech from the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) on this subject. That opinion, coming from him, was more weighty, perhaps, than from myself. However, he showed that the *Globe* had been exciting the dispute and the resistance to Canadian authorities in the Red River long before we sent Lieutenant Governor Macdougall and his party up there to take possession of the country. It is to its language and to the efforts of its correspondents that we owe the resistance which was then offered to the Canadian authorities. The *Globe* stated that the half-breeds had no business to accept from the Canadian Government a ready-made government, and we have heard the hon. member for Ottawa quoting extracts from the *Globe* to prove that fact. I will only say that the calm and dispassionate historian of that eventful period, when years have passed away, will have a great deal to say in favor of the energy, moderation and public spirit evinced by the French-speaking half-breeds of the Red River; he will then be able to see that public opinion was so much worked up and excited by an unfortunate incident during the troubles, at least, among a great portion of the population of Canada; that the Government of the day found it impossible to redeem their pledge to grant a full and complete amnesty to those whose principal crime had been the obtaining for their country those liberties inherent to every British citizen. In fact, such a measure had become impossible for any Government, as it was fully demonstrated by the limited and incomplete amnesty which was proclaimed by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1875. The extracts and the argument of the hon. member for Ottawa, this afternoon, showed that the opposite party has done everything in its power to make political capital out of Scott's death, as they have done with every other public question. The men at the head of affairs in the colony expected that amnesty as the essence of their contract with Canada. Now, in fact, those delegates who were then sent from the *de facto* Government in the Red River district, treated with the Canadian authorities; they had interviews; they deliberated over the Bill of Rights, and on the various questions which were these submitted to the Canadian Government. Every one of questions was settled. Every man of common sense will imagine easily the amnesty to be certainly the essence of the contract, which was then thought to be made by the authorities in the Red River and the Canadian Government. There is a great deal of contention of opinion on the question; but we have, from the documents, from the records of the country, from the evidence taken in the committee struck by Parliament, in 1875, proof that the delegates were led to believe that an amnesty would be proclaimed before they returned to Manitoba. Such was the opinion of the people in the country at that time. I was a personal witness to the fact that the then provisional Government organised a reception to be given to Governor Archibald, when they expected him to arrive by the Dawson route. Carriages had been prepared, and an address drafted; and the address was to be presented to the Cana-

dian Governor on his touching the soil of Manitoba. Instead of such a *dénouement*, what was the profound dissatisfaction of the people, what was their intense feeling of humiliation and deception, when they were informed that no amnesty had been granted, and that they would have to flee for their lives from the country they had just liberated. A great deal was said about the expedition of our troops across the portages between Lake Superior and the Red River; a great deal was said in the English reviews of the wonderful feat accomplished by our volunteers under the guidance of Col. Wolseley. I know that his proclamation is not generally known in Canada; but I was in Fort Garry myself twenty-four hours before the arrival of the troops. I saw Col. Wolseley coming to the fort, with his troops displayed in order of battle, and I know he had not a single shot to fire nor a gate to break open; there was not a man, not even a child, to fight with, to gain possession of the fort. What was, then, his proclamation the next day? I take it from the report of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who thought it was rather a piece of curiosity, and therefore inserted it in his report to the Public Works Department at that time. Col. Wolseley, the day after his arrival at Fort Garry, issued the following proclamation:—

"From Prince Arthur's Landing to Fort Garry is over 600 miles, through a wilderness of forest and water, where no supplies of any description are obtainable. You had to carry on your backs a vast amount of supplies over no less than 47 portages, making a total distance of seven miles, a feat unparalleled in our military annals. You have descended a great river, esteemed so dangerous from its rapids, falls and whirlpools, that none but experienced voyageurs attempt its navigation. Your cheerful obedience to orders has enabled you, under the blessing of Divine Providence, to accomplish your task without any accident.

"Although the banditti who had been oppressing this people fled at your approach, without giving you an opportunity of proving how men capable of such labor could fight, you have deserved as well of your country as if you had won a battle."

Now Mr. Dawson, the hon. member for Algoma, adds this:

"This is no doubt very eloquent, and the soldiers deserved all that could be said in their praise, but as it occurs in a document which will doubtless be placed on record, I must protest against its being accepted as a correct representation of the state of matters existing in the Red River settlement when the troops arrived.

"The people to whom he alludes, instead of flying at his approach, like banditti, were quietly following their usual occupations, except those who were out, at his particular request, making a road to facilitate the movements of Her Majesty's troops, and the soldiers had had experienced guides on the Winnipeg, although the contrary is implied."

Those people expected that a complete amnesty would reach that country before the arrival of the troops; they were perfectly ready to receive the Canadian Government; they had organised a demonstration to welcome Mr. Archibald, the first Lieutenant Governor of that country. Col. Wolseley's proclamation, calling these people banditti, calling them cowards, because he had not the chance of firing a shot against them, caused very naturally great humiliation, and, I must say, exasperation in the minds of those people. Col. Wolseley had no right to call them banditti; he had no more right than the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in a speech he delivered in Toronto in 1872. When you call a whole population banditti, thieves and robbers, and when you call them cowards, no wonder if these people, whose minds had been already poisoned by the ill-doings of some officials, resent the humiliation inflicted upon them. Such was the state of affairs at the arrival of the troops at Fort Garry in 1878. The expedition of those troops had been asked for by the heads of the people in that colony, but certainly it would not have been asked for if they had believed the arrival of the troops would have been followed by such results. The whole population was insulted by such a proclamation, and the events that followed showed that population that Canada, instead of considering them as people whose rights had to be respected, looked upon them as a nation whose fate was not worth

that of the Indian. In the presence of these facts, is it improper for me to say they are the remote cause of the troubles which occurred last spring on the Saskatchewan? It has been in their bosom ever since 1870, and some years before, that they had been unjustly dealt with, and that Canada, instead of being a country friendly to them, was a receptacle of foes and opponents. In the presence of the facts I have just mentioned, is it improper for me to say that those facts are some of the causes of the troubles of last spring on the Saskatchewan? The half-breeds, from that moment, looked upon Canadians as faithless invaders, as a people totally foreign to all sentiments of justice, fair play, patriotism and public honor and dignity. They returned to their homes with the deep-seated feelings of the injustice, humiliation and insult with which they, as a nation, had been treated; the good faith of their devoted bishop and clergy had been abused and surprised; their natural leaders were in exile, and the machinery of Government was entrusted to them to organise, when it had been made impossible for them to take advantage of. I have been a witness to their sorrows, to their complaints, and to the utter want of respect which they had towards the Government and institutions of my country. Such scenes I will never forget. I was then able to realise how criminal to their country had been, and still are, those politicians and journalists whose only programme is to appeal to religious or national prejudices in a country like ours, and such was the programme of the *Globe* for the last thirty years. In fact, a whole generation has grown up in Ontario under the teachings of that paper. But the complement of the policy of the *Globe* and its partisans was the promise made by the leader of the Opposition when he was in the Government of Ontario, and promised \$5,000 for the capture of Riel and his accomplices. In the remarks I have made, I have tried to show that the people with whom we had to deal in 1870 was a distinct people, was a nationality by itself, was a people that had its own national characteristics, its own institutions, its own social life; that that people was entirely different from ours, that their ideas of civilisation were not altogether those we have; and I have tried to show that they were forgotten in the agreement which was entered into by the Hudson Bay Company and the Canadian Government, in 1869. Whether it was the fault of the Hudson's Bay Company, as stated by the leader of the Government, or not, I do not know, but I must say that we have to deal now with the causes of the recent troubles, and the causes of a remote nature are some of those which I have cited. Owing to the distance, owing to the impossibility of exercising a proper check upon the conduct of Canadian officials in the North-West, those officials have been, to a great extent, the cause of the discontent, the suspicion and the hostility shown by the natives of that country to Canada; and these remote causes, the existence of which I have cited, were causes which it did not lay in the power of any Government to deal with or to make disappear. I cannot help making a contrast between the expedition of the Canadian volunteers in 1870 and the expedition of the volunteers which has recently taken place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Royal) has taken his seat, and he cannot speak a second time.

Mr. ROYAL. I see that hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to hear the truth on some points.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman took his seat, and I moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROYAL. In the course of my remarks—

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman took his seat.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is not the question of adjournment before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman took his seat with the idea of giving up his right. If an hon. member takes his seat when another member rises to speak, he loses his right.

Mr. McMULLEN. When he sat down, I moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROYAL. I sat down when I was called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman please proceed with his speech.

Mr. ROYAL. I might contrast the two expeditions of troops in 1870 and 1885. In 1885 the troops were certainly more disciplined. They showed a better spirit; and it was seen that a young country, when a portion of its population, rightly or wrongly, chooses to appeal to arms for the redress of its grievances, from every part of that young country the volunteers on the call to arms are unanimous. It shows the strength of our institutions, and I believe that no young country was ever so true to a test as great as that which Canada has had. In 1870 the troops, on arriving at Winnipeg, showed a great deal of indiscipline, of which I was myself witness. But in the present year our volunteers have displayed an amount of discipline, of endurance, of patriotism, that every member of this House is justly to be proud of. The 65th Montreal regiment accomplished a march of thirty-two miles in a boggy, swampy country, which, I believe is unparalleled in the history of any march. Contrast the proclamations issued by Colonel Wolseley and that of General Middleton. In the proclamation issued by Colonel Wolseley there was an insult of the population of the country, while that of General Middleton was a simple and dignified appeal to the people to lay down their arms and submit to the laws of the country. The result of Colonel Wolseley's proclamation was a deep feeling of humiliation and sorrow among the people, while the conduct of General Middleton was such as to conciliate the people towards the Government; and instead of a protracted spirit of resistance and hostility on the part of the people, I am sure that in a few weeks it will be evident to all that the half-breed population did not willingly go into rebellion, but that they were misled by designing politicians. Now, Sir, the half-breeds were accused of cowardice by Col. Wolseley in his despatch; but if we may judge of the resistance that they might have offered to his march to the Red River and of the resistance they have offered to our own troops, I believe if the half-breeds had been so disposed Col. Wolseley would never have been able to issue his proclamation from Fort Garry. At every portage that our volunteers had to make, 25 armed half-breeds could for a long time have prevented Col. Wolseley and his troops from going from Port Arthur to the Red River. Sir, these half-breeds have also been accused of cruelty. Well, we know by the newspaper accounts that it was to the half-breeds that last spring the white prisoners in the Indian camps owed their liberty and their lives. We know that Mrs. Delaney, who was taken prisoner in Poundmaker's camp, was liberated by a poor half-breed, a man named Delphis Nolin, who had only two ponies with him, and who cheerfully gave them up to Poundmaker to assure the freedom of Mrs. Delaney. This is but one instance, but there were many others, during the recent outbreak, which prove the humanity of the half-breeds. Far from exercising any vengeance upon any of their white prisoners, either civilian or military, our English and French half-breeds were instrumental in saving the lives of these prisoners from the cruelties which Indians have always been accustomed to exercise towards their captives. It has also been stated that the half-breeds are inferior to our own people in the arts of agriculture and civilisation.

Mr. ROYAL.

Now, if we look at the reports published in the American papers—which certainly are not over friendly to us—we see that the half-breeds at Batoche, St. Laurent and other parishes, had farms as highly improved as any farm in the State of Minnesota. We have seen the description of the house opposite Batoche, and of other farm houses in that region, which shows that there is a considerable degree of civilisation and cultivated taste among the half-breeds. Agricultural implements are numerous among them, and you will find as many agricultural implements on their farms as on any farm in the eastern Provinces. With regard to the intellectual standing of the half-breed population in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, I believe we have no reason to be ashamed of them, as having descended from English and French fathers, the same as ourselves. An English-speaking half-breed, Mr. Norquay, has for the last eight years, been Premier of Manitoba. We see, also, by the last report, that a French-speaking half-breed won the Governor's medal, at the concourse of the colleges affiliated with the Manitoba University. In the course of my connection with the Administration in Manitoba, I sat at the council table with two or three half-breeds, and I must say they are not inferior to any one in intelligence and intellectual capacity as well as education. I have stated what I consider to be the remote causes of the troubles that have taken place on the shores of the Saskatchewan. I now come to the second part of my observations, and I shall have to state some unpleasant facts to hon. gentlemen opposite, which facts, however, cannot be disputed. I come to the more immediate causes of the outbreak. I have stated that there are remote causes, over which no Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, could have controlled. They were in the essence of the matter. There was the want of sagacity and judgment of Canadians who first went to the Red River settlement. Then there was the utter want of judgment on the part of officials sent in 1869-70, and the fanaticism and want of judgment on the part of some officials sent to Manitoba in 1870. Then there was the want of easy and quick communication, and it is almost impossible for any Government to thoroughly control its officials unless within easy distance. I believe those immediate causes were aggravated to a large extent by the shameful speculation that was carried on at the expense of the half-breeds in the years following 1870. By the Manitoba Act a certain reserve had been set out for the extinguishment of the Indian title in favor of the people of that part of the country. In fact, the half-breeds under that Act were recognised as a distinct people, having distinct privileges and rights, which the Government of Canada had to deal with and settle. And let me here say that with respect of North-West grievances, there are three causes of the grievances in connection with the North-West affairs. There are letters and petitions addressed to the Government by the people, both of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Those letters and petitions have been read and commented upon at great length by some hon. gentlemen opposite, more especially by the leader of the Opposition. Then we have the resolutions and Bills of Rights proposed by Riel and his white Grit followers at Prince Albert and elsewhere; and the resolutions proposed at the Moosomin and Calgary meetings, and they form a distinct part of the grievances. The third class of grievances is composed of the grievances of the Opposition, and I believe they are the only grievances with which to deal in the settlement of this question. Under the Manitoba Act as stated the half-breeds were entitled to have a certain lot of land for the extinguishment of the Indian title. A reserve, comprising 1,400,000 acres of land, was set apart for the purpose. But long were the delays. It is not my intention to make more of those details than should be made of them. And so long were the delays in the apportionment of those reserves, and so protracted the issue of letters

patent, that the people became doubtful of the good faith of the Government, and were easily induced by speculators to sell their rights to the land. They were canvassed by those speculators, who informed them that it would take many years to get possession of their 240 acres; that the Government did not desire that they should get possession of them; and other arguments of that kind were used. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite know something about that, for I believe that some of them and some of their friends own several thousand acres of these reserves. I presume that at one time 240 acres of half-breed claims were actually purchased for 5, 6, 7 and 8 pounds, and those prices prevailed during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The result was that the half-breeds lost confidence in Canadian laws and Canadian promises, and were easily induced to part with their reservations for a mere trifle. In fact, at the present day, I do not suppose that one-twentieth of these reserves remain in the hands of the original owners, and that is the reason why we see so many of these reserves in certain parishes lying waste. The result was, that in 1880, 1881 and 1883, a large number of these half-breeds left the Province, some going towards the Turtle Mountain district, in Dakota, and were thus lost to us entirely, others going westward to increase materially the half-breed settlements at Duck Lake, Qu'Appelle, Battleford and St. Albert. It is stated that, of a strong colony which formerly existed at Wood Mountain, only a few remain, the others having gone to the United States. Only a few thousand half-breeds now remain in Manitoba, although their population at the time of the transfer, in 1870, was 12,000 or 13,000. With regard to the conduct of the several officers, I have referred to the conduct of Snow, Dennis, Col. Wolseley and other officers appointed to deal with the population. These officers very often assume airs of importance amongst those people and as they were looked upon as representing the Canadian Government, they did a great deal of harm to Canada and to Canadian institutions. To the dishonest conduct of some of these officers is due the fact that there are some of these long outstanding claims not yet settled. These claims have been in existence for fifteen years, and have been pressed on the attention of the Government during that time, and I am convinced that if it had not been for the dishonesty of these officers, which the Government could not know of, except after a long time, on account of the difficulty of surveillance and communication, these officers would have been checked sooner and those grievances would have been ameliorated. During the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite these grievances existed, and to a large extent. In fact, if you compare the number of patents issued—and, of course, the number issued was on account of their being no dispute about them—if you compare the number issued by the late Administration and the present Administration, you will see that the present Government have done more justice to those parties than their predecessors. As to surveys, I have obtained the following figures as to the extent of the work done in the North-West by both the Conservative and Reform Governments respectively:

Total area of the North-West Territories .....	9,999,000 acres.
Lands surveyed from 1874 to 1878.....	1,797,120 do
do do 1879 to 1884.....	55,618,500 do
Blocks and Townships, outline surveys from 1874 to 1878, inclusive.....	2,200 miles.
Block and Townships, outline surveys from 1879 to 1884, inclusive.....	36,900 do
First-class traverse, from 1874 to 1878 inclusive do do 1879 to 1884 do ...	200 do
Odometer and other traverse, from 1874 to 1878 inclusive.....	2,300 do
Odometer and other traverse, from 1879 to 1884 inclusive.....	1,600 do
Odometer and other traverse, from 1879 to 1884 inclusive.....	6,900 do

Such has been the work done in the North-West by the two governments; the figures show on whose side was the actual and earnest desire to work for developing our newly

acquired Dominion. I now come to a more sensitive part of my remarks, and I state that the action, the language, the example, and even the direct support of the large portion of the Grit party, appear to have been the most immediate and most direct cause of the late troubles on the shores of the Saskatchewan. No one will attempt to deny that, with any show of reason. And yet let us not lose sight of this remarkable fact, that half-breeds have not the sympathies of the Opposition party. The late Minister of Interior, Mr. Mills, said that no privileges were to accrue to half-breeds—that they had to be either whites or Indians. From 1873 to 1878 very little was done on the part of the Government to satisfy the half-breeds. In fact, nothing was done; as stated by the right hon. leader of the Government, there was a blank in that day. I must say that, except for the reward that was offered by the party opposite for the capture of Riel, the appointment of a judge to try him and the refusal to give representation to the half-breeds in the appointments which were made, and the refusal to recognise those rights outside of Manitoba, very little, indeed, was done by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they come with very bad grace now to defend the rights and privileges of the half-breed population, which they say has been so shamefully neglected by the present Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. ROYAL. During the long and tedious debates on the Franchise Bill, I never interrupted any of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but listened very patiently to their discourses. Now, what was the first act of the present Government towards settling the burning questions of the North-West Territories? They took upon themselves the right to deal with those questions, and to settle them in a manner that would meet the largest demands of those people. During the period from 1873 to 1878 not one act was done by hon. gentlemen opposite. On the contrary, they bungled the whole subject, and it was the worst legacy they left to the present Government, after they left office, in 1878. But that change of Government, in 1878, seemed to have drawn from hon. gentlemen opposite all their interest in the matter. The protection seemed to cause them to rush to arms and not discriminate between the means they might take to overthrow the present Government. War was commenced—a war of words. That war of words may be all right amongst us, because it is confined to newspapers and to some very high and loud talk on the floor of this House; but upon the minds of those people in the North-West it had a very different effect. They took those words as meaning exactly what they intended; they could not understand that two parties fighting upon a certain question did not exactly mean what their speakers said. Now, Sir, I come to the Province of Manitoba. In 1882 the agitation that had been going on in the eastern Provinces culminated there in the organisation of what was afterwards called the Farmers' Union, which, under the color of remedying the condition of affairs that seemed injurious to the farmers at that time, was nothing else but a firm and well-concealed design to strengthen the cause of the Opposition to the Conservative party.

Mr. WATSON. No, no.

Mr. ROYAL. I hear "No" from an hon. gentleman opposite. There was a co-existence of different causes which led farmers to seek to remedy a certain condition of things which they thought to be injurious to themselves, and in the ranks of the Farmers' Union, as first organised, we find some well-meaning Conservatives, but I must say they were in a minority. Granting that the country was in the midst of a crisis such as they professed, the leaders, instead of confining themselves to the immediate purpose of this organisation, as at first established, extended their

protection and patronage to every interest in the Province. There was nothing permitted to escape them. They assumed to correct and control the affairs of the Province, from the management of a school up to the enlargement of the boundaries of the Province to the Hudson Bay, from interference with the individual settler in the growing and selling of grain up to the shaping of the policy of the country in its relation to the Dominion. They constituted themselves a rival Parliament to the Local Legislature, and dictated terms alike to Mr. Norquay and to Sir John Macdonald. They did not deal in protests or remonstrances, but in demands. They took the whole country and its various interests under their protection, and with superb impudence fashioned them according to their own notions. In a word, they exercised the powers of the Local Government and demanded the liberty to exercise them. Such is the character of the institution that was then started, under the fallacious name of the Farmers' Union, by some designing politicians belonging to the opposite party. Now, in November, 1884 meetings were held to protest against the disallowance of railway charters, at which very violent and treasonable expressions were used. I will, with your permission, Sir, read something which will, no doubt, attract the attention of some hon. gentleman opposite. At a meeting held in Portage la Prairie, in 1882, of the delegates, a meeting which was reported to be very enthusiastic by the Opposition press, one gentleman having a seat in this House, was reported as having used the following language.—

"He thought that what was necessary was a Local Government, which would stand up for Manitoba, and if, after all had been tried, we could not get our rights, we must try a little of what some would call rebellion, or petition for annexation to the United States."

Another gentleman, who is a member of the Local House, said:

"The Lower Provinces were, to a great extent, dependent upon this Province to dispose of their superfluous manufactures, and we should say to them, that if they would not give us equal rights with themselves we would have nothing to do with them. He thought our duty was not to petition Mr. Norquay, but to send men into the Local Government who would stand manfully by Manitoba and insist on her rights."

That was the kind of language used by some persons who did not belong to the Conservative party, in the various meetings which took place in 1882, under the color and pretext of disallowance for railway charters. Later on, at a meeting of citizens in the council chamber at Brandon, in December, 1883, Mr. Purvis, one of the leading spirits in the Farmers' Union—

Mr. WATSON. And a Conservative.

Mr. ROYAL. He is not a Conservative.

Mr. WATSON. He has been one all his life.

Mr. ROYAL. Mr. Purvis said: "If we cannot obtain our rights, let us annex to the United States." In February last, a meeting was held of the Farmers' Union, at which that question was discussed, and subsequent to that another meeting was called, for the purpose of discussing independence. The time is not long since when the *Free Press* was stirring up the feelings of the people, and were it not for the sober sense of the people, the agitation would have resulted in a disruption of the Union. The *Free Press* is the recognised and, I must say, skillful organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, in Manitoba; there is no doubt about the activity, energy and enterprise displayed by the editor of that paper, and therefore I attach the most importance to its utterances. The *Free Press* said:

"The threats of Riel are not worth considering, in view of what we have to apprehend from the not less unscrupulous but vastly more powerful traitor who rules the Dominion. \* \* \* It would be better a million fold that Riel and his descendants shall forever remain kings or presidents, or whatever they may choose to call themselves, of the North-West half-breeds, than that Sir John Macdonald should be permitted to proclaim himself and his friends perpetual rulers of Canada."

Mr. ROYAL.

The *Hamilton Spectator* has seen the motive which prompted the paragraphs and comments thereon as follows:—

"That is plain enough. And if it means anything, it means that whatever else may happen, it is of paramount importance that the Grit party should be again placed in power. To bring about the defeat of the present Government, and hoist the Grits into office, is the only thing worth working for. Riel may rebel, Indians may rise, men and children may be massacred, women may suffer worse than death, our citizen soldiers may be slain and mangled and maimed, the entire country, from the Saskatchewan to the Atlantic, may be plunged into grief and may mourn its dead—but what of it? In the language of the *Free Press*, 'it would be better a million fold' that these things should happen than that the Tories should remain in office—it is better a million fold that the murdering, the plundering, the maiming, the killing and the ravishing should go on, than that the greedy clutches of the Grits should be longer kept from the coveted money bags of the Dominion."

I do not charge the whole of the Opposition press and party with being directly responsible for the late insurrection, but were it not for the excitement they created in Manitoba the events of the Saskatchewan would not have taken place. These expressions of disloyalty, because by loyalty I mean devotion to the interests of the country and devotion to the prosperity and development of the country, these expressions of disloyalty are not only confined to the Opposite party in the Province of Ontario; the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec share in the same sentiments. I would not, of course, attribute anything in the insurrection that took place in the North-West last spring direct to the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec. I must say however, that, in disloyalty, they are not the least in sympathy with their colleagues of the Province of Ontario or the other Provinces. In the *Herald*, of the 27th May last, what do we find? We find that the Club National, which is the club *par excellence* of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the Province of Quebec, gave a banquet; that this banquet took place in the city of Montreal; at that banquet toasts were proposed and drunk and responded to, and amongst those toasts were two, one to the independence of Canada and the other to the Republic of Canada; and one of the speakers stated that he wished to God that Mr. Mercier, the leader of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec, might be the first President of that Republic. I believe there is a connection in things; there is something that breaks out, sooner or later, and shows the unanimity of principle and feeling in one party. I would not attribute to the Rouge party in Quebec the events that took place on the Saskatchewan; but in the feelings expressed in the Grit press of Manitoba, Ontario and elsewhere, their partisans in Quebec fully sympathise. The hour being very late, and my observations having been in the first place of a rather lengthy character, I shall dispense with citing extracts that I had intended to read to you. I now come to the end of my remarks. If, Sir, in the course of these remarks, I have succeeded in giving a fair idea of the origin of the first population of the North-West, which we met in going there, of their characteristics, of their high state of prosperity and contentment, of their situation, religious, political and social—if I have succeeded in impressing upon the House that the half-breed nation is not a semi-savage population, but is distinguished for humanity, courage, industry, intelligence and moral character, I will have accomplished much of my task. I have tried to trace the remote sources as well as the immediate sources of the troubles. However, we must not lose sight of the motion before the House. I have tried to show that the immediate cause of the troubles lies in the conduct, the language, and the doings of the Opposition party. I will not charge that party with being a disloyal party; I am willing to give them credit for what Mr. Mackenzie's Administration did from 1873 to 1878, and amongst the doings of that Administration I must pay a high tribute of admiration to the territorial organisation they have given to the North-West Territories. But, Sir, I stop there. I was a member

of the North-West council, and I remember that, when it was mentioned that we had to deal with the extinction of the buffalo, with the small-pox, then raging among certain tribes, with the administration of justice in these Territories we were uniformly, at every turn, met with this answer from Governor Morris, who was then the President: "No funds." It was, unfortunately, the period of deficits, and these gentlemen had no funds for any of these purposes. They could form a North-West council to direct them how to deal with affairs, but, when it came to practice, the uniform answer was that they had no funds, and it was the same when the question of surveys was pressed upon their attention. When the Premier said that a blank existed with regard to the administration of North-West affairs from 1873 to 1878, I would have been glad to agree with him, but I must say that, from the very start, the half-breeds were totally ignored as having distinct rights and privileges, in fact, as having any distinct existence, by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Premier stated, the other night, I think properly, that the leader of the Opposition had abstained carefully from stating his opinion upon the intrinsic merit of the claims of the half-breed population of the North-West. I believe the leader of the Opposition was very right, because, if he had stated that they had rights, he would have logically stated that they had grievances, but he did not state whether they had rights or not, and where there are no rights there are no grievances. In 1873 Bishop Grandin wrote to the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. In 1874 he wrote upon the same question and urged the attention of the Government to the claims of that population. In 1875, again, the same prelate, with all the authority and with all the benevolence he felt for his people, and with the care and anxiety which he felt for the good government of those Territories and their contentment, with the Canadian rule, wrote again to the Government, and spoke of the excitement and uneasiness that was felt then, and which had existed for four or five years among the half-breed people of those Territories. In 1876 Major Walsh, then an officer of that Government, wrote again about the disputed land claims in Prince Albert and St. Laurent. In 1877 Governor Laird transmitted his letters. That forms the whole docket, the whole record of the doings of hon. gentlemen opposite, with what I have stated and with what has been stated, so far, by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and hon. members of this House who have addressed you on the same subject. It is well known that in 1878 there was no allotment; from 1870, when the acquisition of that Territory took place, there had been no allotment on the reserve made for the French-speaking parishes. On the 16th March Mr. Mills, then Minister of the Interior, wrote:

"It is perfectly unnecessary to look up parties who may have claims upon the Government. Let them come forward and state their claims."

That was in keeping with the declaration of the said gentleman, that he would make no distinction between white men and Indians, thereby setting at naught the provisions which had been inserted in the Manitoba Act of 1870. Now, respecting the conduct of the Administration towards the settlers, I will quote some remarks of Mr. Schultz, then one of the members of this House, on the 20th April, 1878:

"Mr. SCHULTZ said that it was quite evident, from the discussion in the Senate, that there existed a strong feeling to these stake claims, and in reference to such grievances he must call attention to a peculiar class of them existing in the parishes of St. Clements and St. Peter, in Manitoba. He had occasion to speak of these before, and had assisted in giving all sorts of data and evidence. No action had been taken, and no hope, apparently, of a speedy settlement, while the greatest inconvenience was experienced by the occupants of these lands. In the neighborhood of the Stone Fort, also, there was a number of quarter-sections sold to Stephens and others, in Montreal, and given to the Hudson Bay Company, which were in the hay-poundage belt, and which, consequently, belonged to the people in that district who owned the river farms, and if the Government desired the good opinion of that section, these matters must be looked into and redressed, and at once.

As regard the amendments to the Disputed Claims Act, he very much regretted that if that Act needed amendment, why had not the necessity been discovered a year ago, and was surprised that the commissioner appointed under that Act should have drawn his pay to the last moment, and only then repented that the Act was unworkable. Too much time by far had been lost in that way, and, apparently, in every other way in the Province. In fact, a fatality seemed to attend all Manitoba matters in connection with land matters. The blocks taken by parishes, and notably that of St. Andrews, had not been preserved intact, but had been altered to suit the convenience of the Department. The issue of scrip had been delayed till all benefit from it had passed away, and the continued delay in the distribution of the minors, land was an injustice to all parties concerned, and was too palpable to need comment. Session after Session, he had spoken of these matters, and would now make a last appeal. He had been often promised the attention of the Government to these matters, and he trusted that these promises would be fulfilled, and believed that in view of these long and grievous delays, and the peaceful and quiet way in which the people had borne them, that the Government would be only performing a just and graceful act were they to remit the payment of the seed grain which they had received."

Not only were the half-breeds ignored by the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but in the organisation of the North-West council no representation was given to them. Also, in 1874, the Government withdrew from sale and settlement all lands for 24 miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and in 1875 they withdrew the lands for 35 miles on each side of the telegraph lines. In 1877 a change was made; there was no homestead, and all land was to be sold at \$1 an acre. In the same year the hon. gentleman introduced his famous Bill for colonisation railways, under which anybody who wanted to build a railway could get an appropriation of 10,000 acres per mile, as subsidy. All this has been done by the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, between 1873 and 1878. The hon. gentleman for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is of the same opinion as his colleague. He says that he does not acknowledge any special rights to the old population of the Territories. He seems to ignore their existence altogether, and during the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite there were interferences with Manitoba in every way. They sowed the seeds of permanent disorder. Their action in Ontario, with regard to the troubles that had taken place in Manitoba in 1870, had the effect of discouraging emigration altogether to the North-West. And, Sir, they signally failed in their attempts to build a railway from ocean to ocean, in order the better to develop that country. Now, I must say that to vote in favor of the motion that is in your hands, I would have to ignore all the facts of the past. It would be ignoring the history of the last twenty-five years; it would be ignoring the teaching and lessons, that the people of Canada and both political parties in the Dominion are bound to obtain from the occurrences and facts which I have stated, very imperfectly, perhaps, but certainly as accurately as it was in my power to do. The present Government, under the distinguished leadership of the First Minister, has accomplished such a work in connection with the North-West during the last eight or ten years that history affords no parallel to it in any country in the world. With a population of 4,000,000, a mere colony, we have acquired a country larger than the United States. Isolated, as it is, being 500 miles from the rest of the world, yet we have organised a Government and established one Province. The First Minister has made treaties with the Indians and established law and order there by means of a territorial government. And we have built a railway connecting ocean with ocean, and we have done that despite our limited financial resources. It has been accomplished by a Government that has been the means of bringing into the North-West 150,000 immigrants, a Government that has arranged Indian treaties and undertaken the management of our Indian population; a Government that has established in the Dominion institutions of permanency and solidity that has been shown in the last events that have taken place in connection with the North-West troubles. I say, under such circumstances, there can be no doubt as to how members of this House should cast their votes on this

motion. When Hon. Joseph Howe, in 1870, declared, after visiting the country during the winter, that he was not in favor of its acquisition by Canada, he never anticipated that an interprovincial trade between Manitoba and the North-West and the eastern Provinces would be built up to the amount of very many millions annually, and that there would be a Province independent as to the management of its own affairs, and there would be in so few years a prosperous and contented community.

Mr. EDGAR. I think this is not an unreasonable hour to move the adjournment of the debate. Two or three hours ago it was understood to be arranged that the division should be taken, but as we have been kept here hour after hour since, and as there are several members on both sides of the House who wish to speak—at all events, there are on this side—I move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is true the discussion has been a little protracted; but it will be remembered that last evening, when the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) had spoken for an hour and a-half, he and his friends wished an adjournment, and this was agreed to, on the understanding that we would have a vote this evening. That was the understanding.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that last evening it was agreed that the vote should be taken this evening. But the hon. gentleman must admit that members on this side of the House endeavored to bring the debate to a close at a much earlier hour than this. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) took the floor at about 12, stating that he would not speak more than one hour. Upon that understanding, several of our friends who were ready and anxious to speak agreed not to speak. The understanding, so far as made, has not been carried out; and the hon. gentleman having extended his remarks to almost four hours, it is nothing but reasonable that an opportunity should be given to hon. members on this side to reply to him, especially after his statement, in the course of his speech, that he would be severe on the Opposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When I came into the House, half an hour ago, several hon. gentlemen opposite were calling "question."

Mr. TROW. I have always understood that it is the part of gentlemen to adhere strictly to their word and agreement. I, for one, would sacrifice all I am worth in this world to adhere strictly to my word. Hon. gentlemen on this side yielded rather reluctantly to my wishes to make this arrangement, and when I mentioned it to the whip of hon. gentlemen opposite and the Minister of Public Works, the arrangement was made on the express condition that the hon. member for Provencher would not occupy more than three-quarters of an hour or so.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Last evening, when this agreement was made, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was not here, and it was solemnly agreed that we should have a vote to-night, at the instance of the hon. member for West Huron, who implored the House that we should adjourn at a certain hour last evening. Two hours ago the hon. member for South Huron was crying out "adjourn," and two hours ago the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was calling out "question" and "divide." Well, I had prepared notes of a speech of some length, but owing to the length of the Session and the amount of work before us, I had agreed not to say anything upon this question, in order that we might take a vote to-night. These hon. gentlemen who entered into this agreement are now asking for an adjournment without having a vote.

Mr. VAIL. We all admit that there was an agreement made last night, that under certain circumstances a vote should be taken to-night. A second agreement was made

Mr. ROYAL.

to-night, and I think it was rather unfair, after entering into that agreement, that the hon. member for Provencher should have been allowed to speak three hours in making the last speech of the debate. I say, therefore, the second agreement has been broken, as the hon. member for Provencher has spoken two or three hours longer than he agreed.

Mr. McCALLUM. We have no objection to sit here and listen to the hon. member for Ontario, if he wishes to speak.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say that as the matter was arranged, so far as it could be arranged, between the Minister of Public Works and myself, I will state the circumstances, from my recollection of them, and the hon. gentleman can correct me if I am wrong. Yesterday night, when the hon. member for West Huron had spoken for some little time, I suggested an adjournment, and the Minister of Public Works, after some demur, agreed to consent to the suggestion that we should close the debate to-night. I called his attention to the great length of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and I asked that he would guarantee that the speeches should not run to such a length on his side. The hon. gentleman will recollect that. Now, we have been seven hours, since 8 o'clock, and our side occupied 1½ hours, to the best of my recollection. Still, I would say to my hon. friends, that under all the circumstances we had better perhaps consent to a vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. With reference to what has been said by the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), I would just say that we understood that the hon. gentleman then addressing the House would not take up more than an hour, or a little more. We listened to him patiently, and I gave way, though I fully intended to make a few remarks. I think it is unfair that the hon. gentleman should have taken the entire evening; that it was certainly conveyed to him in some way that he should only occupy about an hour.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to make a remark in answer to what has been said by the hon. member for South Perth. I may say that when I met the hon. gentleman in the lobby, he said that it appeared that it was the wish of both sides to come to an understanding about closing the debate; that after the hon. member for Bothwell, who was then speaking, had closed, we might take a vote. I observed to him that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) wished to make some remarks, in answer to the hon. gentleman, and that as the debate had been begun by the motion of the hon. member for West-Durham, on the Opposition side, and as an hon. member had answered on our side, and so on alternately, until the hon. member for Bothwell spoke, if the hon. member for Provencher made his speech, that would make an even number on both sides. The hon. gentleman said: Well, I think so; but how long will he speak. I said: I understood an hour or an hour and a-quarter. That is the statement I have to make in answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. In justice to myself, coming from Manitoba, and representing the county nearest to the disaffected district, I intended to speak on this question; but when the whip on this side, Mr. Trow, told me, about a quarter to one o'clock, that there had been arrangements made to close, and that Mr. Royal would get through at one o'clock, I reluctantly gave way, knowing that the members wanted to get home, and knowing that the arguments on this side had not been answered, and that up to that time the hon. member for Provencher had said nothing which I wished to reply to. The hon. gentleman has spent two hours and a quarter longer in making statements which I would have liked to reply to; but as I was present last night when the understanding was arrived at, that there should be short

speeches, and that the debate should close to-night, I am willing to forego speaking on this question, as I would very much have liked to do, feeling a great interest in it. However, my views have been expressed by gentlemen on this side of the House, and I will content myself with simply voting for the amendment.

Mr. EDGAR. I can understand that it is quite possible, after what we were able to observe on this side of the House, that the hon. Minister of Public Works and his friend, for the last two or three hours, have really been trying to put an end to this discussion and to have a vote. Perhaps it was not their fault altogether. Moreover, I happened to go out of the House a few minutes before the adjournment last night, and I must, of course, accept the statements of my hon. friends on this side of what occurred, and for that reason I will withdraw the motion to adjourn.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake (p. 3110).

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Allen,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Auger,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Harley,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Springer,
Casey,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Livingston,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Vail,
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Fairbank,	McIsaac,	Weldon,
Fleming,	McMullen,	Wells,
Forbes,	Mills,	Wilson.—49
Geoffrion,		

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	McLelan,
Allison,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Gault,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Orton,
Beaty,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bell,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bergin,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Billy,	Haggart,	Ross,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Shanly,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Smyth,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Colby,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Thompson,
Curran,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Picton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Woodworth,
Dupont,	McGreevy,	Wright.—105

Amendment negatived, and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL moved :

When any manufactured article is imported into Canada in separate parts, each part shall be charged the same rate of duty as the finished article, on a proportionate valuation, and when the duty thereon is

specific or specific *ad valorem*, an average rate of *ad valorem* duty, equal to the specific or specific and *ad valorem* duties so chargeable, shall be ascertained and charged upon such part.

Motion agreed to, and Committee rose and reported the resolution.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 4 a.m., Thursday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## WAYS AND MEANS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I wish to detain the House a very few moments to make an explanation I was proceeding to make yesterday when I was ruled out of order. I will just repeat the extract which I then read in the *Ottawa Citizen*. (See *Debates* of July 8th). As I was proceeding to say yesterday, if these statements from the *Hamilton Spectator* were true, they would be sufficient to discredit anything I might say in this House in future; and in order to show that they are not true, I will proceed as briefly as possible to dissect the paragraph. It says:

"Somerville says what he knows to be false. Double prices were not paid for press work."

Now, I find in the accounts which were rendered by the *Hamilton Spectator* Company, that they charged for 20,865 tokens of press work, and they only performed 10,433 tokens, for which they were paid 30 cents per token instead of 10 cents the contractors' rates. Consequently, I think I have established beyond any doubt whatever that the statement the *Spectator* makes with regard to not being paid double prices for press work is not correct. Anyone can look at the accounts which were produced before the Public Accounts Committee, and verify my words. Then, the editor of the *Spectator* says:

"The *Spectator* was paid at prices fixed by the Mackenzie Government."

They were not paid at prices fixed by the Mackenzie Government. This is on a par with the charges made by the gentlemen who support this Administration with regard to the troubles in the North-West. They say the Mackenzie Government is to blame for all the blood spilt and all the treasure spent in putting down that rebellion. Now, everybody knows that the present Government, who have administered the affairs of that country for the last seven years, are wholly responsible for that expenditure and that loss of blood. The *Spectator* goes on to say:

"The *Spectator* was not paid for press work never performed; and Somerville does not believe or think it was."

I do believe and I do think so, and I have proven my statements.

"10 cents is not the price paid for any press work under any Government contract whatever; and Somerville knows it is not."

Now, I wish to read from the Sessional Papers of this House, in which a copy of the contract that now exists is printed, and it is open for the inspection of every member of this House, and also the editor of the *Hamilton Spectator*; and I find here that it is stated:

"Press work, per token of 250 impressions of 16 pages royal 8vo, 10 cents; composition, per 1,000 ems of actual measurement, Roman type, 10 cents.

Now, I think I have established the fact that the *Spectator* is not speaking the truth in making this statement; and in doing so I have answered what the *Spectator* says with regard to this matter. But what shall I say of the *Ottawa Citizen*, the journal which charges me with being a sneak and a spy, who acts in the hope of injuring his brother journalists? When we think of the history of the *Ottawa Citizen* in the past, it is fruitful of much discussion. The *Ottawa Citizen* has had a checkered career during some years past. At one time, I believe, it was the property of a Minister of the Crown held under mortgage; at another time it was the property of the sheriff; at another time it was the property of the tax collector of the city of Ottawa; and I believe it only exists, as has been proved by the public records, by the crumbs and the droppings which fall from the Government table, and which it is always ready to take up. And when we think of the history of the gentleman who is the conductor of that journal we have something rather astonishing to remember. We can remember that this purist journalist is the man who was known all over the Dominion of Canada as the celebrated contract broker, as the man who had something to do with securing a large sum of money under the celebrated Whitehead contract. I think he is the last man, and his paper is the last paper, that should charge any hon. member of this House with being a sneak and a spy. I wish to say that in discharging the duty I have discharged, I have been working in the interests of the people; I have been discharging a duty which I owe to my constituents and the Dominion at large in exposing the frauds which have been perpetrated by the Conservative press of this country with the sanction of this Government. So long as I have the honor to represent a constituency in this House, I will discharge my duty in this respect. I am not actuated by any desire to sneak or spy on my brother journalists, but solely by the desire to elevate the tone of the press of this country, to elevate the morality of the people, and I think the country will justify me in exposing these frauds and showing up this corrupt Government in the manner I have.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. \* Before proposing the resolution which I desire to lay before the committee, I desire to refer to one or two items which were allowed to stand when the committee rose upon the last occasion. The first question I wish to refer to is that of rags, which was discussed in the committee for about three hours, and upon my own suggestion was allowed to stand for further consideration. The leader of the Opposition asked at the time what position this article would remain in, if action were not taken by the committee. I informed the House it would remain on the free list under the Order in Council which had been passed. At that time, it was the intention to propose a rate at which this article should be taxed, but after full investigation into the matter, as to the importations, the quality of article imported, the supply found in the country, and the effect on the manufacturing industries of the country, it has been decided to allow this particular article to remain on the free list, and for this reason: The commoner class of rags, to which reference was more particularly made when the question was under discussion, is obtained in the country. That particular kind is not imported, or imported in very small quantities. The more valuable rags that are imported and used in the different manufactures are what are termed tailors' clippings, and I

\* For resolutions see p. 3232.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

find these run from 5 cents to 15 cents a pound. I ascertained if a duty were put on this raw material which enters into the manufacture of a particular kind of cloth made and sold in the country, the result would be to prevent its manufacture in Canada. I need scarcely tell those who have given the slightest attention to the question, that of the class of cloth which is termed shoddy, that which is made in Canada is much better and of more durable quality than that which is imported. I know it was argued that this kind of cloth should not be encouraged; but we must bear this in mind, that if it be not made in Canada it will be imported, and as this kind of cheap article will be consumed in the country; it is, particularly under our policy, better that it should be manufactured here, and the benefits arising from its manufacture accrue to us rather than to outsiders. We have, therefore, decided to allow rags to remain on the free list. The question of inland transportation, the committee will remember was very fully discussed when we were in committee. The difficulties which have arisen, the frauds which have also been committed, have occasioned a good deal of trouble, and the Government thought of suggesting a repeal of that clause of the law, but ascertaining that this would interfere, to a certain extent, with a very large trade, particularly the dry goods and some other branches with which we have never had any difficulty, it has been deemed advisable to recommend to the committee to allow the clause as it now stands on the Statute Book to remain, and to add a provision giving power to the Minister of Customs, for the time being, to determine what shall be the rate to be deducted from the face of the invoice for inland transportation. It may be deemed an arbitrary power, but it is in consonance with all the provisions of the Customs Act, and the House will readily understand that when a dispute arises between an importer and the Customs Department as to the rate of freight, say from Manchester to Liverpool, it will be very easy for the Department to ascertain from the parties in England what the rates upon different kinds of freight are, and to establish, for the time being, such rates as the amount to be taken from the face of the invoice. I will give the committee one illustration of the working of the law as it exists: Take the manufacturing town near Glasgow, Storebridge, 15 or 20 miles out of Glasgow, and a large iron manufacturing centre; we have had invoices presented for Customs with a deduction of 20s. sterling per ton for freight from that town to Greenock; we have had other invoices, with not a month or two difference in time, showing only 5s. deduction per ton for freight, making a difference of 15s. per ton. These invoices, I may inform the House without giving names, were from two large wholesale establishments in the one city in the Province of Ontario. If the Department has the power to say, for instance, 5s. shall be the rate and issues a circular to that effect, all the different ports in the Dominion will, when they receive an invoice from that particular town, allow the importer to deduct the 5s. for freight, and thereby avoid contention with the importer, and prevent fraud when intended. The way in which the invoices have been made out has been this: The amount paid to the manufacturer or merchant in the old country has been precisely the same by both merchants in Canada; only the invoice in the one case would be made out at, say, £6, adding 5s. for freight; while the other would be made out at £5 5s. and 20s. for freight; so that, when the invoices were presented for duty, the one merchant would have the advantage of 17½ or 15 per cent., or whatever the rate of duty might be, on 15s. per ton of every ton of his entry. I am giving the committee the practical working of the law as it has existed, and simply asking now that the Department shall have the power to say, after full enquiry, what amount of freight the merchant shall be allowed to deduct from his invoice. There are other resolutions which I propose to lay before the

committee for its consideration, which will have the effect of increasing taxation upon certain articles, and the changing of the Tariff in one particular, as it affects sugar, without, I think, affecting the revenue in any way. We have found of late that the importation of what are termed the lower grades of sugar, or yellows, manufactured principally from beet-root, which is obtained in Germany and upon which the manufacturers in the old countries receive a drawback of 2 cents a pound, enable them to send the lower grades or qualities into this country, and to prevent altogether its manufacture here. What we propose is to change the sugar duties, so as to create a separate class, and impose the rate of duty now imposed upon the sugars over No. 14 upon all classes of refined sugars. The article in the Tariff will read: "All refined sugars to pay 1 cent per pound and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*." It is also proposed to increase the duties upon spirits and tobacco, both Excise and Customs. The resolutions which I desire to lay before the committee will have the effect of increasing the Excise duty on whiskey manufactured from corn from \$1 to \$1.30; whiskey manufactured from malt from \$1.02 to \$1.32; whiskey manufactured from molasses and other articles of a similar kind, from \$1.03 to \$1.33. The House is aware that the present duties are \$1 per gallon on spirits manufactured from corn, \$1.02 on spirits manufactured from malt, and \$1.03 on spirits manufactured from molasses and other articles of the kind. This extra duty of 2 cts. and 3 cts. was put upon the manufacture of spirits in this country from malt and molasses in consequence of the duty imposed upon corn.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) You add 30 cents all round ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The Customs duty, which is now upon gin, rum, whiskey, and other spirits of like character \$1.32½, it is proposed to increase to \$1.75; and that upon brandies, which is now \$1.45, we propose to ask the committee to increase to \$2 per gallon. The Excise duty upon tobacco manufactured from foreign leaf is now 12 cents per pound. The old duty was 20 cents, and we propose to place the Excise duty upon tobacco in precisely the same position it was before 1873, when it was reduced to 12 cents, and to increase it to 20 cents per pound, and the domestic leaf in proportion. I may inform the committee that, up to 1883, 8 cents was imposed upon the domestic leaf. We propose to increase that from 2 cents, the sum now imposed by the Excise law, to 5 cents per pound. The Customs duty upon tobacco and snuff is now 20 cents per pound. We propose to increase it to 30 cents per pound, which will be 5 cents higher for the imported tobacco than was imposed when the Excise was 20 cents per pound under the old tariff. Under the old tariff the Customs duty upon tobacco imported was 25 cents; it is now 20 cents; we propose to increase it to 30 cents, which will give a better protection to the Canadian manufacturers than the old tariff did, and the protection also to the manufacturers from the Canadian leaf will be 3 cents per pound better than it was under the tariff as it existed previous to the reduction of duty. I have explained as succinctly as I could, without entering elaborately into the figures, what changes we propose to make in these particular articles of Excise and Customs duties. I may state that we do not anticipate any additional revenue of any consequence from the change in the sugar duty.

Mr. VAIL. Will the hon. gentleman state again what the change is ?

Mr. BOWELL. We propose to make all refined sugar pay 1 cent a pound and 35 per cent. without any reference whatever to its grade by the Dutch standard. I was about saying that we did not anticipate any appreciable increase from this change, from the fact that, if the importation of what are termed the lower grades or common kinds of sugar

falls off, it will be made up by the importation of the raw article which will enter into the manufacture of that particular class of sugar in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to admit this without reference to color and without any reference to saccharine strength ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, without reference to color or saccharine strength. The hon. gentleman knows that the saccharine strength is not taken into consideration at all under the present Tariff, only when the refiners purchase their sugars upon a guarantee of a certain strength, when if it exceeds that strength they pay a proportionate advance on the value *ad valorem*. When the test is made by the polariscope, if it is found that the sugar does not come up to the standard, then of course the value of the invoice would have to be decreased in order to obtain the correct *ad valorem* value of the sugar. In the same way, if the purchase be at 85, and the sugar should, upon test, be found to contain 90 of saccharine matter, then, whatever the importer would have to pay, in addition to the face of the invoice would have to be added to its value for duty. That is the only case in which the question of strength can be considered under the present Tariff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically, you exclude all the refined sugars, I suppose, below a certain standard, or certain number. What is your calculation upon that point ? Do you propose to exclude all below 14 or 15, or what number ? I am speaking of the practical result.

Mr. BOWELL. We do not propose to exclude any kind of sugar, but we propose to place all refined sugar under one resolution imposing the duty. The effect we anticipate is this : That that particular class of sugar to which I have referred, will be excluded to a certain extent, but we anticipate that the revenue will be fully made up by the increased importation of the raw material.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is just the point on which I would have doubts myself. Of course it is exceedingly difficult to anticipate what may be the course of trade in this matter; but the hon. gentleman is now proposing to impose on all refined sugars a new rate—and by that word "refined" I suppose he means sugars that have undergone any process of manufacture of any sort. How is any one going to define what are refined sugars ?

Mr. BOWELL. Any sugars that may be imported from any country which have gone through any process of refining. It is almost impossible to answer the hon. gentleman until a test has been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At present on these low grades of sugar, I think you are collecting a cent a pound, I mean on the sugar imported for manufacturing purposes. Just at present raw sugar is brought in on which a duty is collected of half a cent or a quarter of a cent per pound. I suppose this tax of one cent, 35 per cent. would be likely to amount to, roughly at least, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. BOWELL. In many cases it would amount to 2 cents per pound, particularly at the present value of sugar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sugar is low as compared with former years. I should imagine, looking at the amount, there would be a certain amount of revenue lost.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand the Minister the duty is not raised on sugars below No. 9; on all above that, raw sugars are not touched at all; that is, only the raw refined yellow. Well, we have no means of ascertaining, from any information in our hands, what proportion of sugars below No. 9, for instance, are refined sugars. I do not know whether the Minister can tell himself; if he cannot, we are working in the dark, to a great extent. I should judge, however, that the effect of the Minister's proposal

would be to exclude this low class of refined yellows. It is about equivalent to prohibition.

Mr. BOWELL. This word "refined" sugar is not in the Tariff. There is no separate record kept as to what amount is refined or raw. It may be under 9 and still be refined—that is, the lower qualities; hence it is impossible for us to ascertain what quantities were imported of that particular kind of sugar. I agree that this will, to a certain extent, exclude the low grade of sugar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should imagine it would exclude it altogether. We imported, roughly, about 30 millions of sugar between 14 and 9, and that, undoubtedly, would cover all the quantities to which the hon. gentleman referred. Well, it is tolerably clear that we only receive about  $1\frac{3}{4}$  cents on the sugars above 9, and only about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents on sugars below 9. If you put on a tax which will range from  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to  $2\frac{3}{4}$  cents, on the average, you will completely destroy any chance of importing this and the other class of sugar; you are putting on so very low a duty I am afraid you will lose revenue on the change.

Mr. STAIRS. I think that, though it is impossible to separate in the Trade Returns the fine sugar from the lower grades, the effect of the change in the duty will not be to decrease the revenue. For this reason: There will be collected 30 per cent. and 1 per cent. on any sugar over No. 14. This is just the same as has heretofore been collected on refined sugars below 14, and on raw sugars. The only way in which the revenue can be affected will be if vessels brought in refined sugar which came in under No. 14 and were very much higher than the prices of the raw. A careful inspection of the duties on sugars imported into the Dominion, taken from the prices current during last year, will show, as was mentioned by the member for South Brant, in the early part of this Session, during a discussion on the sugar question, that a refined sugar has been purchased in Greenock, quite as low as the ordinary price of raw sugar under No. 14. If the whole of the 30,000,000 lbs. which were imported during the last fiscal year had been refined sugar, and it was exchanged for an equal amount of raw, it would not affect the revenue 5 per cent., because the raw sugar taking the place of the refined would have paid as much, as the refined would have paid 30 per cent. and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a cent. Of course, I do not say it is so. I believe the larger portion of that was raw sugar; but I state a suppositious case to show what the effect would have been if all the sugar had been refined sugar and if its place had been taken by the same amount of raw.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that is the case, the practical result will be, that the burdens of the people will be considerably increased for the benefit of no human being, except manufacturers of sugar. We are raising the duty very largely indeed on grades of sugar which are proposed to be prohibited, and no doubt the refiners will be equal to the occasion, and raise the price accordingly. As to how it may affect the refiners, I offer no opinion; but the Minister does not pretend that he is going to obtain increased revenue, in which he is undoubtedly right, so that it is safe to draw the conclusion that the increased duty will come out of the pockets of the consumers.

Mr. VAIL. I am sorry the Minister of Custom has not gone a little further and made some re-arrangement in the Tariff generally in regard to sugar, for I can assure him that the mode of collecting duties on sugars is very unsatisfactory. The importers of raw sugar in Nova Scotia have for some time complained of want of uniformity in working the Customs laws, and state that while the Customs officials in Halifax are very strict in their administration of the law, and collect duties to the fullest extent that the Act permits, the same rigorousness is not observed in other portions of the Dominion, and more especially at

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Montreal; and if their statement is correct, the importers and refiners of raw sugar in Montreal have a decided advantage over those engaged in the same business at Halifax. The House will remember that early in the present Session an order was made for a return of all cargoes of raw sugar imported into Halifax from Jamaica between 1st January, 1883 and 31st December, 1883; also for a return of all sugars imported into the port of Montreal during the same period, either direct or *via* Halifax, giving the number of pounds in each cargo, the amount of duty per 100 lbs., and the value per 100 lbs. for duty. An examination of this return shows that among other arrivals at Halifax were four vessels from Jamaica. Two of those vessels, *Georgie* and *Annie*, had cargoes for Montreal; the other two vessels were *S. J. Mussen* and *Clifford*; and as the return does not give the dates of the arrival of the vessels or the prices at which their cargoes were entered, in order that the House may be fully informed on the subject, I propose to supply the information. The *Anne* arrived on 23rd April; *S. J. Mussen* on 26th April; *Clifford*, 29th April; *Georgie*, 2nd May. All those arrivals were within a period of one week. It is usual with cargoes that are shipped for Montreal *via* Halifax to be passed through Customs in transit without being entered; but by accident the agent of those two vessels, the *Annie*, and *Georgie* reported their cargoes at the Custom House, when the collector of Customs discovered that the cargoes were invoiced very much below two cargoes of the same kind of sugar arriving from the same port. He immediately called the attention of the agent to the fact, and informed him that those cargoes were invoiced too low; that he could not receive them, except at the same rate as the other two cargoes from the same port were valued. And the case, I presume, was reported to Ottawa. The Customs Act, clause 68, explicitly states that the *ad valorem* duty shall be levied on the fair market value at the time of shipment; and consequently, as I have stated, the collector could do nothing else under the circumstances than require the cargoes for Montreal to be entered at the same rate as the two cargoes for Halifax were entered. The return brought down shows that the sugars were graded below No. 14 and No. 9, and were consequently of the same value and were liable to the same duties. But the return also shows that the duty collected on the two cargoes for Montreal was very much less than was paid by the Halifax merchant, as the following figures taken from the return show:

	Duty.	Value per 100 lbs. for Duty.
<i>Annie</i> , below No. 14,	\$1.59 $\frac{1}{2}$	} ..... \$2 80 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " " "	9, 1.34 $\frac{1}{2}$	
<i>Georgie</i> , " " "	14, 1.60 $\frac{1}{2}$	} ..... 2 85 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " " "	9, 1.35 $\frac{1}{2}$	
<i>S. J. Mussen</i> , " " "	14, 1.81	} ..... 3 54
" " " "	9, 1.56	
<i>Clifford</i> , " " "	14, 1.75	} ..... 3 34 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " " "	9, 1.50	

I have been particular in stating these figures because they have an important bearing on what I intend to say with regard to this matter. On the 16th of December last, there appeared in a Montreal paper the following article, and it is interesting as showing the advantage which the Montreal importers had over the Halifax importers. The article is headed "Sugar Seizures in Montreal," and is as follows:—

" MONTREAL, Dec. 16.—A decision has at length been given in a case between Mr. S. B. Heward and the Customs authorities. Mr. Heward commenced importing sugar from Jamaica about four of five years ago, and after a small cargo had been passed through the Customs, larger consignments were made at the same prices. Through jealousy of Halifax merchants, a seizure was made, but nothing came of it. When navigation opened, the sugar was shipped direct, but the cargo of the first vessel was seized, and a large amount of extra duty had to be paid on it before it was released. As it was under protest a rebate was claimed, and the Department at Ottawa on finding that the prices were similar to the first importation which had been passed; decided that the extra duty ought not to have been charged. But meantime it was found that other firms were importing sugar and paying duty at lower prices.

And that Mr. Heward instead of defrauding the revenue (as they claimed) by invoicing the goods under the proper price, was actually paying a higher duty than his rivals. The question at once arose as to whether Mr. Heward's duty should be lowered, or the other should be raised; the Department concluded it would be easier to drop the duty on the new imports than to raise them on the old ones, so that was done. Mr. Heward, however, claimed rebate on duty previously paid, with legal expenses and damages, but the case has now been concluded by the acceptance of \$1,500 by Mr. Joseph Duhamel, Q.C., who has acted for Mr. Heward, who returned from Ottawa this morning after obtaining a settlement."

Well, Sir, this reads very strangely after the figures I have given to the House, taken from the returns furnished from the Customs Department, under an order of this House. Now, if this statement is correct, and I have no doubt it is, that the Customs authorities have discovered that other firms in Montreal were importing sugars and paying a lower rate of duty than Mr. Heward, who, according to the returns, was paying a lower rate than other firms, I should like to know why the Minister of Customs, who had the papers before him, did not make the Montreal firms pay an equal sum with Mr. Heward, instead of paying \$1,500 out of the Treasury, in order to reduce Mr. Heward's amount down to the amounts paid by firms, which he must have known, were really paying a less rate than firms in other portions of the Dominion. I cannot see what excuse the Minister of Customs will offer for this rather extraordinary proceeding, unless he intends to refund to the importers of sugar in Nova Scotia, the excess of duty which they have been paying. Then there is another ground of complaint that the people of Nova Scotia make, and that is, that while sugar is weighed in Nova Scotia by the Customs officials, I am informed that in Montreal it is weighed by the city weighers, and it frequently happens that these men withdraw samples for classifying. Now anybody acquainted with the sugar trade will see that as sugar is graded on color, drawing samples is a very important part of the business, and if the person drawing these samples is anxious to assist the importer, he can make a difference of a quarter of a cent per hundred pounds, and 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, and apparently do the work fairly. I am not in a position to charge on the officials at Montreal that they have acted unfairly, but I am told that the importers consider that the matter requires the consideration of the Government. What I have stated in reference to these matters may, perhaps, account for the investigation which I am told took place here last year, when it was discovered that sugars landed at Montreal paid, as a rule, 15 to 20 cents per hundred pounds less than if landed at Halifax. This may not seem a very heavy sum to those not familiar with the trade, but when I tell the House, that if applied to the total imports of 1883, of 180,000,000 of pounds, it reaches the respectable sum of \$360,000, it will be seen that it is a matter of considerable importance. I may here state a case which occurred a few years ago, which will go a long way towards convincing the House that there is a lack of uniformity in this sugar business, which should be rectified in some way. A Montreal merchant purchased a cargo of sugar in Halifax, most of it grading over No. 14. It was purchased on that basis, duty paid. The sugar went to Montreal, and it was re-classified there, and, strange to say, the bulk of that cargo was graded under No. 14, while in Halifax it was graded over No. 14, and the Montreal importer received the advantage of the difference in the duty, which must have been a considerable amount, because there was a saving of 25 cents per 100 pounds, and 5 per cent. *ad valorem* on the cost of the article. I think that this shows that there is some very different rule in Montreal from what there is in other portions of the Dominion in regard to this matter. I think I have also shown that there is a serious defect in the mode of classifying and grading sugar, and that a great injustice is being done to the Halifax importers,

which requires the attention of the Government. I shall now proceed to show, in as concise a manner as possible, that the present mode of testing sugar is defective, and if continued, will be ruinous to the West India trade, which is a very important trade to the Dominion, and more especially to the Maritime Provinces. Sugar pays both a specific and an *ad valorem* duty, and is graded on color, and any person who has studied the subject knows that color is not an index of the strength or value of sugar. For example, a sample under No. 9 pays  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and tests 97 degrees, and is consequently a valuable sugar for refining purposes; while another sample, over No. 9 and under 14, pays  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a cent, and tests only 82 degrees, although the first sample is worth from \$1 to \$1.50 per 100 pounds more than the latter; and it often happens that two lots of sugar worth the same price, duty paid, pays 25 cents per 100 pounds difference in duty. The *ad valorem* duty being collected on the cost of the article at the place of shipment, enables the refiners to import the low priced beet-root sugar on more advantageous terms than they can import the brighter and clearer sugar from the West Indies, and the result has been to kill out the West India trade, and encourage the importation of low-priced sugar from China and other foreign countries. For instance, I am told that in the early part of last year, and I presume it is the same now, that sugar could be imported from China of the same strength and landed here duty paid for 25 cts. less per 100 lbs., than it could be imported from Demerara, a comparatively near port, only about 3,000 miles from Halifax. This shows the discrimination of the present Tariff in favor of foreign grown sugar as against West Indies sugar. Of the sugar imported in the last half of the year 1883 which went into consumption in Halifax, from 40 to 50 per cent. was imported from foreign countries, and, as a matter of course, West Indies sugar had to be sold at corresponding prices with these sugars made artificially cheap by the operation of the Tariff, or be sent elsewhere, and the consequence was a large falling off in the importation of West Indies sugar into Halifax during the last half of 1883 to one-third the importation of the corresponding half year of 1882. Refiners in competing with each other must buy in the cheapest market, but the Tariff should be so arranged as to encourage the importation of sugar from countries which it is to our advantage to trade with. In fact, sugar refining at present is an injury to the trade of the Dominion, instead of what it should be, and what we in the Maritime Provinces supposed it was intended to be, a means of building up a larger trade with the West Indies and Brazil, and giving us a market for our fisheries, farms, forests and manufactured goods, as well as employment for a class of vessels from 75 to 200 tons, which are especially adapted to the fish trade, a trade which is in itself of far more importance than sugar refining is in itself. The fisheries of Nova Scotia last year yielded about \$8,500,000, nearly all clear gain to the country, and I think an export of this magnitude, which is largely consumed in the West Indies, and paid for in sugar, is entitled to some consideration from the Government. The statistics for the six months ending 31st December, 1883, shows a decrease in the quantity of West India sugar imported into Halifax of 28,000,000 pounds, or 46 per cent. less than for the same period of 1882. In Brazil sugars, during the same period, there was a decrease of 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., while the importation from China and Germany, countries which take none of our products, was nearly eight times as great as for the same period of the previous year, or 28 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the whole importation of sugar. Now, in view of all this, one would naturally have supposed the Minister of Customs, when his attention was called to it last year, would have taken steps to remedy this grievance. But, on the contrary, as I stated a few days ago, for some reason which I never could understand, unless it was for the express purpose of crushing out the West India trade, the Govern-

ment last Session granted a subsidy of \$48,000 per annum to a line of steamers between Antwerp and Canada and Germany and Canada. These steamers come to Montreal in summer and Halifax in winter loaded with low priced beet-root sugar at 14s. per ton freight and of course West India sugar is thus driven out of the market to that extent. For return cargo they go to the United States and on the homeward voyage call at Halifax again for a mail, which I am told is a bag with one or two letters in it. Then again, with a view, I presume, of discriminating still farther against the West India sugars, the Government, early the present year, passed an Order in Council permitting the importation of beet-root sugar from Germany on payment of duty on the cost, less the draw brack, which the Minister of Customs stated in answer to my question on the Notice Paper, was a little over 2 cents per lb., a further discrimination against the West India sugar of 55 cents per 100 lbs.

Mr. BOWELL. Does that hon. gentleman object to that Order in Council.

Mr. VAIL. I most certainly do, because the effect of it is to allow the low-priced sugars from Germany and elsewhere to be brought in to compete with our West India sugars, and the West Indies trade with us, while those foreign countries do not. Consequently the West India sugar must be sold at as low a rate as the beet-root sugar or find a market somewhere else. Now, the Minister of Customs may say it is very easy to point out defects in the present mode of testing and grading sugar, but what is the remedy for all this? My answer is that he should adopt the polariscopic test, which must necessarily be a fairer and more correct way of getting at the relative value and strength of sugar, more particularly for refining purposes, and charge duty on the actual strength, as they do in the United States. They adopted this test many years ago, and have seen no reason to change. It is the only correct mode of testing sugar. I am told the Belgian Government, some time ago, applied to the leading scientific men of Europe for their opinion as to the best method of levying the duty on sugar, and the reply was, that the use of the polariscope was the best, most correct and fairest mode that could be adopted, whereas the color test was the worst that could be conceived. I have referred to this matter at some length, and, I think, shown the House pretty clearly that there is not only a serious defect in the mode of classifying and grading sugar, which requires the attention of the Customs authorities, but I have also shown that a great injustice has been done the Halifax importers of sugar, which calls for some explanation and redress from the Government. I, therefore, hope the Minister of Customs will look into this matter and see if something cannot be done to place it on a more satisfactory basis.

Mr. GUNN. I think the change will shut out yellow sugars altogether; they were almost prohibited before. The Minister of Customs should have shown us what was the quantity imported, so that we could tell exactly where we were. I do not believe the quantity imported last year exceeded 5 to 7½ per cent., and the loss of duty on this would be from \$50,000 to \$75,000. The refiners are now paying on sugar testing 90 degrees, about \$1.25 per 100 lbs., while the American refiners pay \$2, or 75 cents more than ours. Granulated sugar sells in New York at 6½ cents, and in Montreal at 7 cents, both duty paid; that is ¼ of a cent. more we have to pay for our sugar, and we have ¾ of a cent less duty on it, equal to 1 cent per lb. loss to the people, which, on an importation of 200,000,000, lbs. alone would make \$2,000,000. The refiner is already so highly protected, that I do not think the tax on yellow sugar should be further advanced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It does seem to me this is really a grant to the sugar refiners for extra pro-  
Mr. VAIL.

tection, and taking into account the protection they already enjoy, they are the last class who should approach us again. I have no wish to see the sugar refineries closed; but I say that when it was conclusively shown, in March last, that the average *ad valorem* duty at that time which would have to be paid on granulated sugar imported from the United States, was 96½; when it was proved that it could then have been brought into the country, and the importer had just cleared himself, on paying on an *ad valorem* basis of 96½: when it was conclusively demonstrated by figures, taken from reliable Canadian and New York quotations, that sugar was selling in the United States for ½ ct. per lb. less than in Canada, while the refiner in the States had to pay fully ½ ct. per lb. more duty than the Canadian refiner, I considered that a case was made out showing that the protection given to Canadian refiners was excessive. Instead now of proposing to decrease the excessive amount of protection, the Government propose to leave these highly refined sugars at the same rate, and give an amount of protection on yellow sugars to the Canadian refiners which, in my judgment, will be absolute prohibition of all foreign refined sugar. The Minister is simply delivering the whole trade of the country, bound hand and foot, to the refiners. I fear, at present, that the refiners have a combination among themselves to keep up prices. When an industry has been stimulated to such an extent that production overreaches consumption, and there is freedom of action and competition among those engaged in the trade, the price of the article may not in some cases be enhanced, but where you have the trade in a few hands and an understanding arrived at, as I believe there is among the refiners, not to lower prices, the people have to suffer. The refinery business is in the hands of four or five men, and the probability is there will not be more than four or five men engaged in that business, because there is not room for more, and that being the case the consumer will have to pay whatever price they decide on. The effect of the Tariff changes now proposed will be to give greater protection to the refiner on yellow sugars, at the risk of absolute loss to the revenue and the certainty of increased prices to the consumer.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in assuming that the measure proposed will give too great an amount of protection to the refiners. He makes the mistake he always does in assuming there is no other sugar used in the Dominion than granulated. I think he will acknowledge that not more than one-fifth of the sugar is granulated, and the other four-fifths is yellow sugar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is yellow sugar.

Mr. STAIRS. Yes; but this yellow is under No. 14. and forms but a small portion of the yellow sugar of the Dominion. The member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) fell into the same error as the hon. member for South Brant, and talked upon the increased duty which would be produced by these resolutions, and, as I understood him, he assumed that these resolutions applied to granulated sugars and to the higher classes, whereas they only touch those below No. 14.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He only referred to yellow.

Mr. STAIRS. I understood him to say something about granulated sugar, but I could not hear very well. If he referred only to yellow sugars, the amount affected by these resolutions could not be anything like the amount I understood him to state. This change which is being made in the sugar duties is only carrying out the policy always advocated by the party in power, and which they put into force in 1879. It is no doubt the intention of the present Government to afford sufficient protection to the manufacturers of the Dominion. In reply to the statement of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), as to a combination of the sugar refineries, I may say that I have had

no word of any such thing being in view. My information within the past few months has been to the contrary effect, though I acknowledge that I have not had anything lately, but I believe that the number of refineries now at work in the Dominion render it impossible for them to make any combination, and the Government can trust, in this as in other matters, to the home competition making the price a moderate one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is an immoderate one now. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to compare the New York quotations with the Canadian.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not acknowledge that the prices of sugars to-day are immoderate. Before this change was proposed there was not any protection on sugars below No. 14, the same duty was collected on refined sugars below 14 that was collected on raw sugars below 14, and, if you look at the prices of West Indian yellows, you will find the duty per lb. was a little higher on the raw than on the refined sugars. Therefore, I contend that the Government are justified in carrying out their policy and giving the refiners sufficient protection, because the increased duty put upon these sugars is not very great; it is 5 per cent on a very low cost indeed, not more than 10 cents at the present cost and 25 per cent. The member for Brant acknowledged that he did not object to the manufacturers having sufficient protection. I say the refiners have not as great a protection as the cotton manufacturers had before 1878, under the 17½ per cent tariff. The hon. members talk about duties on granulated sugars, but they do not allow for the duty which is imposed upon raw sugar. The measure of protection is only the difference of these duties, allowing for the loss in manufacture. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) spoke of the sugar refining having injured the trade with the West Indies. If he will turn to the returns up to 1878, he will find that the contrary is the case. I am not going into the question now, because I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but the sugar refining in the Dominion has largely increased the trade with the West Indies instead of reducing it. As to the polariscopic test, though my own opinions are strongly in favor of it, I would point out that it will not help to keep beet-root sugar out. On the contrary, I think it will allow it to come in on more favorable terms than the West Indian sugar.

Mr. VAIL. I do not want to keep it out. I only think it should pay a duty according to the strength, the same as other sugars. It should not come in competition with the brighter and cleaner sugar that comes from the West Indies of a lower grade, without paying the same duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The only result of this measure will be to add to the price of sugar to the consumer, because it is quite clear that the refiner will take every farthing out of the consumer that he can. The only check upon him was the power of importing these sugars when they were at their present low figures, which could be done under the existing Tariff, but will not be done under the Tariff now proposed. This will amount on the average, taking the valuations given us in the Customs return, to 68 per cent., and that on an article which can hardly be called a luxury, which is, if not a prime necessary, at any rate one of the necessities of life for all parties in the Dominion, is a most enormous duty, and, comparing the prices paid here with the prices paid in the United States, under a heavier scale of duty, our refiners are levying an enormous scale of duties on the people of this country. I should like to hear from the Minister of Customs what he has to say as to the difference of duties on cargoes imported in Montreal and in Halifax, which has been alluded to by my hon. friend. Waiving entirely the question of protection, it is perfectly clear that pains ought to be taken to

make the duty the same in the different ports of the Dominion, and, if my hon. friend's facts are correct, it is quite clear that a serious injustice is worked upon the people of Halifax and the refiners there.

Mr. BOWELL. I propose, for a few minutes, to refer to the charge of the hon. member for Digby. It is not a new one on his part. As I anticipated, he has come ready primed in order to renew the attack which he made some time ago, and I think, upon a full investigation of the matter, if he had had all the facts before him, he would probably not have made the serious charge he has, particularly of neglect of duty on the part of the head of the Customs Department in reference to investigation into these matters. That there may have been differences in grading and errors committed in different ports I am not prepared to deny. Any gentleman who has had any experience in administering the Customs law with the numerous ports there are in this Dominion, and consequently the very large number of appraisers and collectors, who take different views upon different subjects, would know that it would be almost impossible even to suppose that you could secure perfect uniformity in all these ports. The question to which the hon. gentleman referred, the importation of these two cargoes of sugar into Halifax and their afterwards having been sent to Montreal and entered at a lower rate, is not strictly in accordance with the facts. I do not say that the hon. gentleman has made that statement knowingly; but I do say this, particularly in reference to the importation of sugars, that when the complaint was received from Halifax I sent an officer at once to make a thorough investigation, not only as to that entry, but to the value of the sugar at Jamaica at the time of exportation and the rates which should be properly charged upon such sugar. The reports made to me were that the demands made of the importer by the appraiser at Montreal, were higher than the market value of the sugar at the time it was exported from Jamaica, and it was the duty of the Department, under such circumstances, to refund whatever extra amount might have been collected. But I can assure the committee that not a dollar has ever been remitted to any importer upon any article, until there has been a full and thorough investigation into the whole question. When those who are experts make an investigation and report, it is not expected that the Department, unless there is something so flagrant that it is easily discovered, would interfere with that report. The charge also made by the Halifax merchants and importers, that Montreal has an advantage over Halifax, was thoroughly investigated, and the results shows that Halifax, on the contrary, in the way to which the hon. gentleman referred, and also in the grading of the sugars, has, if anything, an advantage over Montreal. When the hon. gentleman brought this question before the House upon a previous occasion, as I was desirous of obtaining the fullest information, I wrote to Mr. Dustan, who had visited Ottawa a short time before, and who had made the same serious complaints, not only against the Department, but against the appraisers and collectors in Montreal. He was invited to investigate all the returns that we had, and all the reports made by those who had investigated the question, and the collector in Montreal was written to, asking him to give Mr. Dustan access to all the books and entries, and give him all the information he might require to enable him to satisfy himself as to the manner in which the business was transacted at that port. My letter was dated on the 19th of February, immediately after the debate in this House, and I will read it:

"MY DEAR DUSTAN,—In conversation with the Commissioner a few days since, on the question of sugars imported at Montreal and Halifax, I was informed that you made a thorough investigation in Montreal some time ago, and that you expressed yourself satisfied as to the correctness of the Montreal values for duty.

"Kindly let me know how you found things at that port.

"Yours truly,

"(Signed), M. BOWELL."

On the 23rd February, Mr. Dustan telegraphed to me as follows:—

" Letter 19th received. Judging from my investigation at Montreal Custom House, consider attack of the Nova Scotia refinery on the Customs officials there, a baseless—

Pretty strong language—

" and vile calumny. Writing as to values for duty.

" GEORGE GORDON DUSTAN."

On the 24th February, the day after the date of the telegram, he wrote me as follows:—

" HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA,  
" 24th February, 1885.

" MY DEAR MR. BOWELL,—I am duly in receipt of your valued letter of the 19th inst., asking about the question of sugars imported at Montreal and Halifax, and the thorough investigation made by me at the port of Montreal as to the correctness of the values for duty there. I beg to say in reply that in the autumn of 1883 my attention was directed to an alleged evasion of the payment of a portion of the duties payable upon cargoes of Jamaica sugars, particulars of which were furnished me, amounting to 4,777,046 pounds, of the value of \$139,249, and upon which duty was paid to the amount of \$41,774.70, and that, as compared against the value of seven similar cargoes from the same Island of Jamaica that were entered for duty at the port of Halifax, there was a loss to the revenue of \$7,611.30 upon an undervaluation of \$25,371 "

These are the charges which, he says, were made, and then continues:

" I at once proceeded to Ottawa and received from the Department of Customs leave to call upon the appraiser at the port of Montreal and to satisfy myself whether such a state of matters existed, as I had been led to suppose was the case.

" I was met by the Government in the frankest manner and permitted to make an informal investigation. All the samples of the sugars in question with invoices and entries were in the appraiser's office, and Mr. Moir, the able and efficient grocery appraiser, gave me an opportunity of looking into the matter.

" I had in my possession advices as to the state of the market during the period covered by these importations and I most positively state that I came to the conclusion that all the duty to which the Government were fairly entitled had been paid upon the sugars in question. I need not state any more significant point in the whole matter than this, viz: The alleged undervaluation was made up from a statistical point of view. One cargo averaged against another. Any one familiar with Jamaica sugar will know that cargoes may be made up of different qualities, and as my informant had never seen the cargoes in question, I was not surprised at the result of my examination.

" I came away from the port of Montreal convinced that in that particular instance, there was no just ground of complaint against the Customs Department.

" I have the honor to be,

" My dear Sir,

" Your obedient servant,

" The Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL, " GEO. GORDON DUNSTAN,  
" Minister of Customs, Ottawa."

Mr. VAIL. Who are you reading from?

Mr. BOWELL. I am reading Mr. Dustan's letter. The committee will see that I took the precaution of writing to the man who certainly has the reputation of knowing not only the value of sugar but has a thorough knowledge of the sugar trade in this country.

Mr. VAIL. He had not knowledge enough to make money out of it.

Mr. BOWELL. That is many a good man's fault. There are many men who, as the hon. gentleman knows, have a thorough knowledge of business, but who do not succeed in it when working on their own account, but who make admirable servants and who make money when they are working for others. We see that in every avocation of life. However, I was well aware that the reports of the officers of the Department and of the Commissioner whose name has been mentioned, would not be satisfactory to those who made these complaints; hence I wrote to the man in whom I believe, every one has confidence in so far as his knowledge of the sugar question is concerned; because Mr. Dustan has been connected with this business for a great number of years, and has devoted much of his time to the study of the whole question. I asked him to inform me as to the result of his investigation and that result I have read to the House. It is much better, I think than a report coming from an inexperienced man, or from any one of our officers. In regard to the general statement with respect to the  
Mr. BOWELL.

different importations, I find on going through the return to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and from which he has drawn certain deductions as to one or two importations, that the results of the whole importations for the year 1883 into the ports of Halifax and Montreal do not bear out the statement which the hon. gentleman has made, and the deductions he has drawn from two particular cargoes of sugar. The hon. gentleman ought to know that a merchant may buy sugar in Jamaica or in any other port for export, and that the ruling price of the same quality of sugar may be higher or lower during the same day, and that cargoes may be exported in the morning at one price and in the evening or following day at another price. The sugar market, particularly in regard to raw sugars, varies almost as rapidly as exchange or the stock market. The hon. gentleman does not require to be told that, for no doubt from the thorough knowledge he appears to possess of the whole question he knows the truth of what I have stated. I will be pardoned for occupying a little time in dealing with this question, as I desire more particularly to give information to the importers at the different ports, as this question is constantly cropping up. Montreal complains to the head office that Halifax has an advantage. Halifax merchants declare that Montreal with its large refineries has great influence, and they have gone so far as to say in the newspapers that the weighers and appraisers are under the control of the refiners. I have made a pretty thorough investigation into all these matters, and have yet to learn that there is a scintilla of truth in any of the charges made against our officers in Montreal or Halifax. They have performed to the best of their knowledge their onerous and responsible duties honestly and faithfully. The following is a comparative statement of sugars imported from Jamaica into the ports of Montreal and Halifax direct during the year 1883:—

Ports and Description of Sugar.	Imported from Jamaica.				Proportion of each grade import'd Per cent.
	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Rate of 100 lbs.	
Montreal—	Lbs.	\$	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	Per cent.
Above No. 14.	958,230	31,065	20,455 55	2 13	06.13
From 9 to 14...	6,750,735	211,228	113,998 91	1 69	43.11
Below No. 9....	7,917,096	244,069	112,806 18	1 42	50.76
Total .....	15,626,111	486,362	247,260 64	1 58	100.00
Halifax—					
Above No. 14.	489	16	10 49	2 14	00.04
From 9 to 14...	2,729,891	89,630	47,363 18	1 73	27.13
Below No. 9....	7,331,047	240,064	108,674 44	1 48	72.83
Total .....	10,061,427	329,710	156,048 11	1 55	100.00

The above statement reveals the following facts: The sugars from Jamaica in 1883 were graded as follows: In Montreal, 43.11 per cent. between 9 and 14. In Halifax, 27.13 per cent. between 9 and 14. The aggregate or average duty paid on the same was: In Montreal, \$1.58 per 100 lbs. In Halifax, \$1.55 per 100 lbs., a difference in favor of Halifax of 3 cts. per 100 lbs. In regard to the question of weighing. It is charged by the Halifax press, and it was repeated by the hon. member for Digby, that weighing in Halifax was done under the surveillance of the Customs authorities; and that in Montreal the weighing is done by the city weigher, without any check whatever. The hon. gentleman is incorrect in that statement also. The moment I saw that charge I thought it a very serious one, and I at once sent an officer, Mr. Wolff, to make an investigation into the matter, and I will give the result of that investigation. That officer says:

" CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT, CANADA,  
" SPECIAL AGENT'S BRANCH,  
" MONTREAL, 23rd August, 1884.

" Sir,—I have the honor to state that two cargoes of sugar were lately landed at Halifax ex *Craigton* and *Ayrshire*.

"The consignee, who resides here, not having implicit faith in the weighers at Halifax, despatched a city weigher from Montreal for the purpose of checking the cargoes—and I have now the honor to hand you copies of the weighing of various lots imported by the vessels named.

"It is asserted in some quarters that the weighers at Halifax do not weigh as closely as is the practice at other ports, and further, that owing to their regarding small sized hhds. as tierces, that the Halifax importer gains an advantage on the tare of tierces (so called) weighing over 1,300 lbs.

"As the enclosed statements give you the exact gross weight in each case it will be easy to check the Halifax returns and ascertain if there is any truth in the assertions.

"It is also stated that the Customs weighers at Halifax do not include scrapings in the weight for duty, which should certainly be included, as in many cases owing to the breaking of packages they are very large, representing frequently many hogsheads.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"JAS. F. WOLFE,

"Special Agent.

"J. JOHNSON, Esq.,

"Commissioner of Customs,

"Ottawa."

I am not prepared to say whether that is correct or not, but any one who is acquainted with the sugar trade, will see not only the propriety, but the absolute necessity of adding the scrapings if the correct weight is to be obtained. Then the Inspector reports again as follows:—

"MONTREAL, 6th December, 1884.

"I have the honor to return you file 3591—84, sent me for further inquiry, and to report that I find the weights returned by the officers at Halifax, to agree with weights returned by the private weigher, and that the only difference between the practice of Halifax and Montreal, as far as shown in the treatment of the cargoes ex-Ayrshire and Craighton, as regards weighing of sugar, lies in the weight of tare. The attached statement signed by the assistant weigher at this port, shows the cargo of the Ayrshire to have been entered 9,553 pounds, and that of the Craighton 12,434 pounds short of that. The same gross weight would have been entered at Montreal owing to the latter port only allowing 12 per cent. tare on packages weighing over 1,300 pounds, such packages being considered as hogsheads, whereas at the port of Halifax, the invoiced name of the package appears to rule for tare."

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

"JAS. F. WOLFE,

"Special Agent.

"J. JOHNSON, Esq.,

"Commissioner of Customs,

"Ottawa."

They take the invoices names, instead of applying the rule which prevails in Montreal as that upon which the allowance is made. Now, what does this show? It shows:

RETURN OF WEIGHTS EX SS. AYRSHIRE.

897 hhds. sugar, gross.....	2,094,632		
12 per cent. tare.....	251,356		
		Net,	1,843,276
2 tierces, 1,300 lbs. or less....	2,444		
14 per cent. tare.....	342		
		Net,	2,102
285 tierces, over 1,300 lbs.....	477,612		
12 per cent. tare.....	57,313		
		Net,	420,299
508 brls.....	126,389		
Tare at 26 lbs. each.....	13,208		
		Net,	113,181

Total.....	2,378,858
Entered as.....	2,369,305

To post..... 9,553

RETURN OF WEIGHTS EX SS. CRAIGHTON.

1,086 hhds. sugar, gross.....	2,481,942		
12 per cent. tare.....	297,833		
		Net,	2,184,109
30 tierces, 1,300 lbs. or less....	35,672		
14 per cent. tare.....	4,994		
		Net,	30,678
389 tierces, over 1,300 lbs.....	621,676		
12 per cent. tare.....	74,601		
		Net,	547,075
363 brls.....	89,032		
Tare at 26 lbs. each.....	9,438		
		Net,	79,594
1 half-brl.....		Net,	107

Total.....	2,841,563
Entered as.....	2,829,129

To post..... 12,434

M. F. QUIN,  
Assistant Weigher and Gauger,  
Port of Montreal.

I have given these figures from the actual test of the weighing—a comparison of the two systems, not particularly for the purpose of finding fault with the port of Halifax, but to show that there has been no discrimination against that port, but that on the contrary, in various ways, that in the whole amount of the import of sugar from Jamaica in 1883, they had an advantage over Montreal of 3 cents per 100 lbs., and in these two cargoes an advantage of 12,434 lbs. I have read all the figures with reference to the steamships Craighton and Ayrshire, showing by the calculation that the Halifax merchant, who made the entry, had an advantage in the weighing alone—on the calculation of tare of—of 12,434 lbs. over what there would have been had the importation and weighing been in Montreal, and the entry made at that port. Now, so far as the investigation is concerned—so far as the charges—

Mr. VAIL. Before the hon. gentleman passes from that point, I would ask him is it a fact or not that sugar in Montreal is weighed by the city weighers?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has scarcely given me time. I was coming to that.

Mr. VAIL. I thought you were passing from it.

Mr. BOWELL. I was just going to refer to that point. Sugar in Montreal is weighed by the city weighers.

Mr. VAIL. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. What are you hear, hearing about?

Mr. VAIL. That is just what I said.

Mr. BOWELL. Would you like me to stop there? Sugar is weighed by the city weighers and checked by a Customs officer. I put that same question to the collector, and also to Mr. Wolfe the Inspector. I have heard people "hear, hear" and hallo before they got out of the woods, and I think my hon. friend was in that position.

Mr. BLAKE. He is in the wood.

Mr. BOWELL. No, he is out of the cane and into the syrup, and very soft syrup it is. The inspector reports that

"The weighing is checked by a Customs officer at the time of weighing, and a separate account is kept as a check by the Customs officer, Customs tares and city tares differ of course because they have a different mode of calculating it."

That only refers to the tares, and perhaps that may be the reason why the Halifax merchant had the advantage to which I have referred.

"The Customs officers get no fees for weighing or gauging at Montreal, and importers never know what officers may be sent to weigh their goods."

This is certainly an advantage over the system which prevails at some ports of having one weigher to weigh all the sugar, and every importer knowing who that man is.

Mr. VAIL. Who pays the weigher of the sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs pay him—the Government pay him.

Mr. VAIL. That is the city weigher?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, for all work done for the Customs by him. I do not know how it may be in Halifax, but I have never yet been able to find anybody in Ontario or Quebec to work for nothing, and when we utilize a public officer, such, for instance, as a public analyst, we have to pay him, as we pay all those who do work for us. I can also state to the hon. gentleman that the city weigher of Montreal takes a solemn oath to perform his duties to the best of his knowledge and ability, and we have no right to assume that he is corrupt unless it is proved. I do not propose to occupy the attention of the committee longer, unless there are some questions the hon. gentleman wishes to ask me. I have already referred to the Heward importation, and the hon. gentleman says I must have known it was not correct. Well, I knew from reports, particularly by the Halifax papers that they stated that it is not correct.

I took every possible means of ascertaining the facts, first by sending an officer to investigate and report; then by having an accountant of the Department make a report as to the prices and calculations, and everything necessary, in order to arrive at a correct conclusion, and having found that the statements which had been made against that particular importation were not correct, I took the responsibility of ordering the refund of the extra amount of duty which had been paid. The hon. gentleman objects to the mode of testing the quality and the ignoring of the saccharine strength of the sugar. That is a very vexed question; it is a question that the most experienced experts have not yet decided. The hon. gentleman, in his ideas of the American tariff, is about as correct as he was in reference to the other points to which he has drawn the attention of the House. It is only one quality of sugar which is tested by the polariscope under the United States tariff. There they have the mixed system of the polariscope for one grade, the Dutch standard for another, and the refined for another. I will read them to the hon. gentleman in order that he may not fall into the error again. The American tariff reads as follows:—

"Sugars—class 1. Those tested by the polariscope; all sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscope test as follows, viz.: All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard, all tank bottoms, syrups of cane juice or beet juice, maleda, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, 1½ cents per pound; and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscope test, they shall pay  $\frac{1}{10}$ ths of a cent per pound additional.

"Class 2. Those classified by the dutch standard of color; all sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely: all above No. 13 and not above No. 16, 2½ cents per pound; all above No. 16 and not above No. 20, 3 cents per pound; and all above No. 20, 3½ cents per pound.

"Class 3. Refined sugars; all sugars after being refined, when tintured, colored, or in any way adulterated, value 30 cents per pound or less, 10 cents per pound."

Therefore the United States Government do not adhere to the polariscope test in levying their duty, except in the case of one particular grade of sugar; and it has not been considered advisable as yet to adopt that test as a principle of our Tariff for many reasons. While there may be an error of judgment in the grading of sugar as to its color by the different appraisers and the different collectors in the country, how much greater difficulties would be likely to occur if the whole decision depended exclusively on the eye of the individual using the polariscope. We know that there are many men who are good judges of sugar and have all the qualifications of good officers who could not by any possibility use the polariscope. There are others who of course could; but where you have so many officers, I am very much inclined to believe—and I know this is the opinion of the Finance Minister, who has given this question a great deal of consideration—that frauds and errors would be as likely to occur under the polariscope test as under the present system. The hon. gentleman objects to the subsidy which was given to the line of steamers plying between Halifax and Antwerp, which he tells us has imported some beet-root sugar, which I believe is correct, and he charges the Government with having given that subsidy for the purpose of destroying the West Indian trade.

Mr. VAIL. I did not make that statement; I said it did do it, and I could not imagine any other cause the Government had for it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says he did not make the charge that the subsidy was given for the purpose of destroying the West India trade, but states that it had that effect, and that he could not conceive any other reason the Government could have in doing that, except to create a monopoly of trade in beet-root sugar between Antwerp and Canada to destroy the West India trade. I leave the hon. gentleman to draw the distinction; there is as much difference between that and the statement I made as there

Mr. BOWELL.

is between tweedledum and tweedledee. If the hon. gentleman is correct in his statement, and if he desires that the refiners of Halifax and Moncton should manufacture from the West India sugar alone, and not from beet-root sugars, what would be the result? If there had been no beetroot sugar imported into Canada during the past year, I question whether any of our refineries would be in operation to-day, for the simple reason that if we had exacted the duty upon the 2 cent per pound bounty which is paid by the German Government on exports of beetroot sugar, no merchant or refiner in Canada could have imported one pound of that sugar, and the result would have been that the product of the beet-root sugar from the English and Scotch refineries would have been imported into this country to compete with the product of our own refineries, and we should not have had a single refinery at work to-day, and the price of such would have run up proportionately. Therefore the policy the hon. gentleman is very anxious for this Government to adopt, is one to prevent the refiners of this country obtaining a cheap raw material to supply the market, and thus shut them up, in order as he says, that the vessels for Halifax could go to the West Indies and bring the cane sugar to this country. Where should we find a market for the sugar imported from the West Indies if the refineries of the country could not use it? All they could do would be to bring refined sugars to supply the market. The result would have been precisely what I have stated, the closing of the refineries in the Dominion and the destruction of the West India trade. I make the hon. gentleman a present of his argument, and I have no doubt that when not only the refiners, but the Halifax merchants, look into this matter thoroughly, they will duly appreciate the hon. gentleman's interest on their behalf, an anxiety which will result in the total destruction not only of the West India trade, so far as the article of raw sugar is concerned, but in shutting up all the refineries we have in the country. I apologise to the committee for having occupied its time so long, but this question has occupied so much attention in the Maritime Provinces that I deemed it only right that the information I have given should be laid before the country, in order that the public might know precisely what has been done in the Customs Department, and that if error has occurred it has not been through laxity on the part of the officials or the head of the Department. In no single instance has a complaint been made when an investigation was not at once set on foot to ascertain the truth of the charge. There never yet has been a complaint made at Halifax when I did not at once despatch an official, not only to make an investigation, but to compare the working of the whole system as between the one port and another. I hope ere long to be able to carry this plan out to a greater extent by having some person, who has a thorough knowledge of the West India trade and the value of sugars, to travel from port to port. I think that would satisfy the merchants, and effect a saving probably in the revenue; and if it does not save a dollar, it will satisfy the merchant and importer that we are endeavoring to have one uniform system prevail.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman has given us a good deal of valuable information, but has taken care to evade the real question at issue. As regards the weighers, I understand from the best authority that the weighing in Montreal is done by the city weighers; while, in other ports, it is done by the Customs officials. The hon. gentleman says a Customs officer oversees the work, but one Customs officer could not oversee the weighing of several cargoes being landed on the same day.

Mr. BOWELL. We have a Customs officer to oversee the weighing of every cargo.

Mr. VAIL. Why not make the Customs officials do the work instead of having the city officials and the Customs

officers to oversee them? With reference to the invoice prices of different cargoes arriving at the same time, and which sailed about the same time, the hon. gentleman said that in the West Indies sugar often was bought at one price in the morning and at another price in the afternoon; but in the cases I referred to, that hypothesis could not hold, in regard to the two vessels which arrived at Halifax, as one sailed before and the other shortly after, the two which arrived at Halifax, and yet the Montreal cargoes were entered at a lower rate than the Halifax cargoes. The hon. gentleman says he finds the valuation of sugar entered at Montreal somewhat in excess of the Halifax prices; but referring to his report which covers the year, I find that the average price in Montreal per 100 lbs. upon which the *ad valorem* duty was collected has been for the year 3·16 cents against 3·27 cents in Halifax. This shows exactly the reverse of what the hon. gentleman stated; and he surely will not go back on his return. The Minister has referred to Mr. Dustan's report on his examination in Montreal. Well, strange to say, Mr. Dustan, although he has had a good deal to do with the sugar business, very often differs with other gentlemen who have made this matter a study for a long time, and have had a great deal to do with the importation of sugar, and I do not know that Mr. Dustan is any better authority on this question than some other parties. Within the last year or two there has been a very great difference in opinion between Mr. Bremner, a gentleman formerly engaged in the West India trade, and Mr. Dustan, in regard to the way in which sugars ought to be classified and in regard to the amount of duty paid in Montreal as compared with that paid in Halifax; and, when Mr. Bremner was here a year or two ago, I understood that he made it very clear to the Minister of Customs that there was something wrong in the grading of sugar at Montreal.

Mr. BOWELL. So there was in Halifax.

Mr. VAIL. That Halifax labored under a disadvantage, in the mode of classifying the sugar, was quite clear. The color test is not a proper test, and some other mode ought to be adopted. The Minister of Customs says the people of the United States do not adopt the polariscope test in all cases, but he admitted that they did under No. 13. Well, that goes about as far as we want to have it adopted, because it is only the sugars under No. 14 that are used for refining purposes, and therefore all we ask is that the polariscope should be used for all under No. 14. I do not know that any sugar is imported above 14 for refining purposes, and of course refined sugar does not need to be classified as it pays the highest rate, 1 cent per pound and 35 per cent *ad valorem*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I presume the hon. gentleman, from his argument, assumes that there has been fraud practised in the interest of one of the ports in this Dominion, against another port, in the appraisal of sugar, and he proposes to get over that by the system of testing the strength by the polariscope instead of the present system of appraising it by color. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has ever seen a polariscope or knows anything about the practical working of it. I do not say that in an offensive sense, because I fancy very few except those engaged in the trade have ever seen the polariscope. I had curiosity enough to study its working in the presence of people who were testing it, and the conclusion I arrived at was that there is no system of testing that gives greater opportunities for fraud than the polariscope, if there is a disposition to commit fraud at all. In the first place, I will state to the committee the actual experience of a test. The sugar was taken from a hogshead with a large scoop and thrown upon a table. With an ordinary folder we put a portion of that sugar into the small vessel and dissolved it in the ordinary way, and tested it in the polari-

scope, and found it to have a particular percentage. We took another small quantity from the same pile of sugar on the table and tested that, and we found a difference of 3 per cent. The reason was that purposely, although no one looking at it would imagine that it was done, in the selection of these two little quantities that were to be tested through the polariscope a little foreign matter was permitted to go into one that did not go into the other. When you remember that the cleanliness of the vessels, the purity of the water, the carefulness of selecting exactly the same kind of sugar in quantities for the different tests, all have to be observed, you will see that any person disposed to commit fraud—and the hon. gentleman assumes that, because in Montreal the city weigher is permitted to do the weighing, under the Customs officer, there may have been, indeed he almost suggests that there has been, fraud—he will agree with me, I think, that it will be very easy for anyone, if disposed to commit fraud, if Customs officers would allow themselves to be used in this way, it could be done through the test of the polariscope much more easily than now, because there would be no means of testing it afterwards. Apparently there was the absolute, the accurate scientific test of the strength of the sugar and the duty imposed upon it, when, by the introduction of the smallest foreign substance, great difference would be caused. When I say that the difference which that small percentage would make in the duty paid by one sugar refinery would amount to over \$100,000, you will agree with me that the polariscope does not offer to us that absolute and certain test we ought to have. The advantage of the color test is that at least, you can get the sugar and subject it to subsequent test by the samples preserved in the Department and the various Customs offices. I state these facts because I came to the conclusion—having previously had a strong opinion in favor of what appeared to be a thoroughly scientific method of arriving at a thoroughly accurate test of the saccharine strength of sugar, and therefore the proper duty to be imposed—after spending a part of the day in seeing several tests, I came to the conclusion that there is no means in which fraud can be more easily practised than by the polariscope.

Mr. VAIL. Is it reasonable to imagine that the Americans, clever, shrewd, sharp people as they are, would have adopted the polariscope and retained it, if this was the case.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is a great difference of opinion in the States now about it.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman has seen the polariscope. I acknowledge I have not, but I have enquired a good deal about it. I do not think that the opinion of my hon. friend from Montreal is of much value in comparison with the opinion of the scientific men from Europe, whom I referred to this afternoon. There is not the slightest doubt that the Belgian Government did refer this to the scientific men of Europe, and their report was unanimously in favor of the polariscope test. The hon. gentleman says you may take from one portion of the table and from another and get different tests. I do not see how that is possible, but, admitting that, take the present test. You test by color, but everyone knows that one portion of a hogshead may be very dark and another very light, and it is impossible to get a true test by color. It is no index to the value of the sugar. There may be one bright sugar almost like refined sugar, to be classed over 14 and to pay 1 cent a lb. and 35 per cent., but it may be not more than No. 9 in strength, paying only  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent a lb. and 25 per cent. Does not the hon. gentleman see the unfairness of that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman has not understood my argument at all. I do not deny that the polariscope is a scientific test of sugar; I am dealing with the question of how you can appraise the sugar at the differ-

ent ports so as to avoid the possibility of inaccuracy or fraud. The hon. gentleman based his whole argument in connection with Montreal on the idea that as the sugar was weighed by the city weigher, he suggested—though he did not say so—that the weigher was in the pay of the refiners. His whole argument was based upon the idea of fraud committed by that officer, it is worth nothing unless there was fraud. My point was that with the polariscope there are even greater opportunities for fraud than with the ordinary system.

Mr. VAIL. I made no charge against the weigher; I merely referred to that incidentally as another objection the Halifax merchants had to the mode pursued in Montreal as compared with Halifax. I pointed out that two or three years ago a cargo of sugar was purchased in Halifax that had been classified and graded there. Most of it was graded at over No. 14, and it was purchased upon that basis. It was by accident re-graded in Halifax, the bulk of it under No. 14. That cargo went to Montreal, and the grading showed there was a great change between the classification of sugar in Montreal and in Halifax, and the purchaser of sugar benefitted to the extent of 25 cents per 100 lbs. and 5 per cent. *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. MILLS. Any one who knows anything of testing sugars to ascertain their value with a view to taxation, must admit that the polariscope is a far better test than that of the Dutch standard. Now, no difficulty could arise in the way suggested by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). It is true that where sugars are impure you may find one specimen that, according to the polariscope, would represent a lower grade than another specimen of the same mass; but the scientific men, in making their investigations to ascertain the percentage of cane sugar, would take half a dozen specimens and ascertain the average result. By the polariscope there is no difficulty whatever. One of the difficulties presented in the United States and one that was brought out specially by the committee, was that a practice had grown up of coloring sugars by the use of aniline dyes in their preparation, so that the color of the sugar was no indication of its actual purity and strength. It is well known that in the United States the practice grew up of fixing taxation by the color, adopting the Dutch standard, and that importers made arrangements with extensive sugar manufacturers in the Island of Cuba to have sugars manufactured of a particular number. Some of the finest sugars, some that were nearly a pure such as marked 97 and 98 per cent. by the polariscope, were introduced into the country marked as No. 9 Dutch standard, and they were colored in the manufacture with aniline dye prepared from burnt sugar; the dye running into the baskets upon the centrifugal wheel, and in a short time all the coloring matter, was imparted to the sugar, the water disappearing. The sugar is colored of the exact shade required to indicate the particular standard. It is dried in a few minutes by the centrifugal force, and there you have a sugar that comes into the market as the lowest grade, while it is in fact almost as pure as loaf sugar. It requires simply that the dyes should be washed out and that is about all the refining process it requires. Now, in order to meet that difficulty, we impose this specific duty; but our specific duty does not at all adequately meet the case. It seems to me there are but two tests or fair modes of imposing taxation upon sugar. The one is an *ad valorem* duty fixed according to value, and you take the risk, of course, of fraudulent invoices; the other fixes the taxation by the strength of the sugar, indicated by the polariscope. But the taxation according to the Dutch standard is wholly illusive, and has become specially so since the use of aniline dyes. If you had sugar without any coloring, then the Dutch standard would serve very well, for the nearer pure the sugar is the whiter it will be. But when you use an

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

artificial coloring matter for the purpose of making the sugar of a particular shade, the polariscope should be used.

On paragraph 2, resolution 1,

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I have received a telegram from the Board of Trade of British Columbia, asking that some exceptions should be made in their favor in this connection. The telegram is as follows:

"VICTORIA, B.C., 14th March, 1885.

"Board of Trade wishes you to object strongly to Tariff resolution No. 2, clause 1, referring to duty on transportation charges. European shipment for this Province can only reach us by American railway or *via* Panama through American ports on this coast. Government should exempt this Province from operation of part of the resolution referred to. Kindly interest all British Columbia members in this important matter.

"(Signed)

R. P. RITHET,  
"President."

I think the same representations were made on a previous occasion in this matter. It hits British Columbia a little too hard, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think this will discriminate against British Columbia. This is to enable parties importing from Great Britain and Ireland to deduct the inland charges from the face of the invoice for duty. If you import, say from the interior of Germany, you have to add the charges from the interior to the point of shipment, to the value of the goods for duty. You do not add that when you import from Great Britain. As I understand the telegram, they ask to have British Columbia exempted from all inland transportation charges. I do not see how we could do that.

Mr. BAKER. Everyone knows how far we are from the rest of the Dominion, and some regulation which may not be objectionable as regards the Eastern Provinces may hit us very hardly. I do not wish to enlarge on this subject, because I might have to say something against the Tariff generally.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will remember that the merchant who has sent the telegram has based it upon the resolutions originally introduced. We adhere to the old law, only giving the Customs authorities the power to determine what the amount of deduction shall be. It is not adding anything; on the contrary, it is making a deduction.

On paragraph 3, resolution 3, Geneva gin and brandy,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what computations the hon. gentleman has made as to the probable effect of the increase. I would also point out that he has apparently increased the Customs duties on those articles a good deal more than he has increased the duty on the article of Canadian manufactured whiskey. As a matter of fact, it is an absolute increase per gallon of from 12 to 25 cents, according to the different articles on which the duty is levied. First, what amount of increased revenue does the hon. gentleman expect to obtain?

Mr. BOWELL. I am taking 1884 as the basis of my calculations, because the hon. gentleman knows that the disturbance in trade during the last three or four months, and the general impression being abroad that for various reasons the duties upon spirits would be raised, thereby inducing a large number of merchants to make entries of their goods, it would scarcely be fair to take the importations for the year ending 1885 as a basis. In 1884 the country was in a normal condition so far as regards the revenue. Of brandy there was imported and entered for consumption 247,156 gallons, the duty on which will be increased from \$1.45 to \$2. Gin of all kinds, 418,329 gallons, at \$1.32½. Rum, 124,616 gallons, at \$1.32½. Whiskey, 166,544 gallons, at \$1.32½. Unenumerated spirits, 523 gallons, at \$1.32½, which duties we propose to increase to \$1.75 per gallon. The increases of duty would, if the same

quantities were entered for consumption, be in round figures \$291,755.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is your calculation for this year?

Mr. BOWELL. We do not calculate on receiving this year more than \$150,000, and perhaps \$80,000 from brandy, for the reasons I have already indicated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you expect to obtain about \$200,000.

Mr. BOWELL. From \$175,000 to \$200,000. It may possibly be more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nobody will have any objection to these articles yielding as large a revenue as can possibly be obtained from them. The question the Government must consider is to what extent those heavy duties will promote adulteration and smuggling. So far as regards the inland waters there is not, I presume, much danger; but as regards the Maritime Provinces we know there is a certain amount of smuggling going on.

Mr. VAIL. No. It is charged against us sometimes; but there is none.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I think the circumstances have altered within the last half dozen years, or perhaps the people have all become such strong advocates of the Scott Act that they have set their faces against such liquors. As regards brandy, from which most revenue is expected to be obtained, I fancy a good deal will be smuggled in down in the Maritime Provinces. How do these duties compare with the duties levied in the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. In the United States the duty is \$2 per gallon on the whole. We considered that question when we fixed this rate of duty. The question of smuggling was one that entered into consideration, and I presume just so long as there is a difference of duty and articles can be brought in there will be smuggling. The principal smuggling that has taken place into the Maritime Provinces has been from St. Pierre.

On resolution 4, Spirits and tobacco.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On this item how much do you expect to get?

Mr. BOWELL. About \$60,000, thus making a deduction for entries that may possibly have been made from warehouse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has said nothing about one point to which I alluded, that these duties are undoubtedly somewhat absolutely larger, though not relatively larger, on imported spirits than on spirits manufactured here. There can be no doubt that the skill of the manufacturer has enabled him to convert native produce into tolerable or intolerable brandy, gin and other spirits. The hon. gentleman no doubt does not speak from practical experience, but perhaps some of his colleagues could advise him on that question.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose you are speaking from practical experience.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is that risk going on in increasing the duties, that the more you increase them the more likely they will be to turn round and produce an imitation of the foreign article, and it strikes me the hon. gentleman had not got to a point where the temptation will be considerable.

Mr. BOWELL. That is true, but it is hoped by a rigid enforcement of the provisions of the Adulteration Act, we will be able to put a stop to that adulteration, as far as possible. I believe what the hon. gentleman says to be

quite correct. There are a number of establishments in every city and town in the country where in their own cellars they manufacture from spirits, brandy, gin, and other medicinal cordials I will call them—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Pain killers.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I would not use that word, I think they generally have the opposite effect, particularly when adulterated. The intention of the Department is, as far as possible, to put the Adulteration Act rigidly in force, and more particularly is that necessary when the Department has come to the conclusion that whiskey shall not be allowed to go into consumption for some years after it is made, in order that some of the deleterious matter in it may evaporate. To be consistent with that policy, it will be necessary for the Government to enforce the Act providing against the adulteration of food and other articles. As to the reason we have put liquors as high as we have, we do not expect of course to increase the revenue very much on that point, relatively. But in the United States, where the production is so very large, as no doubt the hon. gentleman is well aware, the manufacturers are allowed to export from bond, without the payment of any Excise duty, and the combination existing among the distillers of the United States, give an additional bonus to the exporters of liquor in order to keep their own market, thus enabling American manufacturers to export to this country at rates so low that unless you put a high duty upon it, they can afford to send it in and pay the duty, thus preventing the consumption of the home made article which would of course decrease the revenue to that extent. That is one reason which induced the Government to raise the duty so high—to prevent if possible the importation of this liquor through the Customs at a rate which would drive the Canadian article out of the market, and thus decrease the Revenue from Excise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The American duty is only \$1, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. It is 90 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the hon. gentleman is right—it is 90 cents on the Winchester measure, and ours is Imperial; so it is about \$1 for the purpose of comparison.

On paragraph 5, resolution 4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know what revenue is expected to be derived from this, which will of course come into effect on a much larger quantity than of the preceding sections.

Mr. BOWELL. The revenue collected for 1884 was \$3,608,246, that is at \$1 per gallon. I am now speaking of the quantities entered for consumption. At \$1.30 per gallon, it would give an additional revenue of \$1,082,473, but we do not anticipate this year obtaining anything like that revenue for reasons that I need not repeat, as the hon. gentleman knows them and called the attention of the House to them a short time ago—that is, that very large entries of this particular article have been made all over the country. We may, however, I think, calculate on getting, during the coming year, at least half that amount of revenue and the year following. If the amounts entered for consumption are equal to those of 1884, they would yield an additional revenue of over \$1,000,000. Perhaps if we succeeded in obtaining \$500,000 this year, it will be as much as we ought to expect. There is very little duty collected on malt liquors—that which is manufactured of molasses upon which a difference of 2 to 3 cents per gallon is provided for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course I have no objection to getting all the revenue we can extract from

this particular article. But, as the hon. gentleman is well aware, the experience of United States authorities led them to doubt whether it was quite safe to have the duties upon whiskey more than about \$1 per gallon. They had it as high as \$2 per gallon—

Mr. BOWELL. That was a war tax.

Mr. SCRIVER. It was \$3, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that paid in currency? They made a series of experiments, and tried to reach the highest revenue producing point, which they finally concluded to be something like a dollar. Now, the hon. gentleman, in putting this on, has no doubt made himself more or less acquainted with the possibilities of our increasing illicit distillation. At one time there was a good deal of danger that that would be on the increase, but whether it be due to the vigilance of the Inland Revenue Department or to the spread of temperance principles I am not prepared to say, but I believe of late years the Department has not been much troubled with illicit distillation. Still there is always an additional risk if you largely increase the duty on whiskey. Has the hon. gentleman anything to say on that particular subject as to the present condition of illicit distillation of whiskey throughout the country?

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the Minister of Inland Revenue would be able to give more information on that point than I can; but my impression is, as the hon. gentleman says, that we have not been so much troubled of late years as formerly. When the Excise duty was much lower than it is now, there was quite as much illicit distillation as there has been of late, the vigilance of the officers having been such as to almost prevent the possibility of its going on. Now and again a still has been discovered in somebody's cellar, but the quantities manufactured have been very small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course there is the risk also—although it is not by any means so serious, I believe—of smuggling from the United States to be taken into account. Now, I would like to know what decision the Government have come to with respect to certain large sums of money which have been lately tendered them in payment of duty. I understand that within the last few days as large a payment as \$340,000 was tendered by one firm, the firm of Gooderham & Co., in Toronto. It was stated that the Government had decided to refuse all payments of duty. I would like to have an authentic statement from the Minister of Customs on that point.

Mr. BOWELL. When I moved that the House should go into committee two or three days ago, I was about to rise to make the statement, but the hon. leader of the Opposition rose before I could get the floor, the late debate intervened, and so I was prevented from making the statement. But as soon as the House was moved into Committee of Ways and Means, I instructed the Commissioner to take the usual precautions and the telegraph offices were taken possession of to this extent, not to send anything over the wires affecting the Tariff; and as it was proposed that the resolutions should take effect on and after the 6th of the month, the tenders of entry to which the hon. gentleman has referred come under the provisions of the law, and the parties will have to pay the duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another matter to which I regret to have to call the attention of the Government and the House. I saw in the newspapers also—though I have no personal knowledge of the subject—the statement that the bonded warehouses in the Province of Quebec were pretty nearly cleaned out before the change, whereas they were not elsewhere. If that should turn out to be correct, it would seem as if there had been

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

leakages somewhere, by which some party had profited. Can the hon. Minister say what he knows with respect to that?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not heard of the rumor that the warehouses in the Province of Quebec have been emptied. What I have heard is that certain parties in that province telegraphed to a distiller in Prescott to draw upon them to pay the duty upon a certain number of cars of whiskey and to ship it. Of course if that were done it would come under the meaning of this provision, and the distiller would have to pay the full amount of the duty. Whether the warehouses to which the hon. gentleman has referred are empty or not, I am not able to say. We have no knowledge of it in the Customs Department, although I may frankly tell the hon. gentleman that I had made no enquiry into that yesterday or to-day, as after sitting in the House until four o'clock in the morning, I had not time.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may state for the information of the hon. gentleman that I have received telegrams from all parts of the Dominion complaining that that privilege was refused.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue acquaint us at the next stage with the facts of the matter as shown by the returns. They could very easily give us the quantity of spirits in bond in the Province of Quebec, say on the 1st of July, and also on the morning of the 6th.

Mr. BOWELL. We will do so as far as possible. The hon. gentleman knows that the returns are only made quarterly to us, and we shall have to make special application to the different ports for the information. I can ascertain from the principal ports.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a matter in connection with this increased duty on spirits as to which I think the committee are fairly entitled to have some information. It seems to me the whole course of the Government with reference to this matter has been one of the most extraordinary it is possible to conceive of. During the month of May the Minister of Inland Revenue put a notice on the Order Paper, stating among other things that it was his intention to introduce resolutions, one of which was to ask the House to give the Governor in Council power to impose an additional duty of 5 cts. a gallon on spirits. What was the result of that notice? In the month of May no less than \$1,140,970 were paid in Excise duty on spirits, while in the corresponding month of the previous year but \$280,217 were paid. It would appear that, by the notice given by the Minister of Inland Revenue to the manufacturers of spirits in this country, 860,756 extra gallons of spirits were taken out of bond; and now the Government come down with a proposition to impose 30 cts. a gallon increased duty on whiskey. Now, what has the Government, through the instrumentality of the Minister of Inland Revenue, done? By giving that warning they have deprived this country of the revenue of 30 cts. a gallon on 860,000 gallons of spirits; in other words, the country has lost \$250,000 of revenue; and for whose benefit? For those who consume the whiskey, or for the general public? No, but for the benefit of one or two distilling firms in this country. That has been the result of their operation, and it is certainly the most remarkable piece of legislation that I think has ever been brought before the Canadian Parliament. If there had been no notice given to those distillers, as following the precedents there should not have been, but if this matter had been dealt with as the Minister of Customs is now dealing with it, when after the horses are stolen, he takes credit for having taken possession of the wires and not allowing the distillers to get any benefit from the change, as they did before, the country would have been the gainer to the extent of \$250,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has charged the Government with having taken \$250,000 out of the pockets of the people.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Prevented it going in.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is not consistent with the facts of the case. It is true that a proposition was made to provide for an additional 5 cents a gallon on whiskey. That was a distinct proposition to make up the loss we expected to sustain in allowing distillers the benefit of the shrinkage. It had nothing to do with the policy of increasing the Tariff. The hon. gentleman complained that in consequence of that notice, the distillers withdrew 800,000 gallons more than they would have drawn out under ordinary circumstances. Well, the most of what was taken out has gone into consumption, and on the small portion left we will lose the increased duty now imposed, 30 cents per gallon; but does the hon. gentleman pretend that any Government can control so closely the relations between the public and the Department, that the distillers may not draw out more liquor than is absolutely required for consumption.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. What does the hon. gentleman mean with his "hear, hear." Is there any signification in it or is it merely from habit. Does he approve or disapprove what I have said. What is to prevent the distillers, knowing that there was a probability of an increase in the Tariff, removing their goods in bond. They have simply shown their good judgment; no Government can prevent speculation of that kind. On the other hand, we find that except on the morning of the 6th May, no attempt was made to remove spirits. On that morning several applications were made to remove liquor from bonded warehouses but they were rejected and the duty will be collected on all these goods.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Inland Revenue has given no explanation of the fact that there was \$860,756 more paid in Excise duty in May this year than in May of last, or of any of the previous years. The House went into committee in March, and it was then given to understand that all the Tariff changes that were to be made were then proposed. Who ever supposed Tariff resolutions would be introduced in March and not concurred in in July? It would be fairly inferred by everybody that, as soon as the resolutions were published, any article that escaped extra taxation would be held over until the next Session. The troubles broke out subsequent to the resolution, and it is strange that the fears of the distillers were not awakened until the time the Minister put this notice on the paper. Hostilities broke out in March, but their fears were not then aroused. How is it that at the time the Minister gave this notice, there was this sudden increase in the amount of goods taken out of bond and duty paid? The notice does not read that the increase of 5 cents was to cover shrinkage or evaporation; the notice was one that shrewd men would act upon, seeing that there was a probability of 5 cents a gallon being imposed. Whether the object was to bring in revenue for that month I do not know, but that these 860,000 gallons extra of spirits removed were for immediate consumption it evidently could not be, because that quantity is more than sufficient for three months consumption, and it would have remained in bond but for the action of the Government. The Government, if they had imposed their duty when they should, would have had 30 cents a gallon on these 860,000 gallons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the least we can say about the matter is this: that there has been very great carelessness and laxity on the part of the Government with respect to imposing this duty. Every body knew well long before the month of May that the expenses

in the North-West were going to reach several millions; and, but for the fortunate fact that the rebellion was suppressed a good deal earlier than might have been expected, the expenditure would have been very much heavier even than the amount named by the hon. the Minister of Customs. Under these circumstances, it was the height of imprudence for the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Government, if they knew, as I conclude they must have known by that time, it would be necessary to provide additional ways and means, to give a notice which they must have known would have the effect of startling all the manufacturers through the country and inducing them to take all they possibly could out of bond. It is clear from what has since occurred that had the same ordinary vigilance been used at an earlier period as was used the other day, this \$300,000 would have gone into the Treasury. All through April we were in possession of facts which showed that the expenditure would be enormous, and it was not asking too much of the Government to have made up their minds then as to what they would do. It appears to me their object may have been twofold. I do not at all mean to say that they desired to give any benefit to the manufacturers of whiskey, but they did desire, I fear, to add largely to the revenues for the current year, without paying much regard to the cost at which it was done or to the effect on the future year. That I believe they did, and, without duly calculating the probable effects of their proposition, they gave on the 7th May this notice, which has to all intents and purposes resulted in a loss of about \$265,000. It is not evident, as the Minister of Inland Revenue says, that this need necessarily have gone into consumption. In the first place, 1,000,000 gallons is much more than a month's consumption. Our consumption every month is only about 200,000 or 300,000 gallons, and, without special disturbing cause, these distillers would never have paid in \$860,000, to which my hon. friend referred. So that falls to the ground. The whiskey has not gone into consumption, and besides, prior to May, the Government were in possession of information which would have warranted them in anticipating the necessary increase of taxes, and putting it on at that time, and they know very well, that, no matter what business was engaging the attention of the House, room and place would have been given to them at a moment's notice for the purpose of imposing this duty at any time. It is clear that very serious loss has been incurred by the public and by the Treasury which need not have been incurred. A little exercise of common prudence, a little exercise of common diligence would have enabled the Government to save this \$260,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It appears to me that the effect of the notice ought to have been quite different from what the hon. gentlemen opposite say. The notice given on the 7th May was quite clear, allowing an abatement on spirits and allowing the Governor in Council to add 5 cents on each gallon and to prohibit spirits being entered for duty for a certain specified time after manufacture. It is quite clear that the distillers were not frightened by the imposition of the 5 cents, and that they did not make a rush for the sake of saving that 5 cents. If we declare that we are going to put 25 cents on any article I think that would not be taken by the trade as a notice that we were going to put on 50 cents afterwards. It would rather be taken as an intimation that that was the amount of duty the Government intended to put on, and would have the effect of quieting the apprehensions of the manufacturers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why did it work the way it did?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To say you are going to put 5 cents on is not likely to alarm them with the idea that you are going to put on 30 cents. But they began to

calculate for themselves; they knew there had been a great deal of expenditure—war expenditure and other expenditure—and they were wise in their generation and saved so much by the transaction; but certainly this 5 cents could not have been a warning to them that they were to be charged 30 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt the distillers were wise in their generation and the Government were not. The point I made was that, as it was perfectly clear as long ago as the early part of April that there would be a tremendously heavy expenditure in the North-West, and as it was perfectly clear to me, and I have no doubt to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the revenue this year and next year would fall short of the calculation, they ought to have known that it was desirable then to take precautions, and it is clear that by taking these ordinary precautions they might have caught these 860,000 gallons, which were taken out so unusually and needlessly in the month of May. It is quite clear that the Government, if they had looked beyond, might have saved this \$260,000, and that they did not do it because they were less wise in their generation than the victuallers. Everyone saw the facts. They were clear enough. I know that the effect of the notice given by the Minister of Inland Revenue was probably simply to intensify the fears of the distillers and call their attention a little more to the position they were in. I strongly suspect, from what I have heard, that several of them, at any rate, believed that this notice, when it came to be acted on would be reinforced by an additional duty, just as, in point of fact, has happened, and that is why they took it out; but it is clear that the same sources of information which were open to these distillers, and which induced them to take a million of gallons out of bond in May, were open to the First Minister and to his colleagues; and by exercising the same foresight and diligence as the distillers, we might have been better off by \$260,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is something in the statement of the hon. gentleman, but not in the statement of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) who said that the notice that 5 cts. was to be imposed proved that 30 cts. would be imposed. The line taken by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) is quite different. His is a legitimate argument, but that was not the argument of the hon. gentleman behind him. Look at England. Just now, there has been a very large expenditure in the Soudan and in Egypt, and I do not think there was very great haste in Mr. Gladstone to put on the duties, and in fact the amount was expended a year before he thought of increasing the duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am sorry that my views are so little considered by the First Minister. He is complimentary to the hon. member for South Huron, and of course we know he is always complimentary to that hon. gentleman. There is this remarkable coincidence to be observed that, coincident with this notice being given in May, there is \$1,000,000 more revenue derived from a class of men who are not in the habit of paying money to allow it to lie idle. If the 5 cents additional duty would not do it, then the prohibition of spirits being entered for a certain time after manufacture would tend in the same direction. The whole notice tended in that direction, and the Minister will not venture to say of his own knowledge that the distillers were not operated upon by that notice. To suppose that they had a hint given them that there was to be an increase would be to suppose something dishonorable in the working of the Department, and that cannot be tolerated. Neither can we suppose that this was caused by the war expenses, because the resolutions had been submitted in March and April and had passed without causing any alarm, nor was there any alarm until May, when this notice appeared. I say unhesitatingly, in my opinion, that it was

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that notice that led to the withdrawal of that amount of spirits from bond, and the withdrawal of that has led to a loss of revenue to this country of \$258,000.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman for Brant gave what, in his opinion, was a sufficient reason for this change in the revenue which induced the distillers to take a large quantity of spirits out of bond and pay nearly \$900,000 more than usual into the Treasury. The hon. gentleman for South Huron suggested another motive which may have operated. He is rather inclined to agree with the First Minister's view. The First Minister says that the distillers knew that there was a large increase in the public expenditure, that the Government must impose more duties and increase the taxation, and what more obvious than that an additional duty should be placed on distilled liquors, and in order to escape those duties they took this large quantity out of bond during the month of May. Well, the hon. gentleman says they were wise in their generation. Then how is it the Ministry were not equally wise?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have heard of that before.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt he has, and the hon. gentleman may have heard it before he came into the House at all. It has been suggested that the distillers heard of it, too, and from official sources: that they derived their information from the Department. Now, there are three considerations presenting themselves. There is the consideration suggested by the hon. gentleman from Brant; there is the First Minister's statement, that these men say that the Government would probably increase the duties on liquors; and there is the third suggestion, that these men must have had information. They were not likely to pay \$870,000 into the Treasury in a month, beyond what they would have had to pay, unless they knew that the increased burden was going to fall upon them. The hon. gentleman admits that the 5 cents per gallon is not a motive that would have moved them to take that course. Then it is very doubtful whether the probabilities of an additional duty would have been a sufficient motive. There must have been something more certain, and that was private information that these duties were likely to be imposed. The hon. gentleman has given no sufficient reason for this course. If the Government intended to impose such duties, they were derelict in their duty in not making their proposition in May instead of July. How was it that the Government, knowing that it would be necessary to impose these duties, did not come down to Parliament in May and ask for power to impose them, and thus save the additional revenue that would have accrued? The hon. gentleman pleads that there was no dishonesty, no improper communication from the Department. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself has told us—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never said a word, one way or the other. I say that the hon. gentleman has no right to make such an insinuation, unless he can prove it. I can only tell him that the insinuation is altogether, in my belief, false and untrue.

Mr. MILLS. Well, Sir, there is the payment of \$870,000 which the hon. gentleman has not accounted for. There is some powerful motive operating upon the distillers. He says that the notice put by the Minister of Inland Revenue upon the Paper was not the motive which operated on these men. I ask him what it was, then?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman, as remarked by the First Minister, had no right to insinuate that any person in the Department had given secret information to the distillers, unless he was prepared to prove it. He insinuated that either the Minister, or some other person in the Department, had given information which ought not to have been given. I repeat that no member of this House

has a right to make an insinuation of that kind, unless he has something upon which to base it. I tell the hon. gentleman that no one in the Department knew anything about this, except the Ministers themselves and the two deputy heads. It was kept scrupulously from every clerk. The hon. gentleman either insinuates that the Ministers had perjured themselves in revealing their intention, or that some employé of the Government had done that which would merit instant dismissal. For myself, I care very little about his insinuations. A man's reputation, where he has lived all his life, should be sufficient to answer an insinuation of that kind. But I must congratulate the Opposition on the fact that two of their financial critics, the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for Bothwell, entirely differ from the ex-Finance Minister. Well, that is a matter that they must settle among themselves. I think from the ex-Minister's experience and knowledge of the working of the tariff he is just as likely to judge correctly of the effects likely to be produced upon businessmen as the hon. member for Brant or the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why was not the same course pursued with regard to the 5 cents duty as with regard to the 30 per cent. ?

Mr. BOWELL. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. A few years ago, when the Finance Minister was about making his Budget Speech, and it was known all over the country that the Government were going to raise the duties on various articles, this same firm of Gooderham & Worts paid into the Treasury, on the very morning of the day the Budget Speech was delivered, about half a million dollars duty upon liquor they had in stock. Well, to their disgust, certainly to their disappointment, there was no rise upon whiskey at all. You might as well ask why they did that. They did it, I presume, for the same reason that induced them to make the last entry. For the reason given by the member for South Huron, no extra duty was imposed, and the result was that the individuals lost by it. As to the question asked by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), why the same course was not pursued, let me say that the impost of 5 cents per gallon upon whiskey was to compensate, as stated in the notice, for the evaporation which would take place in case the liquor remained in bond 12 months. When liquor is put in bond, evaporation takes place to the extent of 5 to 10 per cent., but the holders are obliged to pay duty on the quantity of liquor which was gauged when it was placed in bond. The proposition of the Inland Revenue Department is, that in order to preserve the equilibrium there should be an impost of 5 cents a gallon. So that if the liquor was in bond for one year, instead of paying a duty of \$1, they would pay 94 cents, and this extra 5 cents was imposed to compensate to a certain extent for the loss of revenue which would arise by reason of the evaporation. The longer they kept the liquor in bond the greater would be the proportion, and consequently the less Excise duty they would have to pay.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They would escape payment of the 5 cents, all the same.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They pay the usual duty. If they kept the liquor over one year there was a reduction of 6 cents, but if they did not keep it over one year the 5 cents provision would apply.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The notice given did not state what the provisions would be with respect to the duty, and it was not until the matter had been discussed and there had been questioning and cross-questioning that the committee learned from the Minister in charge what the proposal was. If it was intended to cover shrinkage, it was unfortunate that the notice was not so worded as to make that apparent. There was nothing, however, in the notice, to

show that this was for evaporation. I therefore maintain, in face of all the explanations that have been attempted, that 660,000 gallons of spirits were taken out of bond which should have paid 30 cents a gallon additional duty and given to the revenue of the country about \$250,000. When the full facts in regard to the quantity taken out are known, it will be found that upwards of \$200,000 have been lost to this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister is not quite correct in saying that there is conflict between the arguments addressed by the hon. member for Brant and myself. They are cumulative arguments. They mean that the distilleries were influenced by certain considerations. Just at the moment when people were most influenced by those considerations, which were apparent to every business man and to every politician, came the notice of 7th May, by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and considering the condition of affairs, the manufacturers withdrew 800,000 or 900,000 gallons. My hon. friend is quite right, and I am quite right, and the Minister is quite wrong; and this is quite clear, that \$275,000 which should now have been in the Treasury is in the pockets of two or three large firms, who, by their foresight and tact, obtained the benefit.

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

#### After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 4, spirits and tobacco,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the Minister of Customs to say that he expected an increased revenue from this proposed 30 per cent. of \$1,082,000 on a total of \$3,608,000.

Mr. BOWELL. I said that would be the increase if the Excise entries for home consumption were as great as they were in 1884, but from the fact of large entries being made throughout the country, we did not expect more than half a million this year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood that, but under ordinary circumstances that we might count on \$1,082,000 of increased revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, as compared with 1884, \$1,082,484.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see the Minister has put on the 30 cents a gallon only to make up that amount of increased revenue. It will be necessary for him, in Committee of Ways and Means, to introduce the resolution imposing the additional 5 cents, of which notice was given by the Minister of Inland Revenue, to make up for the shrinkage.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not proposed to introduce that resolution, as it is thought that the 30 cents additional per gallon will be quite sufficient to meet the loss occurring in that way. The hon. gentleman understands that we cannot affect the present year's revenue to any appreciable extent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the Minister's calculation of increased revenue is all wrong, because the 5 cents was to make up for the loss, and if it is not imposed the Minister is simply putting on 25 cents increased duty. That is not carrying out what was promised by the Minister of Inland Revenue. Then again, if this is not done, I ask the Minister what amount of protection he proposes to give to the distillers of this country? He is raising the Customs duty higher in proportion than he is raising the Excise, and if the 5 cents is not to be put on, what amount of protection is he to give the three or four distillers of this country?

Of course, the Minister understands that the protection is the difference between the Customs and the Excise duty, less the amount of duty on the corn they import, and he is giving them a vast increase of protection, when what they had before was thought to be ample.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is correct, basing his argument on the supposition that all the spirits which will be entered for consumption would first have remained in bond for twelve months, in order to enable them to take advantage of the shrinkage. But that cannot possibly arise until next year, and that going into consumption will be of the same quality as that which has gone into consumption in the past. If, however, hereafter, they enter any spirits for consumption, except that which has been in bond for twelve months, and they take advantage of the shrinkage, which, of course, they will, if it is in bond, it would reduce it to that extent. Still, the hon. gentleman will see that it will add just that much to the revenue, which will be a still greater protection to that extent to the article produced in the country. From the revenue standpoint, it will be collected from Excise rather than Customs; I do not know that it makes any particular difference. If the foreign spirit is kept out, and a larger quantity is manufactured here, the revenue will profit to that extent.

Mr. BLAKE. When the proposition was brought forward, awhile ago, for the drawback or discount, we were told that 5 cents increase of duty was to be made as a compensation. The Ministerial proposition was, of course, considered; I presume it was not bungled and that it was accurate and well weighed. If so, it was thought necessary then to impose 5 cents, in order to compensate for the expected loss of revenue, by virtue of the operation of the proposition of the Bill which has gone through the House; otherwise, the Ministerial proposition was ill-advised and mistaken. They told us the plan was a complete one, whereby certain allowances were to be made to the distillers to compensate them for the increase of duty. One was to balance the other. Now, what the hon. gentleman says is that very little of that 5 cents will be used during this year, and, no doubt, less this year than in future years, and it will not be necessary then. If we are to calculate for some time, very little will be used, and then we must assume that it was a premature proposition altogether to have suggested this 5 cents duty, to publish it in the papers, as it was for weeks, before the discussion in the House. Now it is dropped, apparently on the theory that it will not be wanted for a good while, and it will be time enough to put it on when the revenue requires it. Now, that was not the view taken the other day in discussing this question. At first the Minister of Inland Revenue was disposed to take that view, but my hon. friend from Brant explained that evaporation would be going on, and he acknowledged that something would have to be done to remedy that difficulty. Then I think we should learn from the Minister what the real gist of his proposition is with regard to the protection. As I understand, the distillers are at present a close corporation, agreed with one another, and they have fixed a scale of prices, which are just about up to duty point, that is, just as high as the duty will permit the distillers to place them, and avoid the importation of foreign spirits. They are therefore taking the whole or nearly the whole advantage of their protection, which is in the neighborhood of 30 cents on the gallon. If I understand the present proposition, it adds about 50 per cent. to their protection, the difference in the Customs and the Excise being about 15 cents a gallon: and the distillers, owing to their small numbers and their agreement, are a practical monopoly, and take the full advantage of the protection. The practical result of that is that the revenue does not gain to the amount of the Customs duty, but only to the amount of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the Excise duty. Of course, we know that certain kinds of spirits will be imported from time to time, and in that respect the revenue will make some gain; but the vast mass of the revenue will be regulated by the Excise, and not by the Customs duty. The result of making such a large increase in the Customs over the Excise duty will be to increase the price to the consumer without increasing the compensation to the revenue to the same extent; and the price being increased to the consumer to that extent, there will be those temptations to smuggling and illicit distillation which have been mentioned more than once in connection with the raising of the duty on spirits. I do not know of any article of consumption which is better calculated to bear a share of the public burdens than this very article, and I have always favored placing the duties as high as practical revenue purposes would permit; but it seems to me that the hon. gentleman's combined proposition of increasing so much the Customs duty relative to the Excise duty will incur a considerable danger from smuggling and illicit distillation beyond that which would be incurred if he kept the Customs duty down to something more nearly approaching the Excise. I should be glad to learn from the hon. gentleman whether I am substantially correct in my view as to the increased protection his proposition produces.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think there is any difficulty in arriving at the amount of protection given by looking at the figures. We increase the Excise duty 30 cents, and the Customs duty from  $32\frac{1}{2}$  to 75 cents; so that the increase in the protection would be just the difference between the two, which would be about 50 cents. But, as I explained this afternoon, there is no protection to that extent.

Mr. BLAKE. On account of the corn.

Mr. BOWELL. Not so much on account of the 5 per cent duty on corn, although that does reduce it, but on account of the system that prevails in the United States, of granting a bonus on exportations; so that the duty does not afford the amount of protection which it apparently does on its face. Under the  $32\frac{1}{2}$  cents, there was really no protection at all, considering the price in the United States. However, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman's argument is in favor of having cheap whiskey in this country, or of enabling the importers to bring in the foreign article, in order that that might be consumed at a cheaper rate than that manufactured in this country. As I understand, he complains that we fix the duty on the foreign article too high, thus giving a greater market to the home producer, while we collect less duty than would be collected from Customs duty if it was a little lower—in other words, that we should collect more from Customs duties at a lower rate, and less from Excise. The intention of the Government in these resolutions is to put the Excise duty just as high as they thought the article could bear, so as to prevent illicit distillation, which has gone on in the past and may go on in the future, and to place just as high a duty on the imported article as they thought it could possibly bear, without encouraging smuggling to any greater extent than it is carried on at present.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand, the Minister has abandoned the 5 cents a gallon to cover evaporation; nevertheless, he allows 5 cents a gallon on the evaporation, which virtually makes the increase in the Excise duty 25 cents a gallon. The home manufactured article will then be \$1.25 a gallon and the foreign imported liquor will be \$1.75. The Minister will see at once that there is a protection of 50 cents a gallon given to the distiller.

Mr. BOWELL. Less the duty on corn.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under the old tariff he had  $32\frac{1}{2}$  cents a gallon of protection, and that worked very well. As the hon. member for West Durham pointed out,

under that protection it has been charged that a ring has been formed and high prices have been obtained. But the Minister is now giving them an advantage of 18 cents a gallon above what they had before. From that is simply to be taken the amount of the duty on corn. I am told by a gentleman, who seems to know, that the product of a bushel of corn is something like four gallons of whiskey. If that is so, the duty on the corn would amount to only about 2 cents a gallon. So that it seems to me it would be safe to leave the duty on the imported article where it is now, and to increase the Excise duties above the point at which the Government are fixing them. The 5 cents a gallon which the Minister proposes to allow for evaporation might be quite safely put on, and the distiller left with more protection than he had before; for even with that 5 cents on, which would raise the duty 35 cents, the distiller would have a protection of  $33\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. It is no part of the Government's business, nor are they, I suppose, attempting unduly to enrich anybody in trade through the operation of their tariff. As I understand, what they do is to give those in trade a chance to carry on their operations, but not to give them a vastly enriching monopoly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The amount of protection given to the distillers is not as great as the hon. gentleman represents it to be. Perhaps he overlooks the fact that the present Bill, or the Bill that passed shortly before this one, provides for the sale in this country of whiskey that shall be aged before it can be taken out of bond—shall be kept in the wood for not less than one year. Of course the 5 cents of which he speaks, that was proposed to be asked for to compensate for the percentage allowed for shrinkage, but which is not now asked for, should not be added to the protection given to Canadian distillers; because, to-day, in the United States and in England, that percentage is allowed the distillers there. The difference in favor of Canadian distillers before this change, was as between \$1.02 and 1.03 cents, and \$1.32 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents Customs; now it is changed to \$1.30, \$1.32 and \$1.33 Excise and \$1.75 Customs. The advantage to the Canadian distiller, under the old system, was, generally speaking,  $32\frac{1}{2}$  cents; the same calculation would be to-day  $42\frac{1}{2}$  cents. The hon. gentleman ought not to count the 5 cents at all, because that the American distiller gets to-day. Before recess, the hon. gentleman stated he did not charge exactly that the intention of the Government, in giving that notice, was to warn distillers that an increased tax was going to be put on spirits for revenue purposes, and that they took advantage of the notice to take out large quantities of whiskey. I explained then that it was not a question of increasing the revenue, but simply a calculation of what was necessary to offset the percentage allowed for shrinkage. The leader of the Opposition told us it was clearly understood, when the Bill was brought in, that the 5 cents power to levy which was asked was to make up that deficiency caused by shrinkage. Then the hon. gentleman stated that, when the Bill was passing through, I said this 5 cents extra, when we went into Committee of Ways and Means, would be asked for. Well, I did not say it would be asked for in any particular way. The hon. gentleman questioned me closely upon it. I said the duty would be less this 5 cents, but that when the question came up we would deal with it in such a way that there would be no loss on that account. Suppose we decided to increase the duty 18 cents or 20 cents, what was there to prevent us adding this 5 cents to that, so as to make up the difference.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When I alluded to the notice of the hon. gentleman, I said the Minister had informed us, when in committee on the resolutions, that his intention was to cover the loss by evaporation by this 5 cents. But we did not understand that until then, and to-day the Minister is not doing that. He has departed from that now, and we have the plain declaration that the policy of the Govern-

ment is to get 30 cents a gallon more by way of Excise. The Minister knows it will take 5 cents to make up the shrinkage, so that the Government policy is not being carried out. The hon. gentleman's argument is somewhat plausible, with reference to the amount of protection to the distillers. He said that on the other side this shrinkage was allowed, and therefore the American distillers had the benefits of it, while our distillers had not. But I suppose that system has prevailed over there for many years, so that the circumstances are not altered in the least by that. The distiller, when he had  $32\frac{1}{2}$  cents protection, was at an equal disadvantage, by not being allowed that shrinkage reduction, as he is to-day, and the circumstances being the same, there is still the 18 cents per gallon additional protection.

Mr. BOWELL. The protection is not so great as it appears upon the face of it. The present Excise duty is \$1; add 30 cents to that makes 30 per cent. additional. Take the \$1.32 Customs duty now levied on whiskey and calculate 30 per cent. on that, will give within a fraction of 40 cents additional; that will make a total of \$1.72 $\frac{1}{2}$ , so that the difference of protection is the difference between \$1.72 $\frac{1}{2}$  and \$1.75. When the Minister of Inland Revenue placed his resolution upon the Notice Paper, stating the intention of the Government to add 5 cents per gallon to make up the loss by shrinkage, the question of raising the Excise duty upon the manufacturer of spirits in this country was not then decided upon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wanted, on the last resolution, to draw the attention of the Minister to the increase on manufactured tobacco from 12 cents to 20 cents. No one on this side, that I am aware of, has any objection to the increased duty on tobacco or spirits. I think they are fair objects on which to levy revenue, and the Minister is perfectly justified in getting what he can out of them, consistently with preventing illicit distillation and smuggling, and other evils. But in 1883 Sir Leonard Tilley, the Finance Minister, delayed his Budget for a long time, and, when he introduced it, gave as his reason for the delay that changes were being made in the United State tariff of Customs that would have a material bearing upon legislation in this country, and he had to wait until those changes were announced, in order to frame legislation to meet them. The proposition was before Congress on the 3rd March, but did not reach him till the 16th. They proposed to reduce the Excise duty on manufactured tobacco from 16 to 8 cents, and he said in that case we should do the same. He made this statement:

"I may state here, that owing to the fact that the United States have reduced the Excise duty on tobacco and snuff from 16 cents to 8 cents per pound, the Government found it an absolute necessity, for many reasons—although there are other articles on which they would rather relieve the people from taxation—to reduce our duty on tobacco made from foreign leaf from 20 cents to 12 cents."

He found it an absolute necessity for many reasons. He gave us the reasons in the opening part of that speech, when he used these words:

"One proposition alone was, that tobacco should be reduced from 16 cents to 8 cents a pound; another proposition was that it should be removed entirely. If either of these propositions carried, it would become necessary for the Parliament of Canada, for the purpose of preventing illicit trade, protecting the honest trader and protecting our own manufacturing industries, that our duties should be reduced in proportion to the reduction made in the United States. Therefore, if the proposition to reduce the duty 8 cents per pound on tobacco were adopted, it would necessitate a reduction in Canada which would involve \$750,000."

I would ask the Minister is not the Excise duty in the United States now what it was in March, 1883, and here we are proposing to put on this 8 cents, when the Finance Minister told us it was absolutely necessary to take them off, to prevent illicit trading, protect the honest trader and protect our own manufacturing

industries. That is the difficulty I see in this proposition. The reasons urged by the Finance Minister were so strong at that time that Parliament listened to him, because he presented the matter as an absolute necessity. I believe the Excise duty on tobacco is precisely the same in the United States as it was in 1883, and now we are proposing to put our duty on again. How does the Minister propose now to prevent this illicit trade; and the other evils which the hon. gentleman said would surely and inevitably follow if we did not reduce to the same level as the United States did in 1883.

Mr. COSTIGAN. One of the principal objects of this change is to increase our revenue. At that time it was not a matter of such great importance as it is now. I recollect the statement of the Finance Minister at the time, and I remember the views he entertained. I have not forgotten it, nor had I ignored the importance of the point the hon. gentleman has just made, but I feel confident that the proposed duty can be collected. It is true that no change has been made in the United States, but I feel more satisfied than I did at that time in the capacity of the staff to collect the duties. Improvements are made from time to time, and especially is that the case with regard to tobacco. It has been brought under better control and under a better system of collection than at any previous time. Like everything else, experience leads to improvement. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the present system of collection is more successful than that of some years ago, because the Finance Minister calculated for a loss of some \$500,000 derived from tobacco, and no doubt we should have lost that quantity, according to the reduction made; but on account of a more perfect system of collection, under new regulations, we succeeded in reducing that loss to about one-half. I think that is a very good proof of the improvement in the system of collection. I am quite satisfied that the same thing will occur under the increased tariff now proposed. I do not think that we need fear the amount of smuggling that was feared some years ago. I am quite confident that this amount of revenue can be collected.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the total amount of increased revenue that is anticipated from all the changes proposed?

Mr. BOWELL. The total increase on tobacco, based upon the entries of 1884, would be \$773,376. We do not expect as much revenue in the Excise. I deduct from that \$60,000. The probabilities are, that we will not receive over \$516,000. That does not include cigars.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has some millions extra revenue, then.

Mr. BOWELL. I hope so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman's estimates be correct, although he will not receive next year that amount, he proposes to impose about two millions additional taxation.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; that is the calculation, based upon the importations of 1884.

The following resolutions were agreed to:—

1. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to repeal so much of schedule A of the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15, as imposes a duty of ten per cent. *ad valorem* on "endless felt for paper makers," and the following parts of 46 Victoria, chapter 13, intituled: "An Act further to amend the Tariff of Duties of Customs," viz.: Item 7 of section 2 and all of section 5 of the said Act, also to repeal section 9 of the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15, intituled: "An Act to alter the Duties of Customs and Excise," and to enact as follows:

1. In determining the dutiable value of goods, except when imported from Great Britain and Ireland, there shall be added to the cost, or the actual wholesale price, or fair market value, at the time of exportation, in the principal markets of the country from whence the same has been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transhipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

which shipment is made, either *in transitu* or direct to Canada, subject to such regulations as may be made by the Governor in Council, provided that in case of any dispute respecting the proper amount of such inland transportation charges, the Minister of Customs may determine the same, and his decision shall be final in that respect.

2. When any manufactured article is imported into Canada in separate parts, each such part shall be charged with the same rate of duty as the finished article on a proportionate valuation, and when the duty chargeable thereon is specific or specific and *ad valorem*, an average rate of *ad valorem* duty, equal to the specific or specific and *ad valorem* duty so chargeable, shall be ascertained and charged upon such parts of manufactures.

2. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to add partridge, prairie fowl and woodcock to the articles the exportation of which is prohibited by section 9 of the Act 46 Victoria, chapter 13.

3. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to amend items 18 and 20, section 2, of the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 39, relating to duties of Customs on sugar, as follows:—

1. By adding to the words "sugar" and "sugars," wherever they occur in said items 18 and 20, the words "raw" or "unrefined."

Also by adding thereto the following item, viz.: On refined sugar of all grades or standards, there shall be levied and collected a specific duty of one cent per pound, and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

3. Also to repeal the rates of duty now payable under schedule A, of the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15, intituled: "An Act to alter the duties of Customs and Excise," on Geneva gin, rum, whiskey, and unenumerated articles of like kinds, and on brandy, and to provide there shall be levied and collected on:

Geneva gin, rum, whiskey and unenumerated articles of like kinds, a specific duty of one dollar and seventy-five cents per Imperial gallon. On brandy, a specific duty of two dollars per Imperial gallon.

4. Also to repeal the specific duty of twenty cents per pound imposed on manufactured tobacco and snuff by item 61 of section 2 of the Act 46 Victoria, chapter 13, and to provide that the same be increased to thirty cents per pound.

These resolutions shall take effect on and after the 6th day of the present month of July.

4. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to repeal so much of sections 125 and 248 of the Act 46 Victoria, chapter 15, and of any Act or Acts amending the same, so far as the said sections or amendments thereto determine the Excise duties to be levied upon the respective articles hereinafter mentioned; and to provide that the Excise duties thereon shall hereafter be as follows:—

1. Upon spirits, as described in sub-section (a) of the above first cited section, one dollar and thirty cents.

2. Upon spirits, as described in sub-section (b) of the said section, one dollar and thirty-two cents.

3. Upon spirits, as described in section (c) of the said section, one dollar and thirty-three cents.

4. Upon all tobacco, as described in the first four paragraphs of the said section 248:

On every pound twenty cents.

Except that cigarettes or cut tobacco, when put up in packages weighing one-twentieth of a pound, or less, each shall pay a duty, now twenty, of thirty-five cents per pound, and damp or moist snuff, when containing over forty per cent. of moisture, when put up in packages of less than five pounds each, fourteen cents per pound, actual weight.

5. Upon tobacco, as described in the last paragraph of the said section 248, on every pound, five cents.

These resolutions shall take effect on and after the sixth day of the present month of July.

Resolutions to be reported.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons copies of despatches, correspondence and papers, having reference to the negotiations at Washington, with respect to the termination of the Fishery Clauses of the Treaty of Washington, during the year 1884, and to the present date, in 1885.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 9th July, 1885.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.  
(In the Committee.)

Customs..... \$800,395

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the reasons for the increases?

Mr. BOWELL. The increase of \$6,225 in Ontario is largely caused by the additional officers who had been found necessary at Suspension Bridge and Windsor. On the completion of the cantilever bridge the Canada Southern Railway required a full staff of officers at the port, the same as we have at Suspension Bridge. We had accordingly to increase the staff by six or seven officers. When the Canada Southern made its crossing opposite Windsor, instead of at Amherstburg, we had to put additional officers there. Their salaries, with small increases at different ports, explain the increase of \$6,225. That amount is, however, larger than the actual charge upon the revenue, because at the cantilever bridge at Clifton, I have adopted a new plan of payments, than were formerly made by the railway companies to different officers for extra services, and placed the amount to the credit of the Receiver General, and had therefore to add one or two additional officers at such points, and pay them out of the general fund. My reason for doing this is that I found that officers receiving extra pay were liable to become more the servants of the railway company, or steamboat company, than of the Department. The adoption of this plan involves the placing of a larger number of men at the points I have mentioned; but that is more than compensated for by the amount paid by the railway companies for what are termed extra services. The railways pay \$1,500 a year at the cantilever bridge, which amount now goes into the general fund. There is a decrease of \$325 in Quebec. In New Brunswick there is a decrease of \$2,205. In some of the outer ports I have found there are more men than are really needed, and as they are superannuated or die, I do not fill up the positions, except where officers are absolutely required.

Mr. WELDON. Where is the reduction in St. John?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a saving at St. John. The hon. gentleman will see that there has been a saving of \$450 at St. John. Macadam Junction, which was formerly a port, is now made an outport of St. John and the expenses transferred to St. John. The object in doing that was to bring that junction of the railway under the surveillance of the officers at St. John, they reporting to St. John instead of the office here. The gross reductions in the St. John office have been \$5,000; the increases amount to \$1,550, showing a net decrease of \$450, though much larger if the expenses of the Macadam Junction port of \$1,400 be deducted, as it should be for comparison.

Mr. WELDON. I notice that Grand Falls has been reduced \$2,185, and Woodstock increased \$2,335.

Mr. BOWELL. That is for the same reason, precisely, as in the case of Macadam Junction, so that the preventive officers along that line of railway report to Woodstock now instead of Grand Falls.

Mr. IRVINE. Are there any other changes in that district—shifting officers from one place to another?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of. I have no recollection of changing the officer from one place to another.

Mr. IRVINE. Does Mr. Beadle occupy the same place as he did last year?

Mr. BOWELL. He was moved up to the junction, nearer to the American boundary.

Mr. IRVINE. That is five miles nearer to the American boundary. Then the hon. gentleman says he shifted Mr. Kilburn, the preventive officer. What object was there in doing that?

Mr. BOWELL. The object was to prevent the hon. gentleman's friends carrying on their avocation, as far as

possible. In all these changes I acted on the recommendation of the special inspector, who made an inspection of all the ports along the line of the railway.

Mr. IRVINE. I do not say the hon. Minister has acted improperly; no doubt the inspector gave him good counsel. Nor do I find any fault with him for increasing Mr. Kilburn's salary, because he is a good officer, and he is on the road that leads to Woodstock, where most of the business is done. Nor do I find any fault with him for removing Mr. Beadle from Andover village, which is five miles from the American boundary, and placing him nearer the boundary. But living, as I do, within four miles of the American boundary, and knowing the geography and topography of the country, I ought to be able to give some valuable information. I know every road that crosses the international boundary; the whole frontier is settled, from the lower end of my county to the upper end; the roads lead in every direction, and smugglers are just as liable to go by one road as by another. Now, Mr. Schooley is sub-collector at Centreville, four miles from the American boundary, at \$300 a year, and on that road, where there are only a few houses, the Minister of Customs has appointed Mr. Kearney at \$200. I have pointed out before that this is wrong, and I point it out again, that these officers should not be on that road, as there is no necessity for them. It is a sheer waste of money. If the hon. gentleman looks at the returns he will find that last year only \$335, I think, was collected at that port of entry. It was not for preventing smuggling that Mr. Kearney was appointed.

Mr. BOWELL. If I remember, Mr. Kearney is situated at Florenceville. After the death of the officer at that point, Mr. Kearney was appointed in his place. I did not personally investigate the matter; I took it for granted that the inspectors knew where the officers should be placed, and when that vacancy occurred it was filled. It is not always best to place the officers exactly on the boundary line to detect smugglers.

Mr. IRVINE. Mr. Appleby's father was appointed there before New Brunswick entered the Union, and he was the only man appointed on that side of the river, outside of the town of Woodstock. And Mr. Schooley was appointed in his place, and instead of appointing an officer at Centreville it was thought by the Government that Florenceville was a better place. I think it is simply a wilful waste of money. Mr. Kearney was not appointed to prevent people from smuggling, as any person who understands the country knows.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very glad the only charge the hon. gentleman has against my Department of wilful, wasteful expenditure, resolves itself into the enormous sum of \$200, and that is for a preventive officer along one of the New Brunswick roads, not many miles from the Maine frontier. If I have never any greater sin to answer for, I will go out of office with a very clean record.

Mr. VAIL. The strongest charge is that a merchant doing business in the country fills the position of preventive officer and collector of Customs.

Mr. MITCHELL. One of the great difficulties I have had to experience is that the Minister of Customs has always been a little too stringent in relation to the officers in New Brunswick. He does not give salaries high enough, and in several instances, when I have applied for increases, I could not get them.

Mr. WELDON. A man who is an importer should not be a preventive officer.

Mr. BOWELL. The information is, that Mr. Kearney is not an importer. It is utterly impossible to prevent officers

who are appointed at \$100 and \$200 a year doing nothing else for a living. I fully recognise the fact that a large importer should not be a preventive officer, and in cases where I found officers were importing, no matter how small were their importations, I have intimated to them that they should resign. I have made enquiries into this case over and over again, and have found that Mr. Kearney is not a large importer, as represented but that, on the contrary, his purchases are principally made from the wholesale merchants in St. John.

Mr. IRVINE. I never said, in the House or out of it, that Mr. Kearney was a large importer. I stated that he is a resident merchant in the village of Florenceville, and he is a very respectable man. But what I wish to point out is that two officers are there, the one at \$300 and the other at \$200, to collect \$500. I think Mr. Kearney was not appointed for the purpose of preventing smuggling.

Mr. BOWELL. For what then?

Mr. IRVINE. I will not give my reasons just now.

Mr. BOWELL. He was appointed for no other purpose, so far as the Department in Ottawa is concerned. If there were other reasons on the part of those who recommended him, I know nothing of them.

Mr. IRVINE. I have made application to know who recommended Mr. Kearney, and could not get the information. The Minister of Customs refused to give it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Schooley is a strong and warm supporter of the hon. gentleman, and Mr. Kearney is a strong opponent, and in this lies the secret of the hon. gentleman's continued attacks. He admits Mr. Kearney is a respectable man, but in order to make a case he speaks of his being placed in a little, insignificant place. The hon. gentleman is not doing credit to one of the brightest and most enterprising towns in New Brunswick, and a very important port. I think the hon. gentleman ought, by this time, to give up these uncalled-for attacks, which he makes every Session, on a gentleman whom he admits to be highly respectable.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue says the hon. member for Carleton is opposed to this gentleman because he happens to be of a different shade of opinion from himself. Mr. Kearney is an entirely new appointment. I think it is incompatible with the position of preventive officer to have a man who has been a large importer, and who, while he may be a good preventive officer against other persons, may not be against himself.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for St. John—I will not say, begs the question—but puts into the mouth of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) words which he did not use. I was under the impression that he charged Mr. Kearney with being a large importer from the United States, but the hon. gentleman says he did not know anything of the kind. If he purchases all his goods from any part of Canada the position of preventive officer is not incompatible with his occupation. It happens that Mr. Kearney is not of the political stripe of my hon. friends on the other side, and he gets the enormous sum of \$200 a year, and we waste an hour in discussing the question of whether he should be there or not. I told the hon. gentleman he was put there on the report of the inspectors. The only report I have is that the Centreville office is not required, and Mr. Schooley has been either recommended to be placed on the retired list or to be removed to another place where he would be useful. If that is so, I may act on the suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton, and either place Mr. Schooley upon the retired list or move him somewhere else. Of course, it is not to be supposed that I can visit every \$100 port in the Dominion; but Mr. Wolfe, the special

Mr. BOWELL.

inspector, reports that the Centreville office is not necessary in the interests of the revenue, but that the Florenceville office is. As the hon. gentleman is so anxious that we should economise, I can save the \$300 a year now paid to Mr. Schooley by acting upon his suggestion and removing him.

Mr. IRVINE. I am not sure but that Mr. Kearney and Mr. Schooley are both my personal friends. There are any number of gentlemen in my county who say that Mr. Kearney voted for me at the last election, and I am not prepared to say he did not. The preventive officers in the county of Carleton are very discreet. I do not know one who has interfered with politics, and I was always as personally friendly with Mr. Kearney as I am with the Minister of Customs. I have never said a disrespectful word of Mr. Kearney, but I distinctly state that there should not be two officers on that road.

Mr. SCRIVER. I hope the Minister of Customs was not serious in expressing the opinion that there is nothing incompatible in a man who is engaged in business on our side of the frontier holding the position even of preventive officer in Customs. While it might be true that this Mr. Kearney bought most of his goods in a Canadian city—and on any portion of the frontier, as matters are now, country storekeepers are likely to buy their supplies in cities in the Dominion—still, at certain times, at any rate, these men are in the habit of importing more or less from the other side of the frontier; and I say, from my own experience, that it would be an unfortunate thing if the rule hitherto followed, of not appointing men engaged in business as preventive officers, were departed from.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman would have been a little more fair if he had added what I really said. I said that, where a man was not an importer, and did not import, there was nothing incompatible; but the rule has been, in most cases, in fact, it is a rule of the Department, that if a man is known to be an importer, no matter to how small an extent, not to appoint him, because the temptation is too great.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would point out that any man who is carrying on a mercantile business may at any moment become an importer. I have understood the rule hitherto to be that, although a man receiving less than \$400 a year was not prohibited from following any other occupation, he was prohibited from following mercantile occupations, and that if he was a merchant, whether importing at the moment or not, he could not hold a position in the Customs. That, during my lamented friend Mr. Burpee's tenure of office, was the rule which he informed me he adhered to, and I agree with my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) that it would be very unfortunate indeed, if, even under the circumstances stated by the Minister, that rule was departed from. The trouble is, that if you depart from it in one case you expose yourself to pressure in fifty different cases.

Mr. BOWELL. I recognise the force of that. I would ask the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) what business Mr. Schooley follows?

Mr. IRVINE. Mr. Schooley was a merchant when he was appointed, and he was notified by the Minister that he must either give up his business or his office, and he gave up the former. He is a justice of the peace, and attends to his business.

Mr. BOWELL. His salary is only \$300 a year.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the Campo Bello district, I understood a collector was to be appointed at Grand Manan.

Mr. BOWELL. A preventive officer has been appointed there, a Mr. Kelly, during the busy season, at a salary of \$300.

Mr. WELDON. I think he is member of the Legislative Council in our Province.

Mr. BOWELL. He ought to be a very respectable and responsible man, then.

Mr. WELDON. I wanted to know if it was on account of the vote he gave last winter.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know how he voted last winter. I hope he voted right.

Mr. WELDON. He is one of those legislative councillors who has been living in Toronto for the last two years, and who has suddenly turned up as a preventive officer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the event of a session of the Local Legislature, I would like to know how he can attend to both duties.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a difference between a preventive officer appointed at \$25 a month during the time he is required, and a collector of Customs. He is simply a preventive officer, appointed to look after the smugglers. If he leaves there to attend to his political duties at Fredericton, he will not be paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that the Legislative Council of New Brunswick have fallen tolerably low if their services can be secured for \$25 a month.

Mr. BOWELL. It only shows the respectability of the service.

Mr. WELDON. There is another matter. The merchants of St. John complain a good deal about the discount which is allowed by the Minister of Customs on the invoices. In February last the Board of Trade presented a petition and passed the following resolution:—

"Whereas we fully recognise that Customs regulations are made with the intent of preventing fraud and protecting the honest importer; but  
"Whereas some of the regulations are so interpreted and administered as to practically treat all importers as if their first object is to defraud the revenue; therefore:

"Resolved, That a committee of seven from this board be appointed to consider the subject, and to make such representation to the Government as, in their opinion, may tend to a more liberal construction of said regulations."

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been great dissatisfaction in St. John regarding the mode in which the importers are treated, some of them men of respectability and high standing. One of them, I know, has been a good deal harassed in regard to this matter of discount. Here is what they say about goods which are sold by discounts from manufacturer's prices—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order. We are on the question of salaries.

Mr. WELDON. I think I have a right to discuss the mode in which the Customs are collected. Strictly speaking, perhaps, I may not be correct, but I would like to get the Minister's explanation now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think it would be regular to have a discussion at this time.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite willing to discuss the question with the hon. gentleman now. Of course, it opens the whole question of the Customs law, which is an intricate one. I received that resolution and fully considered it, and will be glad to discuss it, either privately or in the House, with the hon. gentleman. It is difficult to carry out the law so as to please all importers and exporters.

Mr. WELDON. The other day some merchants in St. John actually sold their goods at a heavy loss because it turned out that they had given duties they were obliged to

pay upon discount. It is a matter of very serious importance in the present condition of trade and the keen competition that exists all around. This question of duties upon discount is a very important one for the merchants of St. John. Of course, if I am out of order in bringing this matter up now, I shall take another occasion of doing so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that the port of Brantford is debited with an increase of salary of \$800, of which I do not complain. But I do not think that the Minister of Customs, though he has a good many faults, has the fault of increasing salaries very rapidly in Ontario. I think this sum of \$800 should not be debited to that port.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right. I was going to explain to the hon. gentleman that it remained debited to that port, because Mr. McMichael still remains on the staff at that port until he has been officially located. I am using him now, and have been for some time past, to attend to the duties of different ports where vacancies occur. I have found him so valuable an officer that I am sending him now to the more important ports when the collectors are away on leave. Mr. McMichael is charged with the duty of putting the ports in a greater state of efficiency. He is still charged to the port of Brantford; in another year, probably, he will be charged to some other fund. At the port of Clifton, where he has been for some time, there will be a saving of the amount which was formerly paid to the collector, as he was acting in his place, less the additional amount which we should have to pay Mr. McMichael while there. I have given an increase of salary to Mr. Foster, who was appointed to the Customs some time ago, and who was recommended to me as a good officer, and ought to have an increase. He was receiving only \$500, and I made it \$600.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think he is entitled to an increase. He was appointed under the Mackenzie Administration some years ago, and was promised an increase of salary before the retirement of the late Minister. That is about the cheapest port in the Dominion, in proportion to the business done.

Mr. BOWELL. One of them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is about the sixth port for collections, and the charges are about \$2,600.

Mr. BOWELL. There was collected \$142,841.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wanted that pointed out. What the hon. gentleman has said with respect to Mr. McMichael is true; there is not a more capable officer in the service.

Mr. VAIL. There is an increase of \$1,615 for Annapolis.

Mr. BOWELL. An addition of \$100 has been made to the collector's salary. He formerly received \$800; he now receives \$900; it is proposed to raise his salary to \$1,000, which will probably be the maximum for that port. We propose to place the preventive officer, who now receives \$100, on the permanent staff, at a salary of \$500, in order to look after the American boats running between that port and Boston.

Mr. VAIL. There is an increase of \$200 in Antigonish.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not an increase, because there was a preventive officer employed there the year before last, who received \$200. He died, and the office was not filled last year. This year, I have added two others, McIsaacs, at \$100, and Macdonald, at \$100, which makes the \$200, as formerly.

Mr. VAIL. There is \$105 for Arichat.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a preventive officer at \$100, and \$5 added to the contingent account of the port.

Mr. VAIL. There is a large increase, \$740, at Truro.

Mr. BOWELL. There will be a still larger increase.

Mr. VAIL. I am sorry to hear it; there is no necessity for it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentlemen evidently does not know what business is done at the port, or he would not say there is no necessity for it. The officer who was there filled a number of different offices, and received only \$500 a year from the Customs. He collected \$61,000 or \$62,000, and that was the cheapest port in the whole Dominion, in proportion to the collections. But we found, when a thorough inspection of the port was made, that there had been gross irregularities—I do not say they were wilful irregularities on the part of the officer, but they arose because he did not give his whole time and attention to the business. I intimated to him that he must give his whole time to the business and I would increase his salary, or he would have to retire. Being over age, he asked to be allowed to retire, and he was superannuated on the basis of his salary of \$500. I had to appoint officer Nelson, and give him a salary sufficient to enable him to give his whole time to the business. I have also increased the salary of the clerk, from \$500 to \$600, making a total increase for the port of \$740. That, however, includes an increase for preventive officer McCurdy on the coast, from \$60 to \$200. I shall have to appoint a packer at, perhaps, \$400 a year, in addition, because we are insisting on the work being done at Truro as it is being done at Halifax. The increase of \$700 or \$1,000 will be more than compensated for by extra collections due to increased vigilance, and the prevention of smuggling, which has been going on at Truro to an enormous extent.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think \$200 increase will be wasted if smuggling is prevented. Truro, however, is an inland place, and is very different to a seaport. The goods must come to it over a railway. I do not see why it is necessary to have an extra officer. I am quite satisfied that if the collector of Customs had attended to his duties a year or two ago these irregularities would not have occurred, in an inland place like that. It is true that some of the merchants at Halifax state that the people in the country could get their goods at half the rate of duty, and that there was no use of them applying to head-quarters, because they could not get redress. I do not, however, pay much attention to that, because I think they are apt to complain when there is no occasion for it, and I think the people of the country have a right to have their goods entered at whatever places they choose.

Mr. BOWELL. The port of Brantford is an inland town, but they collect the sum of \$142,841 a year. St. Thomas is an inland town, and it has run up, since I have been in office, from an outpost, with a \$500 officer, to a port of three or four officers, and collections of from \$60,000 to \$100,000; but it is a distributing point for that section of country, and Truro is in the same position. As the hon. gentleman says, the merchants of Halifax have complained, and very properly, because goods were entered at that port, without any investigation or examination, and the result has been that goods were imported and sold at much lower rates than the honest importers were able to do. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should find fault that a great importing city like Halifax—

Mr. VAIL. I am not objecting.

Mr. BOWELL—should find fault because I am trying to put Truro, which is an inland port and a distributing point, in such a position that frauds will be prevented, I do not believe there are more honest importers than those of the city of Halifax, in the Dominion, and they deserve protection. The hon. gentleman says that merchants have a right to import and enter where they please. That is true,

Mr. BOWELL.

but if they import at Truro there should be a sufficient staff of officers to prevent the honest importer from being defrauded of his rights.

Mr. VAIL. Then, as to Yarmouth?

Mr. BOWELL. The collection and importations have increased there very much. The collections amount to \$115,527, and I have found it necessary to add another officer at that port, but the increase is not to the extent that appears. The same remark applies to this place as to Annapolis. There was one office last year, which I did not deem it necessary to fill till this year. The present collector does not receive the same salary as the old one, but \$200 less, and we have had to add the additional officer to whom I have referred, and a gauger, on account of large importation of oil and liquor.

Mr. WATSON. I notice that in Manitoba there is a decrease of \$5,200, there being increases in some items and decreases in others. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain about Emerson.

Mr. BOWELL. The great decrease in Manitoba arises from this cause: that during the boom there were very large importations, and it was necessary to put a large number of officers on the staff. Now, as the Canadian Pacific Railway is being opened from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, a large quantity of goods, which formerly went through the United States in bond and had to be examined at Emerson or Winnipeg, now go through by that road, and the extra staff is not required. I am now reducing the number of those officers as fast as possible. There is also the fact that we made outposts of Portage la Prairie, Regina, Brandon and Calgary, for the accommodation of the settlers and business men of those places. Importations are now coming in, to a large extent, by railway, which formerly came in from Fort Benton by the trails to Fort Macleod, and the collections in those particular localities are falling off. The officers of the Mounted Police act for us, for which they receive a percentage—formerly 10 per cent., which I cut down to 5 during the railway boom, when they were making, as I thought, too much money. Taking the increases in the staff at Emerson, and the transfers, as against the decreases, there is a net decrease of \$5,200.

Mr. WATSON. Has the hon. gentleman any intention of establishing an outpost at Minnedosa, the present terminus of the Manitoba North-Western Railway? It is 78 miles from Portage la Prairie, and there is a great deal of business done there, and it would be a great convenience to the people.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no intention, at present, as the matter has never been brought to my notice. I may tell the hon. gentleman that, as far as possible, I resist all applications for outposts, except where it is absolutely necessary, and every outpost established not only adds expense to the Department, but opens the door to the possibility of greater frauds, because we must appoint men at low salaries, at which we cannot get the very best class of men who are acquainted with the business. But if the trade should justify the opening of a port at Minnedosa, we will do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The vote of \$6,000 for the North-West Territories does not show the allowance paid to the Mounted Police.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a reduction of \$2,000 on last year, owing to the reduction in the collection of duties by the Mounted Police, and a reduction in the percentage paid from 10 to 5 per cent.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I desire to ask the hon. Minister what occasions the reduction in the permanent salaries of the port of Victoria. Last year the amount was \$17,596, while this year it is \$16,596, while that for New West-

minster is increased from \$300 to \$1,300. It seems to me you have been robbing Peter to pay Paul. I hope the hon. minister will rob Paul to pay Peter back again. Possibly, the expenses of Nanaimo, which is now a separate port, were included in those of Victoria.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the explanation; Nanaimo being established as an independent port. It was formerly an outpost of Victoria.

Mr. BAKER. Then, what are the salaries, respectively, of the collector at Nanaimo and the deputy collector at Departure Bay.

Mr. BOWELL. I think we give \$300 or \$400 a year to the officer stationed on the coast from Nanaimo to Cowichan, merely as a preventive officer.

Mr. BAKER. There is a collector at Nanaimo and a deputy collector at Departure Bay, who was formerly the collector for both of those ports. I want to know what salary he is now getting, that his position has been somewhat reduced.

Mr. BOWELL. When Nanaimo was made an independent port, a collector was appointed, and Mr. Peck remained in the position he formerly held as a clerk. He is assistant to the collector at Nanaimo at the same salary he had before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not state why he wanted \$2,400 for British Columbia.

Mr. BOWELL. We have had to put an additional officer at New Westminster, and there has also been an officer placed on the Columbia River, to watch the goods which come up that river into the Kootenay district.

Mr. BAKER. There is no great distinction between the salary of the collector and that of his assistant at Nanaimo. Either the collector should get more or the assistant should get a little less.

Mr. BOWELL. I found Mr. Peck there with the salary he is getting. But I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and if Mr. Peck was out of the way, I would not appoint a clerk at so high a salary. I do not want to say anything disparaging to the gentleman, but I do not know that there would be any injury done if he were away.

Mr. BAKER. I quite agree with you.

Mr. BOWELL. In justice to the Auditor General, I desire to make an explanation regarding the charges against this item of \$18,000 for salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports, and other officers on inspection. When this subject was under discussion before, some hon. gentlemen opposite tried to be facetious at my expense, and I stated that I was not aware why the travelling expenses had been put under the head charged to this item, rather than where they were formerly placed, in the contingencies of the Department. I stated that I thought that was a matter exclusively with the Auditor General. I have found since, however, that he did not place them there. They were placed there by the accountant of the Department, for the reason that all the travelling that took place and which is charged to this item had special reference to disputes in connection with importations, and which legitimately came under the head of the Board of Customs. The travelling expenses of the Minister, the accountant, and the commissioner were placed under that head, because the travelling that took place was for that special service. However, I gave instructions that as that had not been the mode of charging the contingencies in the past, it should not be followed in the future, at least, so far as the Minister and the commissioner were concerned. When the other officers travel on that business, this is the item to which their expenses should be charged. There is an increase of \$2,000 for miscellaneous. Last year it was found that \$13,000 did not cover the expenses under this item. Some

years the printing is greater than others. This year it may be \$1,000 less; next year it may be still lower, and another year it may be increased.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. gentleman answer the question which I gave notice I would ask when we came to Supply, in reference to the request that Ridgetown, in my county, should be made a port of entry?

Mr. BOWELL. I gave instructions the other day to have a recommendation made out to erect Ridgetown into an outpost, under Chatham, and I propose to remove Mr. Duck from the position he now holds to Ridgetown, to act as sub-collector. I do not think it necessary to make an additional appointment, but I will give Mr. Duck a little more salary.

Mr. CASEY. The arrangement is eminently fair and proper, under the circumstances.

Mr. VAIL. With regard to the outside detective service of the Customs Department, I would ask the hon. Minister whether he intends to keep Mr. MacLaren in the employ of the Department, knowing the very improper course he took last year in order to obtain information as to goods shipped from the United States to the Maritime Provinces? I am told he went to Boston, and there bribed the clerk of one of the largest establishments trading with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, induced him to go into the place of business at night with him and make out invoices on the invoice paper of the firm, to carry with him to the Maritime Provinces, and in other ways obtained information very improperly. I am quite sure the Minister of Customs would not countenance such conduct as this detective pursued. I am not making statements from hearsay, because the whole transaction was subsequently acknowledged and sworn to by the clerk. The young man was removed, became very penitent, and made a full statement of what took place. The following is his sworn statement:—

“STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, SUFFOLK, U.S.

“I, Charles B. Gilliatt, of Boston, United States of America, in the employ of Delong & Seaman, merchants of Boston, aforesaid, of my own free will and without threat, fear or promise, make oath and say as follows:—

“I say, that while I was in my room at 8 Allston street, Boston, having leave from above firm to stay at home two days, I was called on by John S. MacLaren, a Dominion of Canada Customs detective, about 8th February, 1885, Friday, and about 2.30 p.m. I did not know the man, and never heard his name before. He introduced himself, after a little talk about the weather, etc., in this way: Said he was a Customs detective, and called on me to make a dollar and make one for me. He then told me what he wanted of me, which was to give him information of smuggling and to furnish him with invoices and a few bills of lading from Delong & Seaman, to compare at the Custom house in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. He also told me that I would get a large amount of money out of it, as well as himself, and that the amount of the fines was to be divided thus: the Canadian Government to receive one-third of the full amount fined each man, and 5 per cent. of the balance to go to a Mr. Wolfe, for collecting fines and forwarding all moneys to MacLaren and his partner, Jack Bonnes, and that the balance of the two-thirds was to be divided between MacLaren, his partner Bonnes and myself, equally. I told him it would not be right for me to do so, and that I would lose my position if I did. He replied that I need not fear; that I would not be known in the matter at all, and that he and the Canadian Government would protect me in all things; also, that he would drop a seizure if he had to make me known at all, and that he would not fine a man or firm if they were not able to pay. To all of this I replied that I would not give him any answer then, but would think it over and let him know the next day, Saturday, when he called about four o'clock, p.m., and made the same promises again, and explained more definitely what he wanted me to do, and then I agreed to give him the papers and information that he required.

“I also saw him Sunday afternoon at his room, No. 1 Hancock street, when he gave me \$5 for which I asked him; then I met him several evenings afterwards at No. 7½ Bowdoin square, and there he gave me \$20 more. He also told me what he wanted me to get for him, and he named places and ports that he said he must have information and invoices for, of the customers we had there. He also told me at his room, Sunday afternoon mentioned before, that he had made \$10,000 out of the seizures he had made; and this he told me confidentially, and seemed to be anxious that I would not say so to any person.

“I then commenced to make out the invoices about Monday night following, and continued to do so almost every evening, sometimes at

the office of Delong & Seaman, and two or three times brought a blotter or day-book to my room, and also to an office in Bowdoin square, in Boston.

"MacLaren was down to the office with me once, and looked at the book I was working from, and compared a few bills of lading with the invoices I had made out. I have received four letters from him, three of these since he has been in St. John, N.B., and Nova Scotia, and one before leaving Boston, asking me to meet him at 7½ Bowdoin square.

"Since then I have received one, which I delivered, without opening, to Delong & Seaman. Two of the other letters I had torn up by a special request from MacLaren; the other two I delivered to Delong & Seaman. The above letters, and all that I was to receive, was to be addressed to me under an assumed name of John Gordon.

"I also further state that the making out of the invoices given MacLaren was done in a hurried and concealed way, unbeknown to the firm of Delong & Seaman, or any of their clerks, and I cannot say that the invoices I gave MacLaren were correct, either in regard to the date of invoice or the amount of goods, or in other respects, as I worked late nights at them, and felt sleepy, and afraid that I would be found out at any time. MacLaren said to me that he did not want any case to go to law for settlement, but he would rather settle with about one-quarter of the amount fined than have a case in court. He also told me to be very careful that the firm did not find me at the office, and told me if the firm or any clerk employed with Delong & Seaman found me at the office while after invoices, and working for him, to say that I came down to write a letter. He also wanted me to go to the office of Delong & Seaman at night, after business hours, with him, to get blank bills of lading and documents that he wanted to make the seizures. I did go with him there twice, and he compared some bills of lading I had made out, with original, and examined the blotter; and he, while there, called off, a few invoices to me, while I wrote them down. He asked me to tear up or burn up all the letters I received from him.

"CHARLES B. GILLIATT."

"Subscribed and sworn to by the above named Charles B. Gilliatt, at Boston, in the State of Massachusetts, United States of America, this 14th day of March, A.D. 1885, before me, a commissioner for Nova Scotia, duly appointed and qualified to take affidavits to be read in the Supreme Court, and any court of record in said Province.

"Witness my hand and official seal,

"A. J. McLEOD,

"Commissioner for Nova Scotia.

"The foregoing is a true copy of the affidavit taken before me as above shown.

"A. J. McLEOD.

"Commissioner for Nova Scotia.

"I, A. J. McLeod, a commissioner for Nova Scotia, duly appointed under chapter ninety-six, section fifty-four, of the revised statutes of Nova Scotia, hereby certify that on the 14th day of March, A.D. 1885, personally came and appeared before me, Charles B. Gilliatt, described in the foregoing affidavit, and in my presence subscribed his name thereto, and I duly swore him to the said affidavit, and I certify that the said affidavit was made and subscribed by the said Charles B. Gilliatt by himself, and in his own handwriting, voluntarily, and without threat or promise.

"Given under my hand and seal of office, at Boston, in the State of Massachusetts, United States of America, this 14th day of March, A.D. 1885.

"A. J. McLEOD,

"Commissioner for Nova Scotia."

It seems to me that a man who will be guilty of such conduct as this is not fit to be in the Department. I would be sorry to say a word to encourage smuggling in any way, or to prevent anyone getting information in a fair and proper way, to prevent smuggling; but I think any man who will go to the United States and bribe a young man, as this man did, to go into a man's place of business at night, or at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and to make use of this, as he acknowledges, was not justified.

Mr. BOWELL. Who acknowledges?

Mr. VAIL. Mr. MacLaren acknowledges himself. I have two or three letters written by him to Mr. Gordon, signed "Jack," or something of that kind, and he acknowledges that he used one of the blank bills he received, and says he intended to fill up the blank bill heads and charge the man with smuggling goods; and while the partner was talking, he would place it on his desk, and charge him with smuggling, and in that way, I suppose, levy blackmail.

Mr. BOWELL. I have most of the letters to which the hon. gentleman refers, but I have no recollection of that letter.

Mr. VAIL. I will read the letters. I leave out certain names, which it would be unfair to bring before the public:

"DEAR GORDON,—I made three seizures in Digby; not a dollar paid; asked time until 1st April; Bear River made 5. Will down the Port-

Mr. VAIL.

land and let you know all. As soon as we return to St. John will send you some money; we will make a big thing out of it. I have not heard from you for more than a week; expect your letters are waiting for me in Digby. Now, don't fail me, and send me every bill at once against Nova Scotia; never mind whether you think crooked or not; I find lots made out by themselves on your bill-heads. Also send me bills of lading and bills for all I have written you for; I trust some are waiting for me in Digby; if not, let me know, as I will have to shut down on some places. Forward all at once, and oblige

"Yours, etc.

"J. MACLAREN."

"Will not touch Yarmouth until I am finishing up; I have been so busy getting up reports that I have little time to write. If I get your letters to-morrow, Monday, will write. Now send Lunenburg at once, or I will be past it, and do not want to return there.

"JACK."

"March 9th, 1885.

"DEAR GORDON,—In a great rush; have finished up Digby, Bear River and Annapolis, and take the train to-morrow for Yarmouth; skip it and go on to Pubnico; thence round the shore to Halifax; then through the valley, and finish up and back to Digby to settle. I am afraid it will be small money here. Bear River will pan out well; three schooners tied up there. Schooner *Portland* tied up; will get *Levoze* when she returns; also six more vessels when they return, so we have not done badly. It will pan out so far (if the Department will settle them as I report) a few thousand. As soon as we return will send you some money. It will take \$300 to pay our expenses for this trip, and I do not want to raise money by note; my cash is on special deposit; a month or so is not long to wait. Now, send as soon as possible, or it will be no use, Lunenburg, Port Medway and all others I asked for, and burn these letters you get from me as soon as read, for fear of trouble. Bear River will do well. Now send me Clementsport at once; we leave this place and Granville, and Bridgetown and valley, until we return from the shore. We are afraid of the snow leaving, so are hurrying up. Your letter I received here; sorry you were blocked in not getting bills. Be sure and send bills of lading for Lunenburg, and send bills with everyone you have done business with. I will use you well; don't fear; all I ask of you is to send the bills, also to keep us posted as things go forward. I downed some of them with bills you thought straight; made false ones on your bill-heads. Be sure and send all of Mahone Bay, Bridgewater; you know our route; we are driving right round the shore to Halifax from Yarmouth, thence by rail to Annapolis; also working Margaretville, etc. I will make you a good summer's work. Now, old fellow, if you have to go down to the office after 10:30 p.m. and write until 3 p.m. for two or three nights, have these posted at once; if you do not I will lose it; so, if you have to sit up all night, do them, and don't make your letters too bulky.

"Yours,

"JACK.

"Lose a night's rest to get me them, and forward at once; not too bulky letters."

"March 14th, 1885.

"DEAR GORDON,—Since writing you we went to Barrington, seized the schooner *Pleides* and fined her \$400. I will be in Mahone Bay to-morrow and down them there, and then to Halifax and up the valley. Now send Clemensport every one of them in full, also send Lunenburg; all we had against there was correct, so was Port la Tour, sorry to say, also send all of Lockeport and bills of lading in all cases, cannot get on without them. What is the matter; I got your last letter all right; I am disappointed about bills not coming forward; look out for a man named Will McDonald; he talks about buying out Durkee. He is from Argyle, Pubnico. Have your address changed if he buys there, and have no talk with him, shun him in every way. I have not settled up with Digby. Now send me all bills of lading for Cape Breton, Antigonish, etc.; you must jump quickly or you will lose it. Send Shelburne all sure, did not stay there or at Lockeport; Bridgewater correct. If you want me to send any dates or anything further, let me know at once. I never got any bills but the two first lots you sent me. If you send them I will rattle the parties and make a dollar for us. It is costing us big money for expenses, hiring teams, etc., and until some time about the middle of April I will not have a dollar, as it takes all I have to run us. Now, answer at once, and let me know just what you can do. Yours,

"JACK."

It appears that he was getting all the information he could, and, at the same time, keeping this man waiting for his money.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Is he a Nova Scotian?

Mr. VAIL. No; I believe he is from New Brunswick. I have given enough to show that this is a very disreputable affair. No man should be permitted to obtain information in that way. I am sure the Minister of Customs will not justify it, and I do not think a man of that style should be allowed to remain in the Department.

Mr. BOWELL. I have had most of these documents before me. Mr. MacLaren was put upon the special staff,

and has been doing detective work for some time. Apart from this particular transaction to which attention has been called by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), I can say that he has been a very good officer in ferreting out and punishing smugglers. A number of cases have been laid before me, with which the member for Digby is well acquainted, he having visited me in order to get the parties relieved of the penalties which the law imposes, and I pointed out to him different cases where the invoices sent by Delong & Seaman, from Boston, did not agree with the correct invoices nor with the ships' manifests. I notice in most of the letters to which the hon. gentleman refers, a reference to false invoices made by Delong & Seaman and sent to the merchants in the Maritime Provinces, upon which entries were made; but upon investigation it was found that they had their invoices of the same date, covering the same goods, with a large quantity left off the invoice upon which the entry was made; and in order to test the correctness of the invoice in most of the cases, MacLaren was shrewd enough to obtain the ship's manifest, showing that the goods were actually brought from Boston to port in Nova Scotia, corresponding exactly with the invoices which the officers found in the possession of the importers, and which were not the invoices upon which entries were made.

Mr. VAIL. Will the hon. gentleman read that portion of the letter where MacLaren speaks of his exploits?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; he says:

"I downed some of them with bills you thought straight, and made false ones."

It does not say that he made false entries; it is the parties who imported the goods who made false invoices upon blanks that were sent them. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that MacLaren made a positive declaration that the charges which were brought against him by Delong & Seaman were not correct.

Mr. WELDON. Gordon says he gave him the bill-heads.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Gordon, whoever he may be, appears to have been a young man in the employ of Delong & Seaman. I believe, from the information I have obtained and from the invoices, that this establishment was established for the express purpose of doing business with the Maritime Provinces, by granting false invoices, to enable people to defraud the Customs. When I first saw these charges in the newspapers, I instructed the commissioner to write to Delong & Seaman, asking them for all the particulars. The information sent was not thought sufficient, and after receiving the letter which Delong & Seaman had sent to the son of Sir Leonard Tilley, in Toronto, asking him to call his father's attention to the conduct of MacLaren, I informed the firm that if they could establish the facts which had been published to the world, not only would MacLaren be dismissed but he would be severely punished for having committed the crimes of which he had been accused. Messrs. Delong & Seaman wrote, sending copies of these letters. I then referred them, through Mr. Wolfe, to MacLaren, he being the accused party. He made affidavit, that the charges therein were not correct; but he did say that he met this young man in Boston, and in conversation with him opened out his business—I am speaking from recollection upon this point—and was informed that the practice of the firm with which he was connected was the sending of false invoices to different parties, upon which to make Customs entries. MacLaren said: Well, if you will give me that information, you shall have a share of the spoils, of whatever I receive as my share of the seizure. They entered into a mutual arrangement, until this young

man was caught, when his employers obtained from him, as I believe, through fear of punishment, the affidavit that the hon. gentleman has read, and then dismissed him, having first promised him that if he would make a clean breast of the whole matter, they would keep him and he should not be punished. Since then I have received a letter from the boy's mother, asking that he should be paid his share of whatever fines were imposed and collected by MacLaren, and which, she alleges, MacLaren promised to give him. I then wrote to Delong & Seaman, telling them that if they would do what they threatened to do, that is, put a case in court—for the hon. gentleman knows that they recommended the merchants in Nova Scotia, the parties to whom he has referred, to resist the payment of any fines which were imposed, and that they would produce evidence to show what a scoundrel MacLaren was—I told them I would assist them in carrying into court any case they selected, and that if they established the charges they had made against MacLaren, he should be not only dismissed but punished. A letter was subsequently received from DeLong & Seaman, asking that all their letters written in regard to this matter should be returned to them, for what purpose I do not know. I did not return any as the matter might come up in the courts. Delong & Seaman never put a case in the courts. Bonus and MacLaren obtained written acknowledgements from the parties from whom they made seizures, admitting that they smuggled, and stating that they made payments in liquidation of fines and penalties. In some cases I declined to accept the settlement made by MacLaren. The evidence was so clear, the smuggling so flagrant, and the fact established that it had continued for years, that I refused to accept the sum mentioned in full liquidation of the smuggling crimes committed, but inflicted additional penalties upon the smugglers, confiscated the goods and intend to sell the vessels. If Delong & Seaman can establish the charges they have made in those letters, I will have the fullest possible investigation. If they establish the charges, and more particularly if that be proved which is stated in one of the letters, that MacLaren himself made false invoices—not only will MacLaren be dismissed from the service, but will be criminally punished. I contend, however, that the letter does not bear the construction put upon it by the member for Digby; on the contrary, it establishes the truth of what is being done from Victoria, British Columbia—I would not say to Cape Breton, because they do no smuggling there—but to the most eastern point of the Dominion, of having two invoices, which is not confined to America, but even prevails in Europe. Possibly MacLaren may have gone too far; he has gone too far if those declarations are correct; but there is nothing more than the statement of the young man who sold himself, and the statement of Delong & Seaman, who are the principal criminals in the whole transaction, to support the accusation. It is not my intention, until the charges, or similar ones, are proved against MacLaren to dismiss him from the service. He has done more to put a stop to the continued and extensive smuggling which has been going on in those Provinces, in the trade between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Boston and other ports, than all the other officers we have had. I can sympathise with the hon. gentleman, because some of his constituents and others have got into difficulty. I know how members are pestered by persons who want to get relieved from penalties imposed for smuggling. If Mr. MacLaren and the other officers on the special service can, by any possibility, put a stop to the smuggling going on, they will deserve the thanks of the community, as they have received them. I have letters from all the principal merchants of Halifax and St. John—but will not refer to them, for it is not necessary—thanking me for having put these officers in the service, detailing the good that has resulted to honest traders. A large merchant in St. John told me lately that he had a customer who had been fined

about \$700, who applied to him to use his political influence—because the gentleman is a Government supporter—to have him relieved. That gentleman declined to do so, stating that he had urged on the Department the necessity of putting detectives on duty to prevent smuggling. The party in question then asked the gentleman to lend him \$700 to pay the fine. This the gentleman said he did, when the individual said he thought he had a little start of the Customs yet. I give that as an illustration. Strenuous efforts have been made by the Government to prevent smuggling going on with the United States, and the officers are entitled to thanks for what is being done to protect the honest trader.

Mr. VAIL. I think the Minister will admit that I have never hesitated to say that where people have smuggled they deserve to be punished.

Mr. BOWELL. You always said that, and then you asked to have them relieved.

Mr. VAIL. I never did so. I have only asked the Minister to deal with the people of Nova Scotia as he deals with other people. I ask no favor. I was dealing with the hon. gentleman on business principles. I ask that he should deal with us in the same way as he deals with people in other Provinces. I do not believe the people of Nova Scotia any more than people elsewhere.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say they did.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister need not go more than a few miles from Ottawa, by rail, to find a place where there is more smuggling in one day than there is in the western part of Nova Scotia in six months. It is very well to tell Delong & Seaman that if they bring on a lawsuit and prove what they have stated, this officer will be dismissed. What have they to do with the matter?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not ask them to bring on the case. I said that if they would bring a case I would assist them.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister has evidently not looked carefully at the letters, or he would have discovered a letter written subsequently, on 18th April. That letter is as follows:—

"In making my statement before Mr. Macleod, I omitted to say that when Mr. MacLaren took the blank printed forms of invoices and bills of lading, that he told me he intended to use them in cases where he could not get a clinch on a man, in this way: he would fill out an invoice and bill of lading as though a man had bought the goods from Delong & Seaman, and while his partner Bonnus would attract a man's attention, he would lay them on a desk; then, under the pretence of searching for documents, he would take these up and accuse a man of smuggling the goods mentioned in the invoice and bill of lading made by MacLaren."

He (Gilliatt) acknowledges having done it.

Mr. BOWELL. He does not acknowledge it.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think any further evidence is required; and I am a little surprised and disappointed that the Minister does not intend to make a full enquiry.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman said he had made a certain enquiry; but he did not say he would continue it. I shall be surprised if he does not continue it. Any man guilty of bribing a man to go into his employer's office at night, as has been described, is not a fit man to be employed under the Government.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to a question with regard to the discounts which importers receive. It is a fact that manufacturers in selling to jobbers, give them a certain line of discount, according to the amount which they agree to purchase in a given line, and they should get the benefit of these discounts in the Customs offices; whereas, these parties who are sent to the United States manufacturers to ascertain their terms do not get the real terms. The result is, that when the importer,

Mr. BOWELL.

who gets a discount which enables him to sell at the same price as the manufacturer sells to the ordinary buyer, imports a portion of these goods, the Customs officer says the discount is only on so much, and the importer does not get the benefit of his legitimate discounts. There have been many complaints in the city of St. John in regard to this matter, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, a petition was sent to the Board of Trade at St. John, which is composed of a large number of merchants, irrespective of political creeds, and I will read the memorandum attached to it. I may mention, also, as showing the manner in which the St. John merchants are treated, that last year no notice was sent to St. John about the changes in Ways and Means, and the merchants there, after paying the duties *band fide*, were called on afterwards to pay additional duties. The following is the memorandum:—

"The regulations governing the duty payable upon these goods do not sufficiently recognise trade usage and the actual facts. A manufacturer selling by discounts so arranges the discounts as that the jobber who carries a 'line' of the goods is in a position to sell to smaller buyers at the same discount which the manufacturer would. The jobber having agreed to carry a certain value or line, gets the larger discount, and is privileged to buy, from time to time—to keep his line assorted—at the agreed-upon rate of discount, no matter how small the purchase.

"The information upon which the Customs Department has based decisions upon such goods is evidently incorrect. That is, the rate of discount quoted as the selling rate in the market of home production is not the discount given by manufacturers to jobbers, but that given by the manufacturers and the jobbers to those buyers who are not jobbers.

"It is natural to suppose that when manufacturers are asked by any other person than one whom they recognise as a jobber, the discount on their goods, that they will protect the jobbing trade by quoting the established discount at which jobbers sell.

"The information as to the discounts given by manufacturers to the jobbing trade should be obtained by the Government direct from the manufacturers, and not from published lists or quotations, which do not give the lowest wholesale prices.

"The interest of the importer should be considered as well as that of the protected Canadian manufacturer, in regulating fixed values for the payment of duties."

This system is very unfair to the importers, who have capital and credit, as it really places them at a disadvantage as compared with other buyers. There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister, and that is, that when small packages are sent, say from Great Britain, inside of larger parcels, unknown to the importer, even though he may be prepared to make oath that he knows nothing about them, he has very great difficulty in getting them through the Customs. Sometimes the packages may be for another person; they are not on his invoice, and he may not know their value, and the result is very great hardship and inconvenience. I think that in such cases, where the persons concerned are men of standing and position, a certain allowance should be made, as against those who endeavor to evade the laws.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's statement is true, to a certain extent, but it opens up a question which would require a great deal of time to discuss fully. The statement he has made, that where a man imports a bale of goods, and a package or enclosure is found therein, great difficulty is found in making entry, is a complaint I have never heard before. In such a case, the difficulty that the man encounters is the confiscation of the enclosure that has not been invoiced. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that the law is very positive on that point, and that it reads in this way:

"If any goods are found in any packages which are not entered on the invoice or entry, such goods shall be seized and absolutely forfeited."

If there be an enclosure not mentioned in the invoice, there is no discretion with the officers of the Department. Parliament made that law, and I am not aware that the hon. gentleman took any exception to it. It would take half an hour to give the various reasons for this clause. I confess that I took the same view as the hon. gentleman, until I had experience. The only case in which the

detention of the whole of the goods is justifiable is provided for in the next clause. If there be any evidence, by way of correspondence or otherwise, or by the invoice, which would lead to the supposition that fraud was intended by the importer, then the whole of the package is to be seized and confiscated. The law is equally clear as to the principle on which a collector can levy duties on goods imported. If a capitalist, with a large amount of money, can buy 5 or 10 per cent. cheaper than another man, the law provides, so far as the Customs duties are concerned that he shall not have any advantage beyond that which his wealth gives him in the purchase of the goods. The law is clear, and those who administer it have no option in the matter. The difficulty that has arisen is in connection with the system of selling in the United States to merchants in this country in giving them additional discounts, provided they purchase a certain amount of goods, that discount not being made up until the end of the year. For instance, a man gets a certain discount if he buys to the extent of \$100,000 during the year, and a different discount if he buys to the extent of \$50,000. I should like to know how any law could be framed to meet cases of that kind. The goods should be entered at the price at which they are sold at the time of exportation, and on that the duty is paid.

Mr. WELDON. What I want to understand is, why a man who pays only \$3,000, at the rate he has agreed upon with the manufacturer, has to pay duty on, say \$4,500, 50 per cent. more than he pays. He does not pay on the value of the goods, but on a larger amount than he has paid for them. It is an act of injustice, and is, I believe, an inducing cause for the smuggling in New Brunswick that is so much complained of.

Excise ..... \$322,125

Mr. COSTIGAN. The increase over last year is \$8,830. There is an increase of \$1,670, resulting from changes which have taken place in consequence of resignations and deaths, and new appointments. They have resulted in an addition of five officers to the staff, or rather four, because one of those officers belong to the Weights and Measures branch, but he is paid \$300 as an Excise preventive officer. Then, there are \$1,336 for promotions. These have taken place in accordance with the Civil Service Act. Then there are \$300 for increases, as the result of examinations. The annual increase of 5 per cent. upon the minimum of each class makes up \$6,000 of that increase. The House will understand that when our officers get 5 per cent. increase, they were appointed at the minimum salary on all occasions, and that increase continues until their salary reaches the maximum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot say that the general result is very satisfactory. I find, although there has been a comparatively small increase in the amount of receipts of Excise, an increase not over 10 or 12 per cent., within the last half-dozen years, the expenses have increased nearly 50 per cent. In 1879 the expenses were \$211,000; in 1884, \$300,000; and in 1886, \$322,000. It appears to me there is nothing to justify this enormous relative increase in the management of the Department. With regard to the \$3,000 allowance to Excise officers in Manitoba, to compensate for increased cost of living, I must say that the state of things in Manitoba is not that which formerly prevailed. I do not object to Excise officers or other servants being paid a fair salary, but I must say that the argument which might hold good in 1881 and 1882 no longer applies at all in many, probably in all parts of Manitoba.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is intended to reduce that as rapidly as possible.

Culling Timber..... \$71,600

Mr. VAIL. Why this increase of \$200 to the supervisor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. With reference to the increase of \$200 to the supervisor, that will still leave his salary under what it formerly was. It formerly was \$2,600; it is not intended that his salary should be increased further.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It must be recollected that the whole of this business means a cost of \$28,000 or \$30,000 over and above what we get out of the timber. If the receipts at all equalled expenditure, there would not be much objection to an occasional increase of salaries, but there is a decided objection, as things stand. I would ask what the \$8,000 contingencies is for?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That must have been for rent of office, fuel, gas, stationery and repairs, and other running expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In running a small place holding a dozen clerks, \$8,000 is a big item for contingencies. I hardly think the fuel and water, and light and stationery will amount to that. What did the hon. gentleman spend for that last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will give that information to the hon. gentleman on concurrence.

Weights and Measures and Gas..... \$84,650.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an increase of \$1,900 in the salaries of inspectors of Weights and Measures.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We appointed an additional officer in Manitoba, and an additional inspector in British Columbia. That involves an expenditure of \$800 and \$600, and the increase through the whole staff only amounts to \$500.

Mr. VAIL. There is an increase of \$50 in the salaries of inspectors of gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This service is growing. I think any one will admit, when we have extended the inspection of gas to several cities in the Dominion, the increase of \$50 is very little.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of a great many other companies, such as insurance companies, where we have inspectors, we charge them to the companies, by way of a special tax. Is anything of that kind done with the gas companies?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; they have to pay certain fees for inspection when the gas is inspected, to test its purity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The salary of \$800 for commissioner of standards is paid to the deputy head, is it not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; he is the commissioner of standards, just the same as the former commissioner under the hon. gentleman. This office was created by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was created in 1873. It strikes me that this item belongs more properly to the head of Civil Government.

Mr. VAIL. I do not see why it should be paid for at all; it should be the duty of the deputy to perform what is required of his office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been allowed for some time.

Inspection of Staples ..... \$2,700

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is a decrease of \$500, in the amount for the purchase and distribution of standards of flour, etc.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this \$200 to pay inspector Borradaile for work in connection with this service?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Borradaile is an inspector in the Excise Department, and when a vacancy occurred in Prince Edward Island, that district was handed over to Nova Scotia and made part of the division of which Mr. Borradaile is the inspector. Although I have not been able to meet his wishes and recommend the increase of salary he expected, I am bound to admit that the extra work thrown upon him during the last year entitled him to some consideration, and I preferred to give him the \$200 for that year, because he had done special services for it, to giving him an increase of salary, which would become a permanent charge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is for next year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The work is going on; this is a compensation for the other.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Borradaile's salary has been increased two or three times. I admit that he is a good officer, but his salary has been increased quite recently, and I do not see why it should be further increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his salary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. \$2,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does that compare with the salaries given to other inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. \$1,800 is the minimum; \$2,400 is the maximum.

Mr. VAIL. How many are receiving more than he is.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are four, I think, receiving \$2,400.

Mr. VAIL. The former inspector did this work, leaving out Prince Edward Island, which cannot be much, for \$1,600 or \$1,700. Mr. Borradaile is appointed at \$2,200.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There was one at \$1,700 and one at \$1,600, making \$3,300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There was an inspector for Prince Edward Island.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does that saving appear?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I was trying to explain this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman stated just now that a considerable saving was made in connection with the inspector; inasmuch as Mr. Borradaile was doing for \$2,500 work that had cost \$3,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That change was made three years ago.

Mr. VAIL. The salaries are out of all proportion to the salaries of the other officers in Nova Scotia. By raising Mr. Borradaile's salary you create discontent among the other officers, and I do not see upon what principle you can give one man a large salary and refuse it to others.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not propose to increase this officer's salary at all. When he went down there it was understood he was to get this increase of salary, inasmuch as he would replace these two officers, which he has done for the last three years. A sum was voted for his salary, making it \$2,400, but it was never paid him. I am quite aware that other officers would feel aggrieved if they saw an officer getting an increased salary which was refused to them. I have tried to avoid that cause of complaint, and that is the reason I refused to give him the increase. But we did

Mr. COSTIGAN.

acknowledge that he had rendered very important services, outside of his regular duties, for which he ought to get this \$200.

Mr. VAIL. It is impossible that he can have been doing any work outside of his regular duties. If you give this man \$200 extra, why should you withhold a similar increase to the inspector of Customs, for instance, whose duties are much more important, and who does much more work? This man's expenses are all paid, wherever he goes; it is one of the best positions in the gift of the Government. Will the Minister tell us what duties he has performed outside of his office?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He has performed important duties, with regard to the inspection of fish, all through the Province, and has made valuable reports and collected information which will be of value in dealing with this subject. He has consulted over 400 deputies on the subject.

Adulteration of food—To meet expenses under the Act..... \$20,000

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is an increase here of \$5,000. It will be needed to extend the operation of the Act, and to enforce it more vigorously. Up to the present time it has not been applied to many places, but the public expect that it will be extended to other places.

Mr. WILSON. Has the hon. gentleman made a division of the territory into different sections, in which to send his inspector?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As soon as Parliament votes the money we will divide the territory.

Mr. WILSON. I think the Minister ought to have an idea as to the division of the territory, the probable expense, and the cities he is to include under the Act, before he asks us for this vote.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The larger cities of the Dominion—Montreal, Toronto, St. John, Halifax and Quebec, are now under the operation of the Act, and we desire to include the cities of London, Hamilton, Winnipeg, and perhaps St. Thomas, and some other of the smaller towns.

Department of Indian Affairs—Grant to supplement Indian fund..... \$34,938

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with this money? Is it to impart constitutional learning to juvenile Indians, in order to fit them to exercise the franchise?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase of \$2,850. This amount is to supplement the Indian school fund in Ontario and Quebec, to increase the salaries of teachers of schools in Nova Scotia, and like purposes.

Mr. MILLS. How is this money expended?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Through the Indian agents.

Mr. MILLS. There has been some correspondence, with a view of placing these Indian schools—subject to the oversight which the constitution gives the Government—to the educational authorities of the Provinces, a system under which, I think, they could be more efficiently managed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The schools are now inspected by the provincial inspectors, but the appointment of teachers is not made by the provincial authorities. That would involve a complete change of system.

Mr. MILLS. I am inclined to think that the system of industrial schools will be found to be very expensive, and the results very limited.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have been very successful in the United States, and in certain places in Canada.

Mr. DAWSON. So far as my observation goes, they have been very successful in my district. With regard to these Robinson Treaty annuities, I would like to ask if any progress has been made towards arranging for the payment of the large amount due to the Indians under this treaty. Some correspondence has been going on for a number of years with the Government of Ontario, and it has been held that that Government having got the land, and the payment to the Indians being liable on the land, they should pay the arrears. If this money were put in the hands of the Indian Department, and laid out in schools or industrial farms, or agricultural implements, it would do a great deal of good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is certainly a wrong to the Indians that that matter has not been settled. It has been pressed on the Local Government, but the answer of the Ontario Government is that this is one of the items to be taken into consideration in adjusting the accounts between the Provinces. I hope it will be settled before long.

Mr. MILLS. I think the Local Government deny responsibility, and say that this is a debt of the old Province of Canada, paid for the so-called Indian title.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The late Government, in consequence of this matter not being settled, advanced a sum of money on account in the meantime, but it has not been settled yet.

Mr. DAWSON. Practically, the Government of Ontario disputed, but they have not wholly denied it at any time.

Mr. MILLS. They contend that this is a matter of the old Province of Canada, that it is not a charge on the land, but was paid precisely the same as the Government paid for the so-called extinguishment of the Indian title further west, for the building of the railway.

Mr. DAWSON. By the Robinson Treaty, it was virtually made a lien on the land.

For Indians of Nova Scotia generally.....\$6,032

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an increase of \$1,000. What is the cause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a vote to open a road and to build a bridge at Chapel Island, in Cape Breton, which, it has been reported, would be a great advantage to the Indians in that neighborhood. Chapel Island is a reserve which is greatly resorted to by the Indians. They had a mission there, and they have been pressing strongly for these improvements.

Indians of New Brunswick..... \$5,090

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase is \$200. It is to enable the Department to increase the salary of the agent, Mr. Craig, from \$100 to \$200 per annum, which is well deserved, and to pay \$100 to the Rev. Mr. Cormier, who visits the Indians in King's county.

North-West Mounted Police..... \$427,700

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This estimate is calculated on 500 men. For subsistence there is a decrease of \$14,600, which is principally owing to the reduced cost of transport. There is a reduction of \$27,000 for forage. Considerable quantities of oats are now produced by the settlers, and the Canadian Pacific Railway furnishes a convenience of transport. Hay is also reduced in price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman proposes to distribute these troops along the frontier, I imagine the convenience of transport would not reduce the forage or the subsistence there very much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not propose that they shall all be distributed along the frontier. There will be certain patrols along the frontier, but the main force will be stationed at Regina, which is a good distributing point, and there will also be forces at Prince Albert, Battleford, Calgary, Fort Macleod, and all the other principal stations. The charge for fuel and light is increased by \$10,000. That appears large. The fuel which, a few years ago, could be obtained within easy distance of the force, has now to be hauled long distances; but it is hoped that we shall soon be able to use coal. Formerly, when there was wood, the police at the stations were engaged in cutting it, to a considerable extent. That is now impossible; besides, the time of the men is too valuable to be employed in that way. It is satisfactory to be able to state that the clothing for the force is entirely made in Canada, with the exception of helmets, and a few small articles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The material is obtained by tender, and is made up into clothing by tender.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked, because, owing to the great difficulty of obtaining employment for the number of convicts at Kingston penitentiary, it was at one time intended they should make up the clothing for the Mounted Police and the clothing for distribution to the Indians. There is always difficulties about employing convict labor, so as not to compete with free labor, but in the case of Government supplies, this labor might be utilised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so. It was found the clothing made in the penitentiaries was not good enough for the soldiers. There can be no objection in the case of the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Indians like good clothes, too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are not so particular about the fit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not wont to question reductions, but I think a reduction on medicines, medical comforts and hospital expenses requires explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Formerly, I think, the medicines were bought under orders of the medical men of the Department. They are now being all ordered under the special charge of Dr. Jukes, a medical man of known experience and standing. He has devoted himself to this Department, and I believe he has improved the quality of medicines and medical comforts, while, at the same time reducing the expenses.

For expenses of the Government in North-West Territories including printing, roads, bridges, ferries and aid to schools, etc..... \$39,000.

Mr. McLELAN. The following are the details of this item:—Travelling expenses of members of council and officials, \$1,000; probable expenses holding elections, \$3,000; public printing, \$2,000; stationery, telegrams and postage, \$500; roads, bridges and ferries, \$9,000; aid to schools, \$6,000; surveys under 43 Vic., chap. 24, sec. 91, \$2,000; rental allowance to clerk of council in lieu of the free residence occupied by him at Battleford, \$500; cost of mail service in North-West Territories, \$3,000; legal adviser, \$200; rental allowance to Hugh Richardson, stipendiary magistrate, in lieu of the free quarters occupied by him at the late seat of Government, \$500; safes, indexes, registrar

books, stationery, furniture, light and fuel for registry offices, \$3,000; light, fuel and stationery for deputy sheriff's offices, \$300; miscellaneous, including maintenance of insane patients from North-West Territory in Manitoba penitentiary, \$500; clerical assistance, \$1,000; registration books, \$300; sheriff's books, \$300; rent of sheriff's office and rooms for holding court, \$600; law books, newspapers and magazines, \$500; fuel at Government House, council chamber and sheriff's office, light, messengers, etc., \$1,800.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this is an important item, I would advise that the details be printed.

For the expenses of Government in the District of Keewatin..... \$1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, since the extension of the boundaries of Ontario, or the confirmation of her claims to the north-west angle, northward to the English River, and since Manitoba has been extended, so as to include the Icelandic settlements, there are really no more settlements in Keewatin, and there is no more reason for having that a separate district than to have the Labrador coast or the western coast of Hudson Bay.

Mr. DAWSON. I think that is a matter which admits of a difference of opinion.

For erection of Mounted Police Barracks.....\$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amount is required for additions, alterations and repairs at the various police posts, particularly Calgary, Battleford and Edmonton.

Surveys of Lakes Superior and Huron..... \$18,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what sum will be required to complete this, and how long a time?

Mr. McLELAN. About two years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the expenditure be in proportion?

Mr. McLELAN. Next year and the year after it will be a less sum.

Putting in force Act respecting traffic in intoxicating liquors..... \$20,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is principally the expenditure consequent on the numerous elections going on under the Scott Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it include payment to the Dominion license officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it has nothing to do with that. It is for the elections under the Scott Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has nothing to do with the license commissioners?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose it costs \$500 in each county?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know the amount. It is a large sum of money.

Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies of his office..... \$2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many immigrants known and ascertained, has this produced, so far as the Minister of Agriculture can tell us?

Mr. POPE. It is not in my Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In whose is it, then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is in the Department of the Secretary of State.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is away, and no information is obtainable, I suppose?

Mr. McLELAN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is an item I think might very well both stand and be struck out.

Mr. MILLS. We are entitled to further information on this subject, and to know how, if this office comes to be connected with the Department of the Secretary of State, and not with the Department of Agriculture, for what purpose does it exist?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you had better let it stand for further information. No one seems to care to be responsible for this office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the contrary, I think, the Secretary of State went into the subject at some length.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we gathered that the Secretary of State thought we had secured one immigrant last year. I am bound to say I am afraid, as far as its value for immigration purposes is concerned, the returns have been exceedingly meagre.

Mr. MILLS. I understood that we had had four Belgians and one Frenchman from that office. That means \$500 a man.

Mr. WILSON. We are entitled to some information in reference to this office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I really think we ought to get some explanation about Mr. Fabre's mission in France. It has now been going on for a long time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Secretary of State had been here, he would have been able to give the explanation.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman proposes to give \$2,500 for the payment of an officer who has not been shown to have anything to do. We had a discussion on this subject earlier in the Session, but the Secretary of State did not succeed in giving the House any information on the subject, though he made it clear that this officer had not done anything for the money. I think, however, that Mr. Fabre did visit two or three places in France, and told them about the extraordinary depth to which snow fell in Canada—some 40 feet, I think.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite have so much difficulty in granting a vote of \$2,500 in order to establish communication with such a country as France. All those who have visited Europe during the last three years, have declared unanimously that were it only for the informations given by Mr. Fabre to Canadians travelling in Europe, this country would be amply repaid for this paltry sum. In fact, since Mr. Fabre has been in France, the people of the continent have come to realise what Canada is. Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, and many other eminent men, testify that Mr. Fabre has done a great deal towards promoting the interests of Canada in Europe. Letters recently received from Rev. + Labelle show that every day his office is full of people, who go to him for information regarding Canada, whilst our compatriots do not fail to require assistance from him, which is always willingly given, while they are on their voyages in France and other European countries. Through Mr. Fabre, business men have been able to communicate with men in high position in finance, commerce and industry in France. His work has been of such a nature, in the first years of his works that it cannot yet be fairly expressed in figures, though it is none the less real.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman represents Mr. Fabre as though he was travelling through the streets of Paris with an advertising sheet on each side. At all events, if Mr. Fabre is engaged in any business of this sort, why have we not some information, showing us what his success has been?

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is not immigrants that we want to get from France, so much as to establish trade relations with her as well as with other European countries. The hon. gentleman ought to know that efforts are now being made to establish direct steam communication between France and Canada, that a large amount of French capital has already been invested in Canada through the instrumentality of Mr. Fabre. If the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) was here, he could tell the hon. gentleman that in the North-West Territories French capitalists have invested large sums of money, thanks to the information they have received from the agency that we have established in Paris, and that they will be instrumental in sending here a desirable class of settlers. We have the Crédit Foncier, and we may reasonably expect that through Mr. Fabre's efforts we shall soon have more extended commercial relations with France, and I do not know that we should lose anything by it. It is true that it is France; but, after all, France is a country with which we can have communication without Canada suffering in its credit, whatever the gentlemen opposite may think to the contrary.

Mr. McLELAN. In addition to the information given by Mr. Fabre to the people of France respecting Canada, I know that a large number of Canadians visit Paris every year, and that every day in the year Mr. Fabre is called upon to give them information to enable them to prosecute their journey; and if he did nothing more than this, I think the money would be well spent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whose servant is Mr. Fabre, in reality? Does he not receive a salary from the Local Government also?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically, he is a servant, I take it, of the Local Government, rather than ours.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They appointed him, no doubt, and we assist his salary, in order that he may be utilised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the Minister of Agriculture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If any good work can be done in the way of facilitating connections between this country and France, I have no objection to it. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken, that the old times and the historic association which subsisted so long between Lower Canada and France are of a character which might warrant parties in introducing—I do not think many immigrants—but possibly a considerable amount of French capital into this country, and if Mr. Fabre can contribute to that, I am not disposed to grudge a reasonable vote for it. But we have a right to know how far he has succeeded in securing the introduction of French capital into this country, and until the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) spoke, no information was forthcoming on that head. When we get to concurrence, it may be desirable to say something more on this item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear that we ought to call on Mr. Fabre to make an annual report for what he has done for his salary?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Reports have been regularly sent in by Mr. Fabre.

Hudson's Bay Route Expedition..... \$30,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is going to be done with that sum?

Mr. McLELAN. The ship has gone out there, with additional observers to be stationed there, and to bring away those who were there. It is thus intended to make the survey as complete as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time did she start?

Mr. McLELAN. In May.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman had any advice from her.

Mr. McLELAN. I had an advice from a point on the Labrador coast. There is no means of again communicating with her until she returns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this supposed to complete the survey?

Mr. McLELAN. No; she will have to go out again next year, to bring back those who remain this winter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The intention is to make a test covering three seasons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the intention. It is supposed that three seasons will show any important change in climatic conditions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many stations were established?

Mr. McLELAN. Six stations were established last season. One will be abandoned, and it is proposed to continue five stations this winter. There will be two winters' observations and three summers' observations.

Mr. DAWSON. Has the hon. gentleman ordered an exploration to be made of the Ungava channel.

Mr. McLELAN. My attention has been called to that matter. If opportunity permits, some observations will be made there during this season.

Extra Clerks to prepare Returns..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention that the staff shall be employed so that all returns ordered this Session will be ready when Parliament meets next year, because many returns were not ready this year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice has been to again move for returns that have not been brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are now about 100 returns that have not been brought down. If this amount of \$10,000 is voted, we shall expect the clerks to be employed during the recess in getting returns ready.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I understand that if this vote of \$10,000 is passed, we may expect to get all the returns ordered by the House this Session when we meet again next year.

Mr. MILLS. It would be well if this could be done. I moved for returns early in February. None have come down, with one exception, and that in a mutilated condition.

Commercial Agencies..... \$10,000

Mr. BOWELL. This is a new item, to cover the cost of obtaining statistical information in regard to the trade of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a curious heading.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; it is, perhaps.

Mr. MILLS. It seems that this information belongs to the Department of the Minister of Agriculture. We have had a volume brought down to us on this subject which was wholly unreliable, so much so that anyone knowing anything about his own constituency found that the information was utterly worthless.

Mr. WILSON. I think we should have some further information on this subject, as in the volume referred to a very small portion of the Dominion was considered at all, and no dependence could be placed on the information contained in it. Under these circumstances, it is rather unreasonable to ask for this sum.

Mr. MILLS. In that volume one party was reported as engaged in the business of hardware whose business was the filing of saws.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was hardware.

Mr. MILLS. It was rather an extraordinary thing, that an old fellow who would get 10 cents for sharpening a buck-saw should be put down as one of the manufacturers of the country, engaged in one of the industries established by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:20 a.m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved,

That when the House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, at 1.30 o'clock p.m., and that Government business have precedence.

Motion agreed to.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I ask the indulgence of the House for one moment, with reference to a personal question. I this morning found some portions of the correspondence which the right hon. leader of the Government thought fit to refer to the other day, and I will present it to the House. I dare say the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) and the right hon. gentleman will be glad to get it, as I observed by one of the papers that they are anxious to have it. On the 7th of May I received this letter:

"55 ELIZABETH STREET,

"TORONTO, 6th May, 1885.

"To Hon. Mr. BLAKE, Ottawa.

"SIR,—The undersigned is just down from South Branch, Prince Albert settlement; have been farming in that neighborhood for five years. Been in the N.-W. for 14 years; on surveys 7 years. I would very much like to interview you on matters concerning the Government agents in the N.-W. T., and the half-breeds' villainies practised on C. P. R. surveys, wilful waste of both provisions and cash by J. A., C. E. I have been interviewed by reporters of papers here, but intend keeping my own counsel until I have been at headquarters. I am a ruined, hard-working farmer; have no funds, or would go straight to Ottawa. If you will send me a pass I will go and see you with my Indian, I have here as witness. He is a Sioux that I adopted when a small boy. Now he is a fine young man and a good specimen for the Government to look upon and treat accordingly. There would be no trouble in the west if my intended advice is noted down. Trusting you will kindly comply with my request, beg to remain, Sir, your humble servant,

"J. E. BROWN."

To which I replied—as I presume the right hon. gentleman obtained the original of my letter, and read it correctly; I read from his own statement:

"OTTAWA, 7th May.

"I have your letter of the 6th, and should be very glad indeed to learn from you any facts connected with the management of affairs in the Mr. WILSON.

North-West Territories. I would willingly comply with your request for a pass to Ottawa if it were in my power, but I have no means of procuring railway passes. It is possible, though by no means certain, I may be in Toronto for a few hours within the next few days, and if so I would try to arrange an interview with you, or if I am unable to manage that, I can arrange an interview with a confidential friend of mine, who would note down, for my own ear only, all you should choose to communicate, if this would be agreeable to you.

"Yours faithfully,

"EDWARD BLAKE."

To which I received this answer:

"55 ELIZABETH STREET, 5 a.m.

"To ED. BLAKE, Esq.,

"SIR,—In reply to yours just to hand, your friend can drop a line stating time and place. I will give him a few pointers that will bear weight with them. I think I stated to you in my last that I had to leave my home on the South Saskatchewan, Prince Albert, and after 17 days in snowshoes across the Birch Hills, lakes and plains, arrived at Troy, with just enough to pay our fares to Toronto, which was \$56.75, and am now here with no funds, not even a dollar to pay our board. C. F. Miles, D.L.S., invited me up to Dr. Johnson, on Bloor street, to-day, and gave me a recommendation to a Mr. H. B. Proudfoot, D. and P. land surveyor, Clinton, also to George Rainball, D. and P. land surveyor, of Pembroke, that are going out on surveys soon. Now, you will observe, if my name appears at once in any of those charges I shall not get a position on any surveys for a long time to come. So I hope, for my sake, you will not mention my name. They can easily investigate and find out what I state to be correct. If you can put in a word for me and my boy to any surveyor that is going out, I shall be most thankful. Trusting we shall soon have a change of Government for the sake of the whole of Canada, beg to remain, obediently yours,

"BROWN."

To which I replied:

"OTTAWA, 12th May, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—I have your letter, and will ask a friend to make an appointment with you. I will take care, as you desire, that your name shall not be used to your prejudice. I will not disclose it until you have had ample opportunity of securing an appointment for the surveys this year, if you are fortunate enough to do so. But I fancy there will not be a great deal of surveying done. I should gladly assist you in procuring employment if it were in my power, but I have no means of forwarding your interests in this respect. With thanks for your good wishes,

"I am, yours faithfully,

"EDWARD BLAKE."

I requested a friend of mine to communicate with a friend in Toronto, asking him to seek an interview with Mr. Brown, and my friend received from the friend in Toronto this letter, of which I read all the parts that bear on this matter:

"TORONTO, 23rd May, 1885.

"MY DEAR —, I have had Brown looked up and have seen him twice to-day, and have come to the conclusion that he is trying what he can make out of either side and making the most of it. He has been to see Sir John and claims that he has agreed to appoint him a Government detective at \$1,200 a year to drive around the North-West, be provided with horse and conveyance, and so on. He says he is now waiting for a telegram from Ottawa—that he is to have money to pay his expenses to Elkhorn. He showed me a letter he had from Small, saying he had sent him a copy of the Homestead Act, and asking him if he had copies of the letters he sent to Mr. Blake he would like to see them. He says he has not sent copies. I had a friend with me at each of the interviews. I am inclined to think his Indian is the same as has been on exhibition in a King street window for a month, and offered to be leased out for show purposes. He says he wants to sell his information to either party who will pay him, and tells me his cash price to our side is \$1,200; on the payment, his lawyer will hand over the roll. He had been indulging, looks hard, and is evidently a tough citizen. I judge he has been fairly educated, has good ability, with a considerable amount of cunning. If I learn anything of the consequence, I will let you know."

Then, after referring to a political matter:

"At this point I got interrupted, and I have not had time to sit down and write letters or anything else. Brown did not turn up on Monday night; considering it was a holiday, I did not think it likely he would be in condition to make an appearance; but he has not put in an appearance since. I think he sees there is little prospect of money, and my opinion, as well as that of those who have seen him, is that he is a dead beat."

I will only say to the hon. member for East Toronto that the shortest way is the best, and if he wanted to see Brown's letters, and had asked me for them, I would have been happy to have given them.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to call the attention of the House to certain words which the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) has put into a despatch which he says was written by me on the 16th of March, which are not in that despatch, and which are not like anything that despatch contains. The words that are really to be found in the despatch to the Lieutenant Governor were those read by the First Minister when he referred to this question:

"It is not necessary to look up parties who have claims. If they care for their interests, they themselves will come forward and establish their claims."

The hon. member for Provencher, professing to make that same quotation from the despatch—and it is marked as a quotation in this report—gives the following:

"It is perfectly unnecessary to look at parties who may have grievances, or who may have some claims upon the Government. Let them come forward and state their claims."

Now the hon. gentleman may be able to say how he has found words like those in any despatch sent by me.

Mr. ROYAL. No doubt the English grammar of the hon. gentleman is more correct than mine, and I am prepared to give him full credit for that. I am not prepared to say whether I read exactly from the document the other night, but I certainly gave the meaning and the sense of it.

Mr. MILLS. Neither its meaning nor sense.

Mr. ROYAL. I have not had, so far, an opportunity of looking at the proofs of *Hansard*. If I see that I quoted some extract in another language than the official language, or the language in which that extract was written, I will certainly make the amendment in the revised edition.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Observing the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in his place, I think it but right to myself and the party of which I am a member to call the attention of the House to the remarks made by him in my absence yesterday, remarks quite uncalled for, and, I am sure, dictated by a feeling that I personally do not entertain towards the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman said:

"When we think of the history of the Ottawa *Citizen* in the past, it is fruitful of many discussions. The Ottawa *Citizen* has had a checkered career during some years past. At one time, I believe, it was the property of a Minister of the Crown, held under mortgage; at another time it was the property of the sheriff; at another time it was the property of the tax collector of the city of Ottawa; and I believe it only exists, as has been proved by the public records, by the crumbs and droppings which fall from the Government table, and which it is always ready to take up. And when we think of the history of the gentleman who is the conductor of that journal we have something rather astonishing to remember. We can remember that this purist journalist is the man who was known all over the Dominion of Canada as the celebrated contract broker, as the man who had something to do with securing a large sum of money under the celebrated Whitehead contract, I think he is the last man, and his paper is the last paper, that should charge any hon. member of this House with being a sneak and a spy."

I may say that for three years previous to September last, I had no editorial connection with the Ottawa *Citizen*, but in September I became connected, with the reservation that during the Session I should not be expected to contribute articles dealing with members of the House of Commons.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I tell the hon. gentleman I have never contributed any article personally directed against any member of the House, since I have been in the House. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), has thought proper to make a personal attack on me, and to resuscitate an old charge. Two years ago, I challenged hon. gentlemen opposite to show in what way I made, or whether I made, these large sums that the hon. gentleman spoke of. In different counties, at different elections, I have met these charges and disposed of them; I have cleared myself before my constituents who have endorsed my course.

The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) deemed proper last January to go to the county of Lennox to make attacks on me, and I there, at a public meeting, disposed of his charges completely; I told the people that under the same circumstances, having the inner consciousness that I had done no wrong, I would, under similar circumstances, repeat those transactions. In all my transactions, I have nothing to regret; I never received any favor from the Government they could not grant to any member of this House; I never approached the Government, directly or indirectly, in any shape or manner, with any object in view that could not bear the most severe scrutiny. I submitted the whole case to my constituents in the city of Ottawa, and year after year was re-elected mayor. Hon. gentlemen think they can brow-beat me by bringing up these charges, but I am prepared to meet them; I am prepared to place my record against the records of those who attack me, confident in the justice of my case. Let hon. gentlemen opposite remember that the only contract-broker we know of, who ever sat in Parliament, was the Speaker of the House of Commons during the Mackenzie Administration, and let them remember that another hon. member, a member of that Administration, had to resign his seat in consequence of his sharing a Government contract, and went back to his constituents, and was defeated. They should remember these things before attacking me, as they do, year after year. I am not afraid of the smallest or the biggest, of the lightest or the heaviest of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am prepared, on each and every occasion, to defend myself against their slanders. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) looks pleased. He has little cause to be pleased; he has no reason to be proud of any hon. member on his side, who, after I had made explanations two years ago and challenged anyone to say then what they had to say against me or hold his peace, will rise in the House in my absence and make insinuations against me. I am prepared to answer these charges before my constituents. Let any hon. gentleman dare to accept the challenge I make; let the best man they have resign his seat and I will resign mine and go to the polls against him in my constituency on all the charges they can formulate.

Mr. VAIL. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I have no doubt the hon. member for Digby has some recollection of resigning his seat and being defeated. After I had served the city of Ottawa in Parliament for three years, a public meeting took place, at which both Conservatives and Reformers were present, the result being that the meeting passed the following resolution:—

"That this public meeting of the ratepayers of the city of Ottawa hereby tender to Mr. C. H. Mackintosh, mayor of Ottawa, sincere thanks for the able, impartial, and strictly honest manner in which the affairs of the corporation have been carried on during his three years' administration of the duties of mayor of the capital."

Amongst the movers of the resolution were Aldermen Masson and Jamieson—two prominent Reformers—and Mr. Henry Bate, another prominent Reformer. Subsequently, at a meeting of the City Council it was resolved:

"That the members of the council hereby express their unqualified approval of the public spirited and judicious manner in which his worship, Mayor Mackintosh has administered the affairs appertaining to the chief magistracy of the Dominion capital during the past three years, and hereby bear testimony to the honesty, impartiality and ability which characterises the discharge of his duties in the responsible position to which the electors elevated him."

And one of the movers of that resolution was Dr. St. Jean, the Reform candidate in 1882, who, in fact, after it was passed, opposed me in 1882; and there were also among the movers of that resolution, Alderman Masson and Alderman O'Leary, two pronounced Reformers of this city. Yet, though I have been tried by my peers, though my con-

stituents have over and over again given their verdict, because a newspaper contained an article which I did not write, or inspire, which I did not even know of and have not read, the hon. gentleman resurrects slanders and cries against me which had grown stale owing to the lapse of years. The hon. gentleman talked about a paper being held by a Minister of the Crown, and held under mortgage. I am not aware that any Minister of the Crown, since I have been connected with the *Citizen*—I can almost state positively that no Minister of the Crown ever—had a mortgage on or a dollars' worth of interest in the stock of the *Citizen* Company. If the contention of the hon. member for North Brant is correct, if his statement that we, the Conservative publishers or controllers of Conservative newspapers, can go to the Departments day after day, or week after week, and draw large sums of money from the Government, is correct, how is it, as he represents, that the *Ottawa Citizen*, which he says I control, is in such an unhappy condition as he says it is, and has been over and over again? How can he reconcile the statement he makes with the further statement that the *Ottawa Citizen* has been in *extremis*? The fact that the paper is in that position is proof positive that the Government has not dealt generously, or with sufficient generosity, towards the papers that support it. I have never asked a questionable favor from the Government, directly or indirectly, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite—any one of them or any number of them—to show that, since I entered Parliament, I have been guilty of one action which would stain my escutcheon as a politician, or bring the blush of shame to the faces of my constituents. Until they can fight me on my parliamentary record, it is unfair and unjust for the hon. member for North Brant to make such an attack upon me. I have never yet taken notice of the slanders heaped on me by newspapers, and my time is too valuable and too precious to waste it in writing articles even on the profound member for North Brant. I have endeavored to live on terms of amity with hon. members. I have never personally written an article in reference to one of them. If I have anything to say in regard to any of them, I will say it to his face.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has alluded to me, I will say that I did state the facts of his connection with the printing contract, and I may say that I intend, from time to time, to recite those facts, and I would recommend the hon. gentleman, before he fulfils his intention of repeating the operation, as he says he would do on any occasion that offered, to study the Act for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys, which has been passed since the last transaction to which he refers.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. So far as advice given me by the hon. member for West Durham is concerned when backed by a statutory provision, I may be inclined to consider it, but, if it were tendered on his own biased political opinion, I would be the last man to accept it. The hon. gentleman must not imagine that I was not aware of that Act in relation to fraud. I said that, under similar circumstances, if I were a private individual, I would do the very same thing; and, when he speaks of the printing contract, let me say that the *Ottawa Free Press*, when I had voluntarily made my statement without being called upon to do so, because I had nothing to be ashamed of, in its issue of January 29th, 1880, said:

"We publish to-day the evidence of Mr. Mackintosh, given in the case *Boyle vs. The Globe*, and the explanation given by him, corroborated by Mr. Roger, seems to put a different aspect upon the printing contract controversy, in so far as Mr. Mackintosh is concerned. It appears from Mr. Mackintosh's evidence, Messrs. Maclean, Roger & Co., entered into an agreement with him some weeks before the tenders went in that he should join and not compete against them for the parliamentary printing. Mr. Mackintosh's interest to be settled in proportion to the amount of the contract if awarded to them. This arrangement it appears was carried out, Messrs. Maclean, Roger & Co., ultimately purchasing Mr.

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

Mackintosh's interest and not his tender, as was generally understood until now. The evidence seems to exonerate him from the allegations heretofore made, and under the circumstances we now deem it but just to place Mr. Mackintosh's position in a fair light, being neither desirous of doing an injury nor misrepresenting any of the parties more directly interested."

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman for some reason or other has thought proper to bring my name in here. He has stated as a fact that I was a contract printer. I was not a contract printer in any way.

An hon. MEMBER. A contract broker.

Mr. VAIL. Nor a contract broker. I had nothing to do with the printing and never received a dollar directly or indirectly from the Government or anybody else, in this House or outside of it, in connection with any printing contract. I do not know why the hon. gentleman wanted to drag my name in, unless he desired to drag me down to his own level.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It appears by what the hon. member for Ottawa has said, that an injustice was done him in attributing to him the authorship of the article referred to in the House yesterday. I am glad to know that the member for Ottawa was in a position to say that it is only at certain seasons of the year that he is editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*—that during the Session of Parliament, the most important of the different seasons of the year, when the most important discussions take place, he vacates the editorial chair. At the same time, he is the responsible editor of the paper, and he must be held responsible for what appears in that paper. I do not see how he can escape the responsibility for what appears in the *Citizen*. The hon. member for Ottawa, and the editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*, has a right to say what he thinks proper in regard to the member for North Brant, and to criticise the acts of the representatives of the people. I am glad to know that the member for Ottawa has an inward consciousness of his innocence in regard to those things which have been matters of history in the past, which have been referred to in the courts, which the judges of the land have taken cognisance of; but I think it will take a great deal of this inward consciousness that he professes to have to satisfy the public that he had nothing to do with contract broking in connection with the printing contracts some years ago. I will not say anything further except that every gentleman who comes here to represent a constituency has a duty to perform, and, in discharging that duty, he need not care for the frowns or the praises of any journal, no matter what its party politics may be. I have been too long used to the abuse heaped upon the Reformers of the country by the Conservative press to heed what is said either by the *Ottawa Citizen* or by any other Conservative paper. Any one on this side who discharges his duty must expect to be traduced by the organs of the Government. I anticipated that, and I would have been a little disappointed if that had not been meted out to me. I have therefore nothing to say with regard to that. So far, however, as the *Ottawa Citizen* is concerned, I have had a note sent to me just now informing me that it is at the present time in the hands of the tax-collectors. That verifies the statement I made yesterday, and the member for Ottawa is indignant that I should make any such statement when the facts are just what I said. He argues that the poverty of the *Citizen* shows that it does not receive a very large share of Government patronage, but in my opinion this only verifies the truth of the old saying that ill-gotten gains never stick. I say these Tory journals can never expect to prosper, or make money as long as they live, as they do, upon the droppings from the Government table. I say that no man who conducts a journal in such a way as that, and who depends upon the offerings of the Government, can possibly conduct an impartial newspaper in the public interest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I know I am saying something which is very unpalatable to some hon. gentlemen, but it is the simple truth, and I think I am here for the purpose of stating the truth.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I did not desire to say anything personal to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), but he interrupted me while I was speaking.

Mr. VAIL. No, I think not.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I understood him to interrupt me while I was speaking, and I then called attention to the fact that the Halifax Printing Company, the firm of the *Halifax Citizen*, had received \$25,000 from the Government of which he was a supporter; and when Mr. Jones, of Halifax, was a member of the company, and the hon. member for Digby himself had been a member of it; and I showed that he had to resign his seat in consequence of that, and was defeated when he went back to his constituents. So far as the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is concerned, what he says about the *Ottawa Citizen* does not matter materially to me; but I think he is wrong in what he says about the tax-collector. I do not know where he gets his information, but even if it were true, the fact that a newspaper is in *extremis* is not absolute proof that it is receiving any favors from the Government. The *Citizen* has received few favors from the Government; it is fighting its own way, and thus the argument of the hon. gentleman that it is a subsidised organ falls to the ground. It makes absolutely no difference what the hon. gentleman says of myself. Gentlemen far superior to himself, men more profound, at least as profound as he is; men more able, at least as able as he is; men more astute, at least as astute as he is; men more honest, at least as honest as he is, have attacked me over and over again, and what is the result?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this has gone far enough.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I have said all I wanted to say and regret I was called upon to say anything.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a personal matter, and I think it has already gone too far. Orders of the Day.

#### THE OFFICIAL REPORTS OF THE DEBATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A very great latitude, an undue latitude, in my opinion, was granted to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) in the first place. He threw across the House taunts like "contract broker," to my hon. friend from Digby, without the faintest justification. However, Sir, I rose for the purpose of calling attention to a matter more pertinent, perhaps, to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who, if I mistake not, is Chairman of the *Hansard* Committee. Now, I notice that in the report of the 8th July, when a considerable discussion took place on the adjournment, scarcely one word of it appears. It appears to me there ought to be some regulation about this matter. Occasionally, on the motion for adjournment, statements are made of some moment. Statements were made on that occasion of some moment by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) and others, and I do not understand why the *Hansard* reporters should condense, to one line, a discussion which, to my knowledge, took some 20 or 25 minutes. I do not desire this *Hansard*, which is already unduly long, should be spun out unnecessarily, but still there ought to be some means to members of this House, who take part in the discussions, of knowing whether what they say is going to be reported. On all other occasions, at any rate, a summary of what passed has been given, and it is very often necessary that it should be. Here the

whole thing has been expunged, and I do not think it should have been expunged under the circumstances.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know whether the hon. gentleman, in referring to me as the Chairman of the *Hansard* Committee, implies that I had anything to do with this omission—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, no; I called attention to it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have nothing to say except that the instruction to the reporters is to report everything verbatim, and if they do not do it they ought to. I confess I have not looked at it; I do not supervise the report in any way, and should be very sorry to have to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not impute any blame to the hon. member on this occasion, but I only called his attention, as Chairman of the Committee, to the fact that a considerable omission was made.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). If we had no *Hansard* we would have shorter speeches and a shorter Session; and I think it would be more acceptable to members of this House if the *Hansard* were abolished altogether.

#### THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

Mr. WELDON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government when the correspondence and telegrams with regard to the fisheries will be brought down.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I will be able to lay all the telegrams, with the exception of one letter, on the Table at six o'clock. I had them to-day, but when I came to look at them I found one important telegram had been omitted from the list, and I sent them back to the Deputy Minister's office to be completed.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman be able to lay upon the Table the papers connected with the transport regulation, that order abolishing the liberty of transport in United States ports, under the 30th article?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not yet received it. Immediately upon seeing the notice in the newspapers, I instructed the Commissioner of Customs to telegraph at once for a correct copy, as I did not deem it advisable to act upon a newspaper copy; and I have since received a copy of it from one of the forwarders in the West, Mr. Beatty of the Beatty line. I am not prepared to lay that upon the Table until I can investigate the effects that it will have upon some of the old orders.

Mr. BLAKE. I was about to invite the hon. gentleman's attention to that also. I suppose he has an authentic copy of the regulation which is cancelled by this. We have seen it in the papers—I have no doubt correctly—but of course we would like to have an official copy. That regulation appears to be a regulation of 1884, but it is, in fact, a consolidation of the Customs regulations of the United States passed about the time of the confirmation of the Washington treaty. It would be very important to have it. Without it, it is impossible for the House to understand the effect of the order; with it, it is very easy to understand it. I think it has a much more serious effect than the First Minister assumed when he spoke the other day.

Mr. BOWELL. The point to which the hon. gentleman has called my attention suggested itself to me, and immediately upon reading the last circular and comparing it with the provisions of the Washington Treaty, I instructed a clerk of the Department first to go to the law office of the Crown—for, unfortunately, it was not to be found in our Department—and then to consult the library, and to take every means possible to obtain the order to which the hon. gen-

tleman refers, as I found it impossible to know exactly the full meaning and force of the last order without it. Of course it takes a few days to get it, but no time has been lost. The moment the order appeared in the newspapers, instructions were given at once to procure the paper.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.  
(In the Committee.)

Lighthouse and Coast Service..... \$549,990

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Marine promised to give explanations on points to which his attention had been called by the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt).

Mr. McLELAN. With respect to Weller's Bay light, I may say that a sand bar on point is in course of formation, and until it ceases the lights cannot be permanently placed to lead clear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's attention was also called to the practice, which was likely to lead to abuse, of lighthouse keepers farming out their places, and employing other persons at inadequate salaries. A statement was made with respect to that matter, and the hon. member for Prince Edward gave an instance of the light at Knap's Point, in which case a statement was made that the man who had been employed as assistant had reported to the Department that peculations had been going on with respect to the supplies. The hon. gentleman promised some information on this matter.

Mr. McLELAN. An investigation was held. It was found that in one of the cases the man appointed had farmed out the work without the sanction of the Department, and when the attention of the Department was called to it, the man who was removed made charges against the lighthouse keeper of peculation. Enquiry was made, and the report was that nothing, except some small article in connection with the lighthouse, had been taken. The man appointed was given notice that he must either attend to the light himself or resign.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister was requested to produce what papers he had on the subject. Has the hon. gentleman the papers with him?

Mr. McLELAN. I did not so understand it. I can, however, send copies to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand, then, from the Minister, that the practice of farming out—I do not mean employing members of the man's family—is distinctly contrary to the regulations of the Department.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means on 3rd March last, and 9th July, the latter to take effect on and after the 6th day of the present month of July.

Mr. BOWELL. The item with regard to labels should be amended by striking out the word "colored." I find that misapprehension as to the words "colored labels," has already arisen, among those who do not understand the technical meaning of the term. They think that it applies to any label printed on colored paper, but that is not the intention. I therefore move that the word "colored" be struck out.

Resolution, as amended, concurred in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked the hon. gentleman to obtain some information as to the quantity of spirits ex-warehoused at certain points, particularly in Quebec, which he promised to ascertain.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not been able to ascertain that yet. I will give it to the hon. gentleman to-morrow, or when the Bill is before the House.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) to amend the Customs and Excise Acts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the resolutions reported from the Committee of the Whole to grant the further subsidies therein mentioned towards the construction of the railways therein described, be now read the second time.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman was to give certain information upon this subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An hon. gentleman asked for some information about the works executed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the North Shore line since they acquired it. Of course I cannot give the exact figures, but I will give a general statement. The amounts are: Expended on roadway and buildings to the 31st of December, 1884, \$4,936,000, and to the 31st of April, 1883, \$4,759,000, the difference, \$177,000, being the expenditure made under that head; for rolling stock the amount was very small, \$300 or \$400; for machinery to the 31st December, 1884, \$39,324, and to the 21st of April, 1883, \$32,186, the difference being about \$7,000, and for furniture a few hundred dollars, the whole being \$7,679; paid to the city of Quebec on account of the Palais harbor property, \$30,000; paid for the Jacques Cartier extension \$150,000; material on hand, \$25,000; sundries, \$19,600. All these sums, with the amount of \$250,000 to be paid for the stock, make over \$500,000. This does not include the interest on the amount paid for the stock and other expenditures. As to the improvements to be made on the road, I cannot give the exact figures, but I will give generally the proposed arrangements. At Quebec there will be an elevator or two at the harbor works, and no doubt the line would have to be extended to the embankment in order to give facilities of communication between Palais Harbor and the docks. Of course, besides that, they would require to have sidings and other terminal facilities. Then a number of bridges that are in wood would have to be put in iron, and generally the line would have to be looked after in order to put it on a par with the remainder of the line. This will cost about the sum I mentioned the other day when I brought the resolutions before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said the other day the company had already expended \$250,000 on improvements, and promised to give the details. He has not done so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I have. The expense of roadway buildings was about \$180,000, and there are the amounts I have stated making the full amount.

Mr. LAURIER. I need hardly state to the House that having the honor to be one of the representatives of Quebec city I take a deep interest in the matter before us, but I have thought it preferable, under all the circumstances, to wait before offering any observations on the subject submitted to the House, until the Government had given us all the details which it had to give on its policy. Leaving aside that part of the resolution which provides for a subsidy to the Edmonston and Rivière du Loup Railway, which, in view of the subsequent proposals becomes of minor importance, the resolutions show us two things: first, that with regard to the policy announced last Session by the Government, of making the

city of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government have come to no conclusion and no decision whatever. During the 12 months which have elapsed since the close of last Session, the Government, who had taken power under the Act, to settle that question, have not been able to come to any decision yet. True, last Session the Government took power, in view of the policy which, they said, was essentially their policy, of making the harbor of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to provide for the organisation of a company, if they could not bring the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway to an understanding with regard to the purchase of the line from Montreal to Quebec. So far, they have done nothing. This year they have taken exactly the same powers; they do not bind themselves to anything definite, but they ask that the powers given to them last year to effect that object, and which have now lapsed, should be again given to them and extended for a period of two months after the close of the Session; that is to say, failing any agreement being come to between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk for the purchase of the North Shore Railway, the Government may organise a company for the same object. We may ask Will this policy be carried out this year or not? Will it remain a dead letter, as it was characterised by the hon. Minister the other day, on the Statute book? or will it have some tangible effect? I say, whether the Government act or do not act, under the subsequent resolution of the Government with regard to the Short Line Railway, they have dealt a death blow to their so-called policy of making the harbor of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as I will show hereafter. With regard to the railway contemplated to connect Montreal with the seaports of the Maritime Provinces by the shortest route and the best route, they have made a selection. They could not come to a conclusion upon the other matter, but on this one they have, and they have selected a route by the way of the International Railway. The Minister of Public Works, the other day, when he introduced this matter to the House, made a statement to which it is my duty at once to take exception. He spoke as follows:—

“The policy of this Government has been to secure the connection of that railway, not only with the harbor of Montreal, but also to extend it to the port of Quebec, at all events, for the summer, and that during the winter months it should communicate with the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, by an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal. That policy was promulgated and supported by Acts of Parliament passed last Session, by which we voted, for a direct line from Montreal to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, a yearly sum of money during a number of years, in order to assist the construction of that extension from Montreal to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax. On the other hand, Parliament, at its last Session, expressed its desire that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended from Montreal to Quebec by the north shore of the St. Lawrence. An Act of Parliament was passed to that effect, and certain conditions were inserted, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway could extend its line from Montreal to Quebec, or failing that, certain other conditions were put in the law. Thus the policy of Parliament and this Government has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be extended on the south shore of the St. Lawrence down to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and on the north shore of the St. Lawrence by the North Shore Railway to Quebec and thence by the Intercolonial.”

I take exception to this language, in so far as it tends to that the policy adopted by Parliament last Session was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway south of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. I take exception to this statement in the most emphatic language. I challenge the accuracy of it. I deny it. I say that Parliament never adopted such a policy as that. I say that Parliament never committed itself to any line whatever for the continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. On the contrary, the policy adopted by this Parliament and recorded in the Act is that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended from Montreal by the shortest and best line,

wherever that could be found, not south of Montreal, not from any other place, but wherever it should be found, after survey, the best and the shortest on the ground. This was the policy adopted by this Parliament, and the hon. gentleman cannot find a single syllable in the records of this House which can justify the statement he made the other day, that the policy of Parliament was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway by the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the seaboard of the Maritime Provinces. I say more. I say this was not the policy of the Government and, if it was, I should be bound to say, and it would be my duty to say, and I should be warranted in saying, that the Government have been guilty of the grossest deception to this House, because the House never heard, until the 1st of July instant, in the speech of the hon. gentleman, that the policy of the Government was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence; that was the first statement that was ever made. We never heard a word of it before, and if it was the policy of the Government, they carefully kept it concealed in their own breast. I repeat that, if such was the policy of the Government, they have been guilty of the grossest deception to the House and the people of this country. Occasions have not been wanting for them to express their views. There has been lurking in the minds of many a suspicion that indeed this was the policy of the Government, that it was in fact what was declared the other day their intention, to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence; but, if there was a suspicion on that subject, the Government never spoke on it, though time and again they had an opportunity of speaking their minds on the subject. There was a lurking suspicion, and that found its way into the press many times, not only that, but the Minister of Militia last summer had a picnic at Rivière du Loup for the express purpose of talking a little with the Prime Minister on that subject, and he the Prime Minister, had an opportunity of speaking then, and what did he say? Did he say that the policy of the Government was that which has been stated now by his colleague, to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway on the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Montreal? No, as reported in the press, the Prime Minister said on that occasion that the Government had no line but the shortest and the best. If that was the policy of the Government then, the policy has varied since, and if it has not varied, then I say the Prime Minister did not act towards those whom he was addressing with that fairness to which they were entitled. Not only did the Prime Minister give his views upon the subject, but the Minister of Public Works himself had occasion to speak on the matter. He spoke in the month of December at the city of Three Rivers, and he did not then say as he said the other day that the policy was to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. He is reported to have made a statement which agreed with the statement of the First Minister, that the policy was to secure the best and shortest line, after proper survey. I say that the action of the Government to-day, coupled as it is with the language we have heard from the Minister of Public Works and even without that, will create in parts of this country, and in several parts of it, a deep sense of regret and indignation, regret and indignation arising, and naturally arising, from the fact that the Government have not kept the promise they made last year to this House, that they have broken the pledge which they then gave to the House and to the public. What is the history of this matter? Last year, when the first measure was presented to the House, the Government took power to decide themselves, without any reference to this House, the selection of the best and

shortest line. I moved an amendment on that occasion, to the effect that the choice should not be final, but should be referred to the House for approval. A majority of the House was induced to negative that amendment, but in order to get their followers to negative it, the Government had to make promises to them, and the promise was that no line should be adopted except after the most complete surveys. Sir Charles Tupper, who had charge of that measure, spoke as follows in reference to the motion which I had before the House:—

"It is intended, before any line is adopted, that the shortest and best route shall be ascertained by competent engineers, and the Government shall locate the line upon the report of competent engineers, upon what they find, after careful examination, to be both the shortest and best line."

This was the promise made by Sir Charles Tupper upon that occasion, but, complete and thorough as it was, the Minister was questioned by some hon. members in order to have the assurance if possible more complete than it was. The then member for Lévis, Mr. Belleau, said:

"I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if the Government is disposed to admit the principle, that, besides the engineer, who is to be appointed by the Government to make the exploration, other engineers who may be suggested by the Provinces interested, could be admitted as parties to the exploration."

And the answer of Sir Charles Tupper was:

"We will be only too glad to receive any suggestions of that kind."

Not satisfied with this, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Grandbois) went on further and expressed his satisfaction and the reason why he would vote against the amendment which I proposed:

"After the very explicit statements made by the hon. Minister of Railways, it will be readily understood that it is my duty to vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec East; otherwise I would have hesitated a great deal, as the county which I have the honor to represent is one of the counties the most interested in having the short line built exclusively on Canadian territory. The resolution states that the shortest and best line will be chosen, which enables me to hope, Mr. Speaker, that the line will really be built on Canadian soil, and will go through Rivière du Loup, as the hon. member for Quebec East has said."

So this was one—not only one, it was the paramount reason for which the member for Temiscouata voted against the amendment, that the Government pledged themselves to have the whole of the lines thoroughly surveyed before they made a choice. Now, I charge this upon the Government, I charge them deliberately on the floor of this House, that they have not kept the promise they made last year. They have broken the pledge they then made. This, perhaps, may be considered hard and strong language, but I use it advisedly, and I repeat that the Government have broken the pledge they gave last year when they said no selection would be made until after the most complete and thorough surveys. After the departure of Sir Charles Tupper, the Department of Railways was put under the control of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, whom I am sorry not to see in his place when this matter is before the House, but I must say in his absence, as I would say in his presence, that strong objections were taken at the time to the Department of Railways being put under his control because he was supposed to be interested in one of the lines which were to be surveyed, and which might afterwards be adopted and selected. The complaints came not so much from the Opposition press as from the Ministerial press. I will quote here the opinion of a Ministerial paper published in Montreal, which is a strong supporter of the Government—it cannot be objected that it is not a most Conservative paper—I mean *L'Etendard*.

Mr. GIROUARD. An Independent paper.

Mr. LAURIER. An Independent paper which warmly supports the Government, but it offered a good example to some members in reference to the Franchise Bill. That is the only question on which the *L'Etendard* did not support the Government:

Mr. LAURIER.

"It is really unfortunate from many points of view that Mr. Pope, the Minister of Agriculture, immediately after the departure of Sir Charles Tupper, was charged with the control of the Department of Railways. Rightly or wrongly it is stated that this gentleman has a considerable personal interest in causing the new railway to pass by Sherbrooke. It is even stated that a considerable portion of that railway, of which the hon. gentleman is said to be the *quasi* or exclusive proprietor, is to be bought by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at an immense profit for Mr. Pope, if he succeeds in getting a route selected which would permit the incorporation of that portion of the road into the new road. We do not know personally how much truth there is in this statement, but we can hardly believe it. But we do not hesitate to say that Mr. Pope should not have been entrusted with the control of these matters as long as there exists the least reasonable suspicion that he has a personal interest to serve in this connection. Not only would he then become a judge in the case, not only would he, one of the chief officers of the State, find himself in a position to be able to serve his own personal interests to the detriment of the State, but such a state of things would create an immoral and dangerous precedent."

Such is the opinion of *L'Etendard*. Now, during last summer numerous complaints were made in the press that the surveys which were made were not *bona fide*, were not thorough, but that they were partial. Another paper to which objection will not be taken as being a Conservative paper, *Le Canadien*, spoke as follows on this matter:

"This exploration is not made. What is now taking place is a farce, a snare, and a sham exploration. The instructions given to the engineers are insufficient, and the engineers are the first to admit it."

*L'Etendard*, speaking again upon this subject, said:

"The apprehensions of the adversaries of the Sherbrooke line would seem to be, to a certain degree, justified by the fact that Mr. Pope, Acting Minister of Railways, is said to be partial to the extent of not giving to the engineers the instructions necessary to insure an impartial survey of the different rival routes."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to the Acting Minister of Railways to say that he stated the other day that he had nothing whatever to do with these surveys. Well, whoever had anything to do with them, the fact remains that the surveys are not accurate, and particularly are not complete. The Acting Minister states that when he took charge of the Department he would not act in this matter. That he entrusted it to the Prime Minister, and that the Prime Minister was responsible for all the surveys. Sir, this story is not new, it is as old as humanity itself. It is the old story—I am not the one, but the woman whom thou gavest to me to wife, she is the one. Whoever in this matter is the tempter, or whoever is the fallen one—whether the Prime Minister was the tempter and the Acting Minister of Railways the tempted, or whether the reverse was the case—and I am rather inclined to believe that the Minister of Railways was the sweet Eve on this occasion—whoever was the guilty one, the fact remains that the subsidy has been granted to, and the selection has been made in favor of a railway in which the Acting Minister of Railways is directly interested, and this has been done after the promises made by the Government last year that no selection should be made except after complete surveys. These promises had been broken and violated. Now, Mr. Speaker, I proceed to show in what manner and to what extent these surveys are incomplete. In the first place, it was generally understood last year that no subsidy should be given to a line passing through foreign territory until it had been ascertained by surveys that it was impossible to find in our own territory a line, not as good, but almost as good as the line over the foreign territory. What was then the first thing to be done? The first thing to be done was certainly to have this line which was projected exclusively upon Canadian soil fully surveyed. A line was suggested by the way of Edmonston and Rivière du Loup. It was then said, and it has been repeated several times since, that as good a line, a line almost as short, and a better line, in respect of gradients and curvatures, could be found upon Canadian soil by the way of Rivière du Loup. Two routes were proposed to connect Rivière du Loup and Edmonston. One was by the way of the valley of the Rivière du Loup, and the other was by the way of Rivière Ouelle. It would appear

that both have been surveyed, but we have the reports only of one survey. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Blondeau) complained the other day that the report of the survey of the Rivière Ouelle route had not been brought down, and in this connection it may be interesting to quote the report of the chief engineer which has been laid upon the Table, at page 2, where he says :

"Mr. Crawford was in charge of section E, from St. Roch to Edmonston. His plans and profiles are not yet completed, neither has he reported; but he states that a good line is to be had in his survey. He hopes to have his plans and profiles complete and his report ready by the end of this month.

"Mr. Crawford also had charge of section F, from Rivière du Loup to Edmonston. He is busy with the plans and profiles, and hopes to have them ready early in May, together with his report. He states that a practicable line may be obtained, though the grades will be heavy."

The report which states that the grades will be heavy has been brought down, but the other report, in which it is stated that a good line could be had, has not been brought down. What is the reason that both reports have not been brought down? If two surveys have been made, why did not the Government bring them both down, so that the House could judge whether their selection was justifiable or not? Moreover, it is impossible to say whether this line, the report of which we have not complete, is better or worse than the other line through the State of Maine, which has been selected. But the two lines are subsidised, the one from Rivière du Loup to Edmonston, and the one by the way of the International and through the State of Maine. Now, what is the object of giving these two subsidies? In so far as the object is to connect the harbor of Montreal with the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, this can be done by either line, and consequently there is no use whatever in subsidising the two—the one destroys the other. Whether the line through Maine be the better one, or whether the Canadian line be the better one, the one subsidy destroys the other, and one of them is wholly useless.

But it was very properly stated at the time that the line through Maine should be surveyed, and if so I am at a loss to know why the line by way of Richmond to the maritime ports has not also been surveyed. Time and again the county of Richmond and several municipalities in adjoining counties have petitioned this Government to survey a line which they proposed, and which they contented was as good, and even a better line, than the International. I cannot see any reason why this request was not granted; I cannot see any reason why, in face of the promise made last year, that no selection would be made until after a complete survey had been made of all lines proposed, this line has not been surveyed. The other day the Minister of Public Works, speaking of the line by way of Quebec, of which I shall speak presently, said it had not been surveyed because, looking at the map and tracing a direct line from Montreal to the harbors of the Maritime Provinces, the Quebec route was too great an angle from the straight line. When the hon. gentleman was tracing that line on the map he must have found that Richmond is very nearly on the central point of the line, and is almost the nearest point on the direct line from Montreal to ports in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman did not base his selection on that fact, and I quite approve of his so doing. It will not do to select a line simply upon the map, for the short line cannot be determined except upon actual survey on the ground, because we know that in railway construction the distance in mileage is not everything, but grades and curves are important considerations. As I have said, the hon. gentleman will find that Richmond is nearly on the direct line between Montreal and the seaports of the Maritime Provinces. But, strange to say, in order to exclude Richmond the hon. gentleman sets the map aside, and to exclude Quebec the hon. gentleman resorts to the map.

There was another line which was proposed, and that was the line by way of Quebec, a line designed to connect the St. Lawrence at Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and to extend from Quebec City to Canterbury. Upon this line one of the engineers of the Government, Mr. Light, reports as follows. The report is dated 26th March, 1885:—

"Sir,—In my report of surveys, dated 23rd inst., I incidentally directed attention to a line designated "The combination line" to connect Montreal with the Maritime Provinces. I feel convinced this line, if established in connection with a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec, will combine in a marked degree the traffic requirements of Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrews, St. John, St. Stephens, Fredericton, Halifax, and the ports further east, placing all localities on a fair and equal footing.

"This combination line will run from Canterbury, N.B., to Lake Chesuncook, in the State of Maine, and from Lake Chesuncook by the valleys of the Famine and Etchemin Rivers to Chaudière Junction, opposite Quebec, and from thence through the bridge and North Shore Railway to Montreal.

"At Canterbury this combination line will connect with the railway system of the Maritime Provinces.

"Starting from Chaudière Junction the line would traverse the valleys of the Etchemin and Famine Rivers, to the height of land near the village of St. Justin.

"The summit is 950 feet above the starting point at Chaudière Junction, or 509 feet lower than the summit on the line surveyed by me, *via* the Rivière du Sud. From St. Justin the line would continue its course south-east, and nearly direct to the vicinity of the head of Lake Chesuncook, where it would connect with the line surveyed during the past season by Mr. Vernon Smith, C.E., between that lake and Canterbury.

"The country from Chaudière Junction to Lake Chesuncook, and I understand from Lake Chesuncook to Canterbury, lies in such a low valley or depression that it would appear as being the natural direct route for a line of railway between the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and as being the channel through which nature intended that the trade between these Provinces should flow."

A little further on he says:

"The eastern extension of the combination line from Canterbury to Harvey would give St. John a good connection, while another extension from Canterbury along the right bank of the St. John would continue this system of easy gradients to Fredericton, at which place the River St. John would be bridged, and the line continued, *via* the head of Grand Lake, for the most part through a flat country, to Salisbury, there intersecting the Intercolonial Railway.

"This line would have a marked effect on the trade with the Maritime Provinces, and would go far to compensate for the increase distance to their ports as compared with Portland, Boston and New York. (See synopsis of distance from Callander to St. John and Halifax, *via* Chesuncook, App. 6.) It would save about 150 miles of railway to Halifax, and nearly double that to St. John; and should be thoroughly constructed with rails and bridges sufficiently strong to carry the consolidation engines (now so much in use in Pennsylvania), capable of hauling a gross load of 800 to 1,000 tons over its grades, or nearly double that which could be hauled on the Intercolonial Railway, with the same power, and at little additional cost per train mile.

"The railways from the Province of Quebec to the ports of Boston and Portland, although apparently shorter, have to ascend the higher lands of the watershed, which is the boundary, and have therefore much higher summits and steeper gradients. The Ogdensburg and Portland Railway passes over a summit of the White Mountains, in New Hampshire, 1,890 feet above the sea level, with maximum grades of 116 feet to the mile and minimum curves of 9 degrees (633 feet rad.).

He goes on further to say:

"The line would pass directly through the extensive coal fields at the head of Grand Lake, New Brunswick, (mentioned in the reports of the Geological Survey), one seam alone of which is estimated to contain one hundred millions tons of coal, so near the surface that it is quarried and not mined. This mineral, at present almost excluded from commerce in this isolated district, could be carried as return freight, ensuring loaded trains both ways, and bituminous coal, reported to be excellent for forging and other purposes, could be delivered at Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa for \$3, \$3.86 and \$4.33 per ton."

That opinion is the opinion of one of the engineers employed by the Government. It is true that the other day some hon. member attempted to cast some imputations upon the professional character of Mr. Light. It is no business of mine to defend Mr. Light from those imputations. His report is there; the figures are there, and they cannot be challenged by any imputation. Moreover, the only imputation made was simply this: that formerly, while in the employment of the Quebec Government, he had been amenable to certain influences coming from Terrebonne. There are more engineers than one in the country, and there are more sources of influence than one also; and I believe, if in former times the source of influence was

Terrebonne, that source is dry to-day, that the source of influence is now to be found in the county of Compton. Upon this report made by Mr. Light the chief engineer made the following observations:

"Query No. 1.—Mr. Light, on pages 2 and 3, expresses a belief that the maximum grade between Quebec and Moncton by way of Chesuncook and Harvey would be 35 to 40 feet per mile, and that the surveys of last season have established that the grades above mentioned can be obtained between Chesuncook and Harvey.

"Mr. Vernon Smith's survey, the only one made between Chesuncook and Harvey last season, shows maximum grades of 53 feet per mile.

"The line between Quebec and Chesuncook has not been surveyed."

I ask the Government why this line has not been surveyed? Was not the promise made last year, that all competing lines would be surveyed, that only competent engineers would be employed; and when one of the engineers employed by the Government says that further surveys should be made in order to do justice to all parties, what excuse can be put forward by the Government for not having this line in question surveyed?

Mr. COLBY. When did he say that? When did the engineer suggest that this survey should be made?

Mr. LAURIER. I will answer the hon. gentleman in the language of Mr. Light himself. In reply to Mr. Schreiber's statement, that the line between Quebec and Chesuncook had not been surveyed, Mr. Light says:

"I always considered that a survey of this line was most important, and strongly recommended to Mr. Schreiber that it should be made, by telegram dated 1st August, 1884. His reply was a peremptory refusal."

Mr. COLBY. Would the hon. gentleman like a copy of that telegram to assist his argument?

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman surprises me. The hon. gentleman is in the secrets of the Government, but why did not the Government take the House into its secrets, and not some members of the House only? Was the promise made only to certain members of the House, who happened to be in favor of a certain line? Was not the promise made to all the members of the House? The hon. member for Stanstead has certain preferences, for which I do not blame him, in favor of another line, but I have just the same right that he has to be put in possession of the secrets of the Government. I charge the Government with not taking this House in their confidence, and confiding to individual members the information they ought to have confided to the House, and that in not doing so, there was another breach of duty to the House.

Mr. COLBY. I asked for information and received it, and if the hon. gentleman had asked for information, it would have been given.

Mr. LAURIER. I act upon the information given us by the Government, but what I complain of is that the Government had supplied us with incomplete information, and what the hon. gentleman has just now stated goes further to justify the charge I have been bringing against the Government. What was the reason given by the Minister of Public Works for not calling for a survey of this line from Quebec? His reason was that he had taken a map and he had caused to be traced there the different lines, and he found such a difference in the angles that he had to give Quebec up. Here is his language:

"At all events, I asked the chief engineer of railways to prepare this other map, and to show on it the air line from Montreal to Louisburg, that is to say, the straight line from one point to the other. I have had that line drawn, and the Mattawamkeag route is contrasted here with the other lines passing through Quebec and the other portions of the territory, and the result is that this Mattawamkeag route is, at its greatest distance from the air line, distant 20 miles from it; that is to say, that the distance to the air line, from the point which is the farthest on the Mattawamkeag route from the air line, is 20 miles, whilst the most distant point on the other lines through Quebec is 80 miles from the air line. It is impossible that any calculation can show that a line which is 80 miles at a number of points from the air line can be shorter than the other line, which is, at its most distant point, distant about 20 miles from the air line. It stands to reason, though there are curves, that if,

Mr. LAURIER,

instead of putting a curve, you draw a line from Montreal to the extreme point, and another line to the point where it reaches the air line on the Quebec route, and do the same thing for the Mattawamkeag route, you will find that that will make two triangles; and it is elementary that the longest side of a triangle is shorter than the two other sides. Therefore, if the distance from the base to the farthest point of the triangle is 20 miles, the route or distance of the two sides of that triangle must be shorter than that of the two sides of the other triangle, in which the distance from the base to the highest point is 80 miles. Therefore, with all my good-will to my native city of Quebec, with all the desire to do all I could do for it, facts are facts, truth is truth, and I must go by the facts and the truth."

Now, I ask if that was what was promised last year when the Government stated that they would have all the competing lines surveyed by thoroughly competent engineers? The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, that railway distances are not measured on maps, that they can be measured only on the ground, not only in point of mileage, but in point of grades and curves which cannot be done on a map, and I say this is a dereliction of duty on the part of the Government, in not having a proper survey made, and deciding merely upon a map. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman was quite sincere when he said his heart was almost broken when he had to decide against his native city of Quebec, but I cannot pity him or sympathise with him, because if he had taken the trouble to take even the insufficient reports he had before him, he would have found that the line by Quebec was actually shorter than the Mattawamkeag line: and perhaps it may not be even yet too late to take up these reports and figures, and change his decision, and thus prevent his heart from further falling to pieces, by doing justice to his native city. I invite the hon. gentleman's attention to the figures he will find in the report of the engineers. The chief engineer—I do not pretend to say that he is influenced—in the papers we have before us, reports the distances by way of the line by Montreal and St. John as 274 miles. But the engineer, in making up his distance, conveniently leaves out the existing railways out of the calculation, and strikes across the country a route which is not surveyed, amounting as he says, to 58 miles. I object to this mode of calculation, and if we want to have a fair calculation we must take the figures we have from actual surveys and existing railways, and not from the fanciful figures derived from imperfect information, as it always is imperfect unless based on actual ascertained facts. Now, the actual distance is calculated from Montreal from Bonaventure station, I imagine; but that is not right. The distances should not be calculated from Montreal, but should be calculated from Hochelaga, though that, perhaps, would not be fair if we are to make comparisons with the other line. I think the best starting point is to base our calculations from St. Martin's Junction, which would be the diverging point of the two lines. Now, what are the distances? The distance from St. Martin's Junction to Chaudière Junction, including the bridge over the St. Lawrence at Cap Rouge is 161 miles. The actual distance, as I find it on the time-table from St. Martin's Junction to Petite Rivière Junction is 155 miles, and from Petite Rivière to Chaudière 6 miles, according to a table which I have before me, so that the distance, between these two points is 161 miles. The distance from Chaudière Junction and Chesuncook is 105 miles. My authority for this is the report published by Mr. Light, page 18; but this part of the ground has not been instrumentally surveyed; we have to go on more or less probable figures; but I can give evidence that the figures—though not given on actual surveys, but only on barometrical surveys—cannot be very far wrong, because Mr. Vernon Smith, in his report, at page 27, says: "It is but a little over 100 miles from Chesuncook to Levis." Then the distance from Chesuncook to Harvey is 136 miles, upon actual survey; from Harvey to St. John, by the existing railway, the distance is 66 miles, making a total of 468 miles. Now, let us see what the distances are by the other line, the sub-

sidised line. From St. Martin's Junction to Mile End, 6 miles; from Mile End to Lachine, where it is intended to bridge the St. Lawrence, about 9 miles; from Lachine to Lennoxville, including bridge, 100 miles; the International Railway, 89 miles; from the International Railway to Mettawamkeag, 136 miles, according to the survey; from Mettawamkeag to Vanceboro, by the existing railway, 56 miles; from Vanceboro to St. John, 91 miles; total, 471 miles. So that by these figures, which cannot be disputed, the calculation of the Minister of Public Works and the map are shown to be erroneous. The distance is actually shorter by Chesuncook than by Mettawamkeag. These are the facts, and these facts I submit to the solemn consideration of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Then, with regard to the gradients; some time ago, when we had a discussion on this matter, it was stated as a blemish on the line which I advocate, by way of the North Shore Railway, Quebec, and Chesuncook, that the gradients from Hochelaga to the Mile End were 82 feet to the mile. If that is an argument at all, it applies to both lines; no train can go from Hochelaga to Mile End unless it passes upon that grade. But on the rest of the line which is to be subsidised by the resolutions, from Montreal to Mettawamkeag, the hon. gentleman stated the other day that the grades are 74 feet to the mile. What are the grades on the line from Quebec to Chesuncook? Mr. Light, in his report, says that they are from 40 to 45 feet to the mile; at all events, he says there is a difference of almost 20 feet to the mile between the grades of the two lines. What does Mr. Schreiber say on this point? On page 15 of the report, the statement made by Mr. Light, in the language of Mr. Schreiber, is as follows:—

"Mr. Light, on pages 2 and 3, expresses a belief that the maximum grade between Quebec and Monoton by way of Chesuncook and Harvey would be 35 to 40 feet per mile, and that the surveys of last season have established that the grades above-mentioned can be obtained between Chesuncook and Harvey."

Then Mr. Schreiber gives this as his answer:

"Mr. Vernon Smith's survey, the only one made between Chesuncook and Harvey last season, shows maximum grades of 53 feet per mile."

I do not think this is a fair statement by Mr. Schreiber, because Mr. Smith actually says, in his report:

"By slightly increasing the earthworks, I believe that on a re-survey the objectionable points may be greatly improved, and that the whole distance from Harvey to Chesuncook may be covered with gradients not exceeding 35 feet per mile, and with no curve exceeding 3 degrees or 1,910 feet radius."

So that Mr. Smith actually corroborates the statement of Mr. Light, that upon this line the maximum gradients could be reduced to 35 or 40 feet to the mile; whereas, it is admitted by the Minister himself, and in the reports, that the gradients on the Mettawamkeag line, or some of them, at least, are 74 feet to the mile. This will not surprise anybody, when we look at the statements which have been made with regard to the summits. Mr. Light says that the summits to be overcome on the line I advocate are only 950 feet, and some of the other engineers 750 feet, whereas it is admitted that on the International line the summits to be overcome exceed 1,800 feet; so that there must be a considerable difference in the gradients. I have only taken the figures so far as they apply to St. John; I have not taken them so far as they apply to St. Andrew's or Halifax. With regard to a line to Halifax, I cannot do better than quote from a letter addressed by Mr. E. H. Keating to the mayor and citizens of Halifax, with regard to the two proposed lines.

"If we now turn our attention to the surveys projected across the country from the vicinity of Quebec, it will be found, if any reliance is to be placed in the statements of the engineers who have examined the ground, that a shorter, cheaper and superior line, passing over much lower summits, with easy curves and moderate gradients, involving no engineering difficulties and free from most of the objectionable features of the more southern route, can easily be obtained. This line has been advocated by Mr. Light and is shown on the accompanying map by

heavy dashes marked 'combination line.' Although this route presents the strongest possible claims for favorable consideration, it is not shown upon the Government map, nor is it referred to in the report. It passes through a country which is said to need railway facilities and development, it does not involve the construction of as many miles of new railway as the southern route described, and it can be much more cheaply built and operated. For the above reasons, in the interests of the port of Halifax and the Maritime Provinces, and in the common interests of the Dominion, I would most strongly urge upon your committee, the Government of the Province, the city council and the Chamber of Commerce, to leave no stone unturned to procure, if it is possible to do so, the adoption of this route, and to spare no pains to prevent, by all legitimate means, the selection of a line which must inevitably have the effect of diverting to foreign ports the bulk of that traffic to and from the west which is ours by right, and will deprive us of our last visible chance of regaining commercial prosperity. In describing the combination line, which is recommended to your favorable consideration, I will first give the distances as measured and calculated by Mr. Light, and over those portions of the route which are common to other projected lines. I will afterwards refer to any apparent discrepancies in measurement when compared with the distances given in the official report of the Government. The combination line is proposed to run from Montreal to Chaudière Junction over the North Shore Railway, 173 miles, crossing the river by the contemplated bridge at Cap Rouge, near Quebec. From Chaudière Junction the line would traverse the valley of the Etchemin and Famine Rivers, and from thence would run in nearly a direct line to Lake Chesuncook, 105 miles. From Lake Chesuncook to Canterbury, 111 miles, the line follows the survey of Mr. Vernon Smith. From Canterbury to Salisbury, 121 miles, it would either go direct to Fredericton or by way of Harvey and Fredericton. From Salisbury to Halifax, 200 miles, the Intercolonial Railway would be followed. The total distance between Montreal and Halifax by this route will thus be seen to be 710 miles, of which 337 miles require to be built, while to St. John the distance would be 481 miles, with 242 to build, or, in other words, there would be a saving over the southern route of 30 miles from Montreal to Halifax."

And then, speaking of the discrepancies, he says:

"On certain sections there are minor discrepancies between Mr. Light's figures and those given in the official report presented to the Government, which are too insignificant to demand any special notice, as they do not exceed one mile in each instance."

Since the discrepancies are so slight, it is not worth while going into them. Now it may be asked: Do hon. gentlemen opposite, representing the Maritime Provinces, which are specially interested in the line to Halifax, expect that this line, as it is now laid down in the resolution, from Montreal to Mettawamkeag and Fredericton and Salisbury, will ever be constructed, as contemplated in the resolution? If they do, they have greater faith in the resolution than I have. I believe the line will be built to Mettawamkeag, but I do not believe it will be constructed any farther east. There are many reasons which induce me to believe that. In the first place, we have this year an increase of subsidy, but we have no explanation as to the reason of the increase. Last year the subsidy voted was \$170,000 a mile for 15 years; this year it is increased to \$250,000 for 20 years, but we have not, so far, a single word of explanation as to what is the cause which has induced the Government to make this increase, or as to the principle on which it is based. The whole thing has been left in the dark. The leader of the Opposition the other day questioned the Government as to that, but he could obtain no answer. Not a word has been uttered on the floor of Parliament, not a paper brought down, to show on what principle this subsidy has been increased. Another question that occurs to me is: who are to-day the promoters of that line? We have not a word of information as to that. All we know is, that it is understood this is to be an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But who are the actual promoters of the line? Who offers to build the line on those conditions? We do not know. And a more significant fact is this: This subsidy has been calculated evidently, and has been brought down to the House—this subsidy of \$250,000 a year for twenty years—to build what? A railway from Montreal to Salisbury? No; from Montreal to Mettawamkeag. Such was the resolution when it was introduced. The resolution then provided for the construction of a railway from Montreal to Mettawamkeag, for a line of railway to connect Montreal with the harbors

of St. John and Halifax *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake and Mettawamkeag. There was not a word of Fredericton or Salisbury. But I understand that certain hon. members from the Province of Nova Scotia went to the Government, and the next day, when the resolutions were introduced, these words were added by a stroke of the pen: That the subsidy should apply, not only as first contemplated, for a line to Mettawamkeag, but also for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mettawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury; so that in the course of a night the whole policy of the Government was altered most materially. The Government brought in a resolution to the House, inviting Parliament to vote \$250,000 a year for twenty years to build a railway as far as Mettawamkeag. This was the subsidy which, in their opinions, was required to build such a railway, yet the following day they propose that addition to the resolution which will increase the construction of the railway by at least 100 miles of new railway. The promoters of this policy were actuated either by honesty or by greed. In the former case, they demanded a subsidy to build a railway to Mettawamkeag and no further, and I suppose they demanded the subsidy requisite to carry out that object. Is it to be supposed these men would undertake for the same subsidy to build 100 miles more of new railway. If they were actuated by greed only, would they give up the large subsidy? These facts lead me to the inevitable conclusion that the railway will never be built to the harbors of Fredericton and Salisbury except on paper. There is another aspect to these resolutions. The resolution proposes what last year was proposed, that the North Shore Railway should be placed under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of making Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government have several times avowed their policy of making Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir Charles Tupper last year spoke in this significant language on this subject:

"And as regarded the other portion, the only hesitation, the only doubt that existed as to the propriety of expending the \$12,000 per mile from Montreal to the harbor of Quebec, arose from the fact that the Government of Quebec had parted with that portion of the railway, and that, at this moment, it did not afford that short and unrestricted line of communication for the Canadian Pacific Railway to make the harbor of Quebec that which it is believed, in the interest of the whole of this country, it is desirable it should be made, namely, the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

So that the Government are here committed, in the mouth of Sir Charles Tupper, who was entrusted with the carrying out of their railway policy, to the policy of making Quebec the summer terminus, and this in the best interests, not only of the city and district and Province of Quebec, but of the whole country. On the same occasion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works spoke in even a more emphatic manner. He said:

"In answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse I must say this—the hon. gentleman speaks as if the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not to be in the Province of Quebec. The extension is to be from Montreal to Quebec, and in the Province of Quebec, and for the benefit of the whole Dominion, but especially for the benefit of Quebec. The intention is to make the harbor of Quebec the eastern terminus in summer of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This has been asked, the people and the press have asked it, and we have come down with these resolutions to carry it out; that is to say, we propose to give \$6,000 per mile in order that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be in the harbor of Quebec."

Now a good deal of mystery has also so far enshrouded the policy of the Government. They took power last year, very large powers, they have taken power to organise the company, to subsidise the railway at the rate of \$6,000 per mile to Quebec. They had contemplated to use their good offices with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway to bring them together so that the North Shore Railway might be placed under the control

Mr. LAURIER.

of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so as to make the harbor of Quebec the summer terminus of that railway. Nothing has been done. Will anything be done this year? They take the same power this year, and they also propose to increase the subsidy. Whether the new arrangements succeed which are contemplated by the Government, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway purchase the North Shore Railway, or, failing this, the Government undertake to form a company to build an additional line from Montreal to Quebec, I say that, by the policy they have adopted, so far as the short line is concerned, they destroy their policy so far as they proposed to make the harbor of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They kill with one hand what they profess to give life with the other. The reason is obvious. Suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company purchase the North Shore Railway; suppose, as has been said by the Minister of Public Works, that they build terminal buildings in Quebec, and that they improve the road; still the line will remain a local road, the same as it is to-day—it will remain in the same condition, with this difference that, instead of being operated by the Grand Trunk Railway, it will be operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. As far as any advantages to the city of Quebec are concerned, as far as the object of making Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, all that will be lost, and the reason is, that in order to make any harbor, whether it is Montreal or Quebec, the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that harbor has to be connected with the winter ports by a direct line of railway. It stands to reason that, though you carry out these resolutions, though you build elevators at Quebec, if there be no connecting line between the summer and the winter terminus, there will be no freight going to the summer terminus. What will take place? The Canadian Pacific Railway purchases the North Shore; suppose they will build elevators at Quebec, as stated by the Minister of Public Works; these elevators are filled with wheat, which cannot all be transported during the summer season; at the close of navigation the elevators are full of wheat; how will that wheat be carried away from Quebec during the winter months? Suppose there is a rise in the price of wheat during winter months? Suppose there is a rise in the price of wheat at Liverpool during the winter months, how will that wheat be carried from the summer to the winter ports, unless there is a direct line of railway from Quebec to the winter ports? It is intended to make winter ports, at St. Andrew's, St. John, and Halifax. Now, will the freight be carried from Quebec to these winter ports if there is no line of railway between the two? It is impossible; the wheat will have to remain there until the following season; and the result will be, that not another cargo will afterwards go to the port of Quebec. So it is manifest, as anything can be manifest at all, that unless there is a direct line of railway between Quebec and the winter ports, though they may on paper make Quebec the summer terminus, it will be only on paper, but the trade will never go to Quebec. It will go to that harbor whence it can be shipped at all times, either by water or by rail. It has been said, by way of objection to the line by way of Quebec, that if you adopt it, a bridge has to be built at Quebec. So say I. I do not deny it, but I say more. I say that the St. Lawrence has to be bridged by the Canadian Pacific Railway at one point or another. It will be bridged, and they have already taken steps to bridge it at their summer terminus, and nowhere else. It will be bridged at Montreal, because they intend to make Montreal their summer terminus; but if the Government are in earnest, and intend to make Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if, in accordance with that, the Government used their good offices with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company,

as they intend to use them under these Resolutions, in order to induce them to acquire the North Shore Railway, they should prevail upon them to make Quebec the summer terminus, and then it will follow that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be compelled to build their bridge, not at Montreal but at Quebec. They will build their bridge wherever their summer terminus is, and wherever their harbor is connected by a direct line with the sea, and nowhere else. So, if the Government are in earnest, they have it in their power to use their influence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make Quebec the summer terminus, and they will bring the short line to Quebec. As a consequence of that policy the Pacific company will have to build their bridge, not at Lachine, near Montreal, but at Cap Rouge, near Quebec. I now address myself to another consideration. The Government have broken the promises they have made to the House; they have not had the surveys made which they were bound to cause to be made; they have selected a line they should not have selected, and which they promised should not be selected until they had full information on the subject. What is the reason? No reason, so far, has been given; no reason has been ever given to the satisfaction of this House, to justify the Government for having done what they have done. In fact, there can be no justification for the Government, after having pledged themselves as they have, breaking those pledges. But in the press of Lower Canada I find some reasons. Reasons are given why this short line has been selected, and if we are to believe the statements made in Lower Canada, not made by the Opposition press, but by the Ministerial press, and not only by one shade of the Ministerial press—because there are two shades; there are men of one hue and men of another hue—but by men of all shades of hue who favor the Government, the reasons given are, that this line has been selected by intriguers. Upon this point I will quote the language of the Ministerial press itself. I will first take *Le Canadien*, which represents one shade of blue color in Lower Canada. Speaking of the resolution now before the House, it says:

"The railway policy is before the House, in so far as the Pacific Railway extension to the seaports is concerned. It confirms that of last year, in this sense, that the short line by the south receives an additional subsidy. Most of those who to-day are protesting, have prepared, during the Session of 1884, the final adoption of the International and Maine route. When *Le Canadien*, *L'Événement*, demanded that before voting thirty millions to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the members should exact the adoption of the northern route, those papers were riddled with invectives. Then was the time to insure the extension of the Pacific Railway through our Province; circumstances were favorable; success was easy. But it was feared that the North Shore Railway would be sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that Mr. Senecal would realise some profit. And first and last, Senecal had to be assassinated, should the Province go to all the devils.

"Such a deplorable policy has had its result; the Sherbrooke route has been adopted; it is the fault of intrigue.

"At all events, it behoves us now to shape our course like business men, and not to lose our time in ridiculous jeremiads. Let ask for compensations."

Then there is another shade represented by a well-known paper in Quebec, called *Le Nouvelliste*, which, commenting upon this very article in *Le Canadien*, says:

"It is the Senecal clique that speaks by the mouth of Mr. Tarte.

"As may be seen, the clique submits easily enough to the selection of the Pope route, by the way of Sherbrooke.

"Everything is for the best, since the so long coveted million is at last going to fall into Mr. Senecal's pocket.

"Will the Province be as easily satisfied? The future will tell us.

"What we predicted five years ago is fulfilled to the letter.

"The Chapleau faction and the Pope faction had each their interest: the one, the sale of the North Shore Railway; the other, the turning off of the Pacific Railway towards the International. Isolated, the two groups were powerless; united, they commanded a majority.

"They united, and their union has secured the triumph of the policy which our district and the whole of the Province fought against."

Now, Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain. According to the opinion expressed by all shades of opinions in the Conservative press of Quebec, this policy is not conceived for the public good; but, in the opinion of these two papers belonging

to the Ministerial press, it has been conceived in intrigue and for private ends. Whether the policy will assassinate Mr. Senecal, as one of these papers says, or will put a million dollars into his pocket, as the other paper says, it is premature to discuss. I would look at the matter in view of Canadian interests. We, from the district of Quebec, feel warmly upon this subject. But we ask for no favors; we ask for nothing but justice. Last year we were promised that no selection of a route would be made until surveys had been completed. We have reason to believe that these surveys will establish that the shortest and best route to connect the eastern Provinces with Montreal must follow the valley of the St. Lawrence to the harbor of Quebec; and believing this, we ask that these surveys should take place, and if it is then found that they do not justify our contention, we will submit graciously to the inevitable. But if these surveys show that the shortest and best line must tap the St. Lawrence to the harbor of Quebec, then, in the language of Sir Charles Tupper last year, the interests of the whole country are linked with the interests of Quebec. For these reasons I move now:

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: In the opinion of this House, additional surveys are requisite, in order to a sound decision for the short line railway, and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys have been made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has ended his speech by a motion to the effect that additional surveys are requisite in order to arrive at a sound decision as to the best route for a short line railway. Well, the hon. gentleman must remember that when these resolutions were brought down it was with a view of having them adopted as a whole, or, as the hon. gentleman proposes, to reject them altogether. The resolutions propose to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway to the seaboard of the Maritime Provinces, and they have no other object, as the hon. gentleman may see upon reading them. The idea is to make this extension to the Lower Provinces, either by the south shore or by the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and thus give an outlet, in the summer, to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec, and in winter, at the ports of the Lower Provinces. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman's motion should prevail, the whole matter would be delayed for another year; and it is for the hon. gentleman, on his responsibility as a member of Parliament, to support this proposition in the interest of the city of Quebec, a portion of which he represents in this House; it will be for him, under that responsibility, to show that it is in the interest of the city of Quebec, in the interest of the Province of Quebec, and in the interest of the Dominion, that the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec and thence to the seaboard of the Lower Provinces should be delayed in order that additional surveys may be made. Of course, the country will judge which of the two policies is the best. The hon. gentleman has labored to show that when I introduced these resolutions—of course, he was too civil to say that I wanted to deceive the House—but he said that I wished to show that the short line should be on the south shore, and not on the north shore of the St. Lawrence; and he quoted a portion of my speech in support of his view; but unfortunately he had not time to read another portion of my speech, which would have explained the first portion. The hon. gentleman quoted a portion of my speech, but, unfortunately, he had not sufficient time to read another portion of my speech which would have certainly explained the point, because my speech was not one extending over three or four days, but was made on one day and at one time, and therefore the whole speech must be read together. This was the quotation made by the hon. gentleman:

"The policy of this Government has been to secure the connection of that railway, not only with the harbor of Montreal, but also to extend it to the port of Quebec, at all events, for the summer, and that during the winter months it should communicate with the seaports of the Maritime

Provinces, by an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal. That policy was promulgated and supported by Acts of Parliament passed last Session, by which we voted, for a direct line from Montreal to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, a yearly sum of money during a number of years, in order to assist the construction of that extension from Montreal to St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax. On the other hand, Parliament, at its last Session, expressed its desire that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended from Montreal to Quebec by the north shore of the St. Lawrence. An Act of Parliament was passed to that effect, and certain conditions were inserted, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway could extend its line from Montreal to Quebec, or, failing that, certain other conditions were put in the law. Thus the policy of Parliament and this Government has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be extended on the south shore of the St. Lawrence down to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and on the north shore of the St. Lawrence by the North Shore Railway to Quebec, and thence by the Intercolonial."

The portion of the speech which the hon. gentleman did not read, but which he should have read, is further down, at the foot of the same column. It is as follows:—

"I come now to speak of the proposed short line on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. In accordance with the promise made to this House last Session, that the Government would see proper surveys were made, in order to ascertain which line was the best and shortest between Montreal and the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, the Government, through the Department of Railways, gave directions to engineers to go and examine the country and certain routes, in order to see which was most desirable, and the shortest and best for the country, and to secure the object Parliament had in view in voting a certain sum of money during a certain number of years for that purpose. Those lines have been surveyed: (1) from Montreal *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake and Mattawamkeag. (2) Montreal *via* Sherbrooke, north of Moosehead Lake and Canterbury. (3) Montreal *via* Quebec and Hartland. (4) Montreal by Rivière Ouelle, or St. Rochs and Edmundston. (5) Montreal *via* Quebec Rivière du Loup and Edmundston."

Therefore, the statement I made and the idea which I intended to convey, and which I did convey in that speech, and in the explanations I gave to the House, was a statement as to the facts—that is to say, that the Government have taken the course which they promised to adopt and which was inserted in the Act of Parliament, that surveys should be made in order that we might ascertain which was the best and shortest route, either by railways built or railways to be built on the south shore, or coming by the North Shore Railway to Quebec, and thence by the Intercolonial to the Lower Provinces. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman had read my speech a little further on, he would have seen that the statement I made was in exact accordance with the Act of last Session. The hon. gentleman says that a promise was given that no selection would be made until after complete surveys had been carried out. The Government did all they could to have perfect surveys made. They employed engineers and expended a large sum of money for that purpose, in order to execute the intention of Parliament, in accordance with the law of last Session. Those surveys were made with as great accuracy as possible. The lines are shown on the map, which I again lay on the Table of the House, and the hon. gentleman will see that the line which the Government recommends, the line which the Government believes to be the best and shortest route is that, which, as I mentioned the other day, is known as the Mattawamkeag line. That line is, according to all the statements and figures which have been laid before Parliament, in the official documents and according to the plan, the shortest. The hon. gentleman has again come forward with a statement of Mr. Light, that another line might be found which would be a shorter line. The other day I showed that it could not be so; that the line advocated by Mr. Light was a line that could not be accepted as the shortest line. The reason I gave—and I tried to show it in as striking a form as possible, after explaining that the line Mr. Light wished to have was what is known by hon. gentlemen opposite as the Chesuncook line, could not be as short a line as the Mattawamkeag line was. I have had another map prepared, which I lay on the Table, and it shows an air line drawn from Montreal to Louisburg. The line in blue shows the line which the Government believes and recom-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

mends as the best and shortest route. The other line marked blue up to a common point is the Chesuncook line. I wish to convey to the House and to the country that the line recommended by Government to Parliament is the best and shortest line, and that it is impossible that the Chesuncook line could be as short a line as the Mattawamkeag line. If you draw a straight line from Montreal to the furthest point on the Chesuncook line, and draw another line straight to a common point on the Mattawamkeag line, you have a regular triangle. If you do the same for the Mattawamkeag line, and draw a line from Montreal to the extremest point of this line—on the air line—and continue another line to the common point, you will find a small triangle south of the Mattawamkeag line, while you have a large triangle north of it. As I said the other day, it strikes the eye at once that it is impossible that that line can be as short as the Mattawamkeag line. For that purpose, I will lay this map also on the Table, so that hon. gentlemen may examine both. The hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment has also taken care to defend the Rivière Ouelle route, and he has tried to show—at allevents, that was the inference from his remarks—that the Rivière Ouelle route had not been properly surveyed, that we had not the information wanted, and that we were selecting the Rivière du Loup line. I think my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Blondeau), who has thus been protected by the hon. member from Quebec East, will be very thankful to him for having called attention to this matter. In this matter, as well as with respect to the other line, the Government had no other alternative than looking at the routes as they are, and even now they do not select one route over the other. The proposed grant is to be given to the line, the same as was stated in the Act of 1883. I think the resolution this year is exactly in the same terms. The resolution is:

"For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup or Rivière Ouelle in the Province of Quebec."

Well, the Government did not select a point of departure; they are prepared to leave it as in the statute of 1883, and have the line determined afterwards. But, in order that hon. gentlemen may have the advantage of seeing the road as surveyed from Edmundston to Rivière Ouelle, I have brought this plan, which will show hon. gentlemen the advantages and disadvantages of the line. It is a question of engineering and of cost, and the company who have to build the road will have to select the route which, in their estimation, will be the best, the most favorable, and least expensive, and a line which will give the largest traffic possible. The hon. member for Quebec East has also spoken of the grades on the different lines. Well, I do not suppose that we, as lay members, can begin to discuss all the grades of these different routes, so as to be able to ascertain them. The hon. gentleman said that on one line the grade was 82 feet at one point—I think he said the International line—and he added it did not matter if we had another point or two of the same grade. Well, it does matter, because, if you have a number of these heavy grades, you cannot succeed in making a good line. The hon. gentleman has also made an appeal to the members for the Lower Provinces, who, no doubt, will be pleased to see the great interest he takes in their welfare, and in the future of their Province, and how much he is inclined in their favor! He is afraid that they may be dissatisfied, and he calls their special attention to the fact that the resolution, of which notice had been given, did not, in the first instance, contain the words "Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury," after the word "Mattawamkeag," and the hon. gentleman is afraid that they may not get the road as far as Salisbury. He says there was a fixed amount of money asked from Parliament, and therefore it was only for a railway which was to be built as far as Lake Mattawamkeag. Well, I am sure the hon. gentleman will be pleased to hear the declaration which the Govern-

ment makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, and to take advantage of this vote of money, of \$250,000 during 20 years, the Government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith; the faith of Parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as Parliament wishes. I think I am explicit enough, and that hon. gentlemen will not have the fears which the hon. member for Quebec East has expressed on that point. Now, the hon. gentleman says that it is all very well for us to speak of making Quebec or Montreal the summer seaport of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that if Quebec is the seaport of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the summer, it is impossible for that port not to be connected with the seaports of the Lower Provinces, because he is otherwise afraid that wheat may come to Quebec and have to remain in the elevators there when the season of navigation has closed. The hon. gentleman must know that in the case of Quebec as in the case of other seaports, when goods are there at the end of the season, they have either to remain until the next spring, or, if there are railway facilities for exporting them, the owners of those goods take advantage of those facilities. If there is anything at Quebec to be exported which has not been exported during the season of navigation, and it is a necessity that it should be exported during the winter, the Intercolonial Railway is available, and there will be other facilities as well, because there are two other roads by Quebec which Parliament will have subsidised. The first is the Quebec Central Railway, which, when extended by the subsidy voted by Parliament last year, will tap the short line to the Lower Provinces. Then, under these resolutions, when they become law, there will be the road from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, and from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, and so on. Therefore, the facilities for Quebec will be much greater than they have ever been before; there is no fear, and I am glad to allay all the fears of the hon. member for Quebec East on that point. The hon. gentleman's fears about wheat and other goods remaining in Quebec are because he had in his mind, that we must have a bridge at Quebec. The hon. gentleman seems to be very nervous just now about the prospects of Quebec in connection with all these great works; he will not allow us to wait a month or a week, but we must do everything at once—if this bridge is to be built, it must be built immediately. But about this short line, the hon. gentleman says, no short line, no extension of the Pacific Railway to Quebec, but we must have new surveys and exhaustive surveys, and these will take a year or two, before we decide about this route, and the hon. gentleman says we must make it pass through Quebec. If, by passing through Quebec, we cannot obtain the shortest route, we must make up our minds to pass elsewhere. It is very unfortunate for Quebec that the short line does not pass through Quebec; I am very sorry for Quebec, though the hon. gentleman did not think I could be; but we must look first to the interest of the country at large. The hon. gentleman represents Quebec, and I have no doubt that is the reason he is just now burning with patriotism, and wants all the interests of Quebec to be put aside, or postponed for a year or two, until new surveys are made; and he does not care if Quebec suffers during that time, or for all time to come. All these may be very good and proper sentiments; but I must say that that patriotism may exist and the railway be built. The hon. gentleman must know that we are making large and necessary expenditures now on all sides, which the progress and the development of the country require; but, on the other hand, if a bridge is required, one day or another, sooner or later, at Quebec, the Government of that period will see what

policy should be adopted and what should be done; but I do not think the hon. gentleman should call upon us to do everything in one day. We must do what we can to-day; let us build our railway; let us bring the Pacific Railway to that great and beautiful seaport of Quebec; we shall have the short line built, and then see what other works are required. The Government and the Parliament of that period will see whether new works should be undertaken, whether that bridge should be undertaken, whether it will be, as the hon. gentleman said, the interest and the necessity of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build that bridge. I have no doubt that if that necessity imposes itself on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they, with their great spirit of enterprise, will not hesitate to see what ways and means should be adopted, in order to have that bridge built; but, at all events, I think the country, and especially the Province of Quebec, will be satisfied with the policy of the Government, and see that we are doing quite enough for one Session. The hon. gentleman has stated that he had a great sympathy for me, because I was sorry my native city could not have everything it wished to have, and he thought my heart was broken. Well, I will reciprocate with the hon. gentleman. If his heart is broken to-day, it is because we have no bridge there; if his heart is broken, it is because we have not made twenty or thirty surveys more than we have made; if his heart is broken, it is because our resolutions will be adopted. Well, I pity the hon. gentleman; and he may be sure that I have as much sympathy with him, under the circumstances, as he has for me. Without wishing to extend my remarks further, I must say that the motion of the hon. gentleman for an extension of time, in order to have new surveys, and to prevent the completion of these lines for an indefinite time—a year or two, or I do not know what length of time—the motion of the hon. gentleman, I think, is not one that can be accepted by this House. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions, and also the Bill, are on the Notice Paper and that we are waiting for these resolutions to be passed to see how far we can go with the Bill. He knows well the whole thing is one scheme, a scheme to complete the great work of the Canadian Pacific Railway; therefore, we ask Parliament to help the Government in adopting these resolutions. There may be on one side or other some interests that cannot be served exactly by these resolutions, but we must rise above these local interests and see what is good for the country at large; we must see whether the interests of the country lie in the passing of these resolutions and of the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. We believe they do. We have made the best selection possible, under the circumstances, for a short route to the Lower Provinces. We are sorry we cannot satisfy all the views of all our friends on both sides of the House, but we are convinced that these recommendations are the best that can be made under the circumstances, and we hope hon. gentlemen on both sides will help us to make these resolutions become law and complete the great scheme of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by bringing the Canadian Pacific Railway to the seaboard of the Lower Provinces.

Mr. L'ANGELIER. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) made some disparaging remarks about Mr. Light, evidently thinking that by killing the reputation of Mr. Light they might also kill the line itself. In furtherance of that project, the other day the hon. member for Sherbrooke doubted whether Mr. Light had power to assume the title which he has assumed in the pamphlet written by him. Mr. Light called himself a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) said he had gone to a great deal of trouble in looking through books which contain lists of members of that institution, and

could not find the name of Mr. Light. I have been more fortunate than the hon. gentleman. I have Mr. Light's, diploma. Here it is—not a very fresh document; it dates back to 1862, when Mr. Light was admitted a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers.

Mr. HALL. Is he still a member ?

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not think that would take anything of the knowledge he possessed at that time. I do not suppose he has forgotten anything he knew in 1862. If he was then found worthy of being admitted a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, now that he has been district engineer on the Intercolonial, for I do not know how many years, for the most difficult district, that of Miramichi where that great bridge is erected which cost several hundreds of thousands of dollars, I think he is still worthy of being a member. I may say, however, for the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman, that he is still a member. Another remark was made about Mr. Light which I want to answer at once. The hon. gentleman said he had received a telegram or letter from a Minister of the Quebec Government contradicting Mr. Light's right to another title which he has taken, that of chief engineer of railways for the Government of Quebec. The hon. gentleman says, on the authority of a Minister of the Quebec Government, that such is not the case. I must say that the Minister who gave that information did not know what he was talking about. Mr. Light is still engineer, and is going to be engineer for two years more, at least, of the Government of Quebec. He was appointed by an Order in Council in 1882, for five years, chief engineer of Government railways for the Province of Quebec, and quite lately he has been acting in that capacity. Only four months ago he made an examination of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and the subsidy has been paid by that same informant—for I think I can give his name—on the report of Mr. Light; so that there was very little justification for the statement that Mr. Light was no longer Government railway engineer of Quebec. I can go a little further. As the informant of the hon. gentleman has been trying to damage Mr. Light's character, I think I can give an explanation of the *animus* he has against Mr. Light. In 1874 the same gentleman was controlling a large part of the stock of a certain railway, and he wanted to float a loan on the London market for that railway. But before doing so he wanted to bolster up his railway by the report of an engineer of reputation, and he selected Mr. Light, as quite competent, at that time, to examine his road and make a report. When Mr. Light had examined it, he said it was better he should make no report, because he found the railway the worst he had seen in his life, and that if he made a report it would not help the hon. gentleman to float his loan on the London market. From that time it appears the hon. gentleman has not been very favorably disposed to Mr. Light. I think that is quite enough as to his character.

On a previous occasion, I stated to this House the importance of the question which is now submitted to us. On several occasions we have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be a great inter-oceanic line from ocean to ocean, and entirely through Canadian territory. At that time the policy of the Government was not what it is today. Not long ago, when the contract which is now being carried out, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was before us, hon. gentlemen will remember that when the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) proposed as a substitute for the line on the north shore of Lake Superior a branch going to Sault Ste. Marie, his motion was voted down; it was considered nothing short of treason, at that time, to think of passing the

Mr. LANGELIER.

railway through United States territory. We must not forget that at that time the hon. member for West Durham did not propose to spend a single copper of our money on a railway in the United States; he was only proposing to bring the Canadian Pacific Railway to Sault Ste. Marie, on Canadian soil, there to connect with American railways, built with American money.

Now we see quite a different policy adopted by the Government, a policy of building a railway on United States territory with our own money.

Last year, when this question came before the House, a resolution was adopted, which has become law since, that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be carried to Halifax and St. John. There was not one word about St. Andrews, or Fredericton, or any of those places that are now mentioned. It was simply from Montreal to St. John and Halifax by the shortest and most practicable route, after complete surveys had been made. After that law was passed the Government did not seem to have changed their minds, because, on the 20th July, the Minister of Public Works, being in the city of Quebec, on the occasion of the laying of the corner stone of the examining warehouse, made the following remarks—I take them from the report of the *Quebec Morning Chronicle*, a Ministerial paper, which I am sure would never dare to do anything to damage the Government or the Minister of Public Works :—

“ That Sir John had just reiterated to him at Rivière du Loup the promise made from the beginning, that the shortest and best line would be selected, that complete surveys would be made, and that no choice would take place before the minutest details were known.”

On the 19th August, at Rivière du Loup, that celebrated lunch took place, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Quebec East, given by the Minister of Militia and Defence; and, if we are to believe some of the Ministerial papers belonging to a lighter shade of blue than those who support the Minister of Militia, only *le dessus du panier* were invited to that lunch; it was a select party of Ministerialists; and what was the statement made by the Prime Minister, as reported by the Ministerial papers? There was a general expression of opinion amongst those supporting the Government, and in the presence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia, that the railway should be entirely upon Canadian territory. I do not see that any word of dissent was uttered by any of the Ministers. Those words, according to the Ministerial organs, were used by the members present, and I do not see that there was any expression of dissent from the two or three Ministers who were present, including the Prime Minister himself. So it had become the settled policy of the Government to have the short line built altogether over Canadian Territory. All that has been changed since, and I do not think it is very difficult to understand the cause of that change, because, if we look back a few days before, we find a report of an interview with Mr. Stephen, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, given by the *St. John Sun*. The report is dated ten days or two weeks before the Rivière du Loup lunch. Mr. Stephen stated that they had made up their minds to choose the Megantic line, that is, the line now proposed. That was a few days before the lunch, when it was admitted on all hands that an entirely Canadian line was the best. That remark made by Mr. Stephen to a newspaper reporter, is quite sufficient to justify the suspicion that, when the Ministers did not express any assent or dissent to the general expression of opinion of their friends at Rivière du Loup, it was because they had already made up their minds in agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway people, as they had ever done. We have not seen many occasions when these gentlemen have differed with the gentlemen composing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I think that at that time the policy of the Government had been decided upon, and that what we have seen since has been only

a sham. The surveys were never serious surveys, they were never complete, and they were only a sham, intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people, to make the people believe that the Government had redeemed their promise not to select their line before they had made complete surveys and obtained minute details of each line proposed. I think I can show that the surveys are entirely incomplete. Not only have we not those minute details, which were promised by the Minister of Public Works, and by the Prime Minister, and by other Ministers who have had the opportunity of speaking on the subject, but we have no details at all; and, in regard to some portions of the line, not only have we no details, but we have nothing at all; there has not been even an attempt at a survey, and that not for a short portion only, because I shall show that there are hundreds of miles that have not been touched by engineers. It is known, although Mr. Schreiber speaks as if thirty lines had been proposed, that there are really only three lines proposed. There may be some links which may differ, but there are only three main lines, one known as the Pope line, which it is proposed to take, the Quebec line or combination line and the Edmundston line. There are some differences of opinion.

Mr. LESAGE. Too many.

Mr. LANGELIER. These are the only three main lines proposed. In the Edmundston line there are some portions proposed to be different in some of the surveys. By some it is proposed to run through St. Roch des Aulnets, by some through Rivière du Loup, but the main line is the same. It is proposed to run through Quebec, to use the Intercolonial, as far as possible, and then to give a new line to connect with Edmundston. As far as the other two lines are concerned, it is the same thing. There are a few links upon which there may be some difference of opinion, but the main features are understood, and it is only to throw dust in the eyes of the members and to complicate matters that Mr. Schreiber can state, as he does in his report, that 30 lines have been surveyed. It is only to make those who do not read his report through believe that he has gone to the greatest trouble, that the Government have gone to the trouble of surveying 30 lines, whereas only three lines have been attempted to be surveyed, and only portions of them, as I shall show.

Let us take, first, what I may call the Quebec line, the combination line passing through Quebec. To show the insufficiency of the surveys last summer, I may say that it was the general talk in the city of Quebec that we were being trifled with by the Government; that the surveys were not sufficient. Everyone knew that Mr. Light, who had been entrusted with the survey of the line from Quebec, had been supplied with such a small staff that it was scarcely enough to run a division line between two farms; it was perfectly ridiculous; so much so, that at the unanimous desire of the City Council of Quebec I had to write to the Minister of Public Works, to call his attention to it, to point out that the people of Quebec considered that they were trifled with in the way the surveys they had demanded were being carried out. I received a very polite answer, as one always does receive from the Minister of Public Works, dated from Broadview, as he was on his way to the North-West, stating that he would transmit my letter to the Acting Minister of Railways, with a recommendation to carry out the suggestion of the letter. I do not know what he may have written, but I see the result, that what I was complaining of has remained, the same state of things has been left to the last moment. An insufficient staff was given to Mr. Light, and not only that, but he was actually prevented, by a telegram from Mr. Schreiber, as he says in his report, from exploring a line which he thought was the best line; and now Mr. Schreiber gives as a reason why such a line should not be taken that it

was not surveyed, when it was not surveyed because he peremptorily refused to allow it to be surveyed.

I will now examine the report of the line called the Pope line, passing through Sherbrooke. I call it the "Pope" line, because it is better known by that name than by any other; and I think it would never become a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway line if it was not the "Pope" line. One portion of that line it is proposed to run from St. Lambert to Chambly. Between these two points there are no surveys at all. Mr. Davy, the engineer who was in charge of the survey, says that the country is very easy. Of that I do not complain, because it is an easy thing to find a good location for a railway in any part of that country. Let us see what he says about the other portion, from Chambly to Lennoxville. We have his report here, in which he says that he did his work hastily. It was not so complete as it ought to be, to ascertain exactly what the location of a line should be. There are only two miles and a-half less by the line he proposes than by the Grand Trunk; and here I may remark, *en passant*, that Mr. Davy is entirely mistaken when he says that the line passes through a country which is badly in need of railway facilities. Any member of the House who will look at the map will see that no portion of the country in the Province of Quebec is better supplied with railway facilities than this portion. There are two complete lines of railway from Montreal to Sherbrooke; one is the Grand Trunk, and the other is the Montreal, Portland and Boston and the Waterloo and Magog Railway, and the proposed line will run at a distance of not more than ten miles from each of these two railways. At page 18 of the blue pamphlet, I will read what the engineer says, to show with what care the survey has been made:

"The eastern half of this survey, between Chambly and Sherbrooke, passes through a difficult country for railway location, making it impossible to thoroughly explore it in one season."

He was only given one season, and he says it is impossible thoroughly to explore it in one season. Now, we had been promised to have a thorough and complete survey of all the lines proposed before any selection was made. Then, the report we have before us gives no information of the Pope line, or the International Railway, as it is officially called, from Lennoxville to the crossing of the Moosehead River, which is already built. We ought to be put in possession of the character of that road, or the important features of it. All we know is what can be gathered from the previous reports of the Minister of Railways. We know there are grades on the railway of 74 feet to the mile; but we know nothing of the curvature. We are only given the maximum curvature or the maximum grades on each line. It is ridiculous to ask us to decide on a route with no more information than this. Suppose a railway should have only one mile grade of 100 feet, and another line should have 100 grades of two or three miles, of 80 feet to the mile; the first line would be infinitely the best. But we cannot judge, because we have no information on that point. Now, from Moosehead River to Mattawamkeag, we have the report of Mr. Spofford and Mr. Burpee, who were the engineers employed to survey and locate the line. Mr. Spofford tells us that he has only located six miles. Out of the 135½ miles, only 69 miles have been carefully located. What does he say of the balance, the 66½ miles? I will read what he says at page 35 of the report:

"The distance by these surveys is 135½ miles, of which 69 miles are carefully located; the remaining 66½ miles are located upon the map from a carefully run preliminary line."

There is what we were promised as minute details of this line. Further on, he speaks of the crossing at Moosehead Lake:

"This large and picturesque sheet of water has been considered by engineers a formidable obstacle in the way of a short line from Lake Megantic to Mattawamkeag, necessitating a long detour in order to pass either south or north of it. Fortunately, there are two islands lying

some 12 miles from the south end of the lake and extending nearly across it, which suggested the idea of crossing the lake, and thus saving a long detour to the south. The survey and soundings show that the crossing of the West Narrows from the mainland to Deer Island is 400 feet in length, with a depth of but 5 feet at the ordinary stage of water. There can be no objection to filling in the greater part (if not, in fact, the whole) of this crossing.

"The main channel of the lake is between Deer and Sugar Islands, and is 2,400 feet in width, with an extreme depth of 34 feet at the ordinary stage of water. A draw-bridge would be required here, for the passage of the small steamers which navigate the lake when free from ice. There has not been an opportunity to examine critically the nature of the bottom, but indications are that it is a firm, gravelly deposit, which would furnish a good foundation for piers, and make it practicable to drive piles, if thought desirable to do so, in the construction of a bridge.

"The East Narrows, between Sugar Island and the mainland, is 650 feet wide, with an average depth of about 6 feet at the ordinary stage of water. The greater part, if not all, of this crossing, can be made by an embankment. A draw-bridge might be desired, to admit of direct water communication between Lily Bay and Greenville but, in my opinion the exigencies of the case do not demand it.

"The saving in distance effected by thus crossing the lake, instead of skirting the south end of it, is in the vicinity of 13 miles, of which several miles would require a large amount of earth and rock work."

So it seems that, first of all, he does not know anything of that most important portion of the lake, the portion 2,400 feet long, with a depth of 34 feet. Then, he admits that it would be necessary to have a draw-bridge, and I would call the attention of the House to this fact. All railway authorities agree in saying that it is better to lengthen a line, even by several miles, if by so doing you can avoid a draw-bridge. Everyone knows the danger of draw-bridges. I do not think there is any draw-bridge which has not been the scene of a very serious accident. Even if the construction of the bridge were possible, it would cost an immense sum. Engineers do not know what the amount would be. There has not been an opportunity to examine, critically, the nature of the bottom, but the impression is, that it is formed of a gravelly deposit. Surely this is not furnishing the House with those details which have been promised. As to the grades and curvatures of this line, here is what Mr. Spofford says :

"This line was run with a view of adopting a maximum grade of 66 feet to the mile, but the topography and distance indicate that a lighter grade can be used in the location. I have, therefore, laid upon the profile a continuous grade of 1.07 feet per 100 feet, or 56½ feet per mile, for 12½ miles, and for 4½ miles a grade of 53 feet per mile, with 2,000 feet of level grade between them."

He adds :

"It is possible that the 1.07 grade can be reduced still further, by increasing the length of the line at Mountain Brook. It is also possible that an entirely different line might be obtained, giving a little more distance, by following another branch of the river, which runs several miles north of the branch followed, but heads near the same point. This long grade is the chief drawback to this route, though not so objectionable as it would be if opposed to the anticipated traffic from the west. However, all efforts and investigation made with a view to discovering a lower summit upon this general route have been unavailing."

He goes on to say :

"Leaving Pleasant River valley, the line runs in a generally easterly direction, over an undulating surface, with no very long grades, though the topography of this section of country necessitates considerable curvature in the alignment at some points. Grades of 1 foot per station can be adopted, with, perhaps, one exception—that upon the east side of Mud Brook, between stations 970 and 1,115. There is some question whether the distance necessary for a 1 foot grade can be obtained here, and I have laid a 1.10 per 100 feet grade upon the profile, to which the location can be adapted."

All this is mere guess work. There is nothing settled. Mr. Spofford says that all efforts and investigation made with a view to discovering a lower summit upon this general route have been unavailing. We will see what that highest summit is which it has been found impossible to reduce. Here is a most damaging feature of the line, which we find in the report of Mr. Burpee, which is annexed to the report by Mr. Spofford. Mr. Burpee, at page 40, says that there is a summit of 950 feet to overcome—besides the height already reached—which is not to be overcome by the combination line. According to other information I have obtained since,

Mr. LANGELIER.

and which is to be found in the smoking room, there is not only 950 feet to be overcome, but more than 1,100 feet. But let us take the lower figure, and that is the figure given in Mr. Burpee's report, which is an official report, and let us see how the matter stands. It is admitted by railway authorities that a rise of 20 feet is equal to an increased distance of one mile. If we make a calculation, we will find that the 950 feet in question will be equal to an increased distance of 47½ miles. The survey of that portion of the line from Moosehead River to Mattawamkeag has been so imperfect that the two engineers in charge, Mr. Spofford and Mr. Burpee, do not give a calculation as to the cost. Those engineers have too much respect for their characters to give an estimate—they do not give even an approximate estimate of the cost of the line. How could Mr. Spofford give an estimate of the cost of crossing Moosehead Lake? He admits that everything is uncertain, and all authorities are agreed that it is a very difficult place to cross. As to the line from Mattawamkeag to St. Andrews and St. John, we have no information given, but the road is to follow the existing line. In one portion of Mr. Schrieber's report it is proposed to build a new line from Mattawamkeag to St. Croix crossing. No survey has been made of that portion of the line, which is 58 miles in length. I understand the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) to say that it has been surveyed. If such is the case, we have not been given information on the subject; and if the Government had that information we should obtain it.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. LANGELIER. When the House took recess, I was endeavoring to show that the surveys of these proposed lines were quite incomplete. So far as the Pope line is concerned, a survey has not been made from St. Lambert to Chambly; and from Chambly to Lennoxville it is imperfect. The grades are bad, and Mr. Davy says that it is not sufficiently explored. From Moosehead River to Mattawamkeag the surveys were made by Messrs. Spofford and Burpee, the former locating only six miles, and out of 135½ miles, only 69 have been carefully located. Further on in the report it is stated that the difficulty of crossing Moosehead Lake has been considered by engineers a formidable obstacle in the way of a short line from Megantic to Mattawamkeag. The curves and grades are bad, according to Mr. Spofford's report, and the survey is so imperfect that Messrs. Spofford and Burpee do not even attempt to get an approximate estimate, and out of 135½ miles, only three are level. Then as to the two routes, one follows entirely existing lines, and the other also, with the exception of two missing links, one from Harvey to Fredericton, and the other from Fredericton to Salisbury, amounting to about 137 miles. So far as this line is concerned, there are 133 miles which are completely unsurveyed, according to the reports which we have, and for 66 miles there has been no location on the ground, so that there are 203 miles of the proposed line which have not been surveyed and located, or nearly one-half of the total mileage which is only located on the map.

I come now to the Edmunston line. One of the proposed locations of that line is by way of Rivière Ouelle, and we have very little information with regard to it. We have a report of Mr. Crawford, to the effect that his plans and profiles are not complete, but he understands that it is an easy and good line.

So far as the Rivière du Loup line is concerned, Mr. Crawford says it is pretty difficult, but he gives some details of his survey.

I come now to the combination line, and here again the surveys are not completed, and we have not the information to make a selection. A portion of this line is well known

by Mr. Light, and it has been explored to some extent, but other portions have been located simply on the map, and I do not think that with regard to it we have sufficient information to make a good selection. The circumstances under which it has been imperfectly surveyed have already been alluded to. Mr. Light, in his report, replying to Mr. Schreiber's objection, that the portion of the line between Quebec and Chesuncook had not been surveyed, says:

"I always considered that the survey of this line was most important, and strongly recommended Mr. Schreiber that it should be done, in my telegram dated 18th August, 1884. His reply was a peremptory refusal."

This would almost justify the idea that Mr. Schreiber did not want the line to be surveyed for fear it might appear a better line than the one he had selected. If Mr. Schreiber had been convinced that a good line could not be found there, no one can doubt that he would have ordered that survey. It is most probable that he knew that the result of his survey would be against his contention, and, therefore, he did not want it to be made. There is the less excuse for him in having prevented the surveying of that line in the fact that there would have remained, looking at the map, only about 40 miles to survey, from the end of Mr. Wicksteed's survey to Lake Chesuncook, where the survey of Mr. Vernon Smith commences. The line proposed by Mr. Light crosses the New Brunswick and Canada Railway at Canterbury, and thence there is a short link to be built to Harvey; and another link from Harvey to Fredericton, and from Fredericton to Salisbury. The line from Harvey to Salisbury is the same as the line advocated by Mr. Schreiber; and that length of 113 miles is entirely unsurveyed. I am told that there has been a private survey of it. Why it has not been surveyed by the Government on this occasion is most extraordinary. The surveys are quite incomplete, and should be completed, before we are asked to come to a decision upon this question. We are asked to make a leap in the dark. In order to show how incomplete the surveys have been, I will quote from Mr. Vernon Smith's report, page 27:

"On a re-survey the work might be lightened and the gradients reduced, by keeping a more northerly route than the one instrumentally measured, skirting the south shore of Telos Lake, following the line of the canal to Webster Lake, and thence by the natural valley of Webster stream and chain of lakes to the Penobscot, near to the present crossing of the survey."

This shows that Mr. Vernon Smith either had not sufficient time or had not sufficient instructions to make a survey, as he says that perhaps a better line might have been found. Now, here are the facts: On the Pope line the surveys are very imperfect—on that portion of the line between Montreal and Sherbrooke, and on the portion between Moosehead Lake and Mattawankeag. No survey has been made between Mattawankeag and St. Croix, nor between Harvey and Salisbury. As for the rest, the line is to pass on existing railways.

Now, I think I have proved that the surveys are entirely insufficient for the House to come to a conclusion upon them; and I now come to the second point of my argument. If we are to take as the basis of our judgment the surveys which we have, and which, in my opinion, are entirely insufficient, our judgment should be in favor of the combination line, because the information, such as it is, justifies that decision; and here is the proof—I will give the distances according to the document we have. I do not know where the distances which have been given to the House have been taken from; but in order to put our opponents, who favor the Pope line, in a position to contradict me, I will give the location of each portion of the line and its length, from the official documents. On the Pope line, from Montreal to Lachine and back to St. Lambert, the distance is 22 miles. In his report, Mr. Schreiber always speaks as if it were proposed to start from St. Lambert; but the line is to be from Montreal to St.

John or Halifax. How is it to reach St. Lambert? It cannot be by a bridge in front of Montreal; for this reason: Some ten years ago a well known railway engineer, Mr. Legge, prepared the plan of a bridge, which was to be a high bridge. It was to start from Hochelaga station and cross over to Isle Ronde, below St. Helen's Island, and thence direct to St. Lambert. The building of that bridge was opposed by all the steamship companies whose vessels sailed to Montreal. Although it was proposed to build a high bridge, those companies were afraid it would obstruct the navigation of the St. Lawrence and increase the current to such an extent as to seriously interfere with traffic, and the idea of that bridge was given up. At present it is well known that the gentlemen of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company intend to build a bridge from Lachine to Caughnawaga; it is also well known that the railway is partly built from Mile End station to Lachine by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to reach St. Lambert the line will have to go by that bridge and that line, and traverse a distance of 22 miles. I take the figures given by Mr. Light, and this distance must be added to the distance given by Mr. Schreiber. A most extraordinary fact is this: Mr. Schreiber gives it as an objection to the line by the North Shore Railway, that the highest grade is 82 feet a mile, but he does not say what is well known to those who know anything of the North Shore Railway, that the only grade of that kind is between Hochelaga and Mile End; and he entirely omitted to say that that same grade would apply to the line he is proposing. It is impossible for him to pass anywhere else than through Lachine or Caughnawaga; he must go to Mile End, and must overcome the same grade. He leaves that, however, entirely out of his calculation.

From Montreal to Lachine, and back to St. Lambert, there are 22 miles; from St. Lambert to Chambly, by the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway, 20 miles; from Chambly to Lennoxville, by the new line surveyed by Mr. Davy, 80 miles; from Lennoxville to Moosehead River, by the Pope line, 89 miles; from Moosehead River to Mattawankeag, by the new line surveyed by Messrs. Spofford and Burpee, 136 miles; from Mattawankeag to Macadam Junction, by the European and North American Railway, 62 miles; from Macadam Junction to St. Andrews, by the New Brunswick and Canada Railway, 44 miles. Total, 453 miles. These figures are easy to controvert, if not correct; I have taken them from the documents we have here. On this route there would be 216 miles of new line to be built; that is to say, 80 miles surveyed by Mr. Davy, from Chambly to Lennoxville; and the portion surveyed by Messrs. Spofford and Burpee from Moosehead River to Mattawankeag, 136 miles. Now, if we take the combination line to St. Andrews, here are the distances: From Montreal to Chaudière Junction, by the North Shore Railway, 172 miles; from Chaudière Junction to Canterbury, by Lake Chesuncook, 216 miles. I take that, because it is the distance given by the city engineer of Halifax, though the official documents give the distance a little shorter. I do not want to be charged with exaggeration; I put the highest distances when they are against me. If I take Mr. Vernon Smith's report, I find that he makes the distance a few miles shorter. From Canterbury, by the New Brunswick and Canada Railway to St. Andrews, 63 miles, making a total from Montreal to St. Andrews, by that location, 451 miles, out of which there are 216 miles new line to be built, from Chaudière Junction to Canterbury.

Now, I come to the distances to go to St. John. I take again the official documents: from Montreal to St. Lambert, 22 miles; from St. Lambert to Chambly, by the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway, 20 miles; from Chambly to Lennoxville, by new line surveyed by Mr. Davy, 80 miles; from Lennoxville to Moosehead River, by the International line, 89 miles; from Moosehead river to Mattawankeag, as

located by Messrs. Spofford and Burpee, 136 miles; from Mattawamkeag to Macadam Junction, by European and North American Railway, 62 miles; from Macadam Junction to St. John, by the St. John and Maine Railway, 85 miles. Total distance to St. John *via* Sherbrooke, according to those official documents, 494 miles, out of which there are 216 miles of a new line to be built, namely, 80 miles from Chambly to Lennoxville, and 136 miles from Moosehead River to Mattawamkeag. To the same place on the location proposed by Mr. Light, the combination line, we find the following figures: from Montreal to Chaudière Junction by the North Shore Railway, 172 miles; from Chaudière Junction to Canterbury, 216 miles; from Canterbury to St. John, by the St. John and Maine Railway, 91 miles; making a total distance from Montreal to St. John, by the combination line, of 479 miles, out of which there are 216 miles of new line to be built from Chaudière to Canterbury, the same as in the line to St. Andrews.

From Montreal to Halifax *via* the Sherbrooke line, the distances are as follows: from Montreal to St. Lambert, 22 miles; from St. Lambert to Chambly, *via* the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway, 20 miles; from Chambly to Lennoxville, 80 miles; from Lennoxville to Moosehead River, *via* the International, 89 miles; from Moosehead River to Mattawamkeag, the Spofford and Burpee location, 136 miles; from Mattawamkeag to Macadam Junction, by the European and North American Railway, 62 miles; from the Macadam Junction to Harvey, by the St. John and Maine Railway, 19 miles; from Harvey to Fredericton, unsurveyed, 18 miles; from Fredericton to Salisbury, unsurveyed, 95 miles; from Salisbury to Halifax, by the International, 201 miles; total, 742 miles, out of which there are 329 miles to be built, namely, from Chambly to Lennoxville, 80 miles; from Moosehead River to Mattawamkeag, 136 miles; from Harvey to Fredericton, 18 miles; from Fredericton to Salisbury, 95 miles. Let us take the same localities, Montreal to Halifax, by the combination line: from Montreal to Chaudière Junction, 172 miles, by the North Shore Railway; from Chaudière Junction to Canterbury, passing by Lake Chesuncook, 216 miles; from Canterbury to Fredericton, a portion of the link that has not been surveyed, 40 miles; from Fredericton to Salisbury, not surveyed, 85 miles; from Salisbury to Halifax, by the Intercolonial, 201; total, 724 miles, out of which 351 miles of new line will have to be built, namely, 216 from Chaudière Junction to Canterbury; 40 from Canterbury to Fredericton; and 95 from Fredericton to Salisbury. The distances which I have given compare as follows: to St. Andrews there is a difference of two miles in favor of the combination line, to St. John 15 miles and to Halifax, 18 miles. This is taking the best view possible of the line through Sherbrooke, because I have taken the new links that are proposed to be built.

If, in order to go to Halifax, instead of using the link from Harvey to Salisbury, it was proposed to use the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax, the line would be 28 miles longer still, as follows: 66 miles from Harvey to St. John, by the St. John and Maine Railway, and 75 miles by the Intercolonial Railway, from St. John to Salisbury, making 141 miles, against 113 miles from Harvey to Salisbury, by the new line; making 770 miles to Halifax by the Sherbrooke line. I do not, however, want to give that disadvantage to the Sherbrooke line, because I suppose that the new links will be built to shorten the distance.

So much for the absolute distances and lengths of the two lines proposed. Let us now come to the other points to be considered, and the comparison is still more in favor of the combination line. Great stress has been put by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) on what they call the air line. They take the map and say: Is not that line shorter, when you go straight, than when you have to go round. That would be very well, if a line of

Mr. LANGELIER.

railway could be built as the crow flies, but, unfortunately, railway trains do not fly. They have to follow the ground as it is, and it is much more difficult to divert vertically from the straight line than to divert laterally. These gentlemen always speak of a straight line laterally, and they say: Your line will divert laterally from the straight line; but they do not state that their line will have to diverge vertically from the straight line, and that is worse. It will have to overcome an extra summit of 950 feet more than the combination line, making, according to railway authorities, a difference of 47½ miles, at the rate of a mile for each 20 feet of extra summit to be overcome. I have already quoted Mr. Burpee's report, which is to be found at page 40 of the Blue Book, and some of the reports I have had since show that it is worse than that. The difference of the summits to be overcome would be, not 950 feet, but 1,152 feet, which would make the additional length 57½ miles for the line by Sherbrooke instead of 47½ miles. I am not going to insist very much on that; I am only refuting the argument of those hon. gentlemen. I say we are not in a position to judge. The Government should have given a complete tabular statement of the grades and curves and summits, of the heights to be overcome, and even the computation of the railway engineers, of the length on each line, taking into consideration the practical lengthening of each line due to the grades and curves and summits to be overcome. We do not know exactly the comparative length of each line. That should have been given, but we are left in the dark. We have the maximum grades and curves, but the maximum may be realised in one line only once, and in another line it may be realised a hundred times.

Another very important fact which must not be forgotten is this: Supposing there is the same summit to be overcome—but in one line it is to be overcome once and in the other twice—it makes all the difference in the world, because it stands to common sense that when a railway train has gone down a very heavy grade, the power lost is not accumulated for ascending the other grade which must be ascended. It is lost for all practical purposes. Those gentlemen have been insisting very much upon the examination of the map. If we judge by the two lines on the map, it is their condemnation. If we look at the country to be traversed by each line, we find that the line through Sherbrooke crosses the mountain diagonally, whereas the combination line crosses the chains of mountains longitudinally, which makes a great difference. It is not proposed to cross all these mountains with tunnels. The summits of these mountains must be overcome by lengthening the distance to be passed. So the map itself is a condemnation of the line advocated by those gentlemen, unless they are going to cross by tunnels everywhere, in order to have an air line. This shows that their mode of calculation is misleading, and cannot be taken into consideration in making a practical decision.

Again, if we are to pass through American territory, it must be admitted on all hands that we should try to have the shortest possible distance crossing that territory. The combination line has 40 miles less of American territory to traverse than the line passing through Sherbrooke.

The line through Sherbrooke leaves aside the eastern part of the Province of Quebec, east from Montreal. All the benefits supposed to be derived from the Canadian Pacific Railway for the heavy expenditure which had been incurred for that road are going to be lost for all the eastern portion of the Province of Quebec if we allow the line to be constructed through Sherbrooke; whereas if we adopt the combination line, all these advantages will be much greater, not only for Quebec, but for Three Rivers, and all the other localities on the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

Another strong objection, to my mind, against the Sherbrooke line, is that it is sure to be tapped by American lines at Mattawamkeag, as will be seen by looking at the map. From Mattawamkeag to Bangor there is already a

railway built, and which is only 40 miles in length. Then, from Mattawamkeag to St. Andrews, the nearest point, there is 106 miles, and to St. John there is 147 miles; so it is evident that the line will be tapped at Mattawamkeag.

The line through Sherbrooke will also necessitate the construction of a second bridge at or near Montreal. It is well known that it is proposed to build the bridge at Lachine, so that there will be two bridges at Montreal. There is no bridge at Quebec, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway should pass by the combination line Quebec would get a bridge. When the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) spoke of the importance of Quebec having a bridge, in order to have the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he was answered, by the Minister of Public Works that the bridge would not contribute to bring the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say this is entirely wrong, and I speak from the authority of the business men of Quebec. This question has been discussed a great deal, and the business men of Quebec are all of the opinion that without a bridge or a ferry it is impossible to bring the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, even in the summer. The great advantage in having a bridge at this point is in connection with the grain trade. Quebec is a good place for storing grain during the summer season. When the European markets are not good the grain may be stored there, and exported as soon as the markets improve. Supposing grain is stored in Quebec to await exportation; as soon as navigation is closed, if there were no bridge at Quebec, it would have to be brought back to Montreal, and then taken through the Lachine bridge; whereas, if this bridge is built at Quebec, grain may be exported at any time; and when the immense docks at Quebec are completed, very great facilities will be given for storing and loading grain. But, on the other hand, to use the expression of one of the Quebec merchants, without a bridge at Quebec that city would be a *cul de sac* in winter, where grain would be stored without any means of removing it.

Moreover, it is admitted that if the Pacific Railway passes through Sherbrooke it will still be necessary to spend a million and a-half to build a branch to Quebec, but that amount will be saved if it is taken to Quebec on the short line. It is proposed by these resolutions to vote one million and a-half to the Canadian Pacific Railway to go to Quebec, and half a million to take it through Edmunston; and something like \$3,400,000 (the present value at 4 per cent, of \$250,000 a year for twenty years) to carry it through Sherbrooke. But if we adopt the combination line, all the money that it would be necessary to expend by way of Sherbrooke would be saved.

Another important fact to which I wish to call the attention of the House, to show that it was a preconcerted plan, agreed upon last year, to select the location through Sherbrooke, is this: that the combination line, which has so many advantages, was not even shown upon the map which has been distributed to members of this House. The line which was shown as being a line located by Mr. Light was, on the contrary, a line that was condemned by Mr. Light, that is, the line going to Hartland. Mr. Light himself was prevented from adopting that location on account of the heavy grades and sharp curves.

Now, the hon. Minister of Public Works tried to show that if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Quebec East was adopted, it would militate against the interests of Quebec, because, as he said, the resolutions proposed by the Government would then be thrown out, and the proposal to take the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec would also be thrown out. But, Mr. Speaker, suppose the resolutions were thrown out, what would Quebec lose? I do not suppose that the rejection of these resolutions would have the effect of removing the rails on the North Shore

Railway between Quebec and Montreal. It is proposed to give the North Shore line to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is all. We already have that line, and it is not proposed to give us any line that we do not possess. It is now controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway, but it would then be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is better for the interests of Quebec, for the local traffic, that the North Shore Railway should be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway rather than by the Grand Trunk Railway, because it will give us greater facilities for commerce between Montreal and Quebec. But as far as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, it does not matter to Quebec whether these resolutions are adopted or not; we will not have the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec, but we shall have two lines of rails between Quebec and Montreal, which will be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Another important point on which we have not obtained information, although we have repeatedly asked for it, is this: The line through Sherbrooke is called by all the newspapers, even by those supporting the Government, the Pope line. The line is principally owned by a member of the Government. The other day the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made an enquiry, the object of which was to ascertain whether it was proposed to acquire that line with the money it is proposed to vote. No answer was given to that question. What does that silence imply? It implies that the railway is to be purchased. It is not only going to have the advantage of being brought into connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the road itself is to be purchased with the money this House is now asked to vote. We never have been able, however, to obtain any information on this point from the Minister of Public Works. That hon. gentleman has given very full information on points that are of little importance; but on this essential point, not one word of explanation has been vouchsafed by him.

The hon. gentleman said that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were taken to Quebec by the North Shore it must be understood that grain carried there at the close of navigation must remain there the whole winter, as goods are now stored in Quebec until the opening of navigation. That is exactly what we are complaining of; that is what we desire to prevent. It is not proposed to remedy it by these resolutions. We want some means of communicating with the Canadian railway system in winter as well as during the summer. We shall gain nothing by the road proposed by the Government.

The Minister of Public Works mentioned that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) wanted everything done at once. The Minister of Public Works wants to have the matter respecting Quebec left over to another Session. What would be the use of building a bridge at great expenditure if the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic had taken another channel. If the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which it is hoped will be very large, passes by the Sherbrooke route, the company will be obliged to expend a large sum for terminal facilities, either in the United States or in the Maritime Provinces, and they would not sacrifice all that expenditure in order to come back to Quebec. It is well known that when trade has adopted a certain channel it cannot be diverted, unless there is a very great difference in the advantages, and there will not be so much difference as to lead the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to come back to Quebec.

We should not be called upon to pronounce an opinion on the documents before us, which are unsatisfactory, and I therefore move the following amendment to the amendment:—

To leave out all the words after "thereof," in the amendment, and insert the following: In the opinion of this House, additional surveys are required, and should at once be undertaken in order to obtain a sound decision as to the proper route for the short line railway, and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys had been made.

The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) insisted that if the combination line were adopted it would be impossible to go on with its construction, because the Legislature of the State of Maine would not meet for two years. That is entirely a mistake. It would not be necessary to have a meeting of the Legislature, because the laws of the State of Maine provide for the incorporation of railway companies without having recourse to the Legislature. There has been no amendment to that law. At chapter 120 it is stated :

"Section 1. Any number of persons, not less than ten, a majority of whom shall be citizens of this State, may form a company for the purchase of and constructing, maintaining, and operating a railway for public use in the conveyance of persons and property within this State, and for that purpose may make and sign articles of association, in which shall be stated the name of the company, the gauge of the road, the places from which and to which the road is to be constructed, maintained and operated, the length of such road, as near as may be, and the name of each town and county in this State through which or into which it is to be made; the amount of the capital stock of the company, which shall not be less than \$6,000 for every mile of road proposed to be constructed, of the gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches, nor less than \$3,000 per mile for any narrower gauge, and the number of shares of which said capital stock shall consist, and the names and places of residence of at least five persons, a majority of whom shall be citizens of this State, who shall act as directors of the proposed company, and shall manage its affairs until others are chosen in their places. Each subscriber to such articles of association shall subscribe thereto his name, place of residence, and the number of shares of stock he agrees to take in said company.

"Section 2. Said articles of association shall not be filed and recorded in the manner provided in section 3 of this Act until the capital stock named in section 1 has been subscribed thereto in good faith by responsible parties, and 5 per cent. paid thereon in cash to the directors named in said articles of association.

"Nor until there is endorsed thereon or annexed thereto an affidavit made by a majority of the directors named in said articles, that the amount of stock required by this section has been in good faith subscribed, and 5 per cent. paid thereon in cash as aforesaid, and that it is intended in good faith to construct, maintain and operate the road mentioned in such articles of association, which affidavit shall be recorded with the articles of association as aforesaid."

Mr. SHANLY. It may possibly be supposed, when I rise to speak on a question of this kind, that I rise to speak with some authority; but I would state, at the outset, that I am entirely unable to form any opinion respecting what may be called the engineering merits of the two lines. I am, on general principles, in favor of a thorough and complete examination, for I know that vast sums of money have been wasted in various public works of this country and elsewhere, by not making complete examinations. I had not the advantage of hearing the earlier part of this discussion, as I was accidentally absent from my seat when it took place; but there was a debate took place a week or two ago, prior to my having had the privilege of standing where I now stand, and I have been reading that debate, in order, amongst other things, to arrive, if possible, at something like the merits of the question. And I was grieved to find in that debate that certain members who advocated one line in preference to the other thought it necessary to descend to personalities, perhaps, Sir, under the same rule which has been ascribed to certain lawyers, not of a high class, of course, when your case fails in argument abuse your opponent's counsel. That seems to have been the case with the hon. gentlemen to whom I allude. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) thought fit to assail the private and professional character of a gentleman whom I hold in high respect, both privately and professionally, Mr. A. L. Light, in whose character, as a professional man, I have entire confidence, as I have in his integrity as a man. Now, Sir, I think when people descend to use such an argument as they used against Mr. Light, they cannot have very good faith in their own case. As regards the plans and surveys, and everything else, I say there is nothing before us which would enable any engineer decidedly to state that one line is a better line than the other; and, therefore, it is, that I rise, not to discuss the merits of the line, but I feel I would be neglecting my duty, I would be false to my friendship, if I were to fail to rise

Mr. LANGELIER.

and defend my friend, who has not an opportunity of defending himself. And, Sir, because I think there is not sufficient information before us to enable us to judge as to the comparative merits of these lines, I shall act upon that opinion, and shall support the amendment. I have nothing to say, further than this: that the proper course is to make a complete and thorough survey of the line before any subsidy is voted.

Mr. WELDON. I disagree with my hon. friend from Megantic, and I rise to state why I shall vote against the amendment. This is a question of great importance to the Maritime Provinces; it is a burning question throughout the length and breadth of those Provinces, as we feel the great necessity of having a line giving us connection, within a short time, with the western systems of railway. The Intercolonial Railway, so far as the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are concerned, is regarded as one which is almost useless for commercial purposes. Unfortunately, in times long since, a portion of the territory of New Brunswick was taken off by the Ashburton Treaty, which, in that respect, I believe was an act of injustice to us, and despoiled us of our territory; and the result is, that the State of Maine is there like a wedge, separating those two portions of the Dominion, one from the other. If I thought it were possible that we could have a short line through Canadian soil, I should have been willing that such a line should be constructed, but it is practically impossible, and we are obliged to cross through the State of Maine for the purpose of connecting the Maritime Provinces with the great Provinces to the west. We have been advocating this line for years without help—that is, the Megantic line—until, for the first time this year, we found the people of Quebec coming forward to help us to get such a line. Some of them are opposing our opportunity of getting this road—not on the old cry, that we must have a line through Canadian territory, but on the ground that there is a shorter line by Quebec than by Megantic. I am not going to enter into a discussion with regard to surveys and matters of that kind. In the last Session, when we had a resolution of a similar character, when the hon. member for Quebec East moved that the matter should not be left with the Government, but that the subsidy should be voted by Parliament, I felt it to be in the interests of my constituency and my Province, as well as the Maritime Provinces generally, to vote against my hon. friend on that occasion; and now, as the Government has decided the matter, I am prepared to endorse their action in this case. There are a number of different lines, and we find that the engineers, like the doctors, disagree, and who is to say which is right. We cannot afford to wait forever, or until these full surveys are made. We want the connection, and we want it as fast as possible. I agree with the hon. member for Megantic, that if it is not built within a reasonable time, trade will turn in different channels and will continue to run in those channels, and while Quebec is contending against the Eastern Townships about this line, we are suffering in the Maritime Provinces. We are suffering in the Maritime Provinces, and by the time these differences are settled, we shall find that traffic arrangements have been made to carry the traffic to those ports to which nature has given greater advantages than ours possess, and we shall be left out entirely in the cold. Now, there are three lines which have been referred to. First, there is the Megantic line. Then, Mr. Light brings forward the Chesuncook line. This is the first time we have heard of this line; and while we are talking of interested parties in Sherbrooke, we must remember that Mr. Light—although I do not wish to damage his reputation—is largely interested in the bridge to be built at Quebec. Although we have the opinions of different

engineers, the responsibility rests on the Government and on the engineer they have selected; and if their engineer has selected the Megantic line, I think we, who are unskilful and unprofessional men, should adopt that line. In our Province, as I have said, we have been agitating for this Megantic line. Last winter, for the first time, a deputation was sent from the city of Quebec to our people; but that deputation, although received with every respect and courtesy, were told plainly that so far as our people were concerned the Megantic line was the line they wanted, and the line which they believed was in the true interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces. While Quebec is to have the summer port, we desire to obtain for the Maritime Provinces the winter port. Then, the combination line is put forward to compete with the Megantic line; but since the last debate took place a line is proposed by Mr. O'Sullivan, the only claim advanced in favor of which is that it is all on Canadian soil; it crosses the mountains in a direct route from Grand Falls to Moncton, but Major Robinson and Captain Henderson found it impossible to get a line where he proposes to carry his. But I protest against that line on another ground, because the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are hand in hand in endeavoring to get this short line, and I think weight should be given to the fact that every member from the Maritime Provinces is in favor of the Megantic line, and that the line proposed by Mr. O'Sullivan in his letter is one that would leave St. John and St. Andrews, and the whole valley of St. John, without any advantage whatever. We complain that when we go to Montreal we have now to travel 100 miles eastward before we can turn our faces towards Montreal, and Mr. O'Sullivan proposes to give us another line, which will compel us to go farther still. We have not only this line surveyed, but a charter has been granted in Maine for a line across that State. The hon. member for Megantic has called attention to the railway law of the State of Maine, and has pointed out that we need not wait until the Session of 1887 in order to obtain a railway charter, because the law of that State provides for it; but my hon. friend forgot to point out all the steps that have to be taken. Every company, after certain things are done, and when it is approved by the Railway Commissioners, obtains an endorsed certificate, and that certificate being filed, the company becomes *de facto* and *de jure* a corporation, but it is also enacted as follows:—

"Every corporation organised under this Act, before commencing the construction of its road, shall present to the Board of Railroad Commissioners a petition for approval of location, accompanied with a map of the proposed route, on an appropriate scale, and with a profile of the line on a vertical scale of ten to one compared with the horizontal scale, and with a report and estimate prepared by a skilful engineer from actual survey. The Board of Railroad Commissioners shall, on presentation of such petition, appoint a day for a hearing thereon, and the petitioners shall give such notice thereof as said board shall deem reasonable and proper, in order that all persons interested may have an opportunity to appear and object thereto. If the Board of Railway Commissioners, after hearing the petition, shall approve the proposed location, and that the public convenience requires the construction of such road, the corporation may proceed with the construction of their road."

In the case of larger roads, application must be made to the Legislature for a charter; and so far as I have been able to ascertain, the general law adopted in Maine is for the purpose of enabling parties to build short lines, pretty much as we do by our Consolidated Railway Act, without application to the Legislature. Now, we have to consider that a charter has been granted by the Legislature of Maine for a railway across that State, to connect with our system. If we ask to build a line across the State of Maine, which will divert the traffic from other portions of that State, we cannot expect them to authorise a line which would draw the traffic from the Penobscot and Bangor districts to New Brunswick and Quebec. I feel that this is a matter which cannot be delayed; I believe that it is in the interest of the Maritime Provinces that it

should not be delayed. What we want is a union with the western system of railways, in the hope of getting a portion of the traffic that passes over that system. Give us the line, and then I am not afraid of the energy and enterprise of the people of Halifax, St. John and St. Andrews, and of the counties through which those roads will run, finding means to counteract the natural advantages which the American ports possess over them. That is for us to do. What we ask this Parliament to do is to give us a helping hand, to enable us to form a connection with that system of railways, and leave the people to develop, by their own energy and enterprise, the trade which we think we are entitled to. I do not wish to detain the House any longer; I only desire to give the reasons why I shall vote against this amendment, because it is calculated to produce delay and to injure the interests of the Maritime Provinces, for I fear that if we let this opportunity slip, many years may elapse before we shall get another. We may find that these railways cannot wait until we get over our differences, and the consequence will be that the traffic, instead of coming to our Provinces, will be diverted to the cities on the seaboard of the United States, to which nature has given advantages over us; but we hope by this line to counteract them and get a share of the traffic.

Mr. GIROUARD. I rise to say a few words to explain the vote I intend to give, and my remarks will apply to the amendment as well as the resolutions. The railway resolutions have two objects in view: first, the purchase of the North Shore Railway, and second, the construction of what is called the short line. With regard to the purchase of the North Shore Railway, I would remind the House that last year, when the Quebec railway resolutions came up for discussion, I expressed the view that it was unfair to deduct from the indemnity payable to the Quebec Government the sum of \$6,000 a mile for the road from Montreal to Quebec, either to purchase the North Shore Railway or to build a new road. I protested against the Government retaining a sum out of the Quebec indemnity for that purpose. I could not do more, because the Province of Quebec was interested to the extent of \$2,300,000. However, my protest was made, and holding to-day the views I expressed then, I feel called on to vote against the first resolution, for the purchase of the North Shore Railway out of the \$960,000 which forms a portion of the indemnity to the Quebec Government. The ground I take is, that in the past we never deducted anything from railway company subsidies, under the pretence that the Canadian Pacific Railway might want to purchase the roads these railway companies were intending to build. Take, for instance, the Canada Central road, which was subsidised to the extent of \$12,000 a mile, and the Callander and Gravenhurst, only a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Callander to the railways leading to Toronto, which were subsidised \$12,000 a mile; and in both cases the full subsidy was allowed. I do not see, therefore, why the Quebec Government, which has built a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, a portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, should not receive \$12,000 a mile for the road from Ottawa to Quebec. Now, as to the short line, it is true Parliament committed itself to the building of a short line last year, but only to a certain extent. It did not commit itself to building a short line that would cost about four times more than what was contemplated last year. Last year we voted \$170,000 a year for fifteen years towards the construction of that line; to-day we are asked to vote \$250,000 a year for twenty years: that is to say, last year the sum of one or two millions of dollars was asked to build the road; this year the sum of about \$5,000,000 is asked. The case, therefore, does not stand in the same position at all. The hon. member for Stanstead (M. Colby) laughs, but I would ask him if \$250,000 a

year for twenty years at 4 per cent. with sinking fund, does not represent about \$5,000,000 capital. Last year I entertained the same views as to the commercial utility of the line, which I still hold. I never thought we could divert traffic from Boston and Portland during the winter months to Canadian ports, for besides the climatic difficulty, there is the difference in distance to contend against. Though last year I was willing to vote \$170,000 a year, to meet the wishes of the members of the Maritime Provinces, I did not believe it would have the effect of securing to Canada the traffic which now goes by Portland, Boston and even New York. If I could see that the building of this line would make any great difference in the trade of the Maritime Provinces, I would be willing that we should expend a few millions of dollars to obtain that result, but I believe the advantages by Portland and Boston cannot be overcome by building a line which, though 100 miles shorter than the existing lines in Canada, will still be too long to compete against Portland and Boston lines. I, therefore, cannot give my sanction to the expenditure of so many millions, for the mere purpose of giving to the Maritime Provinces a road which, after all, will only be of local advantage. We have already spent \$42,000,000 in building the Intercolonial, which is our chief means of communication with the Maritime Provinces. To maintain that road costs us \$2,000,000 a year, which, some years, is met by traffic returns, and in other years is not. There is no doubt that the result of building this short line upon the traffic of the Intercolonial would be such that the revenue of the Intercolonial will fall far short of the expenses. I believe the short line will take at least one-half of the Intercolonial traffic, so that we will be called upon to pay, not merely the \$250,000 asked to-day, but a million dollars a year to meet running expenses of the Intercolonial. For these reasons, I cannot give my consent either to the purchase of the North Shore road or the construction of the short line; and as to the proposition of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), to have further surveys made, I do not see any advantage that will accrue from spending another \$30,000 or \$35,000 on new surveys.

Mr. TASCHEREAU. The question which is now submitted to the House seems of such great importance to me, and will be also of such importance in the discussion on the hustings at the next general elections, in the district of Quebec, at least, that I cannot let it pass over without giving some of the reasons which induce me to vote in favor of the Government's resolutions. In the district of Quebec, two great questions are agitating the public mind: the first is the question of the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which Quebec desires to possess within its limits; the second is the question of the short route, which the population of that city and of some of the neighboring districts claim with loud voices. The first question seems now settled by one of the resolutions laid before the House, which guarantees, in the most formal manner, the prolongation of the Canadian Pacific Railway line to Quebec, where it should find the summer terminus; and, had it not been guaranteed in that way by the Minister of Public Works, I certainly would not vote for the resolutions altogether. Upon that question there should be then no difficulty in voting for the resolution, and reproaches should reach no one who would vote for it. The second question, the question of the short route that the present resolutions definitively determine, *vid* Sherbrooke, is a more ticklish question, and will surely excite dissensions in the minds of a good number. It is quite certain that, besides having the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, should the old city of Quebec become one of the links of the short route, and connect Montreal with the ports of the Maritime Provinces by a bridge over the St. Lawrence, between Cap Rouge and St. Romuald, the

Mr. GIROUARD.

old city of Quebec would derive from these immense advantages, and would, in the near future, see added to the list of its glorious titles the more lucrative title of a rich, commercial, manufacturing and maritime city. But, Mr. Speaker, let us consider, first, that the question of a short route from one point to another is not a question which can be decided by the law put on the Statute Book, but is a question of geography, laid down by nature itself. And I don't see anything else in the resolutions now submitted than this: that the Government, at the instance of the people of the Eastern Townships and of the Maritime Provinces, is going to subsidise a line of railway from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces *vid* Sherbrooke, like it has subsidised the North Shore Railway, from Quebec to Ottawa, like it subsidised the Lake St. John Railway, the Quebec Central Railway, the Rivière du Loup and Edmundston Railway, in the Province of Quebec, and so many other railways in other Provinces. If it is not the short route, will that subsidy make it? Certainly not. If the short route is *vid* Quebec, sooner or later the trade will find its way through this last-named city. Like the water that has been diverted from its natural channel always seeks after its natural course, and, if not prevented by artificial work, always ends in finding it, the trade may, for some time, be diverted from its natural channel, which is the shortest, but will always end in finding it also. And, Mr. Speaker, nature cannot give all to the same place. If nature gave Quebec one of the finest ports in the world, if it gifted Quebec with one of the most magnificent sites of the world, surrounded it with so many charming places, who can blame nature not to have put this admirable city on the shortest route between Montreal and Halifax? And as it is this route that we are trying to find, because the trade, blind and unpoetical as it is, instead of seeking on its way after beauties of nature, charming and adorned places, looks always after the straight line, which is the shortest way from one place to another, we must then adopt, to subsidise it, the route which is proved to us as meeting the most the needs and exigencies of trade. It is here no question of sentiment, but a question of business; it is no question of predilection for one place or another, but a question of commercial necessity. In fact, it is a question of commerce, which has its own indisputable rules. Then, we must not look at it and judge it through the prism of our personal sympathies, but with the severe and impartial eye of business men. For my part, then, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the personal sympathies that I might have for the city of Quebec, which is dear to me for more than one reason, notwithstanding the fact that I desire, as much as any one, its progress, its prosperity and its material grandeur, I cannot, after having seriously studied the papers and reports laid before us, attentively listened to the reasons given on each side, do otherwise than give my assent to the resolutions which contain the choice of the short route through Sherbrooke. And what I stated before is the first consideration upon which I based my opinion, a consideration merely of general interest, completely disengaged from sectional and local interests, which may sometimes lead the mind in a false direction. In the second place, I must recollect that I am here, not as a member of the city of Quebec, but that I represent here the county of Beauce; that this county is formed partly with Eastern Townships directly and largely interested in the completion of the International Railway, which goes through them; that this line crosses a part of the county of Beauce, which part would derive great advantages from the prosperity and of the success of this line. If a part of the county of Beauce has its market at Quebec, another part of the same has it at Sherbrooke, and that is the new part of the county which requires the most for its development, easy access to markets and real marks of encouragement. And, besides, will not, after this, the

lower part of the county of Beauce be connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway by the Quebec Central, which the choice of the route through Sherbrooke will assure and accelerate the completion of, giving to the parishes along the Chaudière River and the large townships of Marlow, Linière, Jersey, Shenley, Gayhurst, etc., easy access either to Quebec, Sherbrooke or American markets. Another reason: When the subsidy of \$211,000 had been voted last year by Parliament to assure the completion of the Quebec Central Railway, which now has to be completed all through the county of Beauce, was it not granted because this road was considered as an important feeder of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which it was to be connected at some given point within the State of Maine? Although I was not, last year, a member of this House, and although I was not present at the conferences which preceded the grant of this subsidy, I always thought, however, that those \$211,000 were granted largely upon that consideration. The same interest which existed last year, and brought the Government to the granting of this subsidy, prevails again to-day. And were I to vote to-day against the present resolution, would I not undo what my predecessor did last year, and contribute to unbuild the Quebec Central and decrease its importance, which he contributed so much to build and increase its importance, working in this connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, of which it will be, as I already stated, an important feeder. Many reasons, then, induce me to give my vote in favor of the resolutions brought by the Government: 1st. Reasons of general interest and then reasons of a secondary value, consisting in the immediate and considerable advantages which my constituents would derive from their adoption. I cannot forget that I represent, in this House, a county exclusively composed of farmers, and that the interest of the agricultural class must stand for me, in the first place, before the commercial and manufacturing classes of the cities. In voting down those resolutions altogether, what would be the result for Quebec? The question of the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is decided in their favor this year, and which will become within a few weeks *un fait accompli*, will be left one year more to the mercy of political eventualities; and who knows what may or may not happen in a year's time? Why let the occasion pass without giving Quebec that great and long-sought-for advantage of becoming the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir, in voting for the resolutions, I believe that I will vote in the interests of my constituents, agriculturists and farmers, in providing for them new markets for their products, new accesses to those markets and consequently in increasing their chances to reach wealth and prosperity. For a long time past this question has been before the public, and my intention has always been well formed to give this question the most serious consideration and give upon it a vote completely independent of party links, if the policy of the Government upon this question were not, in my opinion, completely a just and legitimate one. After having studied the question most carefully, I am happy to declare that the opinion I formed upon it is in accordance with the policy of my party and of my leaders, and that in this circumstance, as in many other instances, I may, together with the accomplishment of my duty as a conscientious member, give them the help of my vote. It only remains for me now to beg pardon from the House for the errors I must have been guilty of in using a language which I am not very familiar with, but it was my desire to be understood by all, and I hope that in consideration of my good will you will excuse my temerity.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). This is a question which is of especial interest to the people of the Maritime Provinces and also to the people of the Province of Quebec, but

we regard it in no sense as a provincial question. It is a question which is rather national than provincial in its character, involving, as it does, the commercial interests of this whole country. I regret that the hon. members from Quebec have felt it their duty to oppose these resolutions. I regret that these amendments have been offered, because I had hoped that the resolutions would have received the unanimous support of the hon. members of the House, no matter to which political party they belong. The object of these resolutions is to secure for our own people the future trade of this country and to use it to build up our own seaports. This is a laudable object, and one which should enlist the sympathies of every member of this House; and it is because I believe these resolutions will attain that important object that I feel it my duty to support them. I do not intend to refer to that portion of the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, which refers to making the city of Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I can only say that in my opinion there can be no difference of opinion as to the fact that the claims of the St. Lawrence route, as a summer route for our traffic, are superior to those of every other. The natural advantages of that great river, improved as they have been, from time to time, by large expenditures of money, have already secured for it a very large percentage of the foreign trade of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns they will find that in the year 1884, of the foreign imports of those provinces, 70 per cent. came *via* the St. Lawrence, and about 30 per cent. *via* other routes. In the exports, the difference was still more marked. Upwards of 90 per cent. of the foreign exports of those Provinces went by the St. Lawrence, and less than 10 per cent. passed through the United States in bond. I do not, of course, include in these figures the exports and imports to the United States. These figures, however, show that the St. Lawrence route has already a practical monopoly of the foreign trade of the west. It is my desire, and I believe it is the desire of every member of this House, from whatever part of the Dominion he may come, to see its control of this traffic not only established but extended, to see it in the future embrace not only the trade from our own North-West, but to embrace the transcontinental trade that we hope will be developed, and also to draw into the same channel a large portion of the exports of those States which lie between the great lakes and the Rocky Mountains. I trust, too, that when this trade is developed the enterprise of the merchants and business men of the city of Quebec, with the facilities which they will possess when it is made the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will secure for them a large share of that traffic; for, in my opinion, the importance of that city, the importance of the River St. Lawrence as a great highway for trade, can never be ignored. The value of this great river in this respect, as well as its beauty and the grandeur of its scenery, were referred to early in the present session by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) in his usual eloquent style; and, Sir, I feel that it is a source of pride to every Canadian to know that that magnificent river which, for natural beauty and for the grandeur of its scenery has no rival, and which in the past has contributed so largely to attract foreign travel to our shores and make this country known, occupies at the present time the very first position on this continent as a great natural channel for trade and commerce. Sir, I feel it to be the duty of this Parliament, and I hope it will always be our endeavor to strengthen its claims to that position, so far as it is possible to do so by legislative action. But while I endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Quebec East, in regard to this matter, I cannot endorse the views he has expressed with regard to the winter outlet for our traffic. When we

come to deal with the question of a winter outlet we have a very different and a very difficult matter before us. The first question, and one of vital importance, is the question of distance. This question of distance in the past has been so serious a matter that it has defeated every effort of the Government to carry this traffic over the Intercolonial Railway to the seaboard; and, although we now adopt the shortest and most direct line possible, it still presents itself as a very serious obstacle to the commercial success of this scheme. This question of difference of distance between our own line and the lines leading to American ports is one which can never be entirely removed; it can only be reduced to a minimum, and I believe every hon. gentleman will agree that it is not only important, but absolutely necessary, that it should be reduced to a minimum. I believe every member of this House agrees, and the hon. gentlemen who support this amendment also agree, that the policy which was adopted by the Government last Session and which then received the sanction of this House, is the only true policy, namely, that the shortest and best practicable line should be adopted. Well, Sir, it is in pursuance of that policy, after an entire season has been passed in making surveys, and upon the report of the Government engineer of railways, that the present route has been selected. We must all admit that we have largely to depend upon the experience and the judgment of engineers in these matters. I feel that it is a matter for regret that in the present instance we have so much difference of opinion; that some engineers should advocate one line and some another; that some of these engineers have been willing to stake their professional reputation on the assertion that the respective lines which they advocate are the best. And, Sir, we have a gentleman and an engineer of undisputed ability and wide reputation in his profession stating in the House to-day that there is not sufficient information before the House yet to enable any engineer to give an opinion upon this question. Well, Sir, when I find so much difference of opinion, I have decided to give my faith to the judgment of the Government engineer of railways, for I feel that there is no higher authority to which I can appeal in the support of the choice which the Government has made, and as a guide to the action of the House in this matter, than the authority to which I have referred. Then there is another important consideration which has been referred to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon). I believe that it is shown to be the shortest and best practicable route that will meet the interests of all the important seaports in the Maritime Provinces. It is true, I believe, that a shorter line can be obtained to the Port of St. Andrews to the south of this line, and a shorter line may be obtained to the port of St. John to the south of this line. It is possible, if we can rely upon the opinions which have been expressed by some of the engineers, that a somewhat shorter line could be obtained to Halifax and Louisburg to the northward of this line. The difference of distance, however, between any of these lines which I have referred to, and the line which has been selected, is, in any case, but trifling, and this may, therefore, be regarded as a compromise line. While the interests of no one of the seaports in the Maritime Provinces have been considered of paramount importance in this matter, the interests of all have been properly guarded. Then there is another consideration which is of importance. As the hon. member for St. John correctly said, the people from every section of the Maritime Provinces have been for years looking to this route for direct railway connection with the west. Practical business men have been devoting their attention and energy to this matter, with the hope of securing the construction of this line. It must be borne in mind that we are not proposing to build a Government line of railway, but that the subsidy we are offering is given as an aid to private enterprise, as an inducement to capitalists to enter

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

upon the construction of this important work. The views, therefore, of practical business men become important in this matter. And while in the one case we have these facts, that through private enterprise a company has been organised some years and chartered to construct a line of railway through Maine over the very route indicated in the resolutions; while a large amount of private capital has already been expended in surveys and in promoting this enterprise; while we have every reason to believe that with a sufficient subsidy capitalists will be found ready and willing to construct this line, we have no good reason to hope that the same result would be accomplished if any other line were adopted. We have no reason to believe that capitalists will be found to construct any other line that has been proposed. I intended to refer to the objection offered to this line on account of its running through Maine, and the danger that some have apprehended, that lines would be constructed to divert trade in that direction. This matter, however, was dealt with on a former occasion, and I shall not allude to it. I will, however, allude to the matter which has been referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). He has spoken, in the first place, of the amount of this subsidy, and said that the amount would be equal to a capital of \$5,000,000. The hon. gentleman must have overlooked the fact that this subsidy only continues for 20 years; and the leader of the Opposition, on a former occasion, gave as the amount which this subsidy, capitalised, would represent, and if I recollect aright it was about \$3,400,000. That would be equivalent to about \$10,000 per mile on the length of the line to be constructed; and when we have regard to the cost of the line, of the character that this road will require to be, it will be apparent that that will only be sufficient to pay about half the cost of the work remaining to be constructed, and a large amount of capital will be required in addition to the subsidy to secure the construction of this work. I will also refer briefly to the prospects of this line. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has expressed doubts as to whether this line can ever be made a commercial success. I do not wonder that he has expressed those doubts. I have already alluded to the disadvantages under which we labor, from our geographical position, in the Maritime Provinces. I feel that the competition which we will experience from the American lines will be very keen. I recognise the fact that it is absolutely necessary that we should avail ourselves of every advantage we possess to the fullest possible extent. What are our advantages? Railway traffic is usually classed under three heads: The ordinary freight traffic, the passenger traffic, and the mail service and express business. From the Canadian railway returns I find that of the gross receipts about two-thirds are derived from freight traffic and one-third from the other sources. From the best information I have been enabled to obtain from the public returns of the leading American railways, whose accounts of receipts and expenditures of the different classes of traffic are kept separate, it appears that of the gross receipts from freight traffic about 80 per cent. is required to pay the working expenses, leaving about 20 per cent. for profit; of the gross receipts from passenger travel about 60 per cent. for working expenses, leaving 40 per cent. for profit. The importance, therefore, of a large passenger traffic will be apparent, as it brings larger profits. Those incidents of traffic are governed by somewhat different principles. In moving freight, cost is the first consideration. With the mail service, time is the first consideration; cost is the second. With passenger traffic, time, safety and comfort are the great considerations; cost is secondary. As the result of the operation of those principles, freight traffic usually seeks its ways to the seaboard by the shortest route. Passenger travel, on the other hand, inclines to a longer land journey, and makes the ocean voyage as short as possible. While, therefore, from our geographical posi-

tions in the Maritime Provinces, we are placed at some disadvantage as competitors against American lines for freight traffic, we have some advantages in the competition for passenger traffic. But it must be observed that many conditions are necessary to successful competition. Not only must the shortest and best route be selected, but the line itself must be of the best description. The roadbed must be of the most permanent and substantial character, one on which the highest rates of speed can be attained, combined with the greatest safety. The rolling stock must be of the best description, and it must be equipped with all the comforts and conveniences which modern travellers consider desirable and necessary. I believe if those conditions are met, the Canadian line in point of time has an advantage, while so far as regards comfort and safety it can be made equal to any possible line of travel between America and Europe; and if these important advantages are turned to profitable account, the Canadian lines will be placed in a vastly more advantageous position in the competition for freight traffic. In the first place, it will have a profitable business upon which it can with certainty rely, first-class ocean steamships would be brought to the Maritime ports in greater numbers, the competition which would result, combined with an abundant supply of cheap fuel, always available, and a shorter ocean voyage, would reduce the rates of ocean freights to the lowest possible point, to a point below any which could be quoted on any other seaports on the American coast. Then another important advantage would be secured, by placing this line under the control of one company. I admit it is not an essential consideration, but I regard it as a very important one. I admit that, in the main, traffic will be governed by ordinary commercial rules, and that the line of railway which can deliver freight at its destination at the least cost to itself, will, in the end, win traffic from its competitors. But where other things are equal, or nearly so, it is well known that the ownership of a long line of railway practically determines the destination of its entire freight traffic; and, Sir, under such circumstances, with a line of the best description constructed and thoroughly equipped, controlled and managed by one company throughout, I feel that we might hope in the future to overcome the chief difficulty with which we have to contend in the Maritime Provinces, and that we might reasonably expect to see the great and growing traffic of the west which, during the summer time, will always find an outlet by the St. Lawrence, in the winter season successfully directed to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces. I shall not longer detain the House at this late hour, and this late period of the Session, but I believe that in the resolutions which are now proposed by the Government we are laying the foundation of a sound and successful enterprise. I trust, Sir, that the amount of the subsidy which is offered will be found sufficient to induce capitalists to construct this line of railway. I trust that the same men who, with such remarkable energy and ability, carried forward the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with a rapidity which is unprecedented in the history of the world, will also be induced to undertake the construction of this line, and that the people of the Maritime Provinces, who have been looking to this projected line of railway for many years, for a direct and intimate connection with the sister Provinces in the west, will at last realise what they so long hoped for, and that this line will also become part of our great transcontinental railway, which in future is to connect our seaports on the Atlantic with those on the Pacific coast.

Mr. TEMPLE. I wish to say a few words on this subject, which is rather an important one to the people of the Maritime Provinces. I wish to deal with two routes, that is, the southern and the northern route, and the route proposed by

Mr. O'Sullivan. In order to do so I shall give the figures and the distances of the two routes, and I will endeavor to show the entire impracticability of Mr. O'Sullivan's route, not by my own knowledge of the route altogether, but by a survey that was made by Major Robinson, under the British Government, in 1848. Some hon. gentlemen in this House seem to be disposed to ignore entirely the Maritime Provinces. The road proposed under these resolutions has been in contemplation, and has been spoken of by the people of the Maritime Provinces for a number of years. They have been looking forward to its completion, and I hope we shall now have it completed under these resolutions. I trust, Sir, that the hon. members of this House will not vote down these resolutions. Although we live down by the sea; although we are down-easters, as the Yankee might say, yet, living in the east, we live where hon. members from the west receive the first light of day. And I might say also that we have some bright and shining lights from the east in this Parliament—we see them all around us; and I trust that when this vote is given, hon. members will consider us, and not leave us altogether in the dark. Now, in the first place, I propose to deal for a few minutes with Mr. O'Sullivan's pamphlet. He says:

"The supporters of the southern route in one sweep arrive at the conclusion that the shortest route is by Sherbrooke and Moosehead Lake, and to prove this they take up the plan to show that the Edmundston line forms two sides of a triangle.

"St. Thèrese and Moncton are two points that must be common to the trunk line of the Dominion, whatever route is chosen between these points, unless that the entire interests of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton, as regards railway communication with the west, centre in St. John, N.B., which has not yet been admitted by any one."

In the first place, he ignores entirely St. Andrews and St. John, and he goes across the country from Grand Falls, as I shall show. He goes on:

"The choice of route for the short line from Montreal to the Canadian winter seaports should not be made from a local standpoint; but it should be made from that high, impartial standpoint, where may be united and centered the most and greatest interests, both national and commercial, of the entire Dominion."

I agree with him in that. As far as I understand the resolutions, I believe we are to adopt the shortest and best practicable route, and this was the understanding, I think, of the resolutions last year. Now, what does that mean? We cannot go 100 miles beyond that, even if we were ever so willing to do it; that is my opinion; otherwise I would agree to this line; but it goes across the Tobique Mountains, as I will endeavor to show:

"And if it can be proved that as good a line and as short a line can be had on Canadian soil, to fill the above conditions, as can be had on United States soil, it seems to me that any man who has the least spark of patriotism or who values his oath of allegiance should vote for the all-Canadian route."

There is no doubt about that, and I think we would all vote for it; but, as I said before, under the resolutions we cannot do it. Now, I will show the House that Mr. O'Sullivan is in error as to the distance. The distances of the northern route are as follows—I take these figures as given by Mr. O'Sullivan himself:—

	Miles.
Montreal to Quebec.....	172
Quebec to Rivière du Loup.....	116
Rivière du Loup to Edmundston.....	80
Edmundston to Grand Falls.....	40
Grand Falls to Fredericton.....	130
Fredericton to Salisbury.....	85
Salisbury to Moncton.....	13
Total.....	636

That is the distance of the northern route. But that is not the route Mr. O'Sullivan proposes; but had he been honest in his convictions he would have taken this route instead of the route he has proposed. Mr. O'Sullivan's northern line is as follows:—

	Miles.
Montreal to Quebec.....	172
Quebec to Rivière du Loup .....	116
Rivière du Loup to Edmundston.....	80
Edmundston to Grand Falls.....	40
Grand Falls to Moncton.....	200
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>608</b>

A difference in favor of Mr. O'Sullivan's route of 25 miles. Mr. O'Sullivan calls the distance from Grand Falls to Moncton 168 miles; but that is straight across the country, although, if a line could be constructed there at all, I am sure it could not be done under 200 miles. I know that country very well; I have travelled over it year after year; it is a very mountainous country; and the River Tobique runs through it for over 60 miles. It is impossible to construct a railway across that river; it would cost millions upon millions of dollars to build 100 miles of railway through that country. To prove that, I will show by Major Robinson when he surveyed that country, in the effort to get an all-Canadian route from Halifax to Quebec. It was to be a military road, and therefore he was forbidden to go near the boundary line. If he had struck the River St. John at Woodstock or some other point near the boundary line he could have got on without any trouble; but going through the centre of the country, it was impossible to find a practicable route, so that he had to abandon the attempt. Now, I will give you the distances of the southern route:

	Miles.
Montreal to Chambly.....	20
Chambly to Lennoxville .....	80
Lennoxville to Moose River.....	89
Moose River to Mattawamkeag.....	135
Mattawamkeag to Harvey.....	81
Harvey to St. John.....	64
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>469</b>

The distance from Harvey to St. John is put at 60 miles in the reports; I put it at 64, and I am sure I am right. Taking Mr. Schreiber's report after I made up this statement, I find it shows a difference in the mileage in the case of each of the routes. According to Mr. O'Sullivan's figures, the northern route to St. John from Montreal, by way of Quebec, Rivière du Loup, Edmundston, Grand Falls and Fredericton, is 599 miles, a difference in favor of the southern route of 130 miles; but, as I said before, under the resolutions it would be impossible for us to adopt this line, if we were ever so willing to do so. I will take the northern route again, and the distances are as follows:—

	Miles.
From Montreal to Quebec.....	172
Quebec to Rivière du Loup.....	116
Rivière du Loup to Edmundston.....	80
Edmundston to Grand Falls.....	40
From Grand Falls to Moncton.....	200
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>608</b>

The southern route is as follows:—

	Miles.
Montreal to Chambly.....	20
Chambly to Lennoxville.....	80
Lennoxville to Moose River.....	89
Moose River to Mattawamkeag.....	135
Mattawamkeag to Salisbury by Fredericton.....	194
Salisbury to Moncton.....	13
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>531</b>

Showing a difference in favor of the southern route of 77 miles. So that he is wrong in all his figures, and they are mystifying in every way. Taking Mr. O'Sullivan's own figures, from Grand Falls to Moncton is 167 miles across a straight line over the mountain, which still leaves a difference of 52 miles in favor of the southern route, although he had made it himself 25 miles different in his own favor. All this proves that Mr. O'Sullivan's report  
**Mr. TEMPLE.**

is entirely wrong, as regards distances, and is impracticable. No doubt Mr. O'Sullivan is a clever man, for it takes a clever man to misinterpret statements and mystify figures, as I fear he has done in his report. I said I would show where he had made an error, in reference to the country over which he proposes to take this line. I will show the House his line is utterly impracticable, according to explorations that have taken place years ago. Major Robinson, in his report of 1848, says:

"The fourth obstacle is the broad and extensive range of the highlands which occupy nearly the whole space in the centre of New Brunswick, from the Miramichi River north to the Restigouche. Some of these mountains rise to an altitude exceeding 2,000 feet.

"The Tobique River runs through them, forming a deep valley or trough, which must be crossed by a direct line and increase greatly the difficulty of passing by them.

"This river runs directly, and all the roads going east or north-east have to cross this valley.

"The lowest point of the ridge, overlooking the Tobique River, at which any line of railway must pass, is 1,216 feet above the sea. Then follows a descent to the river of 796 feet in 18 miles, and the summit level on the opposite ridge or crest between the Tobique and Restigouche waters is 920 feet above the sea, or a rise of 500 feet above the point of crossing at the Tobique water. These great summit levels which must be surmounted form a serious objection to this route."

He goes on to say:

"The fifth and last obstacle to be overcome, and which cannot be avoided by any of the routes, is the mountain range running along the whole course of the River St. Lawrence, in a very irregular line, but at an average distance on it of about 20 miles. It occupies, with its spurs and branches a large portion of the space between the St. Lawrence and the Restigouche River. The rocks and strata composing the range are of the same character and kind as the Tobique range. The tops of the mountains are as elevated in the one range as in the other."

And the peculiar formation of the strata and general course of the valleys and streams renders it most improbable that any further explorations to improve this direct line through New Brunswick would be attended with much success. Unwilling to abandon the direct route through the centre of New Brunswick, by which, if a line could be successfully carried out, the distance would be so materially shortened as is apparent by the mileage given in route No. 4, it was determined to use every effort to decide either the practicability or impracticability of such a line. To this end large parties were employed the whole season. Winding up he thus condemns the line. That part of the direct route (Nos. 3 and 4) viz., the line from the bend of Petitcodiac by Boistown to the Restigouche and the St. Lawrence, crossing the range of New Brunswick mountains, having to surmount two summit levels of 1,216 and 920 feet, causing heavy grades and increasing materially the cost of transport; passing through a totally unsettled and wilderness country; involving greater difficulties in the transport of the materials necessary for its construction, and supplying food to the laborers engaged in its formation; excluding the towns and settlements on the Gulf shore, and so preventing the development of the vast resources of the country to be derived from the fisheries; and also inflicting a serious loss to the interests of the main line, and to the intended branch from the City of St. John, in New Brunswick, is, notwithstanding its one great advantage of diminishing distance, recommended most strongly to be rejected. Of course, so far as we are concerned in Fredericton, it is not material which route the line takes. If it goes by Mattawamkeag, under the resolution, it passes through Fredericton; if it goes to the north, it passes through Fredericton; but I wish to see the line carried out in accordance with the resolution now before the House. Owing, of course, to our geographical position, the road will strike us on any point. Mr. O'Sullivan has said in his winding up, quoting Sir Walter Scott:—

"Breathes there a man, with soul so dead  
 Who never to himself has said:  
 This is my own, my native land."

I will say, in response to that, in the words of Temple :

" There lives a man who is so base  
As other men's figures to deface,  
All in his own, his native land."

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before recording my vote upon the question now before the House, I desire to explain it. As I said a few days ago, when the Government moved these resolutions, when I thought it my duty to say that these resolutions did not fully meet my views. As I said then, they comprise three perfectly distinct questions, which are merged into one sole motion. These three distinct questions again come to-night under the same form, and the Government, who are asking us to vote the present resolutions, ask that we should vote first the grant to the Edmunston Railway secondly, the choice which they have made of the Short Line, and thirdly, the Pacific Railway extension to Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I wish the position which I am taking to be well understood. The hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) comes here with a motion in amendment, asking that all the words of the main motion be struck off, and that his proposition be adopted by the House. If that motion of the hon member is adopted, the three resolutions moved by the Government are put aside, and we are left with no alternative, except to pass condemnation on the Government. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this may be fully subservient to the interest of a political party, but that it is not at all in the interest of the country, and for that reason I shall pronounce against the amendment of the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), because I find that he lays aside all the questions whose happy solution would be in the interest of the country at large and of the district of Quebec in particular. It does not follow, Mr. Speaker, that I am in favor of the resolutions of the Government; on the contrary, I make these restrictions for the moment, but when the time comes to vote on the resolutions, I shall record my vote against them. The sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) has the same bearing. It strikes out, it is true, all the words contained in the main amendment, but it substitutes similar words to them, and the only difference is the provision that the surveys to be made will be made at once. I do not object to such a provision, as I would have no objection to declare, with the hon. member for East Quebec, that the Government should have kept the promises which they have made both to Parliament and to the country; but I will add this, if we adopt the sub-amendment and the amendment, we lay aside all the resolutions, while I only object to one, or perhaps to two, of the questions involved in the resolutions, such as proposed by the Government. For the same reason, therefore, I shall vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Megantic. Sir, what is the end which is sought to be attained by the present legislation? The object is to secure to the Maritime Provinces, or at least to a seaport in the Maritime Provinces, the shipping of the western traffic, the Pacific trade. At the present time Montreal is the terminus of the Pacific Railway, and as such the distribution point of trade. The traffic may take two routes; it may take the southern route or the northern route. If the traffic, when it leaves Montreal, immediately takes the southern route, a bridge must necessarily be built at Laachine; then the laws which regulate trade will apply there as they will elsewhere; and if, to-day, we are discussing before the House the choice of a line which is pretended to be shorter, if the Government have made their choice, which is that of the Mattawamkeag line—because they pretend that that route is the shortest of any—in preference to a line which would run through Canadian territory, for the same reason, when the traffic once gets on the other side of the river, at Montreal, it will take the shortest line, and as it will only have 297 miles to go to Portland, it will go to Portland,

and will never go to the Maritime Provinces. Here, Sir, is an argument which I used some ten days ago in this House, which has never been answered, and which cannot be answered. If we cannot avoid altogether these grave inconveniences, we have at least at our disposal a powerful means of extenuating them, and it is this: If the traffic, instead of taking the southern route, takes the northern route, and goes down to Quebec, then Quebec, instead of Montreal, becomes the great distributing point for trade from Quebec; the traffic would have to go 317 miles to reach Portland. If we take St. Andrews, in the Maritime Provinces, as the nearest port to Quebec, from Quebec to St. Andrews the distance is 258 miles. These figures are taken from the reports brought down by the Government; these figures are given by the Government engineer, Mr. Schreiber, himself. Therefore, from this point of view, Quebec becomes the point of distribution of trade. The traffic coming to Quebec by way of the North Shore Railway, it follows necessarily that the shortest route, the winter port which is nearest to Quebec, is in the Maritime Provinces, either at St. Andrews or even at St. John, to compete with advantage against Portland. But as long as the flow of trade is not directed towards Quebec, as long as traffic will be allowed to go from Montreal to Portland, we cannot expect to keep the trade on Canadian territory. For that reason, and for that reason only, I shall pronounce against the line which goes through Mattawamkeag. With regard to the promises made by the Government, I do not wish to say any more about them; I have expressed my views on that question the last time I spoke in this House. I believe that, in the interest of the country at large, in the interest of the Province of Quebec, and more particularly in the interest of the district of Quebec, the Short Line which goes through the city of Quebec ought to be chosen. I regret that the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), who pretends to represent here more especially the interests of his city, or, at least, the interest of his constituency; I regret the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), the chief magistrate of the city of Quebec, instead of serving the interests of their party, by making a motion whose result would be, if it was adopted, to deprive the city of Quebec from all the advantages which these gentlemen ought to strive to secure for it—I regret, I say, that instead of making that motion, they have not made a motion in the direction of my remarks, in the direction of the true interests of the city of Quebec, of the district of Quebec and of the country at large. I hope that when we shall have voted against the amendment of the hon. member for East Quebec, and the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Megantic, the time will have come when we can move an amendment embodying the opinions which I now express, and which, I have not the least doubt are the opinions of most of the hon. members of this House. I do not intend to fully discuss the question. The hon. members who spoke before me, the hon. members for Megantic and East Quebec, have given figures which have proved that the line passing through Quebec is even shorter than that which it is sought to-day to impose upon the House. I say to impose, and I do not think that the word is too strong. At all events, I do not wish for the moment to go over these figures again, but I say this: There is one well-established fact which the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Lesage) pointed out in this House the other day, and it is the diversity of opinions expressed by the different officers employed by the Government in the survey of these various lines. This diversity of opinion on figures and facts, which are in their line, which are within their province, ought to open the eyes of hon. members of this House. I believe that, under the circumstances, the Government ought to give us more extensive surveys, and should give us an opportunity of examining the figures which have been given. I

believe that it was one of the chief means employed by one of the hon. members who advocated the Short Line *via* Sherbrooke. He has pretended that Mr. Light was a man who went to work with his eyes shut, who had given figures which were not accurate; but we find that if we take the figures given by the Government engineer to contradict these figures, we stand face to face with the same inaccuracies, with the same interests, and perhaps with interests which are even greater. I believe that, for these reasons, the Government, seeing that these officers have not come to a uniform decision, seeing that the men whom they have employed did not agree on the surveys which they had made, ought to postpone their decision, and even hold an investigation, to verify the reports which have been laid before the House. There are some of these reports which, if they are not accurate, are an insult to this House, and those who have made them ought to be punished. There are men who have come and stated things in dishonest reports, and who have tried to mislead public opinion, and even hon. members of this House. They are men who, if convicted of dishonesty, should not for a moment continue to hold the position which they now occupy, and to control, as they do, the destinies of the country, the same as the Deputy Ministers do. For the reasons I have just stated, I believe that in the interest of the city of Quebec, in the interests of the Province of Quebec and of the country at large, we should vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Mégantic, because this sub-amendment does away with all the propositions made by the Government, and even against the amendment of the hon. member for East Quebec. As I said awhile ago, when the main question comes before the House to be voted upon, I hope that we will contrive to move an amendment which shall better express our views, and which shall be in the interest of the country at large and of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. HALL. I do not propose to take up the time of the House in regard to the merits of this question, in addition to the remarks made by me the other evening, but these remarks have been criticised by two hon. members to-night: one questioning their propriety, the other their correctness. It was very natural and commendable that the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) should come to the defence of his colleague and friend Mr. Light. So far, however, as the question of propriety is concerned, the House is to bear in mind that the question before it was, whether the surveys, which had been made at great expense to the country and which demonstrated that there was a practical line by a certain route, should be set aside, on the impressions of Mr. Light as to a theoretical line of his own. As it was within my personal knowledge that his professional views heretofore had proved not only erroneous, but disastrous to my Province, I felt justified in making, under these circumstances, reference to those matters, and my statements, in those respects, have not been controverted, and could not be controverted, because the facts alleged were matters of record. As to the statement I made about the use of titles by Mr. Light, the impression has been conveyed by the hon. member for Mégantic, that my statements were inaccurate. I can only say that they are not. I stated that he was not in the employment of the Government of Quebec. I knew it personally, and I have the certificate of a provincial Minister, to that effect. The only statements in contradiction is, that under an Order in Council, Mr. Light had the right for two years to use the title of engineer of the Province of Quebec. Whether, now that his services have been dispensed with as such engineer, he is entitled to use that designation or not, is for hon. members to consider. The answer to the other statement I made, as to his not being a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, is that a good many years ago he was a member of that institute, he has written a

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny).

letter to the Quebec papers, stating that he intends to renew his subscription, and again become a member of that institute. It was within my own knowledge that his use of that title was criticised by the institute itself, and that it appeared by the catalogues, for many years past, that he was not a member of that institution, and the only answer to my statement, is that he has formerly had that right and intends to avail himself of it hereafter. My statement, therefore, is not, and has not been disputed; but unless I made this explanation, the remarks of the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langeher), might have led the House to imagine that my statements were incorrect.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter is one of great importance to us in the Maritime Provinces, and by that I do not wish it to be understood that it is not of equal importance to all the Provinces, because there is no Province whose interests are not affected by it. I was sorry to hear a statement from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) (and I hope the spirit in which he made it does not actuate many members of this House), that he was willing last year to vote a small amount of money, by way of soothing the feelings of the people in the Maritime Provinces, towards a project in which he had not much faith, but he was not prepared to vote any more money to encourage what he believed to be a chimera, or something like that. I have a great respect for that hon. gentleman, but I think there are many members in this House who believe that, in view of the opening up of trade between the Maritime Provinces and the Upper Provinces, this is a line which will pay, and that there is a great deal more than a chimerical idea in it. The hon. gentleman stated that we built the Intercolonial Railway for the people of the Maritime Provinces. "We" is a very large person, sometimes, but "we" does not mean the member for Jacques Cartier or even the members from Quebec or Ontario alone. All the Provinces of the Dominion assumed the debt for the building of the Intercolonial Railway, and I think nearly one-half of that line runs through the Province of Quebec. At any rate, if not, the longest part, the most expensive part, runs through that Province, and that is the part which brings in the shortest returns. So it is not merely the Maritime Provinces which were interested in building that railway. The people of the Maritime Provinces have some claims to be considered in this respect. We contribute, in common with the larger Provinces, to the canals, nearly all of which are in the upper Provinces. We cheerfully contribute our proportion of the cost of deepening the St. Lawrence and making that great waterway which we hope it will be; and I think we have a claim, which we have a right to prefer, that this short commercial line should be completed, and that the Maritime Provinces should be joined, as closely as their geographical position will permit, with the older sections of the Dominion of Canada. I think that derives additional importance from this: We speak a great deal of the through trade, and it is a very important thing in connection with this road; but there is also the interprovincial trade. When the Provinces formed a Dominion, and when, more especially, the National Policy was adopted, the Maritime Provinces were, to a larger extent than before, thrown upon the older Provinces of the Dominion, and they were, to a greater extent, thrown off in matters affecting their commerce and trade with the United States, especially with the Eastern States. So it becomes us, more than ever before, to overcome every geographical difficulty which it is possible to overcome, by opening up the shortest commercial route between those Provinces and the Upper Provinces, and to develop the interprovincial trade as much as possible. I do not understand the present discussion to be upon the advisability of having a short commercial road of that kind. After the vote of last year, when the principle was

settled by a large majority, after the amendment proposed now by the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), which does not attack the principle at all, but simply desires to delay the embodiment of that idea, I think it is not seriously contemplated in this House to antagonise the idea of building, as soon as possible, a commercial line between the Maritime Provinces and the west. The amendment of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) is simply a motion for delay. I watched the hon. gentleman very carefully in the course of his speech, to see if he gave any sufficient reasons for further delay in putting into execution the principle to which we are all agreed. The main reason which he gave for delay was that the Government last year had made a pledge that the subsidy should not be granted or the railway built until reports had come in from competent engineers. The hon. gentleman said the Government had not carried out that pledge, and hence his amendment. Now, I think the Government has carried out its pledge, both literally and in spirit. Some five or six different surveys have been made; they have been thoroughly gone over by the Government engineer. He says that they are amply sufficient to enable the Government to base the location of a line upon them. But the hon. member for Quebec East is not satisfied with the number of surveys. He says there is another line which ought to be surveyed, the combination line. Now, it is interesting to note the change of base which my hon. friend has taken since last year. Last year he based his motion for delay on the ground that there was another route on all-Canadian soil, very nearly as short, and, on the whole, he believed it to be a good one, and that it ought to be adopted, in preference to going through American territory. A large part of his argument last year was based on the Rivière du Loup and Edmunston route, and especially the desirability of having the line through all-Canadian territory. Now, it has been shown by the surveys that there is a considerable difference in distance between that and the so-called American route. My hon. friend this year, just as Parliament is ready to put the idea into execution, comes forward again with a motion for delay, but this year it is not based upon the patriotic necessity for having an all-Canadian route. He himself goes against his argument of last year, because he bases this further claim for delay upon the ground that the combination line of Mr. Light will be shorter and better than the Megantic line, but which combination line runs for a long part through American territory. So that although he shifts his ground, yet he is always consistent in asking for delay. Now, Sir, to what limit must this go? Five surveys are made, and yet the hon. gentleman asks for delay in order that another one may be made. If we delay another year and five more surveys are made, is there any probability that my hon. friend will not come back next year with another motion for delay, because, forsooth, Mr. Light or some other person may have made upon paper a line which he declares to be better than any one that has been surveyed already? If my hon. friend bases his arguments upon Mr. Light's figures, I think he has his answer very well from the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), himself an engineer of large experience, who stated that, in his opinion, no surveys had been made, so far, which would warrant any person in being certain about the comparative merits of either line. My hon. friend also argued that the Edmunston subsidy and the Megantic line subsidy were antagonistic; that one cut out the other; that if one was given the other would be useless. Now, I do not subscribe to that opinion. I think the Megantic route and the Edmunston and Rivière du Loup route run through very different sections of country, and meet the requirements of very different sections of country; and even if the Megantic route be subsidised, there is very good reason, from a New Brunswick point of view,

and from a Quebec point of view, why the Edmunston and Rivière du Loup route should also be subsidised. My hon. friend also gave, as a reason for his amendment, that no company had come forward to build this Megantic line. Well, I think that the House, and all hon. members who have given the least attention to this matter, will agree with me that the promoters, and the company who will undertake to build the Megantic line, are within sight far more than the promoters and the company who will take up and carry through the combination line. My hon. friend then tried to make capital for his amendment by saying that the line south of the St. Lawrence had resulted from intrigue. I am not going to enter into that question, except to point out that the proof which he offered for his assertion is not such as will be satisfactory to this House. The proof that he gave consisted of extracts from newspapers in Quebec and other parts of the country. Well, I need not remind my hon. friend that newspapers say some very astonishing things about almost every public man who comes within the eye of the people, and my hon. friend would be the last man who would be willing to be judged in this House, either as to motive or as to practice, by what correspondents or editors of newspapers might say about him. These were the reasons given by my hon. friend, and I ask every hon. gentleman in this House if these reasons are sufficient to justify delay in a work of so great urgency? I do not think they are. But after these apparent reasons of the hon. gentleman, I think he gave the real reason why he sought delay last year, and why he seeks delay this year, and that was, that by some means or other he has persuaded himself that the future of the city of Quebec, as a summer port, depends upon whether this line goes south of the St. Lawrence or passes north of that river and crosses near the city of Quebec or goes by it. Now, what are the competitors of the city of Quebec, as a summer port? Well, in summer Quebec would have as competitors Montreal, Portland and Boston; and if this route goes through it will have as competitors the Maritime Province ports. It is for any member to decide whether or not Quebec will be put in a different position in competition with those other ports, provided this road is built, or provided it is not built. As summer ports, Quebec and Montreal are now in competition. They will be in just the same position when the road is built by Megantic, and no more. The competition between Halifax, St. John and Quebec, as summer ports, is, with all the differences, in favor of Quebec. There are some 300 miles distance in favor of Quebec, and whatever would go there as a summer port, without this line being built, will go there if the line be built. When you come to the other side of the question, and consider what are the competitors of St. John and Halifax and other winter ports, you find those competitors to be Portland and Boston, great cities in the United States. There is a competition in which St. John and Halifax and the Maritime Province ports stand at a disadvantage, if the distance and the kind of a road are at all against them; and even if you have the very shortest line, and the very best road, and the very best equipment, from the central point of Montreal down to the Maritime Provinces, you give them all they can do, in order to make a fair competition for any considerable portion of the trade with ports which lie much nearer Montreal, so far as distance is concerned. This House should pause before, for the sake of getting this road on the north shore and having a bridge built at Quebec, it runs the risk of making this road 50 or 60 miles, or even 30 miles longer, and takes away from its chances in the keen competition it will have to meet for this great through traffic with the winter ports in the United States. I have very little else to say with respect to this subject, except this: I do not believe in this policy of delay. As the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said, while we are squabbling among ourselves about the

combination route, and the Megantic route, between which, it seems, there is very little difference, but in which all the geographical lines and the tendency of the investigation so far go to favor the Megantic route—while we are squabbling about these rather unimportant particulars, it may be that the trade of the great North-West will take a set and current, which it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for us to turn. Trade and commerce do take sets and tendencies, and when once trade gets into a certain channel, it is very difficult to get it removed to other channels, and it is of the first importance that just so soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway is open for through traffic from the Pacific, at that very moment, if possible, or as soon after as possible, there should be this uninterrupted communication with the Maritime Provinces by the very shortest possible route; and, if possible, this line should be controlled in the interests of the great through line, in order that the trade, at its inception, may be drawn to our ports and through our channels. For these reasons I am against a policy of delay. As regards the Maritime Provinces, we speak the sentiments of nine-tenths of the people when we say that this is something in which they have a deep interest and sympathy, and they will thank no public man in this House for depriving them of this communication for years, and making them run the risk of entirely losing it. Here, now, is a proposition by which we believe this line can be constructed and carried to the Maritime Provinces. No one knows what the complexion of affairs may be, or who may be the members of this House, or whether, if it is put off one year, it may not lead to its being put off for years and years, until the project may ultimately come to be abandoned. So I say we ought to vote against a policy of delay, unless some stronger reasons can be given than those that have been adduced this afternoon. But there is a stronger point than all. Without Maritime Province ports the view is taken that this great undertaking on which we have spent so much money, and the burdens of which we shall have to bear for many years, is uncompleted. We not only want summer traffic but we want winter traffic as well. We not only need summer ports to do our general business, but winter ports as well, and we can secure trade for them only by building the very shortest possible line of communication between the great central channel of commerce and trade and the sea coast, through whose ports we expect to do a great part of this business. Much depends, from the point of view of the Maritime Provinces as well as of the rest of the Dominion, upon the best facilities being afforded for interprovincial trade. Not only on the ground of promoting interprovincial trade, but on the ground of the necessity of securing through trade in the interest of the country as a whole, as well as of the Maritime Provinces as the winter port system, I strongly plead for no more delay. Let us vote the resolutions; let us have the communication, and then depend, as the hon. member for St. John says, upon the energy and business capacity of the people of the Maritime Provinces to hold up their own end of the commercial progress of this country, and make for themselves a future in this Confederation which will be both prosperous and satisfactory.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I promise not to detain the House more than a few minutes. But on a question of this importance and on the settlement of it must greatly affect the prosperity of the Maritime Provinces, I think it is the duty of members who represent constituencies in those Provinces to give utterance to whatever sentiment they may have on this question, because they will not only be criticised for their actions here, but their actions may be criticised twenty-five, thirty or forty years hence. It will greatly depend on the success of the line we may adopt here now as to the character of the criticisms that may be brought on the heads

Mr. FOSTER.

of those on whom the responsibility rests of adopting a line. I am not at all in sympathy to-night with advocates of delay. I think we have, perhaps, had too much delay in dealing with a matter of this importance, but I must admit this, that we ought to be in a position not to ask for delay, we ought to be in the position of having all the requisite surveys, explorations and plans before us, in order that we may be able to judge as to what route will be most profitable and advantageous to the Maritime Provinces, and to the Dominion generally. With that feeling I am in full sympathy. The delay asked last year was based on similar grounds to the application made this year, namely, that we had not possession of sufficient information; that we wanted more information. The House granted the request. It was desirable for the Maritime Provinces to have the contract entered into; but the Government considered that it would be in the interests of the Dominion that the delay of one year should take place. What for? In order to have sufficient information on which to base our judgment this Session. Have we that information now? It will perhaps be presumptuous to offer an opinion, because I am not an engineer, and do not pretend to understand the different terms of an engineer's report. Yet, what do I find? I find that a man who has recently been returned to this House, a man most capable of expressing an opinion on this subject, an engineer of great reputation, tells us, that with all the attention he has been able to give to this subject, having read the discussions on it, having examined the plans—he, as an engineer, cannot state to the House or the country that he could make a choice between these routes, because the surveys are not sufficient. Well, Sir, if he is not in a position, how am I to say—how are the Government to say, and decide, that this is the best route? For that reason, I am in sympathy with the idea that we are not in a position to-night to give that intelligent vote that I think we should give on such a matter as this. I think it is much to be regretted, when the Government acceded to the request of the House to give them a delay of one year, they did not cause such surveys to be made as to enable them and us positively to say, not only that they had struck a certain line, but to say that they had struck the best line, and would be able to lay before the House reports upon which they could confidently claim that it was the best. We find that an engineer who appears to be pretty eminent in his profession—I do not say, for I cannot say, that his information is correct—but on his authority, he states that there is a line over all-Canadian territory that is shorter by, it is true, only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles, than the one we are asked to adopt. Well, even if it were 10 miles or even 25-miles longer, I say we should not throw it overboard in favor of one through American territory. I say we should be willing to put ourselves to some little disadvantage in order to get such a line as that. I do not know whether this gentleman is accurate or not, but I will give you his figures, in order that they may be recorded as part of the discussion, because it is not only to-day, but hereafter, that our action will be criticised, and this will have a tendency to show upon what information the vote was given. He points out that from Montreal to Moncton the distance is 550 miles, by a route over all-Canadian territory, while by the route which is now proposed the distance is 551 $\frac{1}{2}$  miles, or a difference of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles in favor of the all-Canadian route. He gives you 172 miles from Montreal to Quebec, about which there is no dispute, because it is already built; he gives you 66 miles on the Intercolonial Railway, about which there is no dispute; then there are 105 miles which are not built, and which may be speculative. Then from Edmundston to Grand Falls there are 40 miles already built; and from Grand Falls to Canaan, 148 miles, which may be altogether speculative, and which I am not prepared to say is correct or not. Here is how he arrives at it:

"From Moncton to Canaan the Intercolonial Railway runs in a nearly direct line for Grand Falls, and by measuring on the plan and adding 10 per cent. for curvature, the distance from Grand Falls to Canaan is 148 miles, making the whole distance from Grand Falls to Moncton only 167 miles; while by Mr. Schreiber's roundabout way *via* Fredericton the distance is increased to 232 miles."

Now, Sir, if that is a practicable route, I think hon. gentlemen will see these will be pretty nearly the distances.

Mr. WELDON. That would not benefit the valley of St. John.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Yes; I agree with the hon. gentleman, so far as St. John, York County, Sunbury and Charlotte are concerned, it would not benefit them to go to Moncton, but we are told that here we are not to consider small localities, but the great interests of the whole Dominion. I have as much sympathy with St. John and these other counties as anybody has, but we are told not to go past the shortest and most practicable route, for the purpose of favoring certain localities, and St. John is a small locality compared with the whole Dominion. Do not misunderstand me as saying that St. John has not its importance, but it should not divert us from the most practicable, straight and direct route. Now, it appears to me that it would have been worth while for the Government to have had that route surveyed, so as to be able to give us positive information. I am going to vote for the resolutions, but I do it with great reluctance, but I am moved to do so on my own Province being generally in favor of this line, because the people of Sunbury, York, St. John, and the western counties, are almost unanimously in favor of it. One reason may be, because it passes through that portion of the Province, and may be of benefit to it. At the same time, if I were firmly convinced that these figures I have given were positively correct—but we have not the information to enable us to say that they are—I would not vote in favor of the other line, but would vote in favor of this, because it would give us a line in our own territory, and a shorter route than the one we are asked to vote for. We are asked to build 360 odd miles on the one, as against 252 on the other. There is another consideration. My hon. friend from King's, N.B. says we should not encourage delay, because once traffic sets in in certain directions it is difficult to divert it. There is something in that argument, but I fear that notwithstanding our obtaining the route which is now proposed to this House, and for which I intend to vote—I cannot help expressing the fear that when we do get it, it is not going to be so great an advantage to the Maritime Provinces as we hope it will be.

An hon. MEMBER. We will risk that.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Well, I express that fear, because there is already a line from Montreal to Portland, at a distance of 272 miles, and that is controlled now by the company into whose hands we all hope the short line will be thrown, when it is completed, that is, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so that the whole line will be under one management. That is only 272 miles, and when in winter through traffic reaches Montreal from the western portion of our Dominion, the people will look upon it simply with a commercial eye, and when they are asked: Will we send the traffic over the short line or to St. Andrews, which would be 430 miles instead of 272, I think, Sir, they will take the road which gives them 272 miles instead of 430, and send it to Portland. I would hope and wish that it would be otherwise, but I am afraid that would be the result. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mitchell) says I am mistaken as to the Canadian Pacific Railway having full control from Montreal to Portland. I had understood that they had some running powers, but I am not in a position to say. Notwithstanding, I think they will find it to their advantage to acquire control over it, in order to have

only 272 miles of railway instead of having 430, and if they go to St. John, 472 miles, or to Halifax, 248 miles more. I am expressing these fears because I cannot help entertaining them, and that is another strong reason why I feel that we ought to have had these other lines surveyed before we were called on to vote. There is another matter to which I would like to draw the particular attention of the Government. In the explanations or the assurances which have been given, I have not understood that the Government have yet made it clear that their intention is, after this vote has passed the House, and when these subsidies are granted, and the contract is entered into for the purpose of carrying into effect the law which will be enacted upon these resolutions, to insist on the parties who undertake to construct this line securing the lines that are already built to St. Andrews, to Fredericton and to St. John. Hon. gentlemen must understand that the first point where this line will strike the existing system of railways in the Province of New Brunswick is at Mattawamkeag.

Mr. WELDON. No; it is in the State of Maine.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Mattawamkeag is not in New Brunswick, but the New Brunswick system runs into the State of Maine; and the first point it strikes to reach the New Brunswick system is Mattawamkeag. From that point it goes to Macadam Junction. From that point, to St. Andrews, it takes one route; to St. John, it will have to proceed over the same route for some distance; and to Moncton or Salisbury, it will have to go as far as Harvey, and then branch off again, and go by a new line to Fredericton, then across the St. John River to Salisbury, by an entirely new route, and then proceed on the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax. So that there are three different branches which this company, when they enter into a contract with the Government, would have to secure or obtain running powers over—one to St. John, another to St. Andrews, and a new line to Salisbury. I have followed the discussion and have read the speeches which have been delivered on this question, and it has not yet been made clear to me that it is the intention of the Government, before entering into a contract for the building of those portions of the line, to see that the company have running powers over those different roads.

Mr. WELDON. All the roads west of St. John are under one management.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). But they are not under the management with whom the contract is to be entered into, and arrangements would have to be made with that one management. Now, I have given expression to fears I entertain; and notwithstanding those fears, notwithstanding the great regret I feel that we are not in a position to make a more intelligent choice to-night, yet, as the great majority of the people of New Brunswick favor this short line, I reluctantly vote for it, although I should not feel that reluctance if I were sure these figures were correct.

Mr. COLBY. I trust I shall be in a position shortly to relieve the anxiety of my hon. friend, a gentleman in whose candor and discernment, and in whose desire to do the right thing, I have the most abundant confidence. My hon. friend would see his way clear in this matter did he not think that we should have further information with regard to the all-Canadian route. He assents to that proposition. He, like every loyal Canadian, would desire most earnestly, were it possible, that the short line should be an all-Canadian route. There can be no two sentiments about that. Unfortunately, however, by the Ashburton capitulation, as it is sometimes called, the State of Maine is so far projected into the Dominion of Canada that the northern boundary line of that State is more than 100 miles north of a direct line drawn from Montreal to Moncton. Consequently, it is absolutely impossible, in the nature of things, that a short line from

Montreal to Moncton, the common point for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, could be built entirely through Canadian territory. Now, I know I must be very careful in commenting on engineers, after the rebuke I have received this evening; but a gentleman who I suppose to be an eminent engineer—for all engineers seem to be eminent—has given us his views—a Mr. O'Sullivan. I never heard the name before, although I have no doubt of his eminence and ability, and his very great candor, and every word he utters should be received as Gospel, because he is an engineer. Mr. O'Sullivan has laid before this House a paper which I have in my hand, in which he advocates an all-Canadian route. I, having the same anxiety my hon. friend has, to find this short all-Canadian route, have taken a little pains to investigate the grounds on which Mr. O'Sullivan forms his opinion. I made enquiry at the Department, addressing a letter to the engineer who made the survey of the line from Rivière du Loup and Rivière Ouelle to Edmunston, Mr. Crawford, in order to ascertain the correctness of Mr. O'Sullivan's data. Mr. O'Sullivan gives us the distance over the North Shore Railway from Montreal to Quebec, and he gives the distance from St. Rochs to Edmunston as 105 miles. In his profiles connected with his report he gives the summit on that line as 750 feet. I thought that to be a very important fact if true, and I enquired from the engineer, who gives me his statement over his own signature, that this summit, which is represented as 750 feet, is 1,520 feet. The engineer, however, reports that there is another line by which, although at an increased distance, a lower summit, though not so low as Mr. O'Sullivan represents, could be obtained, and says:

"Although the above are the summits of the different lines, a lower pass than either was crossed at the St. Francis River on the Rivière du Loup line, namely, 900 feet above high water in the Bay of Chaleurs. To make use of this, however, it is necessary to take a portion of each survey and the line is lengthened. The distance will then be:—"

And he gives the distance as 140 miles instead of 105 miles. Now, in order to get the line 105 miles long, you must surmount a summit 1,520 feet high, and in order to attain so low a summit as 900 instead of 750 feet, you would have to adopt a line lengthened by 35 miles; and yet this candid engineer does not take the trouble to inform us of that fact. Then his next point of departure is Grand Falls. He draws a straight line across the country to a point called Canaan. My hon. friend from Kent thinks we should have more information as to that. The Government was not destitute of information with regard to the line from Grand Falls to Moncton or to the bend of the Petitcodiac, as it was formerly called, nor was any hon. member, who was in this House at the time of the great Intercolonial Railway discussion, ignorant of the nature of the country through which that proposed line was to pass. It was a matter of public discussion; it is of public record; it is to be found in the official documents in the possession of the Government, and the Government would have stultified itself had it attempted to run a line which had been surveyed and re-surveyed by Major Robinson, years ago, in order to ascertain the short line from Moncton to Quebec, and which had been found impracticable. Major Robinson says:

"It is quite impracticable as a railway route.

"The 4th obstacle is the broad and extensive range of the highlands, which occupies nearly the whole space in the center of New Brunswick, from the Miramichi River south to the Restigouche. Some of these mountains rise to an altitude exceeding 2,000 feet. The Tobique River runs through them, forming a deep valley or trough, which must be crossed by the direct line, and increases greatly the difficulty of passing by them. The lowest point of the ridge, overlooking the Tobique River, at which any line of railway must pass, is 1,216 feet above the sea. Then follows a descent to the river of 796 feet in 18 miles, and the summit level on the opposite ridge or crest, between the Tobique and Restigouche waters, is 920 feet above the sea, or a rise of 500 feet above the point of crossing at the Tobique water. These great summit levels, which must be surmounted, form a serious objection to the route."

He gives many further objections; I will not trouble the House by reading them at this hour:

Mr. COLBY.

"Unwilling to abandon the direct route through the centre of New Brunswick, by which, if a line could be successfully carried out, the distance would be so materially shortened, as is apparent by the mileage given in route No. 4, it was determined to use every effort to decide either the practicability or impracticability of such a line. To this end, large parties were employed the whole season."

What is his summing up:

"That part of the direct route (Nos. 3 and 4), viz., the line from the bend of Petitcodiac by Boistown, to the Restigouche and the St. Lawrence, crossing the range of New Brunswick mountains, having to surmount two summit levels of 1,216 and 920 feet, causing heavy grades, and increasing materially the cost of transport; passing through a totally unsettled and wilderness country; involving greater difficulties in the transport of the materials necessary for its construction, and supplying food to the laborers engaged in its formation; including the towns and settlements on the Gulf shore, and so preventing the development of the vast resources of the country to be derived from the fisheries; and also inflicting a serious loss to the interest of the main line, and to the intended branch from the city of St. John, in New Brunswick, is, notwithstanding its one great advantage of diminished distance, recommended most strongly to be rejected."

I would say again this was the official information; this work had been done at the expense of the Imperial Government years ago, and here is a map accompanying the report, laying down the exact route, which is the route of Mr. O'Sullivan, until it comes within a few miles of Grand Falls. The engineer says the country between Grand Falls and the Tobique River is of a most objectionable character; that you must either commence above or below, in either case of really increasing the distance. So my hon. friend is censuring the Government for not having made this survey, when the Government had all these facts in their possession, which, however strong their desire to take up an all-Canadian route, made it impossible for them to do so. What is this appropriation for? We are endeavoring to promote a line from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. Now, this line would have been surveyed if the Government had not been in possession of the fact that it is 130 miles longer to the city of St. John than the short line by way of Megantic. But it is apparent that it is 150 miles longer to St. Andrews; it leaves New Brunswick out in the cold. This northern route—much as we might desire it, if it was found a short route, a practicable route to Moncton—being 130 miles longer to St. John and 152 miles longer to St. Andrews, is, in view of the policy of the House, as pronounced last year, an absurd and impossible route, not worthy of discussion. It does not meet our requirements in any possible way. The question before the House is this: Is it necessary to take time to make further surveys, in order to ascertain the practicability of the different routes. I venture to say no hon. member can, after this explanation, made upon the authority of official documents, say it is necessary to waste any more time, in order to ascertain whether the all-Canadian route is one which answers the requirements of the resolution. The next line which comes before us is that surveyed and recommended by Mr. Light, the line from Quebec to Harvey. A survey of that line was made by Mr. Light, at his own special instance. He was employed as the engineer, because the people of Quebec had confidence in his high professional standing, and in his fidelity to the interests of the city of Quebec. For that reason he was selected, and the route he surveyed from Quebec to Harvey was the route of his own recommendation. But he himself condemned that route after examination, and the hon. member for Megantic admits that he condemned it. Do you want more time to survey this route which Mr. Light himself has condemned? You do not want more time to examine that route. What comes next? It is the route which Mr. Light last winter proposed. Knowing that his own route would be condemned, and finding that a good route had been found to Mattawamkeag, he put in a supplementary report, recommending his combination line. I interrupted the hon. member for Quebec East in his argument, in order to put him right. I asked when Mr. Light pointed out his combination route, or

expressed his wish there might be a survey of it, and he stated that in August last Mr. Light sent a telegram to that effect. I asked for a copy of that telegram and obtained it. It has no reference to the combination route. The hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), says a suspicion must attach to Mr. Schreiber because he did not make that survey. What does Mr. Light say? Here is a copy of his telegram, dated 18th August, 1884:

"Came in from survey Saturday night; have finished twenty-five miles of good line. But I think we are not rising fast enough on first fifteen miles to get easily over the summit. Consider desirable to put on a supplementary line, beginning at summit and running out near St. Henry, some forty miles long, so as to gain elevation quicker; also, line up the Etchemin, joining the present line, about sixty miles from St. Charles; but have not sufficient staff to do so; should like authority to employ two small additional parties of my own selection for about one month; the expense will be trifling compared with the issue."

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Why was he refused?

Mr. COLBY. That raises another question entirely. I believe \$57,000 is the expense incurred in these surveys already, and that the appropriation had been anticipated. I felt it to be my duty to criticise, and with deserved severity, from my standpoint, the report of Mr. Light. He has given it to be understood that he wanted a survey of the combination line to Lake Chesuncook, that is not true. His mind was running to Hartland, and his idea was to find a better route from the St. Lawrence up to Hartland than the one he was taking. His first idea so far as any evidence has been given, with regard to the combination route, was taken from Mr. Vernon Smith's report in which he says that, looking towards Quebec, there seems to be a good country in that direction. Then, putting what Mr. Light knew of Wicksteed's survey and Vernon Smith's survey, it was natural to infer that there was a good route through there, and I have never expressed the opinion that there might not be a good route. But Mr. Wicksteed's was simply a barometrical survey, no other having been put on the line, and Mr. Wicksteed says the barometer was unreliable. I say no engineer has a right to say: "Here is a line so many miles long, with certain curvatures and certain gradients," when there has been no instrumental survey at all, and where, from the point at which his survey diverges, to Lake Chesuncook, about 50 miles has never been stepped upon by an engineer.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). There are 113 miles on the Mattawamkeag that have not been surveyed.

Mr. COLBY. I am coming to that. I am not complaining that it has not been surveyed, but I say that an engineer has no right to pledge his professional reputation that the grades will not exceed 40 feet to the mile, that the curves will not exceed a certain degree of curvature, and so on, upon such insufficient data as Mr. Wicksteed's survey of a portion of the road, which was barometrical and not instrumental. It was a fair criticism, a legitimate criticism, and my hon. friend, who has just come into this House and spoken for the first time to-night, to the great delight of both sides of the House—a gentleman of high professional standing, and no one has a greater opinion of his ability than I have—who chivalrously defended an absent friend, should, I suggest to him, have considered whether, in doing that, he might not have been doing injustice to others. I did not go out of the record to attack Mr. Light's reputation. I know nothing of his character or reputation, but I took his reports and criticised them fairly, and pointed out inaccuracies of the most glaring character, inaccuracies in his map and in many other respects, and I judged him by the record, and not by anything outside of it. High and eminent as he is, the more careful he should be. He must expect that members of this House will criticise his statements, as I did, in the spirit of fairness, and in no other spirit whatever. The hon. gentleman, not intending it, I presume—I am sure he would not have done it if he had

listened to the debate—should not have charged me with going beyond the record to attack an absent gentleman. I attacked a gentleman who was present in the report which was before us, and I am not liable to the castigation, or blame, or censure that my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) unintentionally, I believe, attempted to inflict upon me. Now, with regard to this route, admitting that this combination route is a good route, then I say it is a longer route—and there is no sophistry that can cover that up. It is a longer route to St. Andrews by 40 miles, to St. John by 30 miles, and to Halifax by 30 miles, aggregating to all these ports more than 100 miles, and I can clearly show by the figures which are admitted, with the exception of one correction which I have to make, with regard to the Lachine distances, but the House has been wearied in regard to that. I have this objection to the combination road, or to any other road in that section, and I call the serious attention of the House to this: There is a certain point to which we ought to go, in order to meet the wish of the Maritime Provinces, because they have just claims; having contributed with all other parts of the Dominion to the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they should be permitted to participate in its immediate advantages. But I say there is a point beyond which we ought not fairly be asked to go. Now, Mr. Light, the special advocate of that route, tells us in his report that in order to carry his line out it is necessary to build a bridge at Quebec, which he estimates will cost \$5,000,000. It is a magnificent bridge, there is no doubt about it; I am told by those who have seen it that it is a most magnificent structure, as it has been photographed and published in some of the illustrated papers. He says it is necessary that the Government, in order to construct that bridge, should give a guarantee of 4 per cent. for twenty-five years upon \$5,000,000, which means the exact subsidy which we are asked to give to this short line in the Maritime Provinces. This combination route can only be carried out by swallowing up the entire subsidy in crossing the St. Lawrence, before even making a start for the Maritime Provinces. Now, is this country prepared to do that? The Maritime Provinces do not ask it; no one in the Maritime Provinces asks anything of the kind. You are not doing it to oblige them. Whom are you doing it to oblige? If you do it at all, it is to oblige a certain section, a certain locality, which is entitled to as much consideration as any other locality, and which, in these same resolutions, will receive a large sum of money. There is no man in the Lower Provinces that asks it. But in order to oblige that locality alone this Dominion is asked to spend \$5,000,000, before even we make a start towards the Maritime Provinces. Now, to my mind this is a fatal objection to the whole project of a route by Quebec. I say to our Maritime Province friends that if they are willing to wait until this country is prepared to guarantee 4 per cent. for twenty-five years upon \$5,000,000 to build an unnecessary bridge across the St. Lawrence, and another \$5,000,000 to carry the road to the Maritime Provinces, they may just as well throw up the whole thing at once, for I do not believe the people of this Dominion, or their representatives in Parliament, are prepared to go that far. I say this is an unnecessary bridge, for it is unnecessary for any purposes that we require it for. We do not need it for the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway has its outlet, and a good one it is, by the way of Lévis, and the Grand Trunk, and the Victoria bridge at Montreal. Were I a citizen of Quebec I would not feel that a bridge crossing the river nine miles away and making Quebec simply a way station on that throughfare was of any advantage to the city of Quebec. I should feel that Quebec was benefited, by being made a terminus, by the fact that transhipment had to be made there, by the fact of the ferry, but I should not feel that it was going to increase the

importance of the city of Quebec to have a thoroughfare pass nine miles away from it. It is just like a railway passing through a man's farm, where he lives several miles from the depot. It does not help his farm to have the railway go through it; the advantage he gets is his proximity to the depot. And the city of Montreal will get no advantage in that sense from the Lachine bridge. The traffic will come down and will pass it. Montreal people will not see the railway, unless they have the curiosity to go up eight or nine miles and see the heavy trains pass. But I say there is no actual advantage to the city of Quebec which would justify the expenditure, and even if there were a great local advantage, it is not an advantage to the Dominion of Canada at large, and it should not be placed as an incubus upon this road. I say it is weighing down this necessary road which is in the interests of the Dominion at large, and of the Maritime Provinces especially, it is weighing it down by an unnecessary five millions. The Lachine bridge will have to be built. It is a portion of the Ontario and Quebec system; it is to be built as a commercial enterprise: it will be built in any event, and not a dollar of this subsidy will be taken to construct the Lachine bridge. No request will be made to Parliament for one dollar to construct that bridge. It is as good as built now. In fact, very able men in this city, who have a high reputation, are examining it, with a view of tendering for its immediate construction, which is sure to be realised in the immediate future. That bridge will be no expense to the country whatever. Then why burden this great and necessary enterprise, so important to the Maritime Provinces, by an unnecessary debt of \$5,000,000, or \$3,000,000, or whatever the sum may be, for the construction of an unnecessary bridge—unnecessary in the sense I have indicated—at Quebec? Admitting all that Mr. Light claims for the combination line, however hopeful it may be—as it would be hopeful, if he spoke upon actual data—but admitting all he claims for it, the building of this very expensive bridge is an insuperable obstacle to that route. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will come lastly—no, not lastly. Here is another route: there is the air line, as shown on the map, between Montreal and Moncton. There is the route advocated by one man, Mr. Graham, called the air line. I will not discuss it; I will simply say this: I suppose it is the desire of all that this road shall be a practical road, a satisfactory road, and that it shall cost as little as possible to this Dominion. Now, that air line, if it should be built, would have to be built as a new road. You would have to build from Montreal to Richmond a line running straight along the Grand Trunk, a line wholly unnecessary.

Mr. LANGELIER. Why not take the Grand Trunk?

Mr. COLBY. Why don't the lion and the lamb lie down together? Perhaps when the millennium comes and Sir Henry Tyler and Mr. Stephen are willing to pool everything—which I hope, in the interests of this country, they will not do—when they are willing to give up to each other all the advantages each possess, when they are actuated by that great and universal benevolence, then, perhaps, the suggestion of my hon. friend may be carried out. But no man can seriously say that this scheme is practicable; and our Maritime Province friends want to be served by the Canadian Pacific Railway. They want a line to run across this continent, a consecutive line, under one management, not broken into by any other road whatever; they want the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that is what this appropriation is made for. No hon. gentleman in this House supposes the Grand Trunk is going to give up 76 miles of its main line on a great thoroughfare running from Montreal to the Atlantic, for the convenience of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, if they did, it would be done at a cost fully equal to the cost of building a new road. Then, I say you have got to commence at Montreal and

Mr. COLBY.

build a new road, if you take that air line. But nobody wants it, that I ever heard of; no interest in this country wants it; nobody is asking for it, except this gentleman, who has wasted a great deal of ink in the newspapers in various sections of the country, as an advertisement, perhaps, as much of himself as of the line which he espouses. If I had time I could point out the physical difficulties that belong to this air line, and which are well known to gentlemen familiar with that locality. I will come lastly to the line which is the short line, which is the short line upon the map by measurement, which is believed to be the short line and is actually the short line to the Maritime Provinces. That line has been surveyed; we have the result before us, with all its difficulties. This eminent engineer, this gentleman of high standing, as no doubt he is, who has urged the northern route, has given us an illustration of what it is. We have it in the smoking room and we have it here. He places himself behind the shield of truth, and with that shield he gives us a plan drawn upon a horizontal scale of 50 miles to 1 inch, but for every inch there is 100 feet, if you go perpendicularly. That is holding up the mirror to nature. It is like a toy-mirror which boys use. If the mirror is turned one way, a man is a pigmy, but if it is turned the other way, he appears to be high in the heavens. It is an absurd caricature. Does any man suppose that a railway line would run up a mountain side as is shown in this plan? That profile, I say, is a caricature. The elevation which he points out there is distributed over 80 miles of distance, and amounts to less than 17 feet to the mile, and yet, if you look at the map, you would imagine the line was going over one of the Himalayas. If the mirror were held fairly up to nature the elevation would be almost undiscernable to the eye; it would not amount to more than  $\frac{1}{10}$  of an inch—it would be only a speck. Yet, this gentleman who holds up this distorting mirror places himself under the shield of truth. The short line route has been surveyed. It goes through as good a section of country as can be travelled, in order to get from Montreal to the Atlantic coast. We cannot have prairie, for it does not exist. But the grade from Montreal to Sherbrooke does not exceed 53 feet to the mile, and that is a very practicable grade, as everyone knows. Now, as regards the grades on the International—and here we see the candor of the gentleman who has been held up here as a disingenuous engineer. Mr. Schreiber, in his report, states the fact that there is a 74-foot grade on the International, and on every road going by the southern route he indicates a maximum summit of 74 feet. He makes that statement without mitigation or explanation. I have the report of Mr. Ramsay—I will not read it, on account of the lateness of the hour, but I will lay it on the Table—who located the line, and he says it was constructed with a maximum of 66 feet, because at the time the road was built, although they expected it would become in the future a portion of the through system, there was only a small subsidy and a comparatively small municipal subscription, and they were obliged to make the cost of construction conform to their financial condition; but he said it was built with reference to reductions; and a small expenditure, without involving any increased distance, would reduce the maximum to 60 feet to the mile. And yet that is the most objectionable point of the whole road. That route has been surveyed; it is a practicable route. It is a compromise route, and that is a very important matter. This line is for all the Maritime Province ports, not for St. Andrews alone. If it was, another route would be selected. If it was for St. John alone, a different route would be taken. If it was for Halifax alone, no better route could be taken. But St. Andrews and St. John have conceded something, in order to meet Halifax, which is the most remote. Who are asking for delay? Do the members representing the city of

Halifax? Does the member representing St. John; does the member for Charlotte, representing St. Andrews? Are those members representing those districts, for the benefit of which, particularly, this road is to be built, saying: We are dissatisfied with this matter; the surveys have been insufficient; we want you to take more time, and to be sure you are right? No; those gentlemen who are most interested, whose constituencies are most interested, who have examined the question with the most care, stand shoulder to shoulder, differing as they do politically; the member for St. John joins the members for Halifax, and the member for Charlotte, representing St. Andrews, will stand by them on this vote, saying: We are satisfied with the survey and satisfied with the Megantic route; we do not wish delay, but we want the road to be built with all reasonable dispatch. Then, this line has been proved, by instrumental surveys, to be a practicable route. It is the short route; it is the best commercial route, for it passes through the State of Maine, in a way which will give it a larger trade than would be secured by any line running north of it; and this line is endorsed almost unanimously by members from the Maritime Provinces, irrespective of party, with one or two possible dissentients. It is for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces that this appropriation is being made. They have examined the question because they are interested parties. I venture to say that while the Blue Books of some hon. members have been locked up, others have been studying them at night, and they have come to an almost unanimous conclusion that this route is in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. Who is to stand in the face of these facts and gainsay them? If they are satisfied why should we not be satisfied? Ought we not to be satisfied? The results of further surveys of the different routes would not alter the conclusion reached, and, in fact, no further surveys are needed. I think the case for further delay is entirely unfounded. No case has been made out. The requirements have been fully met by the official documents, and every other point has been met, and there is no necessity for further surveys. And I believe this House will, with very great unanimity, come to the conclusion that this line should be built now, as the Provinces want it, in such time that the channels of trade will not have got worn and set, and the trade of the great west can be taken down to the Maritime Provinces. The members from the Maritime Provinces, one and all, desire this to be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and by no other corporation. And we have evidence of that feeling in the position taken by their representatives. I have a report from Mr. Petersen, the engineer of the Atlantic and North-Western, stating that he has gone very carefully over the matter, and fully endorses the opinion of the Government engineer. What does Mr. George Stephen, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, say. He says, in a letter read by the hon. member for Halifax, that in his opinion that is the best route in the interest of the country, and he does not admit his willingness to embark in any other enterprise, but is ready to proceed immediately with the construction of this road. Then all the parties interested in the Maritime Provinces and the Maritime ports, particularly the corporation which is to build the road, which aims to build the road, which is the only corporation which will build the road—all these are unanimous, and it is only the cavillers, only those who want to make political advantages, with few exceptions, who desire to obstruct or delay it. I say, with some few exceptions, if it is obstructed, it is for local considerations of that kind, which are not essential to the carrying out of the main enterprise, or for the sake of embarrassment.

Mr. GILLMOR. I had made up my mind that it was not necessary for me to say anything on this subject, but my hon. friend from Stanstead has rather enthused me, and

I wish to make a few remarks. The hon. gentleman has not magnified the importance of this enterprise, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, and I am as much interested, and my constituency is as much interested, as any constituency can be. More than 40 years ago, energetic and enterprising men undertook to construct a railway from St. Andrews to Quebec, before this unfortunate Ashburton Treaty was completed. At the time we commenced with our preliminary surveys and explorations that treaty had not been decided, and some 35 years ago we commenced operations on a railway known as the St. Andrews and Quebec road, and during all those years, my constituents have been looking for a short line to Montreal, and they perceive now that their expectations are about to be realised. With regard to what my hon. friend from Quebec has said, that it was his opinion that the whole operation would end when they reached a particular point at Mattawamkeag, I must say that I do not share that fear. About nine years ago the Acting Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Stanstead, when this enterprise of the International line was about being commenced, without any expectation of receiving any aid, came to the Maritime Provinces, and to the county I represent, to look over the prospects and see if they could get the people to take any interest in the enterprise, so as to carry it to completion. If the object at that time was to go to Mattawamkeag, then to Portland and Bangor, I think they would have turned their attention to Portland and Bangor rather than coming to the Maritime Provinces. I believe the object of the projectors of the International line was to make the shortest and best connection with the Maritime Provinces, rather than to reach the ports in the State of Maine; and I have never seen any deviation, from that time to this. I do not think hon. gentlemen need have any fear of the road reaching Mattawamkeag, with the intention of stopping there, and letting the trade go to the United States. It would be out of place for me, even if I were able to do so, to go into the question of distance and curves and grades, and it would serve no useful purpose, but I am satisfied myself that the International is the shortest and best line, as a compromise line, for all the Maritime Provinces, and I am satisfied if we do not get that line, we will get no line in the Maritime Provinces. With regard to its cost, taking into consideration that the Maritime Provinces have paid their proportion of the \$100,000,000 towards the construction of our great transcontinental railway, the subsidy now proposed to continue this railway from Montreal to the Lower Provinces, amounting to \$3,400,000, is not a large appropriation for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces. If this line does not give us all the trade coming from the west, it will give us that which is quite an equivalent to the cost—a short, speedy, and cheap inter-provincial communication. I have been a little amused to hear my friends from Quebec charging that the present Government are going contrary to the interests of Quebec. During the whole time I have been here, Quebec has been paramount in the interest and favor of the Government, and never until this time has the Government been charged with neglecting the interest of Quebec. On the contrary, it has been said that the Government were unfairly influenced in favor of Quebec, and I think the Minister of Public Works, and the Ministry as a whole, have no idea of neglecting Quebec, and it is rather to their credit that, in a matter which is in the interest of the Dominion as a whole, they have had the courage of their convictions, irrespective of party or local interests, and that they have understood the true line to select for the best interests of the whole Dominion. Furthermore, this great Canadian Pacific Railway must be one great continued whole. I do not know whether they can construct the line on the present subsidy, but if this road is to be constructed at all, as I understood by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), it is to be con-

structed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I know that it was the opinion of my late lamented friend, Mr. Isaac Burpee, who was not ill-informed on these questions, that this was the most desirable line, and that if a subsidy were granted it would be built on this route. I have his opinion in this regard in my desk at this moment. Of course, our different constituencies in the Maritime Provinces may think that each one should contend for his own particular locality; but I think, if our people were present, they would know that many things have to be decided here on the principle of give and take—the principle of compromise—and I am glad that so many, irrespective of party, have concluded to support this line. One evidence that this is a practical line is the fact that private parties have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in it, and if they embark in this enterprise it is not likely that they will build the line to Moosehead Lake or River and let it stop there. They did not undertake to do that. They knew that there was a practicable line across Maine to Mattawamkeag on the European and North American line. On the strength of the practicability of that route, they have invested large sums of capital. That is an evidence that it could be built. A fresh evidence of the truth of that survey is given in the reports. The hon. member for Megantic, (Mr. Langelier) to-day endeavored to show that it had high grades, that it crossed the Moosehead Lake, and that there was some 30 feet of water there; but these statements carried evidence of truth and correctness, because they did not disguise the facts. It would be very easy, if it was desired to practice deception, to make the depth of water 5 or 6 feet; if a convenient engineer had been there, he could have made 6 feet as well as 30; but that statement bears truth on its face. I do not wish to say anything about the character or the capacity of engineers. They are very much like other men, and a good deal more so, sometimes; but some of them have very convenient scales and measurements, and I think some new light must have entered into the brain of this engineer when he discovered this combination line. It was made very plausible on paper, but I do not think it speaks much for any gentleman's reputation that he can lay out a route without having surveyed it. I knew Mr. Light when he was a young man, something like thirty years ago, and when he was employed on the St. Andrews and Quebec line. At the same time, without going into the question of the different routes, I think you have only to look at the maps to see that you cannot get any shorter line than that by way of the International line; and that it is practicable is evident from the fact that hundreds of thousands of private money has been already invested in that line. One very great objection urged against this line is that private means have been invested in it. I think it is, perhaps, unfortunate that the Acting Minister of Railways, many years ago, before he ever dreamed of being Minister of Agriculture or Minister of Railways either, invested his energies and his means in that line. But I do not see Mr. Pope's line mentioned in the Bill. It is the shortest practicable line that can be obtained from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces. If this subsidy is granted it will be given to some company. It seems to be imagined by some that this company are going to take out of their subsidy a large amount of money to enrich some private individual. That is not my experience of companies; they do not usually give their subsidies away. If the company can utilise the International line for their own interest to carry out this great scheme, what objection is there to it? I do not wish to see public money voted to enrich any private parties; but there is no objection to existing lines being utilised. There was no wrong in the parties engaged in this International line many years ago, to secure a direct and practicable route to the Maritime Provinces, embarking in it; and in order to carry out this great scheme of a railway from ocean to ocean,

Mr. GILLMOB.

I see nothing unfair or improper in utilising that line or in building a new line, just as they choose, so long as it serves the public. I have expressed my views about this great undertaking before. That is past; the money is expended, and the great transcontinental line is now nearly completed to Montreal. The next thing is to reach a port in the Maritime Provinces. I do not wish to draw any comparisons; but I am glad to see that no one is opposed to continuing the line to the Maritime Provinces, except the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). He seems to think that Canada has done enough when it has built the Intercolonial Railway. This is the first time I have heard it asserted in this House that the Intercolonial Railway was built for the Maritime Provinces. The Intercolonial was much more important in the interest of the Western Provinces than of the Lower Provinces. The Upper Provinces had no ocean port for six months in the year without going to the Maritime. If the Province of Quebec has not been considered in regard to railway expenditure, I should like to know what Province has been. That Province has the North Shore line; it has the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; it has the Edmunston line; it has the Central Quebec line, which will connect with the short line we contemplate; and in what respect has that Province been slighted or neglected? I think it comes with ill-grace from a Quebec representative to oppose this measure. Now, I will vote most heartily for the measure. I am opposed to delay; I think there is no argument or reason for delay; I believe the International line is a practicable line and a shorter line than any other that can be had, and therefore I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BOSSE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty as a representative of the city of Quebec, not to allow the occasion offered by the adoption of these resolutions to pass without expressing my opinion on this subject, and without stating the reasons which have induced me to form this opinion. It is particularly in view of the position taken by the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), and by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), mayor of Quebec, and by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), that I owe it to my myself, as I owe it to my constituency, to declare, as emphatically as it is possible, that I believe I would not be doing my duty towards my constituents and towards the electoral division of Quebec Centre if I did not give my fullest and most unswerved support to the resolutions such as they have been introduced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOSSÉ. (Translation.) The hon. gentlemen are saying "hear, hear;" but let them wait a moment, and perhaps they will not say it with such irony. I say my full and unswerved support in favor of the resolutions which have been introduced, not because I approve the three resolutions in full, but because, in order to obtain the Pacific terminus for Quebec, we must take the resolutions as a whole, without dividing them, or without taking them apart, one from the other, and I must lay aside the objections I may have against what is called the short line. I am satisfied that the welfare of the city to which I belong depends on the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway being at Quebec. For a long time we have fought to attain this end, and now that we are near the result it would be unfortunate to let it slip. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) has declared that he would vote against the amendment and the sub-amendment which are now proposed. He has stated that he would do so because he thought that by his vote he would run the risk of causing Quebec to lose the terminus. At the same time, he declared that he would move an amendment to one of the resolu-

tions—if I understood aright, to the resolution which is connected with the short line. He has not seen—and that is where he made the mistake—that his motion in amendment would necessarily involve the result which he seeks to avoid, by voting against the amendment and the sub-amendment which are now proposed. The three resolutions which have, no doubt, been dictated by what the Government considered to be in the interest of the various localities which they concern, are, by the declaration of the Government, urged upon us as a whole; they must be adopted as a whole or rejected as a whole; they must stand or fall as they are. It is not in our power to divide them or to parcel them out. If I thought the thing would be possible perhaps I would not follow the course which I have adopted. But it is because these three resolutions are submitted to be adopted or rejected together, that I am obliged to concur in the adoption as a whole. I said that the Pacific terminus at Quebec is, for us, a matter of the greatest necessity. That terminus, by itself, and the fact that it will enable us to get rid of the monopoly from which we have so long suffered, are, for me, the two great considerations which induce me to take that course. The city of Quebec has, for many years, maintained itself by its lumber trade and ship building. Either directly or indirectly, Quebec lived upon those two industries. Unfortunately, both disappeared at the same time. About the same time, or a short time thereafter, disastrous fires destroyed the greatest part of our city; and if the experience of other cities had repeated itself among us, the cities which have exclusively lived upon their lumber trade have inevitably disappeared with running out of the industries which supported them, and the same thing repeating itself in our midst, Quebec was doomed, but there was among us such vital forces that, notwithstanding those disastrous circumstances, Quebec has been able to maintain itself and to increase somewhat. Thanks to the success of its industries, thanks to the establishment of manufactures, it has not only kept up its population, but even became more prosperous than it was in the best days of the ship building and square timber trade. But those industries, started under such different circumstances, notwithstanding their prosperity, were not as thriving as they might have been, had they not groaned under the tariff which was imposed upon them by the Grand Trunk Railway, the North Shore Railway and Richelieu Company. Labor was cheaper than in surrounding towns and cities, land was also cheap and the manufactures have been able to sustain competition. But that competitor has become disastrous for us. The rates imposed by the Grand Trunk on the south shore of the St. Lawrence; the still higher rates imposed by the Grand Trunk since it controls the North Shore Railway; the corresponding high rates of the Richelieu Company, have almost isolated us from the rest of the Dominion. The Richelieu Company found profit in it, and so did the Grand Trunk Railway. I have not much to say against them, as business men, but in order to get rid of them, I have everything to say, because it was making Quebec powerless, and causing it to be deserted for ever, if that style of thing continued. Such is the position in which we found ourselves, and I say that to get out of that position we would have sacrificed everything. I say that, if by these resolutions, our position is changed, and if, added to that, we obtain the Pacific terminus at Quebec, there is not a Quebecker who, by studying the facts and weighing them, seeing what we will come to if that state of things continues, and what will be the position in which we will find ourselves if we obtain the control of the North Shore Railway, by the Pacific and the terminus, I say there is not a Quebecker who will not vote in favor of these resolutions. We have a choice to make. We have to choose between the position which we might hold if we wish for the resolutions, or that in which

we actually are, and which will perpetuate itself if we do not obtain redress. It is the short line which appears to be the bugbear, but I do not see any reason that we should feel anxious about. In my opinion, it cannot be for Quebec a source of anxiety, and for these reasons: It will never enter anybody's head that when western trade has once reached Montreal it shall take this short line and run over three, four or five hundred miles to go to the various seaports of the Dominion, and that it will not stop at Montreal, where it is already to take the steamers, or according to circumstances, that it will not go down to Quebec to be shipped from there. This so-called short line cannot draw the western trade by that route, because it is too long, and it cannot compete with Montreal, because the cars, on leaving Montreal, will have hundreds of miles to run over to reach the seaboard, instead of the produce being shipped from Montreal. It cannot be objected that the building of a bridge at Lachine will open a new route, and that consequently the trade will be directed towards Portland and other American ports. I do not see that there is a serious danger of that kind, because the distance between Montreal and Portland is 300 miles, and Portland is 300 further from Liverpool than Quebec is. We would have to suppose that trade would take, willingly, this longer route of 300 miles by rail and 150 miles by water to reach Liverpool. It is said that there would be compensation in the cost of freight, that there would be compensation through the greater amount of trade in those cities, but they are large enough to compete for ever, I do not say temporarily, against the advantages offered by Quebec and Montreal. If, unfortunately, we have at Quebec a society which has caused so much damage to the trade of that city, let us hope that by the force of circumstances it will soon cease to exist, to the greatest benefit of Quebec, and even of those who belong to it; and even if such would not be the case, even if we had to fear the competition of Portland and Boston, have we not already the Victoria Bridge, which gives a right of way to cars which do not belong to the Grand Trunk Company, and do we not know that their rates have lately been reduced from \$14 to \$4.50. Do not these rates represent what would be the cost to a company of building a bridge. And do we not all know that this bridge has been built in such a way as to allow the laying of a double track at a much lower cost than that of the building of a new bridge. All these considerations tend to show that the danger which is pointed out in the direction of Portland and Boston already exists, if it exists at all, and if trade is to take that direction it has already taken it at the present time. Therefore, I do not find in that short line any disadvantage which can compare to the great advantage which we are to derive from the Pacific, but the hon. members for Montmagny, East Quebec and Mégantic say that the surveys which have been made for this short line have been inadequate. Far from me the idea of saying that I can decide, from the returns brought down, that one line is better than another. None of the proposed lines are absolutely located, or recognised as practicable. But again, I say that I see no danger to Quebec from the short line. I cannot stoop to that consideration, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, our harbor is closed for six months in the year; we cannot think, during that time, of being benefited by these advantages. During six months only our port is open to navigation, and it is only during that time that we can derive the advantages which I have mentioned. It would be perfectly useless to have the short line during winter, because we could derive no benefit from it, because we could only see the trains going over a bridge nine miles away from us. In summer I submit that it would be perfectly indifferent to us that the short line should pass *via* Quebec, because the trade will stop there to be shipped, and would not willingly go over hundreds of miles by rail to reach seaports at more

remote points. I repeat that in spite of all that has been said and of all that has been done we will have the Pacific Railway terminus at Quebec. The argument is brought forth that our position is the same as it was last year. This, Mr. Speaker, is not so. Our position last year, let it be remembered, was that given to us by a law which enacted that \$960,000 would be appropriated to the purchase of the North Shore Railway in case the Pacific Railway could make the necessary agreements. A delay of six months was allowed to make these arrangements, which were entirely optional with the two companies. After those six months, if the arrangements were not made, the \$960,000 were to be appropriated for the construction of a new line to be built, which was to be organised. Such was then the position, but such it is not now. A year ago everything was optional; each company could conclude to not enter into these arrangements. Now, as the Government tell us, the arrangements are complete and final. The particulars of these arrangements have been stated to us. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has agreed to sell, upon certain stated conditions which I will discuss. The Pacific has also, we are told, agreed to purchase the road on the terms imposed by the Government. That position is altogether different from that in which we were last year. Last year there was an offer to sell or to buy. Today the conditions are settled, agreed and determined. As we are told by the Executive, it is a final settlement, and all that is required is the sanction of Parliament. Sir, I believe in the statement made by the Executive on the subject. I believe in it, such as it has been made to us; the more so, as I rely upon the honor of the one who made it—upon the honor of the Government, in whose name it has been made; and for another reason, because no Government would survive such a statement if it was not fully executed and followed to the letter. This is for me another guarantee, as, for my part, I state it emphatically, if these arrangements, such as they have been pointed out to us, if the policy which was enunciated to us was not carried out, I would be the first to condemn the Executive for misleading the House and the first to withdraw my support from them. This, Mr. Speaker, satisfies me on the question whether we shall have the terminus, and I take it for granted that the terminus will be given us within as short a delay as possible. But we are told: Supposing that we should have it, that would give us nothing, because we have no winter port; but we forget the crossing, we forget that the crossing is one of the conditions of this contract under the existing law, and that consequently the produce can be carried over from Quebec to Levis during the whole of the winter season. We also forget the Bill now on the Paper, by which the navigation will be kept free opposite Quebec throughout the winter; but we forget something more, we forget that there is not only the grain trade, which can be carried on during fall and winter, we forget the shipment of grain through Quebec during summer; we also forget the enormous exportation of square timber which comes down from Ottawa during summer, and which, owing to the operating of the North Shore Railway by the Grand Trunk, has only come down by water, because the Grand Trunk Company has until now always refused to carry it; we also forget what could be done with the cattle trade, which must necessarily come to Quebec, thus saving to the shipper the enormous losses which they suffer between Montreal and Quebec. I say that for these conditions our port must take a very large development. I may be mistaken, but I say from the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway will be relegated to the South Shore, while the Pacific Railway Company will be in the same position on the north shore, that a bright future lies in store for us. These two great companies will wage a keen and legitimate competition to one another, and bring to our ports the enormous traffic of the western part of the Dominion; and even if we should

Mr. Bossé.

only get a small portion of this traffic, there is quite a difference between that prospect and the disadvantage under which we have labored until now. To attain this end we cannot afford a delay, which has often proved so fatal to us. Have we not already favored to lose the benefit which the legislation of last year had secured for us. We have on Paper a legislation giving aid to the Pacific Railway Company. These resolutions, according to the hon. Minister of Public Works, form a part and parcel of the resolutions which are now under discussion. They must all go together. If, to-day, we should lose the opportunity of obtaining the terminus at Quebec, where would we be a year from now, with the unexpected changes of all kinds which might come up. I say, moreover, that we will have lost the opportunity this year of controlling the company and of securing the terminus for Quebec. In a year from now the coercive means which we have now and which can be utilized will have ceased to exist, and we will not be able to control the Pacific and bring it to our port. I see in the postponement and in the fact that we should lose the only opportunity afforded to us, something which would be unfair towards the city of Quebec. For these reasons, and as I do not wish at this late hour to enter into other considerations which might be favorable to the adoption of these resolutions, I must vote against the amendment and the sub-amendment and in favor of those resolutions.

Mr. FISHER. I believe that this is a question of the utmost importance, of national importance, and not only of interest to the Maritime Provinces. A question in which all and every part of the Dominion should take part and think well over before deciding upon it. The proposition of the Government is probably an effort on their part to repair, as much as lies in their power, the great evil which they entailed upon the country when, a good many years ago, they located what is called the Intercolonial Railway. I believe it is in consequence of that mistake, which was protested against by hon. gentlemen on this side, that to-day Canada is called upon to grant a large subsidy to build a short line to connect the Maritime Provinces with the rest of the Dominion. It is not my place to decide so intricate a question as that of the engineering capabilities of the different routes, especially after the expression from a high professional authority which was given this evening. I allude to the expression of opinion which the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) gave, and I think the House may congratulate itself that he arrived here so opportunely as to be able to give a timely warning to Parliament, a warning it will be well to take to heart and ponder on before casting our votes. I am not going to enter into an elaborate discussion of the various comparisons of distances and grades over the different routes. That has been done by hon. members who have already addressed you, though I think I have some data to go on, but, at this late hour, it would be out of place to allude to this question at any great length. I cannot refrain from alluding to one or two points brought forward by hon. gentlemen who support the resolutions. The Minister of Public Works alluded to the obvious absurdity, that of any triangle, the two sides might possibly be shorter than the one. Of course, we know well, when a triangle is formed of straight lines that is impossible; but when we find one side of the triangle shaped like a corkscrew, it is quite possible that it might be longer than the other two. I am not in a position to state whether this is the case or not. I will not attempt to decide the question of railroad mileage, but as long as there is question about it, I feel bound to support the amendment of the hon. member for Quebec East. When the hon. Minister of Public Works spoke of that base of a triangle, he alluded to it as being as nearly as possible an air line. I presume we can take

an air line between the points of Montreal and Canterbury, because I find, on looking at the map, that all the various routes proposed, even those that go to St. John and St. Andrews' converge on Canterbury. Therefore, I think the portion of the line eastward from Canterbury may be almost disregarded in the comparison of distances. If we take the air line from Montreal to Canterbury, the Minister of Public Works says that line goes at every point some 20 miles from the present proposed route; while, if the Quebec route be taken, the air line is, at one point at all events, 80 miles distant from it. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) alluded to all the lines proposed. I had imagined even he was going to omit the line which he alluded to as the line of one man, and I confess that I almost feared to have the temerity of being the only man who referred to it. When the hon. member for Stanstead spoke on this question, the other evening, he alluded to the rush for this subsidy. He said: Now, at all events, there are several Richmonds in the field. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has any idea of making a pun, but I thought that, at all events, there was one Richmond, the seat of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, which had a claim for this short line route. The hon. member for Stanstead said Mr. Graham was the only man who advocated that route. I am not going to advocate it, because I do not consider myself to be in a position, any more than the House, to decide on the merits of the question; but before going into the question of that particular route, I wish to allude to some things which relate particularly to the proposition before us. In this respect, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether, in the proposition now before the House, there is any arrangement made as to how the subsidies therein contained are to be disbursed to the companies which may take up the undertaking? In these resolutions there is nothing which intimates how the money will be paid, whether at a certain rate per mile of the road constructed, or upon certificates of the engineer, or in what way. I believe in the other House the Minister of Justice said this money was to be paid out at a certain rate per mile of the road constructed. If that is the case, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether the whole mileage from Montreal to Halifax is to be considered, or only the mileage that is to be constructed, and not the mileage that may be taken now as built. These two propositions would involve very different operations. From the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland, I am inclined to think this money is going to be paid for the line that is to be constructed, because he said the subsidy of \$3,500,000 will amount to \$10,000 a mile for the 330 miles which have to be constructed by this route. The Government, however, has not given us information on this point. But when the hon. member for Stanstead spoke, he alluded to the taking over of lines from St. Lambert to Chambly and Chambly to Lennoxville, etc., instead of having to build a new line from Montreal by the line round the back of the mountain to Lachine, across the Lachine bridge, and from Lachine to Chambly, and from there north of Waterloo to Lennoxville or Sherbrooke. We do not know which is the proposition of the Government, or how this money is to be paid out to the company who undertake this work; and, if the proposition of my hon. friend from Stanstead is to be taken as the true proposition, namely, that the bridge at Lachine and the various portions of railway now built between Chambly, West Farnham and Sherbrooke are to be taken, we must add a considerable number of miles to the distance to be calculated from Montreal to the objective points in the Maritime Provinces. Then, perhaps, we would find that the one side of the triangle is not shorter than the other two sides. My hon. friend from Stanstead said this bridge at Lachine was going to be built. I

would not dispute his statement of that point, in regard to which he should be well informed as one of the originators of the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, under whose charter that bridge must be built if he is not now one of the shareholders. He also stated that the people of Montreal would not be able to see the traffic going over that bridge. If that is the case, it seriously affects the people of Montreal and the whole of the calculation. In the consideration of this question there is a lot of information which we have not before us. We do not know the line of railway to which we are asked to give this subsidy. Therefore, I contend that we are not in a position to state whether the subsidy should be given as proposed in these resolutions, to a line by Sherbrooke, Mattawankeag, Frederickton and Salisbury. There is another point which is a reason why it is not necessary we should not decide to-night, or even this Session, in regard to this matter. My hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) says the people of the Maritime Provinces want this railway immediately. One would imagine that the resolutions involved the immediate commencement and completion of this road; but the Minister of Public Works, in answer to my hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), said that the company were to be given two years to commence and four years to finish the work. Then, it is evident that there is no necessity for this great haste to night. It will do no harm to wait until next Session before finally deciding upon the route, and in the meantime we may be able to get the additional information which is necessary for the Government, for the engineers, for the House and for the people of Canada, before deciding upon this question. Great stress was laid by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), and other hon. members, upon the air line. In looking at the map, I find that the air line from Montreal to Canterbury passes through the town of Richmond, goes on from there and passes to the north of the International line, 25 miles at least, I am convinced. Well, Sir, that route which my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) rather made fun of, the Richmond line, starts from the town of Richmond and proceeds almost coincident with the air line eastwards to a point called Portage, on the boundary line between Maine and the county of Beauce, in the Province of Quebec. It then proceeds just north of Chesuncook Lake, only about 15 miles at the farthest point away from the air line between Montreal and Canterbury. Then from the north side of Chesuncook Lake it follows what is called section B of the Government survey, to Canterbury. If the merit of that road is considered, it will be found that if an air line must be the shortest, then the line from Richmond must be a shorter line than is the line south of Moosehead Lake, and by the International. The only objection to that line that I understood the hon. member for Stanstead had, was that the whole of it had to be built; and he also said that the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Richmond was not available for this purpose. Well, that is a very wide question, which involves the question whether this country is absolutely dependent upon only one railway corporation. I do not think we are so dependent; I believe that we can obtain our objects without begging the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build this line. But that seems to be the stand taken by the hon. member for Stanstead, and other hon. gentlemen. Then there is another point to which I wish to allude. Within a very few miles of that line there is already communication with the city of Quebec. Within a few miles of Portage, the point to which I alluded, on the boundary between the county of Beauce and the State of Maine, we have the Quebec Central, and it has an extension by the Etchemin valley; and I understand from those well acquainted with the facts that that distance is only 30 miles. But if we should not take the Grand Trunk at the line from Richmond eastward to Portage, I believe it would be more in the interest of this

country that a line should be taken from the northern bend of the International, near Lake Megantic, and go to Portage, which would be a line inside our own territory, and then, joining the line from Quebec by the Etchemin valley to Portage, strike across the State of Maine to Canterbury, which would give us less distance in the State of Maine, while it would also open up one of the best of our counties in the Province of Quebec, the county of Beauce. And if the line was taken from Richmond eastwards, we would find that the great county of Richmond and Wolfe would be opened up and greatly benefited. The hon. member for Stanstead seems to think that the only person who was interested in this line was Mr. Graham, of Richmond. The hon. member forgot that the Government of this country has been appealed to by petitions from the county of Drummond, and from various municipalities in the county of Richmond and Wolfe, asking a survey of that line. That line has not been surveyed by the Dominion Government, and why? This is a question which somewhat puzzles me, because of the very obvious fact that that line passes through the town which is represented by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who is considered, I believe, one of the most prominent supporters of the Government in this House. Early last fall a public meeting was held in Richmond, asking that gentleman to induce the Government to try a survey through his county, but the Government did not try that survey. I believe the answer given to that request was that it was too late in the day. Well, Sir, I happen to know that after that time other survey parties were sent out to survey the line between Sherbrooke and Montreal, to the north of Orford Mountain. Certainly, if the season of the year was not too late to survey that portion of the proposed route, it could not have been too late to try a survey from Richmond eastward. One would suppose that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, who was a supporter of the Government, and would naturally be supposed to be interested in the county which he represented, would, as an assistance to his county, have endeavored to obtain the survey of that line. And, Sir, did I not know the peculiar circumstances of the hon. gentleman, I would not think it possible to explain that fact. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite will say that it was impossible that any such line could be carried through. Well, Sir, one might have thought so, but I think I have seen enough of hon. members opposite to know that they are quite ready to get a little money spent in their counties whenever they can. It does seem an extraordinary thing that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe should not have attempted to find a line through his county, which would have been, perhaps, a better line than the one proposed. Why did he not do it? The only reason I can think of is the fact that, as I know, that hon. gentleman is more intimately connected with the International railroad, more intimately connected with the city of Sherbrooke, in which he resides, more interested in that portion of the country, than he is in the county which he represents. Sir, this is one of the reasons why it is important that this question should not be decided to-day. I believe this is one of the reasons why we should take more time to ponder this question, before we vote upon it, because I contend that there are suspicious circumstances connected with this matter, and they are suggested to my mind in consequence of what I have just stated. When I find that an hon. member who is a supporter of the Government in this House does not try to benefit his own county, but in consequence of what I know to be the greater personal interest that he has in another direction, he prefers to see a line carried outside his own county—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I do not think the hon. gentleman should attribute any personal motives to the hon. member.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FISHER. I will withdraw the expression, certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call your attention to the noise and discourtesy shown to my hon. friend by gentlemen on the other side of the House. I think your attention might have been called to that, also.

Mr. FISHER. As I said, I withdraw the expression attributing interested motives to the hon. member. I can only say that I would be glad to be able never to think anything against a member of this House; but, Sir, I am at a loss to imagine what could have actuated that hon. gentleman, when he refused what was evidently to the advantage of his county. Sir, I find that this question not only involves the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, but I find that it is surrounded by other circumstances, which I consider so suspicious as to make me unwilling to decide upon this question to-night. I find that it is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the only company in this country which is able to perform this work is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I find that in a letter signed by Mr. Stephen, president of that company, he states that that company is ready to undertake the building of that road. The letter is addressed to two hon. members of this House, who represent the city of Halifax in this House.

"To M. B. DALY and J. F. STAIRS:

"SIRs,—Referring to your letter of the 16th of June, on the subject of the proposed short line between Montreal and the seaports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I have to say that the route indicated therein (that proposed in the Government resolutions) is, in the light of our present knowledge, the best that has been proposed, and this route is preferred by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to any other that has been suggested. I will say, further, that it is the desire of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take up this scheme as a natural and necessary supplement to the Canadian Pacific Railway as it now exists. The company will be ready without loss of time to enter into negotiations with the Government for carrying out this project, as soon as the necessary legislation is obtained.

"(Signed), GEO. STEPHEN."

Now, I think, in view of the facts which occurred this Session, this is an extraordinary letter. It throws a good deal of light upon the question. It is only three or four weeks since this company came to us *in forma pauperis*, asking for assistance to carry out their original contract, to do the things which were specified to be done in the contract. But the building of this short line is not mentioned in the original contract. When the Government asked Parliament to grant the company this assistance, they told us it was going to be just sufficient to enable the company to carry out the terms of the original contract. Now, what do we find? We find this same company offering to undertake the most onerous obligation, practically coming to the country and saying that they are ready to undertake a vast work, while hon. gentlemen opposite say that the work is so vast that this subsidy would be but as a drop towards that end. Yet we find this same Canadian Pacific Railway Company which, a few weeks ago was so poor, are now ready to undertake this great enterprise. But there is another and a worse aspect to this question. When this letter was written, on the 16th of June last, it is evident that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were desirous of undertaking this new contract and of carrying through the short line to the Maritime Provinces; and at the same time they were negotiating for assistance in order to carry out their original contract. At the same time that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were negotiating with the Acting Minister of Railways, who brought down the resolutions to this House for giving them assistance, they were proposing to the Government of this country to undertake an obligation by which they would have to buy from that same hon. Minister the railway which he owns in the Eastern Townships of the Province of Quebec. It is true I have had suspicion as to the reason why the short line was adopted; but when I found that letter, and saw the statement made about the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, I confess my suspicions became almost a moral certainty, and subsequent evidence in regard to the matter was such as no disinterested person in this House or the country could afford to overlook. It is a most improper state of affairs. If I were to characterise it in the way I should like to characterise it, you, Mr. Speaker, would probably call me to order, as using expressions contrary to the proprieties of the House. I therefore will not do so, but I state again that it is a most improper thing that the Minister of Railways, at the same time he was negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to afford them relief in their embarrassment, in connection with the enterprise of building a railway across the continent, should have been engaged in receiving propositions, and the company engaged in considering an undertaking to enter into another contract, which would oblige them to either buy or secure favorable running powers over a line which is owned by the Acting Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman told us that he himself was so much interested in the International that he could not have anything to do with the resolutions. He told us he was so interested in that railway that he could not bring down the resolutions for the short line, and the First Minister brought them down; and at the same time the Minister of Agriculture knew he was himself a party negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to the short line. This state of affairs is very suspicious, and it leads us to believe that the determination of the Government to insist upon the adoption of the short line, in which is included the International, is a policy hasty, ill-considered, if not unconsidered, and I believe all independent-minded members in this House should support the amendments moved by the hon. member for Megantic and the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was somewhat surprised to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher); I was somewhat surprised at the line of argument he adopted and at the amount of ignorance he showed, especially in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman commenced his remarks by attacking a line of railway for which I hold myself as specially responsible as any member in this House. If there is any member to whose activity, public conduct and strenuous efforts the location of that line may be attributed, I believe that man is myself. And then the hon. gentleman casts reflections on the location of the line, and attempts to throw on the Government, at this day, the responsibility of determining that location. When he endeavors to place that responsibility on the Government alone, he is ignorant of the events of that time. I was a member of the Government of that day, of which my respected and hon. friend the First Minister was the leader. Was the Government alone responsible for the location of the line? No; Parliament, by an immense majority, adopted the location. We find the leaders of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs voting for that location, and yet we find the whole blame thrown by the hon. gentleman on the Government, if blame there was. I want to make no excuse for the location. I assume my share of the responsibility, as a member of the Government of that day. It was a location approved by Parliament and by the British Government, which aided us in raising money, and guaranteed a certain portion of the cost of the construction; and looking at the result, there is no reason to be ashamed. I assume, so far as one individual can, the responsibility of that location. Let us see how the leaders of the Liberal party voted on that question. With the exception of Mr. Workman, there was no member from the Province of Quebec who voted against it. Among those who voted for it were Sir Richard Cartwright, Messrs. Geoffrion, Holton, Joly, Pelletier, Poser, Tremblay, and others. If the hon. gentleman is conversant with the position of any of those members, and with the

proceedings that took place, he would not say that the Government of that day alone were responsible for the location of the Intercolonial, but that Parliament almost unanimously supported it. I am not making this statement in extenuation of the act. I do not wish to relieve myself of any responsibility connected with it. I repeat, as I did in 1867-68, that the location was justified by the necessities of the country, by considerations for the future security of the country, and by what would best serve and conserve the interests of Canada. I was a little surprised at a remark made by my respected friend, the member for Jacques Cartier, for whose opinions I have great respect and who manifests a great deal of that independence which I myself occasionally exhibit. I was surprised that that hon. member made a mistake in referring to the position of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman stated that the Intercolonial cost \$42,000,000. I am not prepared to say whether my hon. friend has overstated the amount or not, but this I will say, that the people of the Province of New Brunswick do not thank the people of Quebec or Ontario for the outlay upon the Intercolonial Railway. It was our due; it was a matter of treaty; it was part of the bargain. It was a concession they were bound to give us, and I appeal to my right hon. friend to say whether I am not stating the facts, in saying that in the bargain, which was the foundation of the legislation which led to Confederation, it was not stipulated that that road was one of the conditions of the consummation of the Union. What right has the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to cast in our teeth that we have had more of the public money of Canada than was proper, or than we were entitled to receive; that we were indebted to Canada with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, and the outlet for us which it afforded. We, in the Maritime Provinces, have desired and have always shown our desire to develop the country in the west; \$100,000,000 are being spent in lands and money on the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Montreal, to the Pacific Ocean. Who gets the benefit of it? Do we, in the Maritime Provinces get the benefit that you do here in Ontario and the Western Provinces? Do we participate in the enjoyment of these advantages which you will enjoy in the building and running of that road? Certainly we will not. And if we have not those privileges; if we cannot enjoy the advantages of that enormous outlay, surely we ought not to have that cast in our teeth, when we want a short line of communication, when we wish to perfect that system, when we wish, having Montreal and Quebec as summer ports, and an outlet for that country, is it not right, when we have winter ports, when we have St. Stephen and St. John, and Halifax, open at all seasons of the year, is it not right that we should have those privileges, and is it proper to have it cast in our teeth that we got so much advantage by the building of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. GIROUARD. I never said so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I withdraw the remark. I am not going to discuss the merits of these lines. I think, after the able speech—the magnificent speech, if I might so term it—the forcible, energetic and earnest speech of my hon. friend from Stanstead, it would be inconsistent for me to take up the time of the House in discussing the relative merits of the two lines. But I will take up a few minutes in discussing the impossibility of carrying out the ideas of those who speak about an air line, which was dilated on to some extent by the hon. member for Brome. The hon. gentleman talks on a subject about which he knows very little. That question was better understood, and as fully discussed in 1867, and certainly better discussed than it has been during the present Session. These surveys of Major Robinson were fully before Parliament, before the Parliament of that day, and perhaps few men took as much interest in the discussion of that matter as I did; and I tell the hon. mem-

ber for Brome that notwithstanding the various surveys made on that occasion there were but two lines that Parliament entertained the slightest idea of accepting. These were the Intercolonial Railway, as at present located, or Major Robinson's northern line, and his survey by the valley of St. John. The third line ran through what was a sea of mountains.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). What?

Mr. MITCHELL. British Columbia is indignant that I should use a portion of the title that the leader of the Opposition applied with reference to his Province. The central or air line was looked upon at that time as an impossibility, and was rejected, and but two lines were discussed, as I have said, with any probability of being adopted. I merely speak of this to show the almost impossibility, the great improbability, of any sane man accepting an air line through our country, no matter how short. There is one passage which I do not think I have looked upon for 15 years, but in the report of the middle line of Major Robinson, my impression is that there is one 13-mile section of that road which will cost about one-third the cost of the whole Intercolonial Railway, thus showing the improbability of ever building a line such as the hon. member for Brome talks about, as an air line.

Mr. FISHER. I did not allude at all to Major Robinson's line.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; the hon. gentleman did not, but the hon. gentleman talked of an air line which would go through very much the same country as Major Robinson's line. He did not allude to Major Robinson's line because he did not know anything about it—that is the fact of the matter. The hon. gentleman has chosen to refer to the views and feelings of an hon. gentleman who is not now in this House—the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and he speaks of that hon. gentleman being so dead to the interests of his county as to advocate a line which passed by his own county, and he went so far as to impute motives, which were scarcely in order, according to the rules in this House. Does the hon. gentleman forget his own position? Does he recollect that the county he represents is in close proximity to the line he was opposing? What will his constituents say when he goes back for election, when they quote the speech he made to-night; when they ask him what county he represents; if he represents the county of Brome, which is in close proximity to this line, or if he represents the city of Quebec, or some of the ports of the Lower Provinces. What answer will the hon. gentleman make? I am afraid he will not be quite as cool as he was to night in making his speech. He also took occasion to refer to another hon. gentleman who was not present—the respected member who is Acting Minister of Railways in this country. I think his remarks were certainly not such as he ought to have made with reference to a gentleman who has occupied the high position he occupies, who possesses great parliamentary and practical experience, and who, with all due regard to the hon. member for Brome, possesses quite as much alike of the confidence of the country and of Parliament as the hon. gentleman himself, and I think a good deal more. It has been my honor and pleasure to occupy a position in the same Cabinet with that hon. gentleman, and a position in Parliament along with him, and I say that when the hon. member for Brome made these remarks, I felt ashamed of him attempting to impute motives to the Acting Minister of Railways. They would be unworthy of him if he entertained them, and they were as unjust as they were uncalled for. I will not, at this late hour of the night, occupy the attention of the House; but I will give him one more hit before I part with him, and it will apply to the gentlemen who sit beside

Mr. MITCHELL.

him—I refer to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and to the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Lange-lier). They all sounded the same keynote and rang the changes of delay, procrastination, put off. What has been the cry of these gentlemen against the Government of the day? What has been my own cry? Too much procrastination, too much put off, too much delay; and yet in one of the most important concerns which relate to the Maritime Provinces, it is to be put off to the injury of the country, and of the constituency I represent. We, in the Maritime Provinces, have our rights. When we entered this Confederation we did so believing we would get our just rights; we have never got them. We went into this Confederation believing that we would get even-handed justice; we have mighty hard work to get it out of these western people. When we put our assets into the Treasury of this country we put in valuable assets, representing every dollar of our debt. What did the Upper Provinces put in? They put in rotten institutions, like the Grand Trunk Railway, with \$46,000,000 of debt. The right hon. Premier smiles at that. When he was asked about it, he said it was a first-rate asset—a railway stretching all through Canada. We may follow it up with the canals; and when we get a distribution of money for railways or other public works, what do we find? Where we get a dollar, \$10,000 goes to Ontario—save and except Nova Scotia, because when Sir Charles Tupper was here he always looked after its interests; and when one of these important works which our Province demands is under consideration in this House, we find all kinds of obstacles put in the way to cause delay and procrastination, and to throw it over for another year. Now, I am just going to conclude with one piece of advice to the Government, and it is this: I find in these resolutions, in addition to the short line, that we are going to take over the North Shore, and we are providing for a line to be built to Edmunston. That is all right enough; I do not object to that; it goes to New Brunswick. But in this North Shore deal I do not know what terms the Government have made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company; but I find, in the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, that the Government take over this line from the Grand Trunk, and, as near as I can make out, they give \$592,000.52. They also take over the \$250,000 of stock which, I suppose, they pay for at par. Then I find such terms as expenditure on roadway and buildings, \$176,000; expenditure on rolling stock, machinery, furniture, etc., \$7,609; Palais harbor, \$30,000; Jacques Cartier line, \$150,000; and sundries, \$19,000. Now, I want to give the Government a little bit of advice about this matter, which, I suppose, they will take kindly, though they very seldom do. If they are going to let the Grand Trunk Railway Company cover up any little steal in this matter, I pledge my word that I will look after it. I do not want the Grand Trunk, under cover of getting paid for any improvements on the road, which I am willing they should get, to make a steal of \$200,000 or \$300,000 into the bargain: and I want to warn the Government. Let any man see what improvements the Grand Trunk has put on the North Shore. They have wooden bridges, with only ten or twelve years of life, and the cars have not seen a paint brush for years. You can see the same thing all through; and I would ask the Government to have these things properly investigated before they give the Grand Trunk half a million dollars, without knowing what it is for. In conclusion, I intend to support these resolutions, and to vote against the amendments.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to give an answer to the statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) when he took my friend the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) to task, because he had stated that the Government were responsible for the selection of the route

of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman took exception to that, and said the responsibility was shared by Parliament. I want to refer the hon. gentleman to a motion which was moved by Mr. Dorion when the Bill was before the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the year before. You refer to the year before the act was done. Never mind what his opinions were before he changed them.

Mr. LAURIER. I will answer that. That motion of Mr. Dorion was voted down; the hon. gentleman knows it:

"That it be an instruction to the committee to amend the Bill so as to provide that the location of the line of the Intercolonial shall not be adopted without the previous assent of Parliament."

That was voted down. The following year I know the question was raised again, and was voted down by Parliament, because, otherwise the guarantee of the Imperial Parliament would have been lost. So that the answer he made to the hon. member for Brome was not very strong.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has simply confirmed the statement I made.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Langelier to amendment :

To leave out all the words after the word "thereof" in the amendment, and insert the following: In the opinion of this House additional surveys are requisite, and should at once be undertaken, in order to a sound decision as to the proper route for the short line railway; and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys have been made.

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	McIsaac,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Cameron (Huron),	Guay,	Mulock,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Harley,	Paterson (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Holton,	Platt,
Cartwright,	Innes,	Ray,
Casey,	Kirk,	Rinfret,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Shaully,
Cimon,	Langelier,	Somerville (Brant),
De St. Georges,	Laurier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Edgar,	Lister,	Trow,
Fisher,	McCraney,	Watson,
Fleming,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—39.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Allison,	Farrow,	McNeill,
Auger,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gillmor,	Orton,
Benoit,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Riopol,
Bourassa,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hickey,	Ross,
Burpee,	Homer,	Scrivier,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Irvine,	Sproule,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Colby,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Townshend,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Weldon,
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wells,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dickinson,	McDougald (Picton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	McGreevy,	Wright.—107.
Dupont,	McLelan,	

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. LESAGE. (Translation.) I move, in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after "that," in the amendment, be left out, and that the following be inserted in place thereof:—

The House does not now concur in these resolutions, but that they be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend them as follows:—

By striking out from the first clause the words "via Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury," and by adding at the end of the said clause the following words:—

The said subsidy to be given to the company which will build the line, which will be found to be the shortest and most practicable after complete instrumental surveys of all the lines which may pretend to obtain this result.

Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night, and especially after the long discussions which have taken place, it is no time to make a long speech. Still, I cannot allow the remarks made before the House by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), with regard to the different lines which may reach Canadian seaports, to pass by without contradicting certain statements which he has made. The hon. member for Stanstead began this discussion by referring to the through line on Canadian territory, and he endeavored to point out that that line would be 139 miles longer to St. John and 159 miles longer to Halifax. I shall leave that line aside, as I have no vouchers in my possession to prove the contrary, and I will deal at once with the other lines which he has criticised more especially for the benefit of his own cause. The hon. member for Stanstead has himself stated that Mr. Light had made a report in the course of the year 1884, and that it was in the course of the winter in the same year that he had informed the engineer of the Department of the existence of a new line which he called the combination line, and to support his statement he read the telegram which Mr. Light had addressed to Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer of that Department. Well, I think that my hon. friend made an error of fact. In the course of the summer of 1884 Mr. Light was actually making an instrumental survey of a line from the St. Charles Branch Railway to Churchill Lake. That is not at all what we call the combination line, and what Mr. Light was asking the Government to cause to be surveyed, but a new line passing through the Etchemin valley, and which had already been barometrically surveyed. This was the true combination line, and that gentleman, by playing upon words, will not mislead public opinion on this, even by reading the telegram. And I refer to page 25 of Mr. Light's report to prove my assertion. Besides, I will quote that part of the report which is addressed to Mr. Schreiber, and which reads as follows:—

"COMBINATION LINE.

"I beg leave to direct attention to line (marked No. 3 on the general map) which was explored as far as the summit and favorably mentioned in my report on the reconnaissance made in July last. Starting from Chaudière Junction it would traverse the valleys of the Etchemin and Famine Rivers to the height of land near the village of St. Justin.

"This summit is 950 feet above the starting point at Chaudière Junction, or 509 feet lower than the summit on the line surveyed by Rivière du Sud. From St. Justin the line would continue its course south-east, and nearly direct to the vicinity of the head of Lake Chesuncook, from whence it would connect with the line surveyed during the past season between that lake and Canterbury.

"From data on hand, there is every reason to believe that grades not exceeding 35 to 40 feet to the mile can be easily obtained in both directions, by this route from Chaudière Junction to Canterbury.

"This line appears to me to possess advantages peculiar to itself, which I have deemed it my duty to point out in a special report."

The Hartland line is a line from the St. Charles Branch Railway and not a line from the Chaudière to Hartland. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to bore the House with these particulars, but the question is of such importance that I desire that it should be well understood before taking a decision. Besides, the hon. member for Stanstead went so far as to state that the engineer of the Department, Mr. Light, had found a line which was very important and very

easy to finish, but that for the time being it was not thought advisable to grant it, because it was too late, and he admits himself that the line was exceedingly advantageous. Such is the sum of the demand I now make to the House. When Mr. Light, in August, 1884, was asking the engineer of the Department to cause an instrumental survey of the said line to be made, it seems to me that it was time to grant it. People now cry out, and in order to defend their position they say: "The route is, perhaps, superior to that which we have adopted, but you have come too late." Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is never too late to defend a question in which the Province of Quebec is interested, from Montreal to Quebec and from Quebec to the Maritime Provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. LESAGE. (Translation.) It seems to me that the hon. members opposite might allow me to explain. As a rule, I do not uselessly take up the time of the House. I never made a four hours' speech on the Franchise Bill, nor no six hours' speech on the North-West troubles. Now, Sir, to come back to my subject, my friend the member for Stanstead has stated that Mr. Wicksteed has made an inadequate survey, with imperfect instruments, of the River Etchemin. This is false, but I say that, until now, you have not had an adequate survey, neither for this line nor for the others—a survey which would be sufficient to allow you to decide such an important question. He said that the combination line was longer than that from Montreal *via* Sherbrooke and Mattawamkeag. He has quoted figures in support of that statement. I hardly know where he has taken them. At all events, they cannot be very positive, since he admits that the combination line has not been surveyed. He appealed to our hon. friends the members for the Maritime Provinces. He told them that that combination line should not be adopted. Still, after waxing very pathetic in his expression of a well-known sentiment, he comes forward and states that the combination line is by far the longest. How can that be, since, at the beginning of his speech he said that the line advocated by Mr. Light had not even been surveyed? How does he know it, then? Well, Mr. Speaker, this combination line, which is said to be unknown, but which is perfectly well known, that line is the shortest and most direct, it is the one whose curves are the least, whose grades are the lowest. And the hon. member for Stanstead has done nothing else but to state a fact which he has not proved. It is very easy to say that a line which one favors is shorter than another, but how could he prove it? It is by the reports of engineers, and there are none before the House. True, we have some reports with regard to a certain line, for instance, 40 miles of which are unsurveyed. The combination line, such as represented by the reports before the House, is the shortest and the most advantageous, as I will show by the following figures:—

Description of Line.	Via Sherbrooke.	Via Quebec and Combination Line.	Difference in favor of Quebec.
From Montreal, <i>via</i> Megantic and Passadumkeag to St. John.....	525	481	44
do do Halifax.....	801	710	91
From Montreal, <i>via</i> Megantic and Mattawamkeag to St. John.....	491	481	10
do do Halifax.....	†767	710	57
From Montreal, <i>via</i> Combination Line to St. John.....	491	481	10
From Montreal, <i>via</i> Combination Line to Halifax.....	720	710	10
From Lachute, <i>via</i> Megantic and Passadumkeag to St. John.....	563	485	78
do do Halifax.....	839	761	78
From Lachute, <i>via</i> Megantic and Mattawamkeag to St. John.....	529	495	44
do do Halifax.....	805	761	44
Grade maximum per mile.....	74	40	34
Curves minimum.....	.....	4 degrees.	.....

Mr. LESAGE,

Description of Line.	Via Sherbrooke.	Via Quebec and Combination Line.	Difference in favor of Quebec.
Greatest altitude above sea level, say.....	2,000	1,200	800
Haulage power, consolidation engines.....	20 1'd cars	40 1'd cars.	20
Cost, including bridges over St. Lawrence in both cases, <i>via</i> combination lines to Chesuncook, (see Appendix 7).....	*10,240,000	8,470,000	1,770,000
Cost, including bridges in both cases, to Mattawamkeag <i>versus</i> combination line to Harvey (see Appendix 8).....	*11,200,000	10,500,000	700,000

† The distances *via* Passadumkeag and Mattawamkeag are based on the assumption that the extension eastward from there to Moncton will be carried to St. John and over the existing lines of railway.

\* These estimates are based on the assumption that the syndicate carry out their intention of bridging the St. Lawrence at Lachine, and building a line from Lachine to Sherbrooke. In the last estimate *via* the combination line to Harvey, the Quebec bridge and connecting lines are estimated for single track, in order to institute a fair comparison with the Lachine bridge.

I am not bound to rectify the figures of the hon. member for Stanstead, which, with his ordinary eloquence, he has so well laid before the House, and especially before the members from the Maritime Provinces. I will simply say to the House that I do not make of this question a sectional issue, but it seems to me that when we come before the members from the Maritime Provinces with the above mentioned figures, and when our opponents come and say: Here are other figures—it seems to me that we have a right to express a doubt as to what is before the House. What I ask is a minute and thorough survey, and I only ask what is fair. But a line is forced upon us without an accurate survey, without giving us any reasons based upon the reports of enquiries. It is intended to make us accept a line from Montreal by way of Mattawamkeag to St. John, and we are told that it is the shortest line. I do not wish to contend that it is not the shortest nor the most favorable line; but at least let it be proved to us by figures and reports made by competent engineers. Let it be proved that the Sherbrooke line is the best, and I shall lay aside all other considerations, and I will be ready to vote in favor of the resolutions. But it is not when the chief engineer of the Government admits, himself, in his reports, that a great portion of this line has not been surveyed, when he has not even given any plan or profile before the House calculated to set aside our statements that the levels reach from 1,800 to 2,000 feet, that we can decide with a knowledge of the facts; and more than that: for the purpose of the case, the reports of the engineers who were sent to survey this Etchemin line have been falsified, and consequently this shows their perfect fairness and their ability, which ought not to have been questioned. Therefore, I hold that the reports, incomplete though they may be, are truthful, until the contrary is shown to me by other and more complete reports, applying to the whole distance of the three lines mentioned, so that we may decide with a knowledge of the facts. That decision taken by the Government proves, moreover, this fact: that we have not been placed on equal footing to compete with other lines, and before this day I have had occasion more than once to remind this Government of the promises which they had made to me, that a full and complete instrumental survey of that important route would take place, and always without any results. The interest I take in this line will surprise no one, when I say that apart from the reasons above mentioned, that the county which I have the honor to represent would have been crossed over from one side to the other by this important line, had it been chosen, as it should have been, were it not for the evil influences which are known. I flatter myself that I am doing my duty at the present time, and when the promoters of the famous short line *via* Sherbrooke come here and say that the surveys made by Mr. Wicksteed were

made with imperfect instruments, when it is known that that gentleman was in the employ of the present Government, receiving his instructions from Mr. Schreiber, sent by that gentleman to answer to the fair demands of the promoters of the line of the valley of the Etchemin River, to survey that magnificent route and do justice without fear or favor to all interested parties, I am astonished at the arguments brought forward to-day, about imperfect instruments, and I ask, if it were not intended to play a farce, or make light of the reputation of engineers, whether qualified or not. I do not know this to be a fact, but I have strong doubts about it. Now, Sir, in answer to the charges brought against Mr. Light, because it was his misfortune to be compelled, by force of circumstances, to make a report which was favorable to the line of the Etchemin River, I shall read a letter addressed to the editor of the *Montreal Gazette*. I have no doubt that it will please the House, and above all, my hon. friends opposite, to see how he refutes the gratuitous charges which have been made, both in this House and outside. The letter reads as follows:—

“To the Editor of the *Gazette*:

“Sir,—My attention has been drawn to the following statement in your parliamentary report of the debate on the short line question on Wednesday last:—

“Mr. Hall supported the Government line from Montreal *via* Sherbrooke and Mattawamkeag, as being shorter than the combination line, and with easier grades and curves. The professional standing of Mr. Light, as well as the feasibility of his line, was open to question. Mr. Light assumed the title of ‘Member of the Institute of Civil Engineers for Great Britain,’ but his name could not be found in any of the rules of that institution. Neither was he Government engineer for the Province of Quebec as he styled himself, two years having elapsed since he filled that position in the construction of the North Shore road. It was Mr. Light who recommended the change from the shore to the Terrebonne line, which cost the Government over a million dollars more than his estimates.

“Mr. Colby said he opposed the Light combination line, and declared that it had not been accurately surveyed. In order to make the line appear short, Mr. Light had made no allowance for curvature, nor were his reports upon it reliable. Moreover, Mr. Light’s road would involve the building of a bridge at Quebec which would cost seven millions, and would necessitate a subsidy as large as that proposed now for the whole line. Mr. Light’s mythical line would, therefore, be not only longer, but more expensive than the line now under discussion.

“Your parliamentary editor concludes from these: ‘The speeches of Messrs. Hall and Colby presented a very fair analysis of Mr. Light’s claims to consideration for his reports. Mr. Hall made a strong point in reference to Mr. Light’s connection with the North Shore Railway, while Mr. Colby left him, literally, without a leg to stand on in his dissection of Mr. Light’s report, and his exposure of its palpable dishonesty.’ My official reports to the Government are on record, and should contain the answers to any criticism of their merits. In answer to Mr. Hall: 1st. The combination line I propose is shorter to St. John and Halifax, and practically shorter to St. Andrews than the Mattawamkeag line, and is infinitely superior to it in point of gradients and curvatures. My report upon these points has been endorsed in every respect by Mr. Keating, C.E., of Halifax, a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, and I have no hesitation in saying it would be similarly confirmed if it were referred to a committee of engineers of standing. 2nd. I was elected a member of the English Institution of Civil Engineers in 1862. My name does not appear on this year’s roll because I omitted to renew my dues, but I have not in any way forfeited my rights of membership. I was reappointed Government engineer of the Province of Quebec in June, 1883, for a further period of five years. The change of line of the North Shore, *via* Terrebonne, made on my recommendation, endorsed by both Mr. Shanly and Mr. Sandford Fleming, was not an additional cost to the Government (although it perhaps may have slightly exceeded my approximate estimate), but a saving as compared with the shore line. The extra cost of the road was principally caused by the great excess of quantities on the Quebec end, located before I took charge of the work. By reference to *Hansard* I find that Mr. Hall, by way of excusing himself from making invidious charges against me, says ‘that I made similar insinuations and charges against the Government engineer, and also made reflections upon the staff which had been selected.’ In reply I would say that I did not mean to make charges, insinuations or reflections against any one, but merely defended myself against misquotations and misrepresentations. Mr. Hall himself also misquotes me unfairly when he says (speaking of my remarks, page 5), ‘that this line termed the International has been traced by way of Sherbrooke and Lake Megantic. He (Light) speaks of a line that ‘has been traced.’ The line has been built and in operation for the last five years, with four trains passing upon it daily. Yet Mr. Light has the unfairness to speak of it in his report as a line that ‘has been traced.’ What I did say (*vide* page 5) in describing the International line: ‘This line termed the International line has been traced *via* Sherbrooke and Lake Megantic, to be carried across the State of Maine through

Moosehead Lake, and from there to Mattawamkeag, on the Maine Central railway.’ Thus Mr. Hall omits all words after Lake Megantic to make a point against me. Mr. Hall further says: ‘The altitude on this theoretical line has only been barometrically surveyed,’ although on page 4 of my preface I distinctly state that ‘the summit had been tested by spirit levels,’ a careful series of which were backed up from the line surveyed, to check this important point.

“Now for Mr. Colby. This gentleman occupies some two and a-half pages of *Hansard* with charges and allegations against me. First, he says in effect that I illustrate my report by a map in which the line between Lachine and Sherbrooke is very incorrectly laid down. At the time the map was arranged it was impossible to ascertain exactly where it was proposed to pass this line, and it will be seen from the remarks of Messrs. Laurier, Colby and Sir Hector Langevin, on page 3076 of *Hansard*, that this matter is still unsettled. Although, for this reason, the position of the proposed line could not be exactly shown, yet the distance from Lachine to Sherbrooke of 104 miles as given in the body of my report in appendix 6, pages 17 and 18, is quite as short as any location will probably make it; thus showing there was no intention to deceive. Second, Mr. Light tells us about this combination line running from Chaudiere Junction to Chesuncook Lake, where it connects with the other surveyed line, and he tells us that the distance would be 105 miles. If any gentleman will take a ruler and draw a straight line on the map he will see that the distance of an air line is 105 miles, and Mr. Light knows that through that country you must allow twenty-one miles of curvature, so that instead of being 105 miles the distance should be 126 miles.’ The actual distance between the points above named, in a straight line, is less than 100 miles. At the foot of page twenty-three of my report on the line ‘instrumentally surveyed’ it will be seen that this latter line was 5 per cent. longer than an air line between the extreme points. This extra length was caused by curvature and is the percentage due to that item. The line by the Etchemin Valley passes over much smoother ground than the line instrumentally surveyed. Therefore the amount of 5 per cent. that has actually been here allowed for curvature is ample. Again, Mr. Colby says that, ‘if you read his report you will find that he gives you the grades and the curvature, and the summits and distances, although there has never been an instrument put over the route, and no man knows anything about the grades or curvatures or summits, except what Mr. Wicksteed obtained on the portion of the same line, by a barometrical survey with an unreliable barometer.’

“Mr. Colby is probably unaware that a careful barometrical survey of some 75 miles of this line from Chaudiere Junction to Baker lake was made by myself in the spring of 1884, and a favorable report then made on it by me to the chief engineer. In this survey I passed over every foot of the line and carefully examined the whole of it. Subsequently the summit height was verified by a series of checks taken with a spirit level from the datum of the line instrumentally surveyed, establishing exactly the true height of this summit above sea level, leaving no doubt that the grades reported by me and even less could be obtained. The grounds for this opinion are so fully stated on page 2 of my supplementary report, that I refer the reader to them.

“As to the cost of the line from Montreal to Mattawamkeag, I would say that a bridge must be built either at Lachine or at Quebec. If a single track bridge is considered sufficient in either case, I estimate that the new work, exclusive of constructed lines, would cost, *via* Lachine and Mattawamkeag, \$11,200,000, and *via* Quebec and combination line, \$10,500,000, so that \$700,000 could be saved by crossing at Quebec. Whether the line I advocate be adopted or not, I contend that I have done my duty to the Government and the country without fear and without prejudice. Time will tell, and the ground will always be there to prove who is right in this question.

“Believing, that in common fairness you will insert this,

“I am, dear Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“A. L. LIGHT.”

I will not insist any further, nor will I give all the figures which might show in the most unanswerable manner, the position which I hold at the present, because they have already been given to the House on previous occasions. Now, as regards the arrangements made by the Government to do justice to the claims of the city of Quebec, by giving it a summer terminus of the Pacific within the limits of that city, I have no desire to discuss them. I am ready to accept on this subject the opinion of the interested parties represented in this Parliament by the distinguished members, and outside by the board of trade, the city council, its business men, its citizens’ committee, etc. Therefore, we have in that quarter all the guarantees required. It would be more than foolhardy on my part to express my views before having their opinion on the subject. Still, Mr. Speaker, the House will allow me here to express my candid opinion that as regards the satisfaction to be given to Quebec by the purchase of the North Shore Railway, or of another independent line, controlled by the Canadian Pacific, and considered as a summer terminus at the harbor of that city, but as regards what I have always considered myself, as the true and only vital question for

the district of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. I refer to the extension of the Pacific from Montreal to the Canadian ports on the Atlantic. It is towards obtaining this result that we should have directed all our efforts. Indeed, what use is it to the district and the city of Quebec to have a change of name effected by the North Shore Railway; let it be called the Pacific instead of the Grand Trunk, if at the same time the Pacific is allowed to have its real extension through the townships to a certain sea port, which will eventually be called Portland. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in so doing you deprive completely the whole district and the cities, from Montreal to Quebec, from all the advantages which we had expected, would be derived from the Pacific trade. For, on account of distance, maritime freight, and insurance, you drive all the western traffic towards American ports, and what is more, we furnish the money to obtain that result. For that reason I say that the real question for the districts of Three Rivers, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces is that which relates to the short line with regard to distance, grades and curves to reach Canadian seaports with the greatest possible facility. If I make a distinction in the resolutions from the standpoint of the advantages which the inhabitants of Quebec might derive from the adoption of the third resolution, by leaving them sole judges of their own interests, and if I am ready to adopt their way of thinking, I desire to be more explicit as regards the features of the second resolution. The choice which the Government has made of the line through Sherbrooke and Mattawamkeag, as the shortest and the most favorable—and that is the object of the present sub-amendment, which I hope, for the reasons above given, will be accepted by the Government.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lesage), to amendment.

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	Lesage,
Blondeau,	Fisher,	Lister,
Bourassa,	Fleming,	McCranev,
Cameron (Huron),	Forbes,	McMullen,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Guay,	Mulock,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Holton,	Paterson (Brant),
Cartwright,	Innes,	Platt,
Casey,	Kirk,	Rinfret,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Shanly,
Cimon,	Landry (Montmagny),	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Langelier,	Watson,
Dupont,	Laurier,	Wilson.—36.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Allison,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Auger,	Foster,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gillmor,	Orton,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Paint,
Beaty,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Billy,	Hackett,	Ray,
Bossé,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bryson,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burpee,	Homer,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Small,
Carling,	Irvine,	Sproule,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Jenkins,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Townshend,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Weldon,
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wells,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Renfrew),

Mr. LESAGE.

Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wigle,
Dodd,	McGreevy,	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McLelan,	Wood (Westm'land),
Farrow,	McNeill,	Wright.—101.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Massue,	

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Laurier) negatived.

On motion for second reading of resolutions,

Mr. LANGELIER moved in amendment :

That the said resolutions be referred back to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide that the whole amount which may be granted in respect of the subsidy of \$250,000 a year shall be applied towards the construction of the unbuilt portions of the proposed line, and that no part thereof shall be used in the acquisition of any line already built and forming a link in the proposed line.

House divided :

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Auger,	Fisher,	Lister,
Bourassa,	Fleming,	McCranev,
Cameron (Huron),	Forbes,	McMullen,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Cartwright,	Holton,	Platt,
Casey,	Innes,	Ray,
Casgrain,	Irvine,	Rinfret,
Cimon,	Kirk,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Dupont,	Langelier,	Wilson.—35.
Edgar,	Laurier,	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Allison,	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Gigault,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gillmor,	Orton,
Beaty,	Girouard,	Paint,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Billy,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hickey,	Ross,
Burpee,	Homer,	Shanly,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Small,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Townshend,
Curran,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Weldon,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wells,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	McCallum,	White (Renfrew),
	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
	McGreevy,	Wood (Westmoreland),
	McLelan,	Wright.—101.
	McNeill,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved :

That all the words after the word "now," to the end of the question, be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same,

1. By leaving out in section 2 the words:—*via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury;
2. By leaving out section 4, and instead thereof inserting the following one:—4. And whereas no arrangement has taken place between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North Shore Railway Company for the acquisition of the North Shore Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway has done nothing yet in the way of constructing a new line between Montreal and Quebec, it is expedient, in the interests of Canada generally, as well as in the interests of the Province of Quebec, in order to better assure the construction of the continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the maritime ports, to amend the Act passed during the last Session of

Parliament, 47 Victoria, chapter 8, so as to enact that the line of railway intended to connect Montreal with the maritime ports by the shortest and most practicable route should pass by the port of Quebec."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. KIRK moved :

That the said resolutions be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending section 2, by providing that the work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the work on the portions of the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine.

Amendment negatived.

Resolutions read the second time, and concurred in on a division.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 158) to authorise the granting of further subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the railways therein described.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3:30 a.m., Saturday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

SATURDAY, 11th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PRINTING COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved that the ninth report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be adopted. He said: This report was presented yesterday and it refers to the printing of a number of documents in the usual way. Reference was made to the committee of the question whether an extra edition of the Geological Survey report should be printed for distribution, and the committee, after carefully considering the matter, recommend that the present edition be considered sufficient. Communication was had with the Geological Department, and it was found that they have about 650 copies of French and English which could be distributed if the House so desired, but the policy adopted in the past is that the House distributes two copies to each member and the Department itself sends one copy to each member, so each member gets three copies; this particular report is published by Dawson Bros. of Montreal, with their imprint, and is sold at their establishment to those who desire to purchase it. The price of the volume for this year, according to the statement of Dr. Thorburn is \$3.75. It was thought by the committee that it was not desirable to change that policy, because the supply of three copies to each member, with the permission to each person who desires to purchase any volume or pamphlet, was thought to be sufficient, and they therefore do not recommend the printing of the extra edition necessary for distribution among members. There is another part of the report which is simply a matter of internal economy. The committee recommend that Mr. Romaine, of the proof-reading branch, shall be hereafter known as the Superintendent of the Printing of the Sessional Papers of Parliament. Every one knows that the term "proof-reader" in no way represents the work which Mr. Romaine has to do. All the Sessional Papers are referred to him from the committee and he goes through them, sometimes takes from them duplicates, and, when a number of tenders are submitted, classifies them,

and supervises generally the Printing of Parliament. It is understood that this does not in the slightest degree affect or interfere with the position which Mr. Hartney has so well occupied as Clerk of the Printing Committee; he still will be the organ of communication between the Printing Committee and this practical printing branch of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

### FIRST READING.

Mr. McLELAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 159) for facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence in and near the Harbor of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that on Monday next the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to provide that there shall be paid to the Senior Puisné Judge of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, residing at Quebec, if the Chief Justice resides at Montreal, or to the Senior Puisné Judge residing at Montreal if the Chief Justice resides at Quebec, an annual salary of \$1,000 in addition to his other salary.
2. That such salary shall be paid out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman promised to give us some information to-day as to his course in regard to what is on the paper and as to what is not yet on the paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th items will be proceeded with. The 6th will not be proceeded with, the 7th will stand and will perhaps not be pressed, the 11th will be withdrawn, the 12th will be dropped. Mr. Andrew Allan has gone to England for the purpose of making arrangements about different steamers of required strength and power. The 13th and 14th will be withdrawn. There will be a measure introduced granting certain lands under certain conditions to the officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers of the volunteers who served in the North-West.

Mr. BLAKE. What course does the Government intend to pursue in regard to the Temperance Bill, and when are we to have the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not a Government measure, so we will not interfere with it; the Supplementary Estimates will be brought down Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman is not in a position then to state when the House will prorogue.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. POPE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 153) to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman promised to bring us down some information the other day.

Mr. POPE. With respect to the point brought up about the item of \$2,500,000, I am informed it really is not in the other and means nothing.

Mr. BLAKE. It means nothing at all; then you had better strike it out.

Mr. POPE. With respect to the 100 miles spoken of by the hon. member for West Ontario, the cost of making the usual allowance of 13 per cent. for shrinkage, was \$2,640,000; the company received \$2,630,000. I do not know how the hon. gentleman made up his figures, but that is the cost furnished to me by the engineer. The hon. gentleman

says there is land besides, but the land is covered a good deal by this loan. With regard to the item of rolling stock, he said that the Order in Council was signed or passed immediately after Sir Charles Tupper left. It is quite true it was signed then, but the arrangement was come to with Sir Charles Tupper. I returned the 1st of May, he was temporarily absent, and I signed the Order in Council acting for him, but the whole thing was made up by him. It occurred in this way. The rolling stock was calculated in the first place by the Chief Engineer on the main line and branches, amounting to \$1,700,000. It was changed, and properly changed, so that they were only to furnish rolling stock for the main line. That made the difference between what was actually given and the estimate.

House divided on motion for third reading.

## YEAH :

## Messieurs

Allison,	Ferguson (Welland),	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,	McLelan,
Benoit,	Girouard,	Massue,
Billy,	Gordon,	Moffat,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Montplaisir,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Paint,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Pinsonneault,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hall,	Pope,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hesson,	Pruyn,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Riopel,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Robertson (Hastings),
Colby,	Kranz,	Ross,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Shanly,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Small,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Smyth,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Stairs,
Daly,	Lesage,	Tassé,
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Temple,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Townshend,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Mackintosh,	Wallace (Albert),
Dickinson,	Mackmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Dodd,	McWilliam (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dupont,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Westm'land).-77.
Farrow,	McDougall (C. Breton),	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Bernier,	Guay,	Mulock,
Blake,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Platt,
Burpee,	Holton,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Scrivner,
Cartwright,	Landerkin,	Somerville (Brant),
Casey,	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casegrain,	Laurier,	Springer,
De St. Georges,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Vail,
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Forbes,	McIsaac,	Weldon,
Geoffrion,	McMullen,	Wilson.-45.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

## WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means. He said: I desire to amend a resolution that was passed yesterday in which there was an error in the Excise duty. The resolution reads:

"Except that cigarettes or cut tobacco, when put up in packages weighing one-twentieth of a pound, or less, each shall pay a duty now twenty, thirty-five cents per pound, and damp or moist snuff, when containing over forty per cent of moisture, when put up in packages."

The word "except" is left out. This imposes a duty altogether different from that which was intended by the Inland Revenue Department. I ask the House to resolve itself again into Committee of Ways and Means to amend

Mr. POPE.

that resolution, and if the House concurs, then to refer the resolution to the committee upon the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that that course is at all regular. The committee cannot amend a resolution unless a resolution gets back to it. The resolution is concurred in, and then forms the subject of the Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. I have enquired into the practice in matters of this kind, and I am informed that if the House resolves itself again into Committee of Ways and Means, and adopts this resolution, when we go into Committee of the Whole upon the Bill containing the clause that has already been passed, I then move this resolution in the committee upon the Bill, with instructions to substitute it for the one which has been passed.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be that is the practice, but it is not the practice that the hon. gentleman stated to us. He asks us to go into Committee of Ways and Means to amend the resolution—that is what I object to. If what the hon. gentleman proposes to do is to go into Committee of Ways and Means to pass another resolution, it will be time enough for us to consider it when we see the Bill in committee.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps I was not as clear as I ought to have been, but that is what I intended to convey to the House.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. I propose to re-enact the whole resolution and substitute for the one we passed, the following:—

4. That it is expedient to impose upon all tobacco, as described in the first four paragraphs of section 248, of 48 Vic., c. 15:

On every pound twenty cents, except that cigarettes, or cut tobacco, when put up in packages weighing one-twentieth of a pound, or less, each, shall pay a duty of thirty-five cents per pound. And damp or moist snuff, when containing over forty per cent of moisture, when put up in packages of five pounds each, and over fourteen cents per pound actual weight.

On damp or moist snuff, when put up in packages of less than five pounds, on each pound twenty cents."

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain what the difference is between this and the resolution which we have passed.

Mr. BOWELL. The only difference between this and the resolution which we have passed is that if the resolution, as it was passed last night, remains upon the Statute Book, it would enable all snuff put up in five pounds packages to pay a duty of fourteen cents per pound, while that which is put up in larger packages would pay a higher rate of duty; consequently the effect would be that it could be all put up in these particular packages, and I am informed that it is the policy of the Department to prevent that. The present resolution will have this effect: Dry snuff now paying twelve, will pay twenty; that was the intention under the old resolution; moist snuff that now pays eight, will pay fourteen; wet snuff in small packages that now pays twelve, will pay twenty.

Mr. BLAKE. What does it pay under the resolution that we passed.

Mr. BOWELL:

"Packages weighing one-twentieth of a pound or less, each shall pay a duty now 20, 35 cents per pound, and damp moist snuff when containing over 40 per cent. of moisture, when put up in packages of less than five pounds each, 14 cents per pound actual weight."

This resolution was evidently drafted under a misapprehension of the law as it exists, because it does not convey the intention of the Department. When the resolution was placed in my hands, of course, I put it before the committee in that shape. It will be much clearer that way.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me quite different, as far as I can judge.

Mr. BOWELL. The difference is more particularly with reference to the weight of snuff, which is not mentioned at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I find wet snuff mentioned here, and it pays 20 cents on each pound. That, of course, is a different rate of duty from that which the resolution we have carried would ascribe to it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite new to the practice which is proposed to-day, and I do not at all intend to accede to it. It seems to me contrary to first principles that we should be called upon to-day, in the committee, to pass a resolution inconsistent with and contradictory of that which we have passed and concurred in, and which is the foundation of the Bill. I do not understand that the House can be called upon by an independent proceeding to pass another resolution, quite different in effect, and containing different provision from that which we agreed to the other day. It is a contradiction of our decision. Of course, our findings are not like those of the Medes and Persians, are not irreversible, but they must be changed. I can see it would be essential to get back the resolution which we have already passed and to amend that resolution, else, when we come to have this resolution reported, we shall have two different resolutions of varying import and effect upon the same subject matter, which seems to me to be a most extraordinary procedure. It may be the practice of Parliament, but it is certainly inconsistent with the general practice of Parliament, with logic or with common sense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It almost looks as if we ought to put both these resolutions in although they are utterly contradictory, and then strike out one. I do not remember any similar case to this occurring before. No doubt these resolutions in Ways and Means have been altered time and again, but they had already been got to the stage of the second reading of the Bill, which makes all the difference in the world. The proceedings with respect to all these money Bills require to be carefully studied, and although I do not want to embarrass the hon. Minister of Customs there is, it seems to me, no escape from the dilemma stated by the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like your ruling on the point of order, with the authority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understand the member for West Durham objects to the resolution now before the committee as being out of order, the committee having already had a resolution on the same subject before it. It is true a resolution has been passed by the Committee of Ways and Means on this subject; but this is intended to increase the duty, and it varies the other resolution in that way. The rule that I consider brings this within the authority of the committee at the present time is this:

"But every new duty must be voted in committee. So strictly is the rule enforced which requires every new duty to be voted in committee that even where the object of a Bill is to reduce duties, and the aggregate amount of duties will in fact be reduced, yet if any new duty, however small, be imposed, or any existing duty be increased in the proposed scale of duties, such new or increased duty must be voted in committee either before or after the introduction of the Bill." (May, 687; 19 English Commons Journal, 330.)

Also:

"But it must always be borne in mind that any duty or increase of duty must be previously voted in Committee of Ways and Means, and then referred with instructions to the Committee on the Bill." (155 English Hansard, 991; 132 English Commons Journal, 112.)

This resolution is in fact an increase of duty and is a proposition which comes regularly before the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. The resolutions which were read are quite distinct and clear, and no one complains of them. If a new duty is proposed to the House of Commons it must be voted

in Committee of Ways and Means. If it is an existing duty according to the law of the land which it is proposed to increase, and that is the increased duty spoken of, it also must be proposed and voted in Committee of Ways and Means. That does not at all affect the question whether having this Session made a determination as to what the duties shall be and having a resolution on our records and embodied in a Bill we can with that unaltered propose another duty, which is another and a conflicting duty. The new duty and the increase of duty spoken of are duties to make a change in the law of the land as it now stands, either to make a duty or increase a duty, but not in the slightest degree affecting the general rule of Parliament, which is that two inconsistent propositions may not be assented to at the same time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not in any way an inconsistent proposition. At the very first meeting of the House of Commons we may vote that a certain duty shall be placed upon an article. Subsequently exigencies may arise, which may require an additional duty to be imposed. We may raise the duty half a dozen times during any given time, and no doubt precedents to that effect can be found.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not say that the duty may not be raised. I say there is a general rule that we cannot do it in this way.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The resolution is that 5 cents shall be added and there is a proposal of 20 cents, and altogether the duty would be made 32 cents.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the resolution is in order on the ground I have stated, and it is competent, as no resolution is yet embodied in the Bill finally passed in this House—that it is competent for the committee to increase the duty.

Resolution reported.

On the question that the resolution be considered,

Mr. BLAKE. On Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will postpone prorogation another day.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it will. There is such a thing as more haste and less speed. The hon. gentleman is some times very slow and sometimes a little too quick. The Minister of Customs was a little too quick in introducing his Bill the other day before he knew what was in it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman's extra quickness will throw us over a day.

Mr. BLAKE. The laws and constitution of Parliament throw us over a day.

Mr. BOWELL. I wish the hon. gentleman distinctly to understand that I did not introduce the Bill not knowing what was in it. I knew the resolutions that were passed. It was subsequently found by the officers whose duty it is to administer the law, that they had made an error in drafting the resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. So the hon. gentleman was willing to change it.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. I am not like the hon. gentleman who never changes his opinions; I have not arrived at that stage of perfection yet.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—Subsidy..... \$2,800,000

Mr. POPE. That is the balance of the \$29,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think 10 per cent. was to be reserved until the work was completed.

Mr. POPE. Not on the subsidy, but on the loan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought there was a certain percentage reserved on the subsidy.

Mr. POPE. No, not on the subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state how many miles remain to be completed at the present time—how many miles are in such a state that they cannot be accepted just now.

Mr. POPE. There are about 200 miles to be completed. I think there are about 140 on which the track is laid and to be completed in October.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where do these 200 miles lie?

Mr. POPE. In the Selkirks and west of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At this present moment what is the position north of Lake Superior? Are the company actually running bi-weekly or tri-weekly trains?

Mr. POPE. They are not running trains; they are doing so much ballasting and that kind of work that they cannot run trains yet, but they expect to run them in October.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What information does the hon. gentleman possess as to when they will be able to run trains from end to end?

Mr. POPE. I could not fix a time earlier than October.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect it then?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was to have given some information asked for by the hon. member for West Durham, touching a certain deviation of part of the road which was swept away, or was in danger of being swept away by an avalanche, and as to what length would have to be substituted.

Mr. POPE. There will be a change in the road of about 18 miles. The engineer reported that the further he considers the matter, the better he likes the change; that it will prevent, at all events, all bad snow slides and things of that kind, and will be a better road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister to say that 18 miles comprises the total amount of new road, or that 18 was the distance added?

Mr. POPE. That is the new road. About 3½ miles is the additional distance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know the grade along these 18 miles?

Mr. POPE. About 160 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not along the whole 18 miles?

Mr. POPE. No; that is the maximum.

Mr. SHANLY. Are these 18 miles so far advanced in construction as to lead to the expectation of being finished this fall?

Mr. POPE. Yes, in October.

Intercolonial—Miscellaneous works..... \$6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very small amount considering the sums we have had to vote for the Intercolonial Railway. But again, although it appears to be of little use, I must call attention to the inexpediency of taking these little votes on capital account. Surely \$6,000 is hardly the sort of sum which should fairly go to

Mr. POPE.

capital account. In all cases where we make a charge to capital account, it should be for some important, definite, specific object.

Mr. POPE. That has always been the annual vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is just what I object to. When the hon. gentleman or his predecessor has got into a tight place in the management of the Intercolonial, the recourse has been to charge as much as has been wanted to capital account. The consequence has been—not solely from that cause, of course—that our Intercolonial capital account has swollen steadily by millions of dollars a year, of which these little items in the long run go to make up an appreciable part. A few years ago it amounted to \$36,000,000; it is now up to \$45,000,000, and I fully expect to see it up to \$50,000,000 within the next three or four years.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will see that any branches we build are charged to capital account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are not going to build branches with \$6,000.

Mr. POPE. I was speaking of capital account generally.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the items that make up this sum.

Mr. POPE. General expenses.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood it was on capital account; what are the items of the capital account?

Mr. POPE. It may not be expended, of course. It often happens that there are claims extending as far back as the time the road was built, and it is a proper thing to charge them to capital account. If they are large claims we will come to the House with them.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this \$6,000 to pay claims?

Mr. POPE. Anything of that kind.

Mr. MULOCK. What is meant by the term claim?

Mr. POPE. They might be land claims that remained unpaid; they might be damages for right of way, damages for water, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the nature of the indebtedness for which this \$6,000 is asked?

Mr. POPE. I say any small claims of that kind may be paid out of this sum. There may be larger claims brought before the House.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is asking for \$6,000 to be applied on capital account. There must be a foundation for his request. It will not do to say that there may be a case. The hon. gentleman gives us a suppositious foundation for his request, but before the House is asked for \$6,000 or any other sum to be expended on capital account, I think the committee has a right to know what it is for.

Mr. POPE. I have answered the hon. gentleman as well as I can.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has exhausted himself in this little effort. He says there may be cases, but his explanation is absolutely nothing; he does not mention any purpose for which this sum is asked, and I think the committee will not be justified in voting it when he tells us that he is absolutely unable to give us any statement of what is the nature of the account for which this money is asked. His deputy is there, and he could tell us. He has stated it may be this or that, but he has not told us what it is for.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought to understand that this is not a vote for actual work done,

but for cases which may arise during the year 1885-86. My hon. friend is not a prophet, and cannot foresee the necessity of a repair here or there or a small claim springing up, and in order to provide for future possibilities there is always a vote of this kind in our services.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be a very fair argument for asking for such a vote chargeable to income. I quite agree with the First Minister that in the working of a great railway like the Intercolonial Railway, these unexpected expenditures may occur; but although the sum is small, this principle of charging these sums to capital account is one I have thought it my duty to call the attention of the House to, because it is liable to abuse. The case is not on all fours with that of a private company. When a private company makes such additions to capital account, it has to pay interest on them; but in our case millions are added every year to capital account, and no sort of check or control is placed on the natural disposition of the administrators of the railway to gratify this or that locality. That is the reason I object to these charges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite understand the position taken by the hon. gentleman; and it is well worthy of every consideration whether the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, like any other finished work, should not be closed as much as possible, and should not be increased definitely for a number of years. But all we can say is that in this case we are following the practice which has obtained from the time the Intercolonial Railway was initiated until this time; but it is quite worth considering whether a change should not be made in this regard. But that is quite different from the argument of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that we should say what accidents might happen in 1885-86, and how this money should be applied. I hope there will be no accidents, but we should have the money if accidents should happen.

Mr. MULOCK. I would remind the First Minister that we are now in the fiscal year 1885-86, and I question if this \$6,000 is for any unexpected items. The capital account of the Intercolonial Railway has been increasing by millions of dollars, and is this item of \$6,000 the only item on capital account? If so, it has a peculiar significance. It is manifest that there is something in this item we do not understand. If the Minister says at present he has no idea whatever as to the application of this money well and good, we shall know about that next year; but I think there is a distinct object for this particular item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a "nigger in the fence," no doubt.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not mean that; but having regard to the gigantic nature of the work, it appears to be too small a sum to stand simply as a vote of credit.

Mr. McLELAN. There are other sums for capital account and they are stated; but with respect to what the Acting Minister of Railways has said as to the claims for the rights of way or other claims. I know as a matter of fact that there were very many owners who declined at the time the payments were made, to accept the sums awarded for right of way, on the ground that they were too small. I dare say there are a number of these sums standing out, and the owners may at any time come forward and say they will accept settlement, or their representatives may present themselves, and it would be unjust not to be able to meet them. Most of them are very small sums, and the hon. gentleman has taken this amount for a number of years to meet these incidental claims as they may arise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The words used are "miscellaneous works," not claims at all, and I question whether the Auditor General could pass a demand for damages when you take a vote for works. I see that, in the

Supplementary Estimates, an amount of \$53,000 is asked for, to pay contractors on the Intercolonial Railway the amounts decided by the commissioners.

Mr. MILLS. The argument of the First Minister would have had more force if we were voting Estimates for the future, but it so happens that the year for which this appropriation is made has closed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; this is for 1885-86.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister says, with regard to the capital account, that there is a great deal in the argument of my hon. friend. A few years ago, there were a number of second-hand cars purchased for the purpose of carrying coal, which were bought from some railway on the other side, and were found to be utterly useless, though they were to replace others that were worn out. That was charged to capital account, and, since my hon. friend retired, nearly \$10,000,000 have been added to capital account in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. In this way the capital account may be increased indefinitely. I can understand, where a few miles of new road are built, that that might be charged to capital account. I can understand that, where a large amount of stock or equipment is required, in addition to that usually used on the road, in consequence of increased traffic, that might be charged to capital account, although I think there is some doubt as to the propriety of adopting that course, but the Government have, during the past seven years, charged to capital account the repairs on their locomotives and the stock purchased to replace the stock already worn out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has always been done.

Mr. MILLS. He has not shown that it has always been done. It has been done since the hon. gentleman has had charge of the road, but it is a most improper proceeding, because it conveys an erroneous impression as to the actual expense for working the road for the year. The hon. gentleman has charged to capital, I think, \$1,400,000 during the past year, and I venture to say that no portion of that can properly be charged to capital account. We have gone forward from year to year largely increasing the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, so that, during the past seven years, that account has been increased by nearly \$10,000,000, which ought to have been charged to the ordinary expenses of the year in which they were made. If the hon. gentleman kept his accounts properly, if the capital account was closed and the expenses for repairs and renewals were charged to the ordinary cost of working the road, we would see exactly what the condition of the railway is, we would see how far it was from being a profitable enterprise, we would see how far in the location of the road the hon. gentleman sacrificed the public interest. But, in the way the accounts are made up, they are altogether illusory.

Mr. MULOCK. When I made my remarks, I did so in the line I took on account of what fell from the Acting Minister of Railways. He gave the committee to understand, in a vague way it is true, that this fund was to meet existing claims.

Mr. POPE. No, I did not.

Mr. MULOCK. He said it might be claims for right of way. Of course, all the right of way has been acquired many years ago, so that must be for the past. The First Minister has given another explanation. He says it is to pay for contingencies in the future. Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it is to pay for claims to be made for right of way not yet settled. The committee can draw its inference from all this as to the purpose for which this particular fund is to be voted. I think the explanations of the Minister of Marine established the fact that this item is to pay some indefinite liability in reference to the past which may be presented, and which may not; not for the

purpose of paying damages or anything in the future in regard to which no cause of action exists, which is the explanation the First Minister offered to the committee.

Mr. WELDON. Some time ago I made a motion in regard to return tickets. Has there been any action taken to extend the time within which return tickets are available? Complaints are still made in the papers in regard to that matter. I pointed out on a former occasion the inconveniences to which parties are subjected under the present regulation, and I had hoped the time would be extended.

Mr. POPE. The time has been more than doubled. We found the difficulty before was that they paid no attention to the time, but the time has been extended.

Mr. WELDON. There is another matter to which I wish to call attention. I hold in my hands a letter which I will read to the committee in regard to the carriage of coal from Spring Hill to St. John, as compared with other places. Here is the letter:

"DEAR SIR,—Will you please bring the following facts under the notice of the House as a specimen of the way we are protected in the Maritime Provinces. How is it that we in St. John are charged \$24.65 freight on a carload of coal from the Spring Hill mines a distance of about 164 miles, while a carload will be taken from Pictou to Quebec, a distance of 680 miles for \$10. You will see that this is not mere assertion as I have sent you the proofs.

"It is also true that we are charged as high or higher rates from St. John to places on this Intercolonial Railway, say a distance of 100 to 150 miles, than goods carried from Toronto and Montreal to Halifax. It does seem very unjust that we should be treated as aliens and foreigners when other portions of the Dominion have the full privileges of citizenship."

I may say that this is from a political supporter of the Government. Here is a bill of lading for \$24.65 on a car load of coal, which is a difference of \$14.65.

Mr. POPE. The rate to St. John for all manufacturers is the same, 85 cents a ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact cost per ton per mile on the Intercolonial Railway from Spring Hill to Quebec?

Mr. POPE. The distance is 560 miles. On a car load of 10 tons, the freight would be \$16 and some cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would hardly exceed a  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent per mile per ton, which is a very low rate. In England a  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per ton per mile is considered necessary to pay expenses of transport. Does this rate pay expenses?

Mr. POPE. We get  $\frac{3}{10}$  of a cent, and when our cars are loaded back that pays well. I think that rate just clears it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does that allow anything for repairs?

Mr. POPE. When our cars are loaded back, we have enough, at any rate, to pay the wear and tear.

Mr. WELDON. When the hon. member for West Durham moved for a return with reference to the Intercolonial Railway this Session, the hon. member for Megantic stated he understood coal was carried on the Intercolonial Railway from Pictou to Quebec at \$10 a car.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the case the hon. member for St. John has made out is so extravagant that it carries its own contradiction. The idea that a car load of coal should be charged \$24.65 from Spring Hill to St. John and only \$10 from Spring Hill to Quebec is so extremely absurd that there must be some mistake. If you will take the rate mentioned, you will find that the car load carried at \$10 must have been a hopper car of 6 tons and the other must have been a car containing 17 short tons.

Mr. MULLOCK.

Mr. VAIL. What is the difference between the rate for coal from Spring Hill to Quebec, and that from Pictou to Quebec? Could the hon. Minister say?

Mr. POPE. No, I could not.

Mr. SHANLY. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals puts the case very gently when he says that we make nothing out of three-tenths of a cent a mile, and that it is part of the price that we pay for the luxury of running a Government railway. I have always been entirely opposed to the practice of running Government railways, even although we beat all other companies in the lowness of our rates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to put a question to my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Shanly), because it bears closely upon the possible and probable future, not merely of this railway, but on a good many other questions of very grave importance. Would he, than whom nobody is better able to judge, say what he considers that such an article as coal might be carried for so as to clear expenses, making reasonable allowance for wear and tear, in his judgment? Three-tenths of a cent, as I gather from him, is too little. Now I tell him frankly why I want to get the information, because I do not wish to take him or the Minister by surprise. Very important questions are now arising in connection with the development of the North-West as to the conveyance of coal. If coal can be carried so as not to involve a loss at three-tenths of a cent on the Intercolonial Railway, where the grades are not very serious, it is quite clear that very moderate rates might be imposed—and I think in that ought to be imposed—in the North-West on the conveyance of coal along the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SHANLY. Do I understand my hon. friend to put that question to me?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. It is not regular, but I would like to have my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. SHANLY. I suppose it is the liberty allowed in committee. I do not care what the advantages of a road may be, I think  $\frac{3}{10}$  of 1 cent cannot possibly be otherwise than a losing rate. In fixing the rate at which to carry coal, you must first know what the characteristics of the road are. Upon a road of good characteristics  $\frac{3}{10}$  of 1 cent might do, but it would be a losing business upon a road of worse characteristics. We must be entirely guided by that. But I know that the characteristics of the Intercolonial Railway are such that it is impossible that coal or any other freight can be carried over it for  $\frac{3}{10}$  of 1 cent per ton-mile, and leave anything at all in the shape of profit.

Mr. PAINT. When Mr. Brydges was at Halifax the Chamber of Commerce put the question to him, when he had the management of the Intercolonial Railway: What are you going to do with the empty cars? He said he was going to carry coal back, that he would utilise them for that purpose. Well, I suppose that is what the Government are doing at present. But there is this in the way. There are a number of steamships carrying coal for something over \$1 a ton to Quebec and Montreal. There is rivalry.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand the Minister to say that three-tenths of a cent per ton-mile is the rate that has been charged for some time from the mines of the West? Has that been cut down?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman quite certain that three-tenths of a cent is the rate?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. What is the rate charged from Pictou to the Londonderry Steel Works?

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman say that there has been any change made in the rate he speaks of for two or three years past?

Mr. POPE. No. There is this difference: Our cars now carry 20 tons, and my hon. friend knows that when you carry 20 tons to the car you can do it for less than when you haul only 10 tons to the car. We have increased the capacity of our cars for the purpose of reducing the rate.

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). The Intercolonial Railway is not a commercial road, but it was built chiefly for the purpose of developing interprovincial trade. If three-tenths of a cent per ton-mile is a very low rate, I think we can find quite as low rates on some of the commercial roads in the United States. I have here an article from the *Mining Engineer*, of New York, of the 16th May, in reference to railway rates, which I will read:

"Some years ago a distinguished iron master, after examining this country and recognising the value of our magnificent deposits of coal and iron ore, expressed the opinion that the great distances to which our raw and manufactured material have to be transported, will always prevent effectual competition with the English works.

"No doubt our 'magnificent distances' are a serious drawback; but the minimum rate at which our railroads, canals, and grand lake and river systems of navigation can carry heavy freights was not appreciated and the influence of distance on price was correspondingly exaggerated.

"Coal, coke, grain and ore are charged the lowest rates, and some of the figures have reached a marvellous minimum. Some of the roads are to-day carrying grains from Chicago and St. Louis and other points at, it is said, from \$2 to \$2.50 per ton of 2,000 lbs. from 10 to 12½ cents the bushel. The distance from Chicago to New York harbor by the Pennsylvania Railroad is more than 1,100 miles, and by some of the shortest routes nearly 1,000 miles, so that the rate of nearly two mills per ton per mile has been reached. It is not claimed that the rate is remunerative as an average to be applied to all the freight moved; but some years ago, when economy in every item of cost had not attracted the attention or been practised as strictly as it now is, one of our best known engineers, at that time attached to a through road, showed conclusively that all over \$2 a ton that could be received for freights for empty cars returning from New York to Chicago would be net profit. At present there can scarcely be a doubt that the actual cost on long hauls over our best managed roads leaves a net profit on the two mill rate. It was shown in the *Engineering and Mining Journal*, a few months ago, that the 'pool prices' fixed by the railroad companies themselves for Cumberland and Clearfield coal would leave the main lines about three mills per ton-mile on a haul of a few hundred miles only, and we have since shown that the pool prices have been heavily 'cut' at the expense of the carrier.

"The anthracite roads have always collected heavier tolls; but when anthracite coal was sold here by auction in 1877, at a minimum average of \$2.35½ per gross ton f. o. b., some of the roads carrying on a percentage rate must have received less than one cent per ton-mile. The Reading reports show that its cost for hauling coal from the Schuylkill field to Port Richmond (about 100 miles) does not exceed one quarter of a cent per ton-mile; and there can be no doubt that the Reading, if once in strong financial position, could take the lion's share of the anthracite trade from all its rivals. The Grand Trunk Railway, though it was before the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, and roundly abused as a monopoly, carried iron ore on a rate of even less than half a cent a ton-mile, and coal at but little more."

Mr. McMULLEN. A return with respect to the character of coal on the Intercolonial was ordered three months ago, but it has not been brought down. Such a return would have furnished all necessary information. The grades and curves of a road have much to do with fixing the rates. There is no road in Canada over which freight can be so easily carried as the Canada Southern. If the grades on the Intercolonial were equally easy, coal could be carried at a low rate; but with grades and curves as at present a rate of ¾ of a cent per ton per mile entails a loss.

Mr. VAIL. A very large amount of money was due from the Londonderry Iron Works for freight. Has the amount been collected?

Mr. POPE. It has not all been collected, but it is all secured.

Mr. BLAKE. Has anything been done towards collecting the accounts for sidings to various factories, which sums

appear in the Public Accounts as amounts due to the Government?

Mr. POPE. There is some difference of opinion about the amounts.

Mr. BLAKE. In the Public Accounts they are represented as debts due. I want to know whether they have been adjusted?

Mr. POPE. My recollection is that they remain unsettled. Negotiations are going on with respect to them.

Mr. BLAKE. In view of the enormous profits made by establishments under the National Policy and the high prices charged for goods, it seems strange that these people should leave their just debts unpaid.

Applying air brakes to 100 engines..... \$ 73,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give some information.

Mr. POPE. Up to the present time we have had the ordinary brakes in use. We have found them not only expensive, but dangerous. Trains could not be stopped with them as quickly as with improved brakes. After a good deal of pressure brought to bear on the Government by those who patronised the road, we felt it to be in the interest of the country to obtain the most improved brakes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whose patent is to be used?

Mr. POPE. The Westinghouse.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman yielded to the pressure last year, for there is a large sum in the Public Accounts for the application of the Westinghouse air brake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An item of this kind should be taken out of ordinary income. To place charges for air breaks to capital account, which is supposed to represent permanent improvements, seems questionable policy.

Mr. BLAKE. How much has already been spent on the application of the Westinghouse air break?

Mr. POPE. I cannot state.

Mr. SHANLY. When these 100 engines are supplied with the air breaks, will that finish the equipment of all engines on the road?

Mr. POPE. All but 15.

Mr. BLAKE. How many engines are there on the road?

Mr. POPE. 160, I think.

Mr. VAIL. There were \$32,500 expended last year.

Mr. BLAKE. This is all charged to capital account.

Mr. POPE. This is a new thing, and we think it properly belongs to capital account. We have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite that in repairing rolling stock we charge it to capital account, but we do nothing of the kind. Our running power has gradually increased from \$1,000,000 in 1877, to \$2,170,868 this year; and as we require more rolling stock to keep pace with our traffic, we charge it to capital account.

Mr. BLAKE. You carry very little more, you have earned a little more money last year than the year before, but the increase in capital account goes rolling on.

Intercolonial Railway..... \$ 2,400,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the hon. gentleman has made certain alterations in the items. There is a decrease of \$100,000 in the charge for locomotive power, \$40,000 for maintenance, and \$30,000 for general charges, while there are increases of \$35,000 each on car

expenses, and station and train expenses. How is the saving on locomotive power to be effected?

Mr. POPE. I am informed that that is expected to result from the heavier new engines which we are putting on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you expect less traffic?

Mr. POPE. No; but we expect the greater power of the engines will enable us to do the traffic with less expense than we did before.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How many of these powerful engines have you got more than last year?

Mr. POPE. We have about 60.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Between last year and this? I notice that the expenditure was \$820,000 for last year and \$720,000 for this?

Mr. POPE. We got five or six new ones between last year and this, and the old ones have been put in very much better repair.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So each of these new and powerful engines is to save you \$20,000 a year?

Mr. POPE. We think, as the old engines are in so much better repair and we have so many new ones, that the traffic will cost us that much less.

Mr. BLAKE. It is pretty difficult to apprehend from the hon. gentleman's statements, what the real condition of things is. A little while ago, the hon. gentleman made a statement, which had often been made by Sir Charles Tupper, namely, that the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway was always kept up to the handle—that the engineers were not allowed to fall back at all, and this was done at the expense of revenue. Now he says that he is going to save \$100,000 this year on locomotive power, because the engines are in so much better repair than last year, so it would appear that they were in a state of disrepair last year. If you have 160 engines or so in the regular course of things, some of them will be wearing out more or less, occasionally one will get smashed from accidents, and so on. But as I understand the rule of the road is that whenever an engine gets behind in efficiency and requires repair, or when an accident happens, the engine is taken in and made right again. If this is so, I do not see how they could have been so much worse last year than this, that you will save \$100,000 on locomotive expenses.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows that when an engine gets old and is in its last day, it costs more to keep it in repair than a new one. The Minister states that he has put out of use a number of these old engines, and is getting new ones, and the expenses required to keep these new ones up to the standard will be much less than the old ones, which were finally condemned and put out of use, and therefore there will be a less expenditure for locomotive power.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman knows that an estimate is one thing and actual expenditure is another. Last year we actually expended \$750,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have the expenses then up to the 1st of July. We would like to know the scale of expenses up to that date.

Mr. POPE. We have not got it.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman said a moment ago that it was \$750,000 and he must have it or he could not have stated it. He could not have been prophesying when he told us the exact expenditure.

Mr. POPE. We have not got it this year. I gave the hon. gentleman what it was the year before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The normal expenditure seems to be about that amount all the time. In 1883 it was \$767,062, so that the hon. gentleman last year took \$60,000 more than the normal amount, and now he claims to be saving so much.

Mr. POPE. I cannot speak as to 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. Could the hon. gentleman state the average price of coal supplied to the Intercolonial Railway last year for locomotive purposes.

Mr. POPE. I am informed about \$2.70.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is impossible. When I left office I let several contracts at \$1.59.

Mr. POPE. The figure I gave includes handling, and so forth.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it supplied under contract?

Mr. POPE. It is now.

Mr. BLAKE. With several mining establishments or with one?

Mr. POPE. Two this year.

Mr. BLAKE. Was any tender made?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And is the coal delivered at the pit mouth and handled by the Intercolonial Railway from the pit mouth, or how is that?

Mr. POPE. It is delivered at the junction on the Intercolonial Railway cars.

Mr. BLAKE. Which mines have the contract?

Mr. POPE. The Spring Hill and the Pictou.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the contract price?

Mr. POPE. The Pictou mine, \$1.55, and the other, \$1.83.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the price which the Intercolonial Railway pays for the coal is \$1.55 and \$1.83, but the price at which it is charged in the working expenses is \$2.73, the difference being the estimated cost of handling. Of course, there would be the cost of putting it into the Intercolonial cars at the pit. The cost of transporting it to the point of consumption, and the cost of loading it from time to time into the engine on which it was consumed; but how this would amount to \$1.18 a ton I cannot understand.

Mr. POPE. It is calculated that the transport costs 50 cents, and the handling 87 cents more.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the average of the mileage of that 50 cents haul?

Mr. POPE. I could not say; the calculation is made over the whole road.

Mr. PAINT. What is the total yearly consumption?

Mr. POPE. I think the contract for this year was for 140,000 tons.

Mr. SHANLY. I presume the whole road is now worked by coal?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Eastern Extension Railway ..... \$ 75,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the special reason for separating this? Is it not part of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. POPE. It never has been included in the Intercolonial Railway, because we have been operating it for a short time, and we may not, perhaps, operate it very long; I do not know as to that. If I had put the accounts together, I have no doubt the hon. member for West Durham would

have complained, and I have separated them to accommodate him.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the good bargain we made in Nova Scotia. I think we paid \$1,284,000 for this road.

Mr. POPE. For the other railway with it—the Pictou Branch.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. We had the Pictou Branch; and now this line costs us something like \$75,000 a year to work it, and the receipts of the road do not equal the \$75,000; so that there is a deficiency in the working of the road, besides the interest on the investment. Then the hon. gentleman said he did not know that we were going to have it very long. That is a hopeful and assuring statement after the account the hon. gentleman gives. Has he made a new contract with the Short Line Company to part with this valuable piece of property?

Mr. POPE. None made yet.

Mr. BLAKE. What premium does he expect to have to pay in order to become relieved from this white elephant of his?

Mr. POPE. I thought the hon. gentleman said relieved from the eloquence. The hon. gentleman has not treated this matter very fairly. We purchased the road at very much less than it cost the Nova Scotia Government; but we also purchased the Truro Branch, which is a good paying piece of road, and I contend we made a good purchase. I do not expect to make much money out of the running of this road, nor do I expect to lose anything. I think when we took it over it lacked something like \$2,000 of paying expenses; but I think it is now paying, and the Pictou Branch will pay about \$30,000.

Mr. VAIL. I hope when the hon. Minister makes an arrangement with a company to take this line, he will remember that the Local Government paid a large subsidy to this road, and will give a *quid pro quo* for it.

Prince Edward Island Railway..... \$ 210,000

Mr. BLAKE. What is the price of coal carried over the line?

Mr. POPE. \$2.70, delivered on the Island by the mining company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the annual deficit in working the road.

Mr. POPE. About \$90,000.

Windsor Branch Railway..... \$ 20,000

Mr. POPE. The profits and cost of maintenance about balance.

Lachine Canal..... \$ 300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the policy of the Government as to this?

Mr. POPE. \$300,000 is a re-vote. To pay final estimate, section 11, \$82,000; spring bridge at Cote St. Paul \$6,000; St. Gabriel basin, \$69,000; chains and booms and additional work in basin \$20,000; settling claims of arbitration, etc., \$111,500. This will close the account for Lachine.

Cornwall Canal..... \$106,000

Mr. POPE. This is a re-vote also. It is to be expended on the works at the upper entrance; a channel made and the construction of a new lock and weir, estimated to cost \$400,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was any part deepened to 12 feet?

Mr. POPE. Yes; this gave a depth of 12 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All through the canal?

Mr. POPE. No; that will be done in the future. \$106,000 is all we want for this year.

Williamsburg Canal—Construction of entrance  
and lock at head of Rapide Plat Canal..... \$ 120,000

Mr. POPE. This is for work at the head of Rapide Plat Canal, which is estimated to cost \$250,000. The deepening of the channel at the entrance is estimated to cost \$80,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the object of building these locks? Unless the Government intend to proceed with the enlargement of the Beauharnois, the Cornwall and other canals, there is no object in building these two locks there.

Mr. POPE. The reason for building these at this particular place is that there was less water there than at any other point on the St. Lawrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth will this give?

Mr. POPE. Fourteen feet on the mitre sill. I felt so strongly that the hon. member for East York was always right that I have carried out his policy.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My policy has not been carried out. We should wait for the discussion of the entire system, whether it is to be deepened to 12 or 14 feet, before doing anything of this kind. The hon. gentleman is aware that the revenue from canals has been decreasing instead of increasing, and now the trade demands the abrogation of all canal tolls, and we are proposing to incur works which are unnecessary unless they are required as part of a complete system. I think the action of the Government is premature.

Mr. POPE. I think it is very desirable that this should be deepened. We have done nothing more than is necessary for the trade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some little time ago, the Minister, or his predecessor, stated that further examinations were going on over the whole of the St. Lawrence channel from Kingston downwards, and that he expected to lay on the Table a statement showing what the estimate of the cost of deepening the channel to 12 or 14 feet would be. Has that work been proceeded with, and has the hon. gentleman got any information on the subject? In my hon. friend's time, there was a great deal of doubt and dispute as to what the cost would be, but that is a good many years ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course a considerable sum has been spent in the Galops Rapids since then.

Mr. POPE. I have not the latest estimate, but I will bring it down to the hon. gentleman.

Welland Canal..... \$ 500,000

Mr. SHANLY. I would ask the hon. Acting Minister of Railways and Canals if this \$500,000 for the Welland Canal is estimated to be enough to give the 14 feet depth throughout.

Mr. POPE. No, it is not estimated that it will complete 14 feet throughout but it makes a beginning.

Mr. SHANLY. It will be money well expended. We have never yet had the full benefit of the Welland Canal enlargement. The largest vessels now in use on Lake Erie and the other "upper" Lakes draw 14 feet. In fact there are no vessels of 12 feet draft, which is the present available depth of the Welland Canal, because vessels will not be built specially to suit that work in its present incomplete state. We must, as it were, do away with the natural barrier separating Lake Erie from Lake Ontario by giving such depth to the canal as will allow of the largest vessels descending into Ontario, and every dollar we expend to that end on the Welland Canal is, in my opinion, much better applied than what we are expending on the river below the foot of lake navigation. No matter to what depth

we make the river and St. Lawrence Canals navigation available there will still always be transshipment from lake to river vessels. Therefore the Welland Canal should be deepened as speedily as possible so as to allow the largest vessels to pass down to where river navigation begins. Transshipment will almost always be the rule at that point because it will pay best to transship. A small tug can take through the river part of the route to Montreal the cargoes of two large propellers put into barges. For the propellers with their powerful engines to be put to do the river work would be a use less waste of power; putting a man to do a boys work. Some years ago when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of the Public Works Department he very wisely took steps that the two entrances to the canal should be at once constructed for a depth of 14 feet. Increasing the depth throughout now between the two end, or "water," locks is rather a question of raising the banks than lowering the bottom of the canal. While the enlargement of the Welland Canal was being debated at that time I was absent from Canada, residing in the United States, but taking the interest I have never ceased to take in our canal navigation I addressed a letter on the subject to the Hon. Mr. Kirkpatrick, the present Speaker, and from that letter he read a portion which I find reported as follows in the *Hansard* of that year:

"The Welland Canal never can perform its proper functions so long as larger vessels can put in at Buffalo than can come down to Kingston, and it seems really too bad, with our long canal experience in Canada, the improvements now entered upon should be deliberately planned on an imperfect and insufficient model. I have always contended that until the foot of Lake Ontario be made for Montreal what the foot of Lake Erie is to New York—the great transshipping point from lake to lake (and river) craft—we never will be in a position to compete on equal terms—where we should be able to do so on much better terms—with Buffalo."

I also find, looking over some documents relating to the same subject, that about 1873, I think it was, a large number of vessel-owners submitted a memorandum to the then Minister of Public Works, in which they said:

"We are fully certain that the tolls on the tonnage of vessels and their cargoes, that will pass the Welland Canal on a draught of 14 feet of water, over and above what will pass if the draught is restricted to 12 feet only, will more than meet the interest at 5 per cent., and a sinking fund of 1 per cent. on the amount necessary, say \$1,000,000 or more, required to deepen the canal and harbors at the extremities to the desired depth."

The same memorandum states that the forwarders and owners of vessels would be willing to pay twice as much per ton for canal tolls in a vessel drawing 14 feet of water as they would be willing to pay where vessels were restricted to 12 feet draft.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is precisely with that object that the late Government did take steps to make the Welland Canal 14 feet. I know it was my hon. friend's intention at the earliest possible moment to give 14 feet depth to the Welland Canal. That bears very forcibly, however, on the whole question as to the wisdom of some of these expenditures immediately after discussion.

Mr. SHANLY. Expenditures at other points?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend's contention is right, and speaking personally I have always thought that there was an immense deal in it—not merely for the reasons my hon. friend has stated, but because it is constantly known to the trade that barges are used as floating warehouses which these large vessels cannot be, except at great expense, when they come down from Montreal. We ought to be careful about undertaking the expenditure of large sums of money for the deepening of the water way between Kingston and Montreal, and it is in that direction that I was enquiring from the Acting Minister of Railways as to the estimated cost, and what general determination the Government had come to, because, although there was good reason, I suppose, to finish the Cornwall and Lachine

Mr. SHANLY.

Canals, there can be no good reason for constructing locks at 14 feet at points like Williamsburgh.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The deepening of the Lachine Canal was practically to extend the harbor of Montreal.

Mr. SHANLY. Quite true, and very properly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was no difficulty at all about the necessity of having 14 feet depth of water. I am exceedingly pleased that my hon. friend from Grenville has expressed himself as he has about the inutility of enlarging the other canals at the present moment. The existing locks are quite large enough for barges. If we have to depend upon them, as I think we must, in the transmission of grain to a large extent, enlarging these locks to the size of the Welland, seems to me at present out of place. I am sorry I am not able to express myself more fully.

Mr. VAIL. I observed the other day a statement that the Government have lowered the canal tolls, which, if true, is a matter of considerable importance when large appropriations are being made for the improvement of the canal system. Now, if we are going on expending money from year to year on these canals, and if we are going to give up the tolls on them, I should like to know where we are going to get a return for the money expended. I have no doubt that the improvement of the canals will increase the trade to a certain extent, but at the same time we ought to consider that promises were made when this money was voted, that a fair return should be made to the country for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to understand from the Minister whether it is already determined upon to commence the work.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Digby. If the Government think proper to lower the tolls in order to benefit the trade of the country and get the trade of the North-West to come by the St. Lawrence, I am sure the country at large will be benefited in other ways. I am an old man, but I hope to live to see the day when the canals of this country will do a much larger business than they are doing now. Then we must also consider the question of the elevation of grain at Kingston, the cost of which would have to be added to the expense of taking grain from that port to Montreal. I believe that the deepening of the St. Lawrence will cost an immense amount of money, and we should pause before we undertake it. But I am sure that the Welland Canal ought to be deepened to 14 feet, and then we should raise the locks from Thorold to Lake Ontario, which, I believe, can be done with \$1,000,000, and could be completed by the opening of the navigation in 1887. I am satisfied that if the Welland canal is improved, it will pay, whether the Government refuses to give the people a free toll or not.

Mr. VAIL. We were told in this House over and over again when these appropriations were asked for, and when we were asking for small sums for the Maritime Provinces, that this canal expenditure would be returned to us. But we have had no return, and now it is proposed to increase the expenditure.

Mr. SHANLY. This question of canal tolls will be more keenly agitated from year to year. It is impossible to look at the canal returns without confessing, however humiliating it may be, that after the large expenditures we have made, at this moment our canal system stands a failure. The hon. member for Digby asks how are we going to get a return for our large outlay without charging tolls. I say that if we were doing the largest trade that could possibly be done through the canals, the tolls collected would still be the smallest part of the benefit the country would derive from the canals. Therefore, I say, that in the present state of the canal trade—and it cannot well be worse—if we can increase our trade by throwing off the tolls altogether, I, for

one, would heartily go for throwing them off. It is in the increased trade that the country really is to get a return for the expenditure.

Mr. VAIL. Will the Minister tell me what the reduction has been, and what the rate is at present.

Mr. POPE. It is two cents a ton now, and it was twenty before.

Murray Canal..... \$170,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to have full information about the position of work on the Murray canal. The work should have been in a much more forward state than it is. The quantity of work to be done is comparatively small, and I think it was four years ago that a sum on that account appeared in the Estimates. It is the opinion in certain sections of the neighborhood that an error has been made in the locality chosen. I should be glad to know what further information the hon. gentleman has on the subject.

Mr. POPE. I have no further information on the subject. The contract was let on 4th August, 1882. The amount was \$1,140,655. In 1884, \$286,100 were paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When is the contract period for completion?

Mr. POPE. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought it was to be completed before this date. How many feet of water will there be?

Mr. PLATT. Is the cost of dredging Presqu'île harbor to be paid out of this vote?

Mr. POPE. It is part of this contract.

Mr. PLATT. Have the contractors undertaken the dredging of the harbor or did the Government let the contract to the contractors who are at present doing the work.

Mr. POPE. The contract was let for the whole work including the dredging.

Mr. BOWELL. The contractors for the whole work let the dredging to Mr. Murray, of St. Catharines. The cost of the work is not separated. The dredging of the harbor will cost from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Mr. POPE. The depth of water required is 11 feet. I have been informed by persons engaged in the navigation of the Bay of Quinte that it did not allow a depth of more than 10 feet.

Mr. BOWELL. 12 feet at the lowest point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is well known that the water falls in particular seasons very much lower than the average; and if the canal is to admit a depth of 11 feet, care should be taken that the navigation in the bay should exceed that.

Mr. POPE. The report of the chief engineer is that there is a depth of 12 feet in the bay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has anything been done of late years to remove shoals and obstructions?

Mr. BOWELL. Not for seven or eight years. The bay was sounded by an engineer when this question was under consideration. There are two points at which there is low water. One, at Nigger Island, where there is a lighthouse, and the other just below Trenton. But the depth of water at those points was 12 feet.

Mr. PLATT. The report of Mr. Page says that 11 feet is all that can be depended on, and Mr. Rubidge states that 11 feet is all that can be depended on without incurring considerable expense in improving several places in the bay.

Mr. BOWELL. That will be when the lake is low.

Mr. PLATT. Yes; at present there are 12 or 13 feet. Has the hon. Minister any report of the progress of con-

struction, of the difficulties met with in the progress of the works, and as to whether time is undoing what the Department has been doing for the last few years? Will the hon. gentleman tell me in what way the payments are made to the contractors, in proportion to the work done, and how does the Minister obtain a knowledge of the number of yards excavated?

Mr. POPE. We obtain it from the engineer.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). That is always done by cross-sectioning previous to the work being done, and then cross-sectioning afterwards.

Mr. PLATT. What I want to find out, is, whether the contractors are paid for the amount of excavation, or for the number of excavated yards they remove.

Mr. POPE. I am told it is the excavation that is paid for. It is like any other work, of course the engineer takes cross-sections and then afterwards he measures up the work.

Mr. PLATT. Last year a certain amount of excavation was done for which a certain amount was paid. This spring it was found that nearly half of the work had to be re-excavated. Will that have to be paid for twice.

Mr. McCALLUM. I suppose that it is like any other contract, the engineer will take his soundings and as the work is done, he will measure up the excavation on the scows by progress estimates. The filling in would I suppose be a question of damages.

Mr. PLATT. If the contractors are to be paid for the re-excavating as fast as the sand fills in, it will cost us from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000, as the sand is filling in very rapidly during the winter and early spring, there being sometimes as much as 50 to 100 cubic feet in a single movement. I would suggest that, under these circumstances, something should be done to protect the canal from the influx of this moveable sand, and that the Government should make immediate enquiry as to the character of the work. Something has been said with regard to the depth of the canal, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, if any representations have been made as to the width of 80 feet at the bottom and 100 feet at the top being sufficient.

Mr. POPE. I may say that both of our engineers have reported that the sand is not filling in, and that it was all a mistake. Mr. Page also gives his opinion that it is wide enough. Mr. Page and Mr. Rubidge both say that it should not be wider. Of course everybody likes a wide canal. At the same time, our engineers report that 80 feet is enough for the business of the canal.

Mr. PLATT. We do not know how much the business will be, but the object of having it, say 150 feet wide, would be to prevent it filling up so rapidly by the sand. This canal has been the result of very much agitation, but the original promoters had better grounds for urging on the Government that it should be made than those who have urged its construction in later years. The hon. member for Grenville has told us that the character of the vessels doing our lake trade has changed so much of late years that even a 12-foot canal is comparatively valueless at the present time. I find that in Mr. Page's report of 1867, he says:

"The principal reason urged in favor of a canal connection between Lake Ontario and the Bay of Quinté, is the advantage which it would confer on commerce by enabling vessels of the class which navigate the lake to avoid the dangers in the vicinity of Long Point during the stormy seasons of the year, by passing through the comparatively sheltered waters of the Bay of Quinté. In order to secure this, the draft of water, should be at least equal to that of the Welland canal, through which vessels drawing 10½ feet can pass. This would render it necessary to take advantage of the full available depth of the Bay of Quinté, which, as before stated, would be 10 feet at the very lowest water, and fully 11 feet at ordinary low stages of the bay and lake."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we find it necessary to deepen the Welland Canal to 14 feet, or 3 feet deeper than it is, intended to make the Murray Canal. Again Mr. Page says:

"It will be observed that the reasons referred to as having been urged in support of this undertaking are entirely of a commercial nature, and though evidently of considerable importance, it may be questioned whether the advantages which the work if executed would confer upon the general navigation would warrant so large an expenditure."

The expenditure referred to was \$860,000 instead of, as at present, \$1,265,000. In view of these circumstances and of the changes which have taken place in the character of the vessels which navigate the lakes, it is important that nothing should be done to lessen the comparatively small advantages which are expected from the construction of this canal. As to the question of width, this canal is constructed without locks, and it is expected to be kept open by the current of water flowing from bay to bay, and the engineers think that with a width of 80 feet this will not be sufficient to keep it clear, and if we are to keep a dredge there constantly, in order to keep that canal in working order, or at a sufficient depth for these large vessels, the expense will be all the greater. The probabilities are that at the time the early promoters of this canal were urging its construction, it would have accommodated three-fifths of the number of vessels navigating the lake. It is doubtful now if it will accommodate more than two-fifths or one-half of the class of vessels Mr. Page mentions in his report. There is no use of talking of deepening the canal unless you deepen a large portion of the Bay of Quinté. Therefore, I do not entertain any very brilliant ideas as to the future usefulness of the Murray Canal. I hold that its usefulness has, to a great extent, been destroyed by the route the Government saw fit to choose. I do not intend to protract the discussion, only in order that information may be given to the House as to the character of the report upon which the Government based their decision as to the route. We recently heard a great deal about the liberty that was taken by members of this House in criticising the acts and reports of Government engineers. I do not intend to criticise the acts and reports of the engineer who made the last survey, but I wish to point out that the representations made in the Order in Council of the 23rd of May, 1882, upon which the present route of the Murray Canal was accepted, were made entirely from the report of Mr. Rubidge. A prior survey had been made by Mr. Page, and I want to point out some of the contradictions in these reports. The Minister, in making his recommendation to Council, on the 23rd of May, 1882, says:

"That from such report it appears that of the points examined with a view to their adaptability as a port of entrance from Lake Ontario, specifically the points known as Weller's Bay and Presqu'Isle, Presqu'Isle is by far the most commodious and best harbor on the coast, having excellent anchorage and enabling a large number of vessels to lie land-locked, secure from all winds; further, that the route having this harbor as its western terminus is the one best adapted to the requirements of an extended river navigation."

Now, the words in Mr. Rubidge's report, on which, I suppose, that recommendation is founded, are these:

"And the fact of its being longer than the No. 2 route, should not be deemed a serious objection, inasmuch as the excess in distance between the bay and the open water of Lake Ontario lies through the land-locked harbor of Presqu'Isle."

Speaking of the same point, Mr. Page, the chief engineer, says:

"Were the channel through Presqu'Isle harbor made, the unavoidable difficulties to be encountered in navigating it would still present an insuperable objection to the adoption of route No. 1."

Now, we have the two engineers directly contradicting each other as to the character of Presqu'Isle harbor. Upon this same point Mr. Rubidge says:

"The larger class of propellers which run in for shelter usually anchor off Calf Pasture light. A vessel bound down the lake, and desiring to enter Presqu'Isle harbor by the new channel, must alter the course about 100°."

Mr. PLATT.

Now, let us see what Mr. Page, who, I suppose, is an engineer of equal ability, says on the same subject. He says:

"A vessel approaching Presqu'Isle must, before getting in range of the inner lights, with a view to entering the harbor, change its course fully 270 degrees, which, in certain winds, it is barely possible to do. When up with Salt Point the course must again be changed to north-westerly, so as to clear 'Calf Pasture shoal' and enter the wider portion of the harbor; in fact, the direction of the entrance, crookedness and insufficient width of the channel, are found by masters of vessels to prove serious obstacles to its being used either as a harbor of refuge or for commercial purposes."

Mr. McCALLUM. What date is that?

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Page's report was made in 1867, and Mr. Rubidge's in the fall of 1881. Of course, the answer will probably be that certain changes have taken place; the chief argument is, that the entrance to Weller's Bay is a changeable channel; but Mr. Rubidge proves that the entrance to Presqu'Isle is likewise a changeable channel.

Mr. BOWELL. No, he does not.

Mr. PLATT. Yes, he does; I will show you. The Minister represents:

"That the total length of the canal proper *via* Weller's Bay is 4 miles 680 feet, while the length *via* Presqu'Isle, is 6 miles 660 feet, or a difference in favor of Weller's Bay, in point of length, of 2 miles. This difference is not, however, held to be of weight, inasmuch as the excess by the Presqu'Isle route lies through the land-locked harbor of that place."

Now, I have here a report, as to which time cannot make any difference. Mr. Rubidge says:

"A comparison of distances from a point in the lake (*viz.*, E.S.E.,  $\frac{1}{2}$  east, half a mile from the main light), which may be taken as common to the navigation into Presqu'Isle harbor and Weller's Bay, shows that the distance from the point mentioned *via* Weller's Bay to the Bay of Quinté is 7.37 miles, whilst that *via* Presqu'Isle harbor is 9.81 miles, showing a difference of 2.44 miles (or 25 per cent.) in favor of Weller's Bay."

Now, what does Mr. Page say as to that? He says:

"A comparison of distances from a point in the lake which may be taken as common to the navigation into Presqu'Isle harbor and Weller's Bay, shows that the length from this point *via* the harbor and route No. 1 to the Bay of Quinté would be fully twice that *via* Weller's Bay to the outlets of either routes No. 2 or No. 3.

"Weller's Bay, however, lies in the direct line of the proposed navigation, and has now the full depth required; whereas the entrance to route No. 1 lies entirely out of that line, and can only be approached by a circuitous channel, to be dredged through Presqu'Isle harbor. It therefore appears that the distance from the mouth of the latter to the Bay of Quinté in route No. 1 should be compared with that from the Weller's Bay entrance to routes Nos. 2 and 3 to the Bay of Quinté. This would show the length *via* the former route to be about three times greater than that by either of the other two."

Now, there we have a direct contradiction of the representations of the Minister when he laid this matter before the Council. The Minister tells the Council that the cost of an 80-foot wide canal *via* Presqu'Isle would be \$721,000, and that the cost of the same kind of a canal by the Weller's Bay route would be \$1,229,000. We find that already a mistake was made in the estimate, because the Council decided on a canal to cost \$721,000, whereas the present estimate is \$1,260,000. A comparison being made with the cost of the Weller's Bay canal, which was estimated at \$1,229,000. Mr. Page's estimate for that canal was \$860,000, and the Government must have had this report before their eyes at the time they made their selection, and I merely point out that in the matter of cost a representation was made to the Council which the facts do not bear out nor justify. These representations were made to the Governor in Council by the Minister:

"That with reference to the route *via* Weller's Bay, it appears to be a fact, from the evidence obtained, that the channel across the bar at that place is of a shifting character, and that its position or direction is not to be depended on after a storm; also, that while the harbor affords good holding ground and deep water, it gives no shelter from the heavy sea rolling in from the lake before south-westerly or westerly gales."

I believe the report of Mr. Rubidge justifies those remarks, so far as the bay is concerned; but Mr. Page, in his report, says of Weller's Bay:

"In 1857 this opening (speaking of the opening in Weller's Bay) is represented to be 100 rods wide, with a channel 150 feet wide and 14 feet in depth; and in 1861 the channel appears to have been 200 feet in width and a depth of fully 14 feet.

"It will thus be seen that from the time when the opening was first made the channel has continued to increase in width."

Mr. Rubidge says:

"It is not improbable that this bar may continue increasing to such an extent as to cause the beaches to unite opposite the cove, in which case Weller's Bay will once more become a lagoon."

Here they are complaining of the shifting sand and the shifting of that entrance to such an extent as to make it unreliable, when the chief engineer tells us the depth is 14 feet and the channel has increased in width.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not that being accomplished now by the action of the water? Is not the entrance to Weller's Bay being narrowed down by the action of the waves and the shifting sands?

Mr. PLATT. I have heard no report to that effect.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why did you want the lighthouses changed?

Mr. PLATT. I will deal with that presently. With regard to the shifting sands, here is what the chief engineer says:

"From what could be ascertained as to the original line of the beach and ridge, it appears that the action of the lake has been such as to carry the sand, of which it is composed, from its original position, and deposit it in such a manner as to increase the width of the bank without materially encroaching upon the area of the bay.

"The fact that the sand has not, so far, been deposited to any extent in the bay, is evident from the material in the bottom consisting of clay, with no stratum of sand over it."

These are Mr. Rubidge's remarks regarding the action of the water:

"By this it will be seen that the action of the lake has been such as to carry the material of which the beach was composed and deposit a great part thereof in deep water inside the bar (where was formerly good anchorage), thereby greatly increasing its width and encroaching upon the bay."

The sand does not encroach upon the bay. Every practical man who has taken soundings has failed to find a stratum of sand there. Thus we see the chief engineer, Mr. Page, contradicts Mr. Rubidge in this important respect. I am told that the channel is not narrowing, that there is a space a quarter of a mile in width of a channel there now, with 16 feet of water. That does not look like narrowing, to any great extent. So far as the change in the direction of the channel is concerned, those lights were never built in range with the deepest channel. The contention was, that the lights had better be built as they now stand and the channel changed by dredging. To say that that channel is not, at present, all that is desirable, is no argument, because it could be easily made so by very little dredging or by changing the lights. An expenditure very much less than the cost of dredging Presqu'Isle would keep Weller's Bay channel permanently open and in range with the lights. I hope the hon. the Minister of Customs, who knows so much about these range lights, will take a note of this, and see that not a summer passes until those lights are made what they should be. I have been simply attempting to show that the Government, in the selection of the route, have chosen a longer route, a route in which we find great difficulty, on account of difficult entrance, and in which the cost of construction is going to be a very great deal more than it would have been by the other route. We know, according to the engineer's reports, that the other is a shorter route, and has a harbor equally good, and more easy of access than Presqu'Isle harbor. The mariners of the lakes have decided, almost unanimously, that Weller's Bay harbor is the best, and that Presqu'Isle harbor would seldom be used by them. The difference between the reports of these engineers, which I have been showing the House, is more marked when we come to the report Mr. Page has made on Mr. Rubidge's report. It appears that the Government decided upon the route of the Murray Canal on

Mr. Rubidge's report, without considering Mr. Page's report. Mr. Rubidge's report did not pass under the eye of Mr. Page until the Government had passed an Order in Council in favor of the Presqu'Isle route. Then, before the contract was let, Mr. Page examined the report of Mr. Rubidge, and sent in the following memo. to the Government:

OTTAWA, 6th July, 1884.

"The lowest tender is that marked L, and the highest is marked C; as, in most cases, the lowest is, I believe, considerably below the fair value of the work, and the highest is probably quite as much above it. In short, it is thought that rates such as would form a mean between the lowest and highest would enable a contractor to execute the work satisfactorily and leave a fair margin for profit. But although there is every reason to believe that the lowest tender is below the value of the work, it is nevertheless 75 per cent. higher than the estimate submitted by Mr. T. S. Rubidge and recited in the Order of the Honorable the Privy Council, dated 23rd May last.

Tender L amounts to .....	\$1,140,625
To which must be added the following items:—	
Superstructures of road and railway bridges.....	35,000
Land damages.....	10,000
Superintendence and contingencies.....	75,000
	<u>\$1,260,625</u>

Mr. T. S. Rubidge's estimate is..... \$721,000

"It has been considered proper to draw attention to this matter in the manner above stated, for the reason that one of the main features of the case (the cost) has been erroneously represented, a result which alone has a tendency to give the impression that other questions of importance may have been inadvertently overlooked."

Here is a commentary on Mr. Rubidge's report which the Government might have taken into consideration; and had they considered it, they might have chosen a different route from the one they selected. Mr. Page proceeds to point out that Mr. Rubidge's estimate is \$721,000, instead of \$1,260,000. Being called upon to explain how it was the tenders so much exceeded his estimate, he explains by saying he did not allow for "rip-rap" and "quarry waste," etc. Mr. Rubidge's report, from end to end, seems to be one elaborate argument in favor of the Presqu'Isle route, as though he had started out with the determination of securing the selection of that route. Mr. Page, I believe, holds that opinion, too. I understand that Mr. Page never sanctioned the report of Mr. Rubidge, and that he told practical men he never would sanction it; that Presqu'Isle Bay was not so easy of access, that it would be more expensive, and the difficulty of entrance would prevent vessels from using it. Much has been said about the shifting sands in Weller's Bay; but I would ask what about Presqu'Isle harbor? Has that harbor not changed? Is the entrance to it what it was years ago? Mr. Rubidge says not. He says:

"That portion of the beach on the mainland extending westwards from the sand banks, referred to above as having been washed away since 1861, was probably swept by the prevailing current (which has here a general set to the westward) across the entrance of Boat harbor to Shoal Point shoal, as the former is now closed and Shoal Point appears to have made toward the west and north on the shoal.

"The old channel or passage into Presqu'Isle harbor, between the Middle Ground and Shoal Point shoals, is also found to be silting up and narrower than formerly. It now lies north of the line of Salt Point range lights, which at one time led directly through the passage, whilst north and east of Salt Point the channel has increased in depth and width."

Here is a description of a magnificently changeable channel, and this is the channel which is chosen because of its permanency, while the other is rejected because it consists of changeable sands.

Mr. PAINT. I rise to a point of order. I think this speech is too long, and I ask your ruling in reference to this matter.

Mr. PLATT. I am about to close my remarks which should have been made two years ago.

Mr. BOWELL. They were made.

Mr. PLATT. They were never made since the selection was made, and hon. gentlemen have no idea of the feeling

which exists among the sailors and the mariners of Lake Ontario as to this selection.

Mr. BOWELL. What route did Mr. Page recommend ?

Mr. PLATT. He recommended a route from the Bay of Quinté to Weller's Bay. I want to tell the House that strenuous efforts were made to induce the Government to select a better course. Friend and foe petitioned the Government; delegations came down; memorials came down, and a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite got the names of every vessel owner and every master and mate trading on the lake that he could find, and they spoke unanimously in favor of the Weller's Bay route; but we could not get even a survey of that route, though it was cheaper than the route proposed by Mr. Page. We discovered what we thought would be a better route than that proposed by Mr. Page, but could not induce Government to order a survey. I will point out one reason why I think the Government steered clear of Weller's Bay. Here is a letter written from Brighton, and addressed to Sir Charles Tupper:

" BRIGHTON, 20th March, 1882.

" MY DEAR SIR,—We have just been informed upon reliable authority that the celebrated George W. McMullen is at the town of Trenton, and has induced the municipal council of that town to call a special meeting this evening, for the purpose of appointing a deputation to proceed to Ottawa to oppose the Presqu'Isle route of the Murray Canal.

" This McMullen Brothers have quite recently purchased a considerable tract of land on the easterly side of Weller's Bay, and are desirous of having the canal enter that bay, in the vicinity of their property, in order to enhance the value of their possessions.

" I enclose herewith a rough sketch of the McMullen lands, and the place where they would like to have said canal enter Weller's Bay.

" I have the honor to be, Sir, yours most obediently,

" THOMAS WEBB."

Mr. COCHRANE. A supporter of yours.

Mr. BOWELL. A leading Grit.

Mr. PLATT. It shows that Mr. Webb, being interested in the Presqu'Isle route, thought the only thing he had to do was to hang up the name of McMullen before the Government, and there was no danger of that route being selected. I make no charge against the Government, but this gives color to the suspicion that the Weller's Bay route was shunned by the Government, for fear that incidentally a person by the name of McMullen might reap advantage from their action. I believe that suspicion is well founded. Since so much has been done to reduce to the minimum the benefits likely to flow from the construction of this canal, I hope that the Government will see that the width is what it should be and that the sides are thoroughly protected. If completed according to contract the probabilities are that the canal will prove a useless ditch, and the expenditure will be money thrown away.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman said he ought to have made this speech two or three years ago. I am sorry he did not make it before the Government went to this expense, I question whether this expenditure is going to be of much benefit to the country, but I know that every member from the hon. gentleman's county has urged upon the Government that it had a substantial claim for certain lands to be set aside long ago, for the purpose of building this canal. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has urged that upon the Government, but now he says he should have warned them long ago. After the Government has decided and has gone on with the work, he finds fault with the work and with the engineer, and you would think that the hon. gentleman knew more than all the engineers in the country. He says the Murray Canal ought to be 100 feet wide. What vessels does he think will enter that canal? It depends altogether upon the slope of the banks whether the sand will slip into the canal or not. If he is opposed to the expenditure of money on the Murray Canal, he ought to propose a vote of want of confidence in the Government. I do not think there will be

Mr. PLATT.

much benefit in it, but it has been undertaken, and he is dissatisfied because it did not go just where he wanted it. In best canals built through sand, the sand will slip in, but means have been taken to shut the sand out in other canals, the Burlington Bay Canal, for instance. The moment he finds that the Government have approved of building this canal in the interests of his constituency, he pitches into the Government for a useless expenditure of money. I agree with him; and if he brings in a motion condemning the expenditure, I do not know that I will not vote with him; but this has been agitated by his own people and by his own supporters strongly, and in every Parliament by the members for Prince Edward county and the adjoining counties, and now he says that the mariners of this country advocate another route. If I am well informed, this man McMullen sent a man through the country and paid his expenses to get the vessel-owners to recommend a certain route. What right had the Government to expend the people's money if they did not think that the counties adjoining these works had a claim on the Government for the money set aside for building this canal? I believe that was the substantial reasonable way urged for building this canal.

Mr. PLATT. I found no fault with the Government for expending money in this particular part of the country. I only said it was of doubtful benefit and the Government ought to be careful. I believe the Government made a huge blunder when they selected the present route, and I have heard a good many complaints from vessel-owners. If the canal were good and useful where it is, it would be as much benefit to my county as it was then. We feel aggrieved because the least possible benefit will be derived from it, principally on account of the direction it has taken.

Mr. BOWELL. Ever since I have been in Parliament we have had an annual debate on this subject. After an appropriation was placed in the Estimates for the purpose of surveys, and after the engineers had made their reports, the Minister of Railways and Canals recommended this route as being the best and the cheapest. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to refer to all the reports, he could have made a good deal stronger case in favor of the adopted route than he has made in favor of his favorite route. The hon. gentleman might have gone back 85 or 100 years, and have found reports on this subject, and he would have stated the matter more correctly if he had said that Mr. Page never made his reports from his personal examination of the surveys of that canal. I am speaking under correction, but I think Mr. Page generally made his reports from the reports of other engineers. As far back as 1854, Mr. Page reported, or rather set forth, the disadvantages that would arise from the selection of the Weller Bay route, and if the hon. gentleman has not seen that report he will find it in the general collection of reports upon this subject. Every one of these reports differed as to the cost, ranging from £40,000 to \$1,000,000. I have taken some trouble to go through all these reports, and I find that Mr. Page never reported in favor of the route which the hon. gentleman prefers. The only report in which he ever made any direct recommendation was to enter by Stoneburg Cove. By the adoption of that route it would have run through the same portion of country as is now traversed by the present canal. Now, so far as the quicksand is connected, the information of the Department is that there is no quicksand. I went over the whole of it myself, and though I am not a judge in these matters, I came to the conclusion that where hundreds and thousands of tons of material were taken from the bottom and the sides of the canal, and piled upon its banks, if the material was of the nature of quicksand the pressure from above would shove it down to the bottom. But there have not been any slides, as mentioned by the hon. gentle-

man, but in dredging out that material they brought the dredging machine close to the bank and took out the material, as much as possible, from under the bank, and they did that purposely so that the banks would fall in. I do not think this Government ever considered the question as to whether Mr. McMullen was to be benefited or not. If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to refer to the files of the *Belleville Ontario*, he will find a long letter from Mr. George McMullen, stating positively that it was of much greater advantage to them personally to have the canal route where it is, than it would have been if it had taken the other route, to which the hon. gentleman refers. When he says that the canal was diverted for the purpose of injuring the pecuniary interests of those parties, he could not have seen the letter.

Mr. PLATT. I saw the letter.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you could not honestly have come to the conclusion that the canal was taken from that route in order to injure those parties. The fact is, the Government obtained the fullest information before they made any selection; and, upon the report of their engineers, they chose the present route. I am convinced time will show that the action of the Government is correct, in taking the route from Weller's Bay. The channel to which the hon. gentleman refers is being filled up, and it is gradually changing, and the lighthouses will have to be changed, in order to enable vessels to get into Weller's Bay with any degree of safety. I called the Minister of Marine and Fisheries attention to this matter the other day, and he promised to look after the matter. It is within my recollection that a portion of this channel used to be a fishing station, and I remember years ago when people used to drive teams from Presqu'Isle Harbor on to the fishing stations. That has since been washed away. That deposit has gone to some other part of the bay, but it is now re-forming again in the same way. No doubt the hon. gentleman will some day find the same bank formed that existed when he and I were boys. As far as the shipping in the channel of the Presqu'Isle harbor is concerned, that channel is not now where it was when the original surveys were made. A large amount of money was expended by the late Government in dredging and straightening that channel. The entrance to the harbor there is of a gravelly rather than a sandy nature. When this gravel is removed it will always remain open.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have read the reports, and I think this work will be in the proper place. I disagree entirely with the hon. member for Prince Edward. I am well satisfied that canals cannot pay; but the question is, whether this canal is going to be a benefit to the trade of the country. I should like to know why this canal is not going to benefit trade, when we know that the coast of Prince Edward is the most dangerous in Ontario. There are more wrecks on that coast than on all the other coasts of Ontario put together. If large vessels come through the canal and pass down to Presqu'Isle harbor and Bay of Quinté, and avoid the Prince Edward coast, why should the trade not be benefited? I should not be at all surprised if the head of St. Lawrence navigation was ultimately at Presqu'Isle harbor. I do not understand why we cannot ship on barges there as well as at Kingston. When the weather is heavy, large vessels carrying grain could come through the channel as far as Presqu'Isle and transship into barges. I remember distinctly when there was a fishing beach where the channel now is. The reports of engineers show a shifting sand bar, and that the lights are now out of range at Weller's Bay. The channel has completely changed; so, if the range lights were as before, vessels would run aground. The channel does not now change. It was dredged in 1871, and has become wider, and may now be regarded as stationary. All we want to

do is to change the direction of the channel to make it one of the best harbors on Lake Ontario. This canal is going to be of great benefit to the carrying trade of the country, and if it does not pay directly, it will recoup us indirectly, in the shape of trade. The hon. member for Prince Edward has quoted reports from the engineers respecting the Weller's Bay scheme, but he did not tell the committee that if that scheme had been adopted the water in Weller's Bay would have been so increased that it would have acted as a funnel, and carried away the canal, unless it had been held by stop-locks.

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

### After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.  
(In the Committee).

Repairs, &c., Harbors and Slides..... \$87,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a reduction of \$2,250. The repairs on the Ottawa River are \$5,000 less than usual.

Expenses in connection with Land and Cable Telegraphs ..... \$23,250

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The extent of the cables and telegraph lines is greater now than formerly, and the staff has necessarily been increased. Nevertheless, the total is less. The amount for repairs in 1884-85 was \$31,900, and for this year \$33,200. The increase is exactly for the same reason.

Telegraph Lines, B.C. .... \$34,500

Mr. MILLS. What is the cause of the reduction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a reduction of \$3,000. We expect, by changing the line on a certain portion, to effect a reduction in the staff, by using, for a portion of the distance, a telegraph line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MILLS. What is the staff of this line?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A district superintendent and 32 operators and assistants.

Mr. MILLS. How much of the amount is for staff, and how much for repairs, etc.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Staff, \$21,200; repairs, \$13,300.

Telegraph and Signal Service generally..... \$9,500

Mr. WELDON. I would like some information on this item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This covers the offices of headquarters and travelling expenses, superintendent's salary and travelling expenses, stationery, and unforeseen expenses in connection with telegraph and telephone service.

Mr. VAIL. Has there been any decision arrived at with regard to extending the cable to Sable Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is in the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is not in his seat at the moment. The cost will be considerable, but I believe that a telephonic service has been established between two or three points on the island, so that communication may be had in that way.

Mr. WELDON. It is important, not only to the interests of Canada, but in the interests of the mother country and the United States, that this line should be established, and I think if representations were made to these countries, they would unite in the work, and it would be the means of saving both life and property.

Mr. McLELAN. I may say that we consider the cost too heavy to be undertaken at present, but a boat has been placed there as a means of communication for the present.

Mr. VAIL. I observe that the amount of this service is the same as last year, so I am afraid the Minister of Public Works has overlooked the petition which I sent in for a telegraph line at Westport and Briar Island, which is very much needed. They have no communication now, except overland, a distance of 40 or 50 miles. I am sure there will be no loss to the revenue, because the receipts will fully cover the interest.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that amount is not covered. However, the Supplementary Estimates, I hope, will be down early next week, and the hon. gentleman may be able to see what is in them.

Mr. VAIL. I think the Minister knows what is in them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, I think I do know something about them, and perhaps my hon. friend can tell by my laugh whether that item is in them or not.

Mr. VAIL. I can only judge from the past. I have seen the hon. gentleman smile before, but there has not been much in the Estimates to show that it amounts to anything. If he gives me a hint that it will be in the Supplementary Estimates, I will be satisfied for the present.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that I must learn by experience. Once a Minister smiled, and it cost a good deal to the country.

Agent and Contingencies, British Columbia..... \$4,000

Mr. VAIL. What are these contingencies? It appears to me there are a great many votes for British Columbia.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think my hon. friends from British Columbia find that there are many. The items are: Salary paid to Mr. Trutch by my Department, \$600; the accountant, Mr. Macdonald, \$1,200; the engineer, paid partly by my Department and partly by the Department of Railways, \$360; messenger, \$400; stationery, \$200; fuel, \$200; advertising, etc., \$200; and travelling expenses and contingencies of the office, \$840.

Mr. WELDON. Is this the only office Mr. Trutch fills?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is the agent of the Dominion there.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman know the total amount of salary Mr. Trutch receives? I think he holds several offices.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is, in the first place, a pensioner under the arrangements of the Confederation Act. In addition to that he receives, I think, \$1,200 as agent of the Dominion, and \$600 for the services he renders to my Department from time to time. Of course, if I had not his services, I should have to employ an engineer of my own, who would cost a great deal more. I think this is an economical arrangement as we can have. Of course, when the railway works are completed, most likely some other arrangement will have to be resorted to.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I think there is a saving of about \$1,500 in that Department. The resident engineer received at one time \$2,100 or \$2,200, while Mr. Trutch receives \$600 for doing the same amount of work.

Mr. BLAKE. How much does Mr. Trutch get altogether?

Mr. BAKER. I believe about \$5,000, and \$5 a day when travelling.

Post Office—Amount required..... \$2,651,837

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the hon. Postmaster General erecting any other post office in Ontario, except Brantford, into a city office, this year.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. CARLING. Not this year.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us generally what the increases are for. I suppose they are for new offices being established.

Mr. CARLING. Yes; there are new mail routes being established in the different Provinces by rail or by stage, and of course new offices opened and additional officers appointed.

Mr. WELDON. The largest increase appears to be in salaries.

Mr. CARLING. The annual increases amount to a very large proportion.

Mr. MILLS. There is a very large increase in British Columbia.

Mr. CARLING. Since the Northern Pacific Railway has been opened, there has been a daily mail from Puget Sound to Victoria, which formerly had only three mails a week. Then, we have established a mail monthly to Port Simpson, and we have also a mail to Kamloops, and as far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is laid.

Mr. MILLS. Will the Northern Pacific be used throughout the entire year, or does the hon. gentleman expect to send the mails by the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. CARLING. Of course, the hon. gentleman will understand we do not pay anything for the mail service on the Northern Pacific; all mails are carried free over American lines; but of course, as soon as our own line is finished, a daily mail will be established on that route.

Mr. MILLS. And will this mail from Puget Sound to Victoria be continued also? The reason I ask is, that if there are no places to be supplied between Puget Sound and Victoria, of course that line would necessarily cease, as soon as the Canadian Pacific were used for the carrying of the mails.

Mr. CARLING. Of course, the American mails will have to be transmitted from Puget Sound to Victoria.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With regard to the erection into city offices of offices that had been on the commission plan before, I have a few words to say regarding the officials. I am glad the hon. gentleman has erected the Brantford office into a city office, but I regret that it is the occasion of great hardship to a number of faithful men who have been in that office for a number of years, and in consequence of the change have lost their positions. Of course, there is no political significance in it, because they are in political accord with the Postmaster General himself. The postmaster says that under the Civil Service rules he had no option but to discharge these men. One of them has been 12 or 15 years in the service, and they all, of course, are anxious to retain their positions. I think there ought to be some provision made for these cases, as their claim is certainly stronger than that of those who may have passed the Civil Service examination. I take this opportunity of asking the hon. gentleman when he thinks he can give Belleville and Brantford letter carriers? Kingston has letter carriers, and I think the post office in Brantford equals that of Kingston.

Mr. CARLING. I think before long the delivery by letter carriers will be established in Brantford. It is one of the most prosperous cities in the west, and the receipts amount to over \$20,000. With regard to the clerks in the office, of course the hon. gentleman will understand that, according to the Civil Service Act, I cannot appoint any one who has not passed his examination. These young men were engaged by the postmaster as his officers, and were not salaried officers of the Government. They were aware we were about to establish Brantford as a city office, and should have taken an opportunity to pass the examination. Had

they passed, the Government would, of course, have given them preference.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The last communication I had was that, if the hon. Minister would retain them in their positions and give them an opportunity to go up for an examination, they would avail themselves of it. The period had passed when the examination was held, and the next examination would not come off for a few months, so that, in the meantime, they could not present themselves. The Act might be amended, so as to give them a few months delay, if they were not ready to pass at once.

Mr. HESSON. I endorse what my hon. friend has said. I have had occasion to interest myself on behalf of one of those young gentlemen. It appears to me that where a number of men for years had done their duty faithfully to the public, although not in the employ of the public, the Government should recognise their services, by retaining them in some capacity, under the new state of things. The postmaster himself objected to the change, because I believe it is going to reduce his receipts, but the young men were in favor of it; and now, when they find themselves on the road, I believe he refused to allow them to go up for the Civil Service examination. If that be the case, they should be continued in the service, until they have an opportunity of passing their examination.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot alter the Act, but I am sure there will be every disposition on the part of the Government to take a liberal view with regard to these officers. I am glad hon. gentlemen have mentioned the subject.

Mr. TROW. What accommodation is given to the settlers at Rainy River, Fort Francis locks, about 100 miles from the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. CARLING. I believe there is a post office established at Fort Francis, and one will be established in a few weeks at Rainy River.

Mr. DAWSON. There is a post office at Fort Francis, one at Rapid River, on Rainy River, and one at Rainy River; three in all. The mail going from Rat Portage to Rainy River is irregular; some arrangement should be made to have a mail twice a week instead of one every week in summer, and once a fortnight in winter. There is a very large settlement now at Rainy River.

Mr. WILSON. In St. Thomas we have every right to expect to have a city post office there. The revenue from St. Thomas has been greatly increased, and is increasing very rapidly, and the population would warrant the Government on deciding to establish the St. Thomas office as a city office. The Postmaster General should take into consideration the propriety of making St. Thomas a city post office. Owing to the situation of the town, and the fact that it covers a great deal of ground, free delivery of letters would be very advantageous. The post office will move into its fine new building within a few days or weeks, and it would certainly be desirable to have it established as a city post office, and provision made for free delivery of letters.

Mr. CARLING. There can be no doubt that flourishing towns, such as St. Thomas, St. Catharines, Guelph, Stratford and Chatham, will, in a very short time, a very few years, be established as post offices, the same as Brantford. But the revenue of those cities and towns is nothing like the revenue derived from Brantford. That of Brantford amounts to between \$20,000 and \$21,000, whereas the revenue of St. Thomas office, at the present time, only reaches \$13,000. Of course, as the Minister of Public Works has erected fine buildings at St. Thomas and Stratford, no doubt they will, in a very short time, be established as city post offices, and free delivery extended to them.

Mr. INNES. I am glad to hear that it is the intention of the Postmaster General to establish free delivery at no remote date in the cities mentioned. If the hon. gentleman is in view of free delivery being established at Brantford, I think Guelph is entitled to it also. The revenue, if not so large as that of Brantford, is very nearly as high, and according to the last census our population is larger.

Mr. WILSON. Our receipts are increasing very rapidly. Our population would compare very favorably with Brantford or Belleville, as we have about 12,000 people. It may be that the people of St. Thomas do not receive so many dunning letters.

Mr. DAWSON. There is a very large postal business done in Prince Arthur. Last year no less than \$315,000 passed through the money order office. The town has now 6,000 inhabitants, and the post office is kept in a little wooden building. That is hardly suitable for such a large and growing town, especially as it is going to be one of the cities of the Dominion. When the revenue will permit, I hope a building for the post office will be erected.

Mr. CARLING. My attention has already been directed to the importance of having a post office built at Port Arthur, and I think the Minister of Public Works has had the matter under consideration. It is not, of course, proposed to erect one this year, but with the rapid growth of the town, no doubt the Government will be able, in a few years, to erect a building for post office and Custom house purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. While the Postmaster General is giving great attention to cities, I desire to remind him that in many offices in rural constituencies there is not more than one mail a week. The country post offices are self-sustaining, and the Minister would make them even more so if he gave them a more efficient service. If he would give a postal service every day, he would be doing something that would justly entitle him to the thanks of the people, and the revenue of the offices would warrant the change. I hope that before long the post offices in rural constituencies will obtain a full measure of justice.

Mr. CARLING. Every attention is being given to the rural districts. There is hardly a case in which, where a petition has been sent in for better service than a weekly service, that we have not given a semi-weekly or a tri-weekly or daily mail. Whenever petitions are sent in by any district, especially a rural district, every attention will be given to the application.

Mr. INNES. After considerable delay it was decided to give additional accommodation to the post office at Guelph; \$1,000 was voted last year for the work, but through some misunderstanding nothing has been done. I understand from the Postmaster General alterations will be made soon and I hope they will not be forgotten.

Mr. CARLING. My attention has been called to the want of accommodation in the post office. A room occupied by the Inland Revenue Department is about to be given up to the post office, and it will give sufficient accommodation for the purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. Drew and Smithurst post offices are only served by a mail twice or three times a week. A petition was sent in last year, praying that one of these post offices might be abolished and the other removed to the railway station. If that were done we could have a mail every day. If the Postmaster General looked into it, he would find that there could be increased accommodation given without any increase of cost.

Mr. CARLING. I shall be glad to make a note of what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to an office in the south riding of Grey, called Glen Eden. Last year a petition was sent to the Department, asking for a daily mail service; I am not aware that it has been granted. I think this office is of sufficient importance to deserve a daily service, and that the receipts would be sufficient to pay for that service.

Mr. HESSON. There is no service, probably, more valuable to the people than the post office, and I think I do no injustice to any other Department when I say that the Post Office Department is very ably administered. But I believe it would be a mistake to comply with all the requests that the Postmaster General receives from the various constituencies. I have myself a great many favors I would like to ask of him, but I know the Department are doing the best they can, and I do not like to ask too much of them, and embarrass the working of the Department. There is no doubt that the people in cities have greater postal facilities than do the people in the country, many of whom have mail communication only twice a week; therefore, I think that the Minister should not neglect the country in favor of the city. I also think that a reduction in the letter postage ought to be made as early as possible to 2 cents, and if I am spared till next year, I shall endeavor to induce the Minister to make that reduction. It may decrease the receipts, but we do not expect the Post Office Department to be self-sustaining in a country so extensive and so sparsely settled as Canada, and I do not think the people will object to drawing upon the general revenue of the country in order to give them increased postal facilities.

Mr. VAIL. In the United States they have increased the weight of the letter to one ounce. I do not know that the receipts of the Department in Canada would warrant the Postmaster General in reducing the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents, but if he could give us that increase in the weight, it would be a great boon to the public.

Mr. CARLING. The questions of the reduction of postage and the increase of weight have been considered by the Department; but I think the hon. gentleman will agree that in view of the greatly increased expenditure which we have made to extend postal facilities, we could hardly reduce the postage at the present time. Last year the American Government reduced their postage from 3 to 2 cents, and though they had a surplus at the time, of \$2,000,000, at the end of the year I think they had a deficiency of something like \$5,000,000. We have lately been doubling the postal facilities in many cases, and we have opened a great many new offices in British Columbia and the North-West, and the great distances between the offices in those regions have necessitated a greatly increased expenditure.

Mr. VAIL. In the matter of post office accommodation, I do not think the balancing of the accounts ought to be considered. There is nothing the people value so highly, and there is no purpose for which they contribute so willingly, as the postal service. I, therefore, hope that the Postmaster General will consider this from the point of view of the public benefit, rather than from the point of view of making the accounts balance.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to a defect in the mail facilities through recent changes in the time tables of some of the railways running from Toronto west. I am not aware of the relationship existing between the Department and the railways, sufficiently to know whether the Department can control the running of trains; but the hon. Minister is doubtless aware that a close relationship must exist between the two in this regard. The train leaving Ottawa in the morning reaches Toronto just late enough to miss the

Mr. CARLING.

early mail trains from that city westwards. The result is, that mails leaving here are delayed in Toronto, and reach London three or four hours later than they would reach it if the train left here so as to reach Toronto in time to catch the western mail. It not only affects the city of Toronto, but all the districts lying west along the main line of the Great Western, and also the Sarnia branch. The main line of the Great Western has, perhaps, to some extent, the advantage, from the fact that the same train that reaches London carrying the mails goes right through, while the mails on the Sarnia branch are delayed in London until the next day. A very slight change in the time tables of the trains carrying the mails would allow the distribution of mail matter along the post offices on the Sarnia branch at three or four o'clock, or at least in the afternoon of the day preceding. Of course, I know the Postmaster General cannot absolutely control the matter, but perhaps representations to the railway authorities would facilitate the earlier distribution of mail matter.

Mr. CARLING. The mail that leaves here at 11 p.m. by the Pacific does not reach Toronto in time to connect with the Great Western going west. The mails, however, are sent forward by the earliest train leaving after they arrive, either by the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk. Every effort is made at Toronto to push forward the mails going west.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). A gentleman leaving here for the west and going by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Ingersoll can catch the train going west from that point and reach London at noon, whereas, if he were to go to Toronto he would not reach London until 6 p.m. If it were possible to arrange to have mail matter for London and district sent to Ingersoll, there would be an earlier distribution.

Mr. FARROW. The mail that leaves here by the Canadian Pacific Railway arrives in Toronto shortly after 8 o'clock, and the Grand Trunk does not leave till 9:25. If clerks were on the train, the mail matter might be forwarded by that Grand Trunk train.

Mr. CARLING. I am quite sure letters are sent on by the train leaving Toronto immediately after the arrival of the mail. There has recently been a change in the time table, which has prevented connection being made. We have, of course, no power to regulate the time of the trains; but we do everything we can to secure connection at Toronto.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has referred to a matter of very considerable public interest, and that is with respect to a reduction of postage and increased weight of letters. These are two entirely distinct propositions. I can understand how the Postmaster General might object to a reduction of postage at the present time, when there is a falling revenue. If we were enjoying a period of prosperity, the loss would be more than restored by the increased number of letters. The question in regard to increased weight of letters is a somewhat different one. It would not seriously affect the revenue. The mails are not over-weighted, and it might be possible to increase the weight from half an ounce to one ounce. This change might make a difference to some persons carrying on correspondence, and might enable people to write longer letters or write them on better paper.

Mr. CARLING. No change of that kind can be made without changing the Post Office Act. The Americans adopted the change on the 1st July. We shall have an opportunity of seeing what the result will be, and what the loss of revenue will be, and then we will be better able to judge of the matter.

Mr. MILLS. Then the hon. gentleman has not made any calculations as to the number of letters going through the post paying double postage.

Mr. CARLING. I have not.

Mr. SCRIVER. I observed, not long ago, that the post office authorities in the United States estimated that a considerable loss would result from the reduction of the rate of postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, the amount being about one-tenth of the revenue.

Towards deepening Welland Canal to 14 feet  
throughout..... \$500,000

Mr. VAIL. Is it understood that it is the intention to deepen this canal to 14 feet. I did not understand it so this afternoon.

Mr. POPE. The intention is to give 14 feet navigation.

Mr. SHANLY. How soon is it contemplated that this expenditure will result in giving you 14 feet on the Welland.

Mr. POPE. If we had been able to let the contracts, it would have been completed by July or August next, but I have no doubt now it will take next season.

Trent River Navigation .... \$113,000

Mr. VAIL. What do the receipts of this canal amount to ?

Mr. POPE. This is for constructing locks and the improvement of navigation between Lakefield and Balsam Lake; only a certain portion of the system has been in operation.

Mr. VAIL. I find that a certain sum is put down annually for expenses and repairs, and it seems to me a very large expenditure, unless there are receipts from it. Surely there must be some tolls. It seems an easy thing to vote these large sums for Ontario, while we, in the Maritime Provinces, find it difficult to get \$1,000 or \$2,000 for a pier, or some other small work, which may be of importance the whole year around—while this canal is only used in the summer and autumn months.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman does not understand the geography of the country through which this canal passes, though, of course, it is quite right for any hon. gentleman to obtain all the information on this or other proposed votes. We are not now discussing the question as to whether or not the country has pledged itself to this Trent Valley Canal. That section of country has been looking forward for a long time when it might have a great canal system connecting the northern system of waters with Lake Ontario. Whether this system will be as successful as it is hoped for, I am unable to say. There are various theories expressed on that point, but the House, some time ago, pledged itself to this system of internal development, and I suppose if the House should now discontinue this work, considerable sums already expended would be rendered useless. Perhaps the Minister will inform me if I am correct in saying that this is part of a scheme for a through system ?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. MULLOCK. The idea being to continue this expenditure, until ultimately you connect the northern waters with Lake Ontario, by means of a canal system.

Mr. SHANLY. Georgian Bay and the Bay of Quinté ?

Mr. MULLOCK. Yes. Before concluding, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he can give us an idea when the canal system will be completed ?

Mr. BOWELL. Part of that canal was built in 1818.

Mr. POPE. Of course, these works are quite independent of other works, of which surveys have to be made, but the time when they will be completed is a matter which cannot be decided yet. For instance, there is the Fenelon Falls Canal, for which Mr. Manning is the contractor, and which

is to cost \$120,000, and to be completed this year; the depth of the water is to be 5½ feet. Then there is the Buckhorn Canal, George Goodwin, contractor, and the cost, \$91,600, and that will be completed this year. Then there is Burleigh Canal, George Goodwin, contractor, and the cost \$176,700, of which \$60,000 is to be expended this year.

Mr. MILLS. This was under the Ontario Government once.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the late Dominion Government went out of power, they passed an Order in Council transferring the whole of the Trent works to the Local Government; but the Local Government failed to carry out the provisions of the law to make the transfer valid, and when the present Dominion Government came into power we thought the work of sufficient Dominion importance not to carry out that arrangement, and we annulled it. I might mention to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) that part of these works were built soon after 1812, when the scheme was first adopted. Some of the locks were getting into decay, and in order to utilise the inland waters as much as possible, those locks, and that portion of the canal, particularly, at Chisholm's Rapids, have been put into repair, to keep them from rotting, so that when the system is complete they can be used.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) seems to think I do not understand the geography of the country. I have travelled a little through Ontario. I do not know whether my hon. friend has had the opportunity of travelling through the Maritime Provinces or not; but if he takes a trip down that way, he will find that these little ponds and creeks in Ontario are insignificant in comparison with the broad Atlantic; he will see that we are a maritime people; that we want a trade with all the world; that a large proportion of our people are on the water all the year round, and that we require breakwaters and piers, such as are not required in the Upper Provinces. I have not the slightest objection to any grants being made that will increase the trade and commerce of the Upper Provinces; but I merely take advantage of this opportunity to point out to the Government that while we are spending these large sums for canal accommodation in the Upper Provinces our public works in the Lower Provinces are in a state of decay, and that unless something is done very soon I am sure our trade will suffer; and I am sure no expenditure could be made that our people would value more than an expenditure in connection with navigation securities. Reference has been made to the former Government. I may say that the average expenditure for the Province of Nova Scotia during the four years I had the honor of a seat in the Government was something like \$240,000 a year, whereas I find in the Estimates brought down now a sum of \$1,500 for the whole Province of Nova Scotia; and last year the amount was \$40,000. I do not, of course, know what the Supplementary Estimates will show, but I hope it will be something large. I hope this matter will be taken into the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MULLOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if any expenditure has been decided upon, or whether any plan has been considered for connecting the Trent waters with the upper waters ?

Mr. POPE. No plan has been decided upon. Surveys are going on, and when the reports are in we shall decide.

Mr. MULLOCK. Where are the surveys going on ?

Mr. POPE. In the upper waters. I think the hon. member for North York was a little severe on the hon. member for Digby. He has travelled a good deal; as he says, he has been often afloat, and as he is a man of years,

surely the hon. member for North York should deal a little mildly with him.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we should not get into deep water among ourselves. Of course, I did not mean anything towards my friend from Digby. It is quite impossible for us, in this extensive Dominion, extending 3,000 or 4,000 miles between the oceans, to be familiar with the various localities of the country. I am very glad, however, that my hon. friend from Digby takes sufficient interest in Ontario to enquire into the expenditures there, and having found out the advantage of these works I am sure he will approve of them. However, I am thankful to the hon. Minister for attempting to reconcile friends here. Now, I want to ask what are the prospects of this canal being available, and the main object of this scheme being attained. It is some years since the Government undertook the work, and, if I remember rightly, they embarked in it with the assurance to the public that they would be able ultimately to connect the two waters.

Mr. BOWELL. As soon as the resources of the country would justify. When the Government—

Mr. MULOCK. When the Government recommended this expenditure to the House, they justified it on the ground that this was going to be a through system, not local or provincial, but one that would afford a highway between the east and the west.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton.) From Chicago to the ocean, if necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; it was to be a grand highway on the water, like a railway on the land. This expenditure has been going on for some years, and the question is, when is the object of this scheme likely to be attained? Can we have any information on that point?

Mr. POPE. I think not, because the surveyors are at work, and they have been making their plans and reports, so that we have not been able yet to make up our minds.

Mr. SHANLY. I think the hon. gentleman from North York need not be afraid of getting into too deep water, as the depth of water will be about 5½ feet. I think the plan we are pursuing is the wiser one. There is a long stretch of water, and by making short pieces of canal in the rock, here and there, you can utilise these waters for local purposes. Each lock built, though it may be some years before it can be used for traffic purposes, will be useful for internal purposes. The hon. member for North York referred to this as a grand route.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say that.

Mr. SHANLY. It will never be a grand route, because it will be utterly impossible to utilise it, beyond the depth of 5½ feet, and where we have such great depths of waters on each side, the St. Lawrence and Ottawa waters, it will be impossible to make use of the Trent Canal in any other way than for internal purposes.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came to the conclusion that this canal, in so far as constructed, was a work essentially provincial, within the jurisdiction and power of the Local Government. The observations of the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) have only served to show that the position taken by the former Government was the right one. I am not going to criticise the appropriation made for this purpose. It may be necessary, in order to extend the advantages of this work to a considerable section of the community; but the remarks of the hon. member for Grenville show that he does not consider it wise on the part of the Government to press forward a work so as to connect the waters of the Georgian Bay with Lake Ontario, at the present time. He thinks it should be pushed forward gradually, be-

Mr. POPE.

cause, even though completed, it would not become a general route for trade. All these observations confirm the propriety of the course of the former Administration, and show the impropriety of the course of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say that a large section of the country through which this system goes will be quite satisfied to pardon the constitutional breach the hon. gentleman is talking about, for the sake of having the canal. The system is a very old one. It has been reported on by many able engineers, and at last the Government adopted the idea of making it a permanent work by connecting the two great waterways. It may be, it cannot compete in all respects with other and deeper waters and with a railway system, but it will be substantially a Dominion work, connecting the two waters, and at the same time of great advantage to the fine district of country through which it passes. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) has fully described the policy of the Government when he said the ultimate object was to connect the two waterways, but to go on with the work by degrees, connecting these internal waters by artificial means in every spot where they could be locally useful, until the resources of the country would allow the completion of the work in the Dominion sense; that is the sense in which the appropriations are asked for.

Mr. PLATT. The Auditor General's accounts would lead us to suppose the progress of the work is quite satisfactory. No less than \$2,236 were paid to A. F. Wood and Wilkinson for valuating land expropriated on that contract. That would constitute a large portion of the route of the canal; but those parties were paid \$3,500 for valuating property on the Murray Canal worth \$1,800.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman is now asking us to make an appropriation, and cannot give information regarding it. If he has not floated down the canal, I would like him to wade through it, so as to be in a position to tell us something about it, what it is being built for and what we have to expect when it is completed.

St. Peter's Canal.....\$ 2,500

Mr. PAINT. The St. Peter's Canal was never finished, but I have not the same doleful account to give that the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has given. The Government spent last year some \$20,000 there, and improved it very much. The sides of the canal were left with jagged rocks to tear the vessels' sides and bulwarks out as they passed through. There was not a post or a ring bolt to fasten a line to, but that has been remedied in a great measure. It will require probably some \$30,000 to complete, and make the work entirely serviceable.

Mr. VAIL. This work pays something. The receipts last year were \$2,193.

Works necessary to increase the supply of water to the Rideau Canal and the Gananoque River... \$ 20,000

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman state why so large a sum is being spent, because, as far as I know, the canal is hardly used at all?

Mr. VAIL. The total receipts last year were \$7,000, and the expenditure was \$36,000.

Mr. POPE. The dam at Devil's Lake was built 45 years ago and was rebuilt in 1872. Some claims for damages not having been recognised, some dissatisfied person tore up the dam in 1876, and it has not been reconstructed. The result was, that the mills at Gananoque and at other places on the route ceased running, as, in the dry season, they could not find sufficient water. They asked us either to furnish the water or to pay them for the damages they sustained.

Mr. MILLS. In what way did the Government come under obligation to these parties for damages?

Mr. POPE. Because they built the dam. I do not say we are liable to damages, but they claimed it. It is proposed to reconstruct the dam and to build three others on the canal.

Mr. WILSON. If the Government is going to assume the responsibility of the expenditure of \$20,000 for the purpose of completing this dam, not really in the interests of the Rideau Canal but in the interest of these saw mills, it is not reasonable to call upon this House to make that vote. We like to have the industry go on, but it is not right that the Dominion of Canada should be taxed for the purpose of enabling these parties to carry on their milling operations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. This water is required for the canal.

Mr. WILSON. Then it has been required since 1877.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been required since 1876. The quantity of water supply in the Rideau Canal has been steadily decreasing, as the settlement of the country has advanced and the country has been drained, and the engineers have been embarrassed to get water enough for the ordinary supply of the canal. Then this water supply also benefits the town of Gananoque, where there are some of the finest industries in iron and woollen to be found in central Canada. It has the double advantage of supplying the canal and supplying these manufactures.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says that this water is required for the use of the canal, but he has not stated to what extent the canal is used. Since the increased railway facilities between Ottawa and the front, the canal business is much reduced. The hon. gentleman has referred to the mills and manufacturing establishments at Gananoque, but I never understood the Government had made any contract with those parties, or had sold them, in perpetuity, a supply of water.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. Then it is precisely the same as any other part of their business; it is for them to supply themselves with water. The hon. gentleman knows that in many instances, when dams are built, parties apply for damages, on account of the water overflowing their lands. Now, to what extent is this vote for the purpose of paying damages like that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As long as the canal is kept open it must be supplied with water. It is quite true that it is not nearly so useful as it was when first built. I remember the time when all the trade between Lower and Upper Canada was carried through the Rideau Canal. But since the improvements on the St. Lawrence and the construction of railways, the canal has become less useful than it was. But still there it is. People are settled along its banks. Government cannot close it up, without great injury to that whole country, where the people have been in the habit of using it as their means of transport for two generations. The millers and manufacturers at Gananoque are not the lessees of the Government, but that is their river; the Gananoque River flows into Gananoque, and a considerable portion of the water of that river is drained away for the purpose of the canal, to the injury of the river. Government has no right to take away the water of the Gananoque River, which these people have been in the habit of enjoying. This, as I understand, will increase the quantity of water in the canal, and supply the people of Gananoque with an additional quantity of water.

Mr. MILLS. These mills were built before the Government diverted any portion of the waters of the Gananoque; but if they were built subsequently to the construction of the canal, and the Government had already been using the water, I do not see how the Government incur any obligations towards the mill owners. The hon. gentleman has not succeeded in showing that. Then, he must see that last year the expenditure was nearly \$50,000, and the revenue was but several thousand. People living along the canal may continue to utilise it, but they utilise the railways to a far greater extent. The canal has ceased to be of much commercial value, and it is a question whether it is to the public advantage to continue the expenditure of these large sums every year, for the purpose of keeping the canal open for navigable purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister says that this expenditure is necessary, in order to add to the supply of water that is needed for the efficient working of the canal. Will the Minister of Railways, if he has it, favor the committee with the opinion of experts as to the need of this route?

Mr. POPE. I will read from the report of the chief engineer:

"Pretty full explanatory details have been given of what is necessary to be done to secure a greatly increased supply of water for the Rideau Canal, as well as for extending the line of navigation northwards to the series of lakes. It is intended to serve as an attachment basin, raised, according to circumstances, and lowered at times, when necessary to meet the requirements of navigation."

He goes on to recommend that it should be done, and says that the estimated cost will be \$20,000. Then he gives in detail the cost of each portion of the work.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the whole evidence that the hon. Minister has?

Mr. POPE. There is more evidence here.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the only expert evidence there is, showing that the supply of water for canal purposes is insufficient for the present exigencies of trade?

Mr. POPE. The experience is general, that the supply of water is insufficient. Mr. Wise, the superintendent, gives his experience, but I have not his report here.

Surveys and Inspections ..... \$10,000

Mr. MILLS. Where are these surveys to be made?

Mr. POPE. At different places. Last year we did not spend the vote; but it is the usual vote.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government to place any amount in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of constructing a canal between lakes Winnipeg and Winnipegosis, or will any of this money be so devoted?

Mr. POPE. I will explain that when we come to the Supplementary Estimates.

Indians, British Columbia ..... \$45,280

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman promised to give some information with regard to the Indians of British Columbia, and the difficulties which have arisen there, and also with regard to this commission, which was appointed in 1875 or 1876, and whose labors it was supposed would be brought to an end before this time. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say how far the Indians have been provided with reservations, and how far the work of the commission remains still to be performed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That, I think, is contained in the report of the Indian Department.

Mr. MILLS. No; it gives some information as to what has been done, but not as to how far the Indians have been provided with reservations, I think.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are several tribes unprovided with reservations. Mr. O'Reilly now holds the position formerly held by Mr. Sproat. He was formerly one of the county judges, and he is a very efficient officer. He was employed some two or three years ago, and was obliged to give his services if called upon to do so. I am much mistaken if there is not in the reports a statement as to the number of reservations which are yet incomplete. It will be some time before all the bands in the interior are provided with reserves. There is no great hurry in laying out reserves, until there is a prospect of white men going in near them. There are two or three reserves which are expected to be completely surveyed this year. As the hon. gentleman knows, there has been a good deal of trouble in making the arrangements with the provincial authorities. They object generally that the reserves have been too large for the Indians. However, the Dominion Government, both when the hon. gentleman was in and the present Government, as guardians of the rights of the Indians, have insisted that these reserves should be—not extravagant, but ample for the Indians, and for their prospective growth, because some of those tribes do increase. There were several reserves which at last had been agreed upon between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments—that they shall be satisfactory in area and position. The next thing is to survey them. There is a small staff of surveyors under Mr. O'Reilly, but they are a good deal behind in their work—that is, there are reserves agreed upon by the two Governments which have not yet been surveyed. I cannot at this moment say what the number of bands are without reserves. Unfortunately, there are several small bands which have been very badly used. The land has been sold without their knowing anything about it. They have no reserves, and we applied to the Provincial Government to buy them reserves in the locality in which these Indians have a right to expect reserves—where their habitat was. The Provincial Government said that they might be given reserves elsewhere, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, particularly in British Columbia, the Indians are very much attached to their locality, and object to being hustled away to a strange country, or far away from the bones of their ancestors. In one case the land was absolutely sold, and they were cut off practically from the rights of fishing, as well as from places for their habitations; and the Government came to Parliament, and Parliament sanctioned the purchase of a small reserve. The funds for this purchase were taken out of the Dominion Treasury, though I think they should not have been, but Parliament voted it. We hope to get it from the Provincial Government, but they see it in another light.

Mr. MILLS. I moved for some papers and correspondence connected with Indian difficulties early in the Session, and though the papers were promised they were not brought down. The hon. gentleman refers to Mr. O'Reilly being a good officer. I do not know anything about him, but if the hon. gentleman will look back to the correspondence which took place prior to British Columbia becoming a member of the Confederation, he will see that Mr. O'Reilly was one of the officers employed by the Local Government to cut down the reserves of the British Columbia Indians. The report made to me this winter—and I have many communications from that Province—is that the decisions as to reserves made by the commission between 1876 and 1880 had not been observed by the Local Government, although the understanding between the two Governments was that the decisions of the commission should be confirmed. I understand that in some cases that has not been done. There are some Indians immediately west of the Blackfeet reservation, on the opposite side of the mountains, whose reserve has been disposed of, to a large extent, to white set-

Mr. MILLS.

tlers. The Indians there have been in the habit of raising cattle and horses, and sending considerable numbers of them to the American market. The range of territory over which their stock has run has been divided up into lots and given up to the white settlers; fences have been put up, and a considerable number of Indian cattle and horses have starved to death, in the past winter, for want of their usual supply of food. I suppose the hon. gentleman has had correspondence with the Local Government on the subject; and it seems to me, looking at the Terms of the Union, whatever we might say with regard to the Indian title elsewhere, it was a matter of contract between the two Governments, that a reasonable extent of territory should be set apart for Indian reserves. If the two Governments could not agree, the matter was to be referred to the Colonial Secretary, but that arrangement was superseded by this commission, who were on the ground, and could deal directly with the matter. I do not know how far the Local Government have been disposed to carry out the understanding in good faith, but I should infer from their treatment of some of these Indians that not much respect has been shown for the occupation by the Indians of the land which they were holding. I think the least that could be done would be that a reasonable extent of territory, of which any band was in actual occupation, ought to be reserved for them, with the same strictness that an individual would be allowed to hold a reserve specially set apart by contract. I think the terms of the agreement between the two Governments are sufficient to enable the Indians to retain possession of the territory in which they were in actual occupation, although it may not have been officially set out as a reservation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The arrangement, at the time of the Union was, that the Indians of British Columbia should be treated as liberally as they had been up to that time.

Mr. MILLS. There was more than that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There may have been. I think the information given to the hon. gentleman is a little exaggerated. That is a fine country, both for grazing and agricultural purposes, and there may have been a few lots sold; but that there, in the centre of that large grazing country, cattle could have starved, I think can hardly be the case.

Mr. MILLS. I can assure the hon. gentleman that my information is strictly accurate, because I obtained it from a party on the ground.

Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories..... \$680,831.45

Mr. MILLS. Would the hon. gentleman state how much of the annuity vote applies to each treaty?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The memorandum I have got is that the increase of \$440 for annuities is to cover additional payments on the estimated natural increase of 1 per cent. of the Indian population. These are the annuities paid to the several bands of Manitoba. I have no memorandum of the annuities paid to each band. I do not think that would be very valuable information.

Mr. MILLS. No; except that the hon. gentleman, when on this side of the House, insisted on that information being given in detail, and formerly the Estimates were printed in that way. It makes this difference, that when the vote is taken in a lump the hon. gentleman can distribute it amongst the whole as he pleases. There is an advantage in having the distribution under each treaty. An Indian may be paid two or three times from appearing in different places, and having the children of, perhaps, some other Indian or belonging to some other band with him. In fact, it is easy to see

by the reports that it is impossible that the payments have been strictly accurate; there seems to be some frauds, and I am asking for this information for the purpose of comparing one year with another, because we know that the rate of increase by birth must be very nearly the same in all the bands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite right. I will get that. With regard to agricultural implements, the increase of \$18,564.46 is to be distributed over Manitoba and in each district of the North-West Territories. For the current year the estimate was exceptionally low. In Manitoba, less than \$1,500 was estimated for the service, the Indian superintendent considering that the Indians would not utilise a greater number of implements than were estimated for. If they are supplied to excess, the implements are allowed to go to the bad altogether. The portion of the increased estimate for Manitoba is intended for purchase of implements still due under treaty, with the exception of three fanning mills, some ploughs and harrows, and a few smaller implements which the Indians need, and which are essential to their advancement, but which they are unable to procure for themselves. In the Birtle district the estimate for the current year has been increased by \$1,165. The increase is due to exceptional efforts made to improve the Moose Mountain Indians, only two years settled on their reserve, and to supply them with ploughs and harrows. Fanning mills are required by some of the long-settled bands in this district, in order that they may be able to prepare their grain for seed and for the mill. The proportion of the increase intended for the Indian Head district is \$1,221.59. For the current year the sum of \$4,117.76 was estimated for; for 1885-86, \$5,339.35 will, it is estimated, be required, mainly on account of the recent settlement of Chief Pie-a-pot, the Assiniboines at Indian Head, and a large number of Indians who have returned from Cypress Hills and joined their bands at Crooked Lakes, File Hills and Touchwood Hills. In the Battleford district the sum of \$6,504.91, as against \$1,487.22, is estimated for the current year. The Battleford district includes the sub-agencies at Carlton and Fort Pitt; and the implements now estimated for are intended to be distributed amongst the bands of Chiefs Big Bear, Little Pine, Lucky Man and Napahase, all of which bands are recent arrivals from Cypress Hills, and are as yet without sufficient means to engage to any extent in agricultural pursuits; \$1,650, it was estimated, was a sum large enough to furnish the implements necessary for the Indians of the Edmonton district during the current year; but \$5,800 will, it is believed, be required. There have been large additions from the Cypress Hills to the Indians of this district, not taking in the Peace Hills agency, and there is also to be considered the fact that the older settled bands have not yet received all the implements due to them under treaty, it being the custom of the Department to issue these only as fast as the Indians become capable of using and taking care of them. In the Macleod district \$1,707.75 was considered sufficient to meet the requirement of the current year, but for 1885-86 \$6,866.85 is not more than will be needed, to enable the Department to expend \$3,600 for wire fencing for the proper protection of the crops in a locality destitute of timber for fencing, and also to supply the Indians—who are now beginning to turn their attention to farming—with the necessary implements.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have tenders been invited for the various supplies for the Indians for 1885-86?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the form of the tenders the same as last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are substantially the same.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to bring under the notice of the First Minister what I consider is an unwise course to follow with reference to the form of the tenders. The Government, in the forms they adopt, have been emphatically pronouncing that Canadian manufacturers are unfitted to supply agricultural implements. For instance, in asking for tenders for ploughs, they specify that only the John Deer plough will be accepted. This is an official declaration on the part of the Government that Canadian manufacturers are not able to supply a plough equal to the American article. In each case the Government ask for supplies, they specify the manufacture, thus casting discredit upon the other manufacturers. For instance, in calling for tenders for waggons, they call for the Chatham waggon, passing over the manufacturers of other waggons equally as good, and in some cases better. Not only is that done, but I find in the return laid on the Table that the Chatham Waggon Company have succeeded in getting through the Department a description of their waggon, in which it is recommended above all other waggons in the country. Government influence should not be used in this way in favor of any one manufacturer, but free competition should be allowed. On the form of tender, a description is given of the Chatham waggon, which, under the circumstances, is really a certificate of the Government given in favor of that waggon. The following is the description:

“Tracks 4 feet 8 inches. Wheels made of best and thoroughly seasoned white oak. Boxing of hubs pressed in by a patent process, which effectually prevents boxes getting loose, as they are sure to do when wedged in. Tire 2½ inches; arms superior to any others made in Canada, in that they receive at the shoulder ¼ of an inch more wood than any other arm made in Canada, and being adapted to receive and will receive the climax truss rod applied by the Chatham Manufacturing Co., only to their waggons, rendering the otherwise strongest axle practically unbreakable; the axles are of the best and most thoroughly seasoned hickory and hard maple. Front hames one solid piece of bent white oak. Tongues of the best of white ash. Reaches of the best of rock elm. It is better ironed in all respects than almost any waggon made, constituting it not only the strongest, but easiest running waggon made. Lower box 10 feet and 13½ inches high; top edge iron bound. Bow bottom of box of best tongued and grooved ash. Upper box 18 inches high, one spring seat, the opening of which is the best Armstrong make. Trees and neck yoke well ironed. Second growth white ash. Each waggon is furnished with a pair eveners chains. Every waggon guaranteed for one year. Double trees of the best timber, also neck yoke, which must be 4 feet long. The whole to be of the best wood and iron throughout, good workmanship and finish, and to be complete and perfect in every particular part.”

In a return I moved for, I find this matter had been brought before the Department, and that there was some correspondence between the Department and a certain firm anxious to tender. I find, under date of 16th April, 1884, a letter addressed to the Department:

“We enclose for your perusal two pages of a letter just received from our Winnipeg house; please read and return. Last season we supplied the Indian Department, through the Hudson Bay Company, a very considerable quantity of agricultural implements, which, as far as we know, give the very best satisfaction. We last year called your attention to the fact that in your specification for goods you were not fair to Canadian manufacturers. We again call your attention to this fact. Ploughs—you call for the John Deer plough, which means the American made plough. You should ask for the John Deer pattern of plough, which is made in Ontario, and quite equal to the American article. You stipulate for the Toronto mower; you should stipulate for a mower equal to the Toronto mower. You stipulate for sulky horse rakes and reapers made by the Massey Company of Toronto; you should stipulate for these ‘equal’ to those made by the Massey Manufacturing Company of Toronto. You stipulate for a Chatham waggon; you should stipulate for a waggon ‘Equal;’ you stipulate for Collard flexible harrow; you should stipulate for harrows equal to Collard’s flexible harrows. The inconsistency of your specification will appear when you state that you have also made a Spaight waggon your standard, which is a very much superior waggon to the Chatham, and costs from \$5 to \$10 more to build. When you stipulate for the John Deer plough, that virtually shuts out every Canadian manufacturer from tendering; and when you stipulate for goods made by any one particular firm, that virtually shuts out every other maker from tendering. We are quite sure that the wording of your specification has been done without due consideration, and without knowing what the result would be.”

This letter was dated the 16th of April, and on the 24th of April the Department replied as follows:—

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th inst., also of an extract from a letter received from your Winnipeg house, which, in accordance with your request, I return, the same having reference to the implements called for by the schedules accompanying the forms of tender for this Department. I also enclose copy of my telegram addressed to you, at your request, informing you that the articles to be delivered must be strictly in accordance with the specifications contained in the schedules. I regret exceedingly that the Department cannot see its way to comply with the suggestion contained in your letter. I may say, in passing, however, that the only article of American manufacture called for by the tenders is the 'John Deer' plough, and the reason for this will be explained in this letter. From the experience gained by this Department in inviting tenders for agricultural implements, and from the manner in which the contracts have been fulfilled during the past five years, it has been found that the term 'equal to' is entirely too vague to describe accurately the implements required, and to insure the delivery of suitable articles.

"Such a description is also little or no guide whatever to the Indian agents who receive over the goods in the Territories, as these men are not experts in such matters, and it is impossible for them to say whether the implement is or is not 'equal to' the articles mentioned in the contract. You are aware that all manufacturers of machines consider their own manufactures the best, and without an actual trial it is difficult even for an expert to judge as to the relative qualities of such goods. Much more difficult is it, therefore, for persons as inexperienced in such matters as Indian agents usually are to do so. The result has been, that many of the articles left, although declared by the contractors to be equal to the sample mentioned in the schedules, when used were found to be quite inferior. It was then, however, too late to remedy matters, as the articles had been taken over by the officers of the Department. The Department has, therefore, in its own protection, been obliged to specify patterns, and the names of the makers of the implements required, to avoid these serious complications, and to leave the agents of the Department without excuse in taking over goods. There is also, in addition to the above, much inconvenience experienced when implements of so many different patterns are supplied, as it is difficult, when parts of an implement become worn out or defective, always readily to obtain the necessary parts to make it again complete, and many of the implements have therefore to be discarded. The Department has, out of the multifarious articles of which it has made trial under the old system, selected those which experience has shown to be best adapted to the country, and these patterns have been adhered to, as far as possible; and where, as has sometimes been the case, it has been found that in some particulars none of those formerly sent in gave entire satisfaction, after due enquiry from practical men, other makers' patterns have been chosen. With reference to the Spaight waggon, referred to in your letter, it was adopted by the Department in the first instance. It was found that, although branded Spaight waggon, they were not complete, according to the specification embodied in the schedules, and were in many respects an inferior waggon. For these reasons a change was this year made, and the Chatham waggon selected, as it was reported to be a serviceable vehicle by persons who had had experience of the use of them in the North-West. Not only were these waggons well made, but they have given every satisfaction to those who have had them. With regard to the mowers, the Toronto mower has given the best satisfaction to the Department, and therefore there can be no reason for changing it for another, it not being desirable to have different patterns of the same machine in use, for the reasons above stated, viz., that when renewal parts are required confusion is caused. The same remark applies to the reapers and horse-rakes called for by the Department. With regard to the harrows, Collard's flexible iron harrow was adopted three years ago by the Department. It has given great satisfaction, and there is, therefore, no reason to change the pattern. As regards ploughs, the John Deer plough has been found to be the most durable, and the best implement of the kind for use in the North-West. Wilkinson's plough was tried, and was proved to be a failure. One of them, for instance, was put to work on a small farm of about 10 acres, attached to the industrial school at Battleford. It worked well for a short time, but the mould-board and point both proved soft in temper. It was, therefore, considered better to adhere to the plough that had proved satisfactory, viz., the John Deer. Since the Department commenced farming operations among the Indians in 1878-79, it has endeavored to introduce at various times Canadian manufactured ploughs. They were received on the contracts of 1881 and 1881-82, but they proved entire failures, and had to be thrown aside as useless. I may state that, in 1882, Mr. Watson, of Ayr, Ontario, who is a large manufacturer of agricultural implements, in a communication to the Indian Commissioner for the North-West, stated that no Canadian make of plough had, up to that time, given satisfaction for prairie work, and that for his trade he intended furnishing American ploughs. Trusting that these explanations will prove satisfactory to you, etc."

That is the reply made by the Department, and to that again the firm replied, on 26th April, two days after the date of the letter which I have read:

"SIR,—We are in receipt of your communication of the 24th of April, which is by no means a satisfactory reply to our enquiries. From your letter it is evident that the heads of Departments at Ottawa know as little about the agricultural implement trade as the Indian agents in the North-West are represented to know. On examination of the schedules  
Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

we find that the articles required by the Department are: 1 mower, 2 reapers, 2 horse-rakes, 8 waggons, 44 harrows, and 147 ploughs. Omitting the ploughs and harrows, the order is very small indeed, very much smaller than hundreds of orders which we have filled. You will, therefore, understand that the objections we make are not from any anxiety to procure the order, which, at best, amounts to very little; but we are writing you as much for the sake of showing that the Department is doing a very unfair thing, and are not carrying out the policy of the present Government. It would be very easy indeed to make a point against the Government on the floor of the House by a reference to the very matter about which we now write. We have evidence, however, that if your Department is made to understand the position fully, anything that is now wrong will be corrected. If the Indian Department require only 1 mower, 2 reapers and 2 horse-rakes, and these must positively be those made by the Massey Manufacturing Company of Toronto, why don't you give them the order, and not advertise for tenders, when it is a matter of impossibility for anybody else but the Massey Company to tender for the goods required? This same remark applies to waggons. If the Department want 8 Chatham waggons, why don't they order them from the Chatham Manufacturing Company, instead of asking tenders from parties whose waggons would not be accepted? This same remark refers to the harrows and ploughs. The order for the former should be given to the manufacturer in Gananoque, and the order for the latter to Messrs. Westbrook & Fairchild, of Winnipeg. It is entirely useless to go to the expense of advertising for tenders of these articles when they cannot be procured, except from one manufacturer in each line, and he can charge the Department any price he chooses. Apart altogether from this, for your Department to ask for tenders as they do, and stipulate for certain goods, only makes other manufacturers incensed to think that their goods should be excluded. The mowers, reapers and horse-rakes made by the Massey Manufacturing Company are good articles, and we have nothing to say against the Department for desiring to order them. At the same time, there are many other similar articles made in Canada quite as good, and which would give equal satisfaction to the Department. In regard to waggons, how the Department ever came to choose such a waggon is beyond our comprehension. It is evident that it has been done from reasons other than the merit of the waggon. The Chatham waggon has only been manufactured for two seasons, and it will be five years before it is known whether it is a good article or not. It has not stood the test of time, nor is it as good a waggon as either the Spaight, the Snowball, the Adams, the Lowrie, the Ramsay, or the Bain. Nearly all these waggons have been in the market longer, are better known and are better goods than the Chatham waggon. In regard to ploughs, in 1880, 1881 and 1882, American-made John Deer plough was the best plough in the North-West, and at that time Mr. John Watson, of Ayr, was bringing American ploughs, as we were also ourselves. Does the Indian Department think that Canadian manufacturers have been sitting on stools, doing nothing, during the last four or five years? For the information of the Department, we may say that immense progress has been made during the last few years in the manufacture of ploughs for the North-West, and to-day the ploughs made by Geo. Wilkinson & Company, of Aurora, or by the Cookswell Plough Company, of Brantford, or by the American Plough Company, of Ayr, of which John Weston is president, are just as good as the American-made John Deer plough, and are very much more largely sold in the North-West Territories. We give these facts for the information of the Department, and again say that it is a very unfair thing for the Department to call for tenders in the manner in which it has. We give herewith a memorandum of Canadian names, which are, in every respect, equal to the goods asked for in the schedule of the Indian Department, and in getting out the schedules in future, if tenders are desired, the option should be given of supplying the goods we mention."

And then they specify the names of certain mowers and reapers and self-binders and waggons, and other manufactures, and go on in this way:

"All or any of these goods are equal to the goods asked for in the schedule of the Indian Department, and very many of them are much superior to the goods asked for. We know that the Department will absolve us from ulterior motives in writing as we do, because the goods that we could supply would be very limited indeed; but we do not like to see inconsistency in anybody, much less in any Department of the Government of our country."

I do think there should have been some attention paid to the representations made some two years ago by that correspondent. I have given all weight to the arguments which have been supplied by the Department in their replies, but it does seem to me that, when there are a mower and two reapers required, and you specify that they should be bought from certain manufacturers, the Government should buy from them, and should not send out forms of tenders, in a manner which is equivalent to giving the Government sanction and proclamation that in their experience these articles are exclusively made by those firms. In agricultural implements there has been great improvements, and many firms are bending their best energies to

perfecting their products. The First Minister must see that the Government are throwing their influence in favor of one particular firm in each line, by the form of tender that is adopted. He can readily understand that the manufacturers are anxious that their goods should stand well in the market, but the Department is throwing a considerable weight in favor of the one article that is specified, to the injury and detriment of other manufacturers of the same article. It does seem to me, also, that it is limiting competition. With reference to ploughs in the North-West, there were none a few years ago, but I can assure the First Minister that in that article, as in others of Canadian manufacture, when they recognised the fact that the Americans, through long experience, had secured a better prairie plough than we had, I know, of my own knowledge, that the manufacturing firms of this country went to vast expense in order to get the American patents and to import workmen, in order to compete with the American products. I believe that what is stated there now is correct, in reference to ploughs, and that in the North-West our Canadian manufacturers have attained the point when they supply as good an article as can be imported. I would like to see that provision struck out, where it is made imperative that they shall have an American plough, so as to give our Canadian manufacturers a chance in that line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place whether the statement that has just been read, about the merits of the Chatham waggon, is going to be an advertisement for that company, one thing is quite clear, and that is that the hon. gentleman's speech is going to be a most substantial advertisement of that particular waggon. I am glad to learn from the hon. gentleman that the Canadian manufacturers now can make as good, or better, goods in every kind of agricultural implements as they do in the United States. I remember, not very long ago, when, perhaps, the hon. gentleman himself proclaimed on the stump in Parliament the extraordinary injustice that was being inflicted upon the poor settlers in the North-West, because they could not get American implements; that it was an injustice that our tariff should keep out an article because we could not make it as good or so cheap, just for the sake of bolstering up the National Policy; that we were robbing the settlers in the North-West. I am glad, however, to learn from such clear evidence as is given by the hon. gentleman that that state of things has changed. Now, my hon. friend speaks of the form of advertisement. Well, that form of advertisement that he wishes to have would never do—such as a plough called the John Deer plough. Every manufacturer, as the hon. gentleman says, has his own plough, his own implement, which he thinks is not only equal, but superior. There must be a specification. If you are going to have tenders at all, you must call upon them to compete in the same article. Now, I take it that the John Deer plough means that Mr. John Deer has a certain kind of plough, in shape, in form and weight, and it is well understood what the John Deer plough is. I take it that any manufacturer in Canada, whether he has bought a patent from John Deer, or whether he steals the patent and makes the plough, if he makes a John Deer plough that man can compete—that is the name of the plough.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; that is an American plough.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear you can have no competition unless the article is the same. I take it that there are a great many implement makers, each having their own form of plough, each having several excellencies. There can be no competition; they cannot fight; they cannot tender; there can be no means of judging who puts in the lowest tender, unless we know that it is for the same article. It would never do for any Department wanting a large supply of ploughs, or

waggons, or any other implement, to allow a general scramble among all the manufacturers, by way of tender, and then afterwards the Department would have to select from all these different kinds of implements. I take it, the Department has learned from their officers, from those who are experts, what article best suits the North-West, best suits the Indians. If the Indians have been accustomed to one kind of agricultural implement, it is inadvisable to change that capriciously, because they will have to commence to learn the use of the implement over again. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is the desire of the Department to get the best article, the article fittest to be handled by the Indians. They must require a special specification, and they offer everything to tender. The Government makes it a principle—I think Parliament insists upon that principle being carried out—to get everything by tender, except in remote portions of the country. There was a time, formerly, when an article could only be got in one place, and from one party, or, from want of transport, could not be got in Canada at all, but that kind of thing has passed away; and now the Departments call for a particular article, giving it the name by which it is known in the trade.

Mr. MILLS. As the Chatham waggon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Chatham waggon, I take it, is known. It is made in a particular way. The hon. gentleman comes from that vicinity, and I dare say he knows whether it is a good waggon or not. At all events, in advertising, it is necessary to specify the article, whether it is the Chatham waggon or the John Deer plough, or the Peter Wilkins plough, or the Peter Jones harrow; all these implements have a particular name, well understood in the market. That is the object of the Department; and if there is any mistake about it, I shall certainly see that there cannot be a doubt raised, as has been raised by the writer of the letter in question, as to whether he could compete or not. If he makes the article, whether it is known as the Chatham waggon or the John Deer plough, and it is equal to sample, he has a chance to get the contract.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The form of tender does not allow that. He cannot make a waggon and call it the Chatham waggon. The tender says it must be the Chatham waggon. The contractor is to supply the Chatham waggon, and is not at liberty to supply any waggon. The letter of the Department to that person was explicit. The party wished to tender, for some agricultural implements equal to any in the market, and wanted to know whether the tender would be received. The Department replied that they exceedingly regretted that they could not depart from the form of tender and accept other than the articles as described. If Massey mowers were called for, they must be made by the Massey Co. If the tender stated that the mowers were to be equal to the Massey mower, half a dozen firms would have competed. So with regard to sugar. The tender for the supply to destitute Indians provides that the sugar shall be Paris lump. Gentlemen in the grocery trade know that this is a kind manufactured by Redpaths alone, and that it costs 1 cent per pound more than the best granulated sugar. We need to give destitute Indians Paris lump, when every Canadian family uses granulated and pay for this lump 1 cent per lb. additional. This limits the tender to the article supplied by Redpaths. There is no chance for the Halifax, Moncton or St. John refineries, because they do not make Paris lump, only granulated sugars. But granulated is good enough for the First Minister's house and for the rest of us, but Paris lump, at 1 cent per pound additional, is needed for the destitute Indians. And so I might run down the list, and show that the form of tender is so framed that a monopoly is given to a particular manufacturer, to the exclusion of other manufacturers. The First Minister is wrong in his suggestion

that there is latitude allowed. That is not so. The provisions are imperative; it is latitude that we want.

Mr. MILLS. According to the form of tender, the article specified must be supplied. There is, therefore, no object gained in calling for tenders at all, and it would be better to purchase direct from the manufacturers, than to provide that a particular article, the product of a particular manufacturer, must be purchased.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must know what he will charge for it.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly; but when you provide that the goods of a particular manufacturer must be obtained, then it is perfectly clear that that manufacturer is master of the situation, and is able to ask what he pleases. You cannot put any other article into competition with his articles. I suppose a score of companies manufacture as good an article as the Chatham waggon. It looks very much like a job being put up on the Department. I have some curiosity to know how such an advertisement got into the tender. Will the hon. gentleman tell us?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot; I do not know.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman think it a proper thing for the Department to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did the Department publish it?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. There has been great carelessness somewhere, for the Department should never have allowed itself to be used in that way. The right hon. gentleman has not been looking as carefully after this part of his public duty as he should have done. That is really an insult to every waggon manufacturer in Canada, with the single exception of that one corporation. I could tell the hon. gentleman something about that company, but I will not make it a subject of discussion in this House. He will find that neither the interests of himself, nor the Indian Department, nor the industries of the country, will be promoted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Departments are trying to do what they can to get the best article for the animal—for the Indian. I do not know how that description of the Chatham waggon got into the advertisement of last year; it is not in this year's advertisement. I cannot agree with the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that when you describe an article by a particular name, it must be made by the party who originally gave it the name. We will take the case of animals. If we had advertised for Clydesdale horses, or Suffolk ponies, or Southdowns, must they have been brought from those particular parts of the country? The Department knows what articles they want, and they want the article to supply the requirements of the specifications.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Take, for instance, the articles produced by the Massey Company. All these are patented articles, and they cannot be obtained anywhere else, until the patent has expired. If the hon. gentleman will make enquiries of manufacturers who are manufacturing the articles of another company, he will find that the particular article so manufactured will not be of the same size as the original article, unless they buy the original patterns.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A few points with respect to the prices paid, and I should have felt it my duty to have gone more fully into this matter at an earlier part of this Session. I am not prepared to say that the advertisements are not broad enough, but the form of tender limits the scope. It is not to be wondered at that one or two large firms, such as Baker & Co., and the Hudson Bay Company, obtain the bulk of the contracts. Take the Chatham wag-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

gon. The First Minister has stated that that waggon could be bought at Winnipeg at from \$50 to \$60. I find the price paid at Indian Head, a station a few hundred miles west of Winnipeg, was \$95. If it was only \$50, it would be below the price of Chatham. They claim that was a benefit conferred on the North-West, but if it was a fact, as they stated, that they could be bought at Winnipeg at that price, certainly \$95 was too much. The same waggon at Fort Macleod was \$125. Then, at Indian Head, a station on the railway, they paid for white sugar 11½ cents per pound, when everyone knows, who is acquainted with the trade, that granulated sugar, at that time, was very low in price, and it certainly could not cost 3 or 4 cents a pound for freight from Montreal to Indian Head. English yellow soap was 14 cents per pound; rice 10½; salt 2½ cents per pound, and so on. I give these as samples, but it seems to me that the whole matter of these tenders for the North-West is one the First Minister should give his personal attention to, with a view of seeing whether an improvement could not be made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, things were very dear in the North-West, but that is rapidly changing. We could not get people in the East to tender, and as we were obliged to get the goods, we had to accept the lowest tender. Now, however, the transport is easy, by the construction of the railway and the progress of the country generally, and they are now just beginning to tender from the Eastern Provinces. I know, with regard to Indian supplies and Mounted Police supplies, sometimes we can hardly get tenders at all, in consequence of the remoteness of the stations, and we have to look out and get them the best way we can. I am glad to say that that state of things is being rapidly cured, and that people in the East are beginning to tender. Prices will soon be very nearly down to the same rate as in Ontario, plus the cost of transport.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. member from Brant, inadvertently, I know, stated that Paris lump sugar was only made at Redpath's. I wish to say that it is now made by the Halifax refiners, and I mention that fact so that no injustice may be done them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was entirely an inadvertence on my part, for though I have handled a great many sugars, I was not aware that it was manufactured elsewhere.

Mr. WATSON. The First Minister states that it is difficult to get parties in the East to tender for these supplies. I pointed out, some time ago, that the reason for that was that the supplies were tendered for at a particular point. If the goods were tendered for to be delivered at certain points on the railway, I think that difficulty could be remedied, because the trouble is, at present, that these firms would not bother with these small contracts for remote places. The result has been that the contracts have been entirely in the hands of I. G. Baker & Co. and the Hudson Bay Company. The Government have had to pay more for the goods than they should have paid, and in many cases they have not been of as good quality as if small tenderers had tendered for them. With reference to the Chatham waggon, there are three or four different waggons which are taken in preference to it, in Manitoba. It has only been manufactured for the last two years, and it has not been tested. There is the Scobell and the Speight waggon, which take the lead in the North-West, and there are two or three others, which are taken in preference to the Chatham waggon. The Government should be very careful as to the quality of the goods they supply to the Indians. Some years ago a lot of waggons came from Listowel, and the tires fell off while they were standing on the streets of Winnipeg. As to the prices, the best waggons sold at \$65 in Winnipeg last year, and I think that the

prices in these tenders are too high, not only for waggons but for ploughs and other articles.

Mr. MILLS. I see that the hon. gentleman still asks for this vote for provisions for use at annuity payments. It was voted in the first instance because these Indians were not on the reservations, but had to assemble at certain points to be paid their annuities, and they had to be fed while receiving their payments. It was assumed that when they became settled on their reserves this practice would come to an end.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right; it is an abuse of long standing. They met at certain points, and some times kept it up for three weeks or more. The vote used to be enormous in those times, but it is being gradually reduced. As the Indians are placed on reserves, the agents go around to pay them. There are still, however, a number of places where they have to assemble, owing to the circumstances of particular localities, and I dare say there are some small presents of food, even on the reserves. With the Indians, you cannot break these customs off suddenly.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the hon. gentleman will, in future reports, give us some information about these cattle, pigs and seed grain supplies, because most of these Indians have, no doubt, already had, in cattle, implements, etc., over and over again the amount required under the treaty obligations, and of course they are getting this over and above treaty obligations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In some cases.

Mr. MILLS. I do not object to that; but it would be most convenient to the House and also to the Department if we had statements showing the amount paid each year. We should have some control over the expenditure for this purpose; we should see what bands are making progress, and what are not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will try and get that up for next year. I do not think we can do it for this year.

Mr. MILLS. Surely the Department know what they have done in the distribution of supplies.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The amount of \$215,056.83 is a large sum for supplies for destitute Indians. In the reports for 1882 and 1883 there are very clear evidences of gross frauds perpetrated by the head men among the Indians on the Government. In several cases the agents report that a large number have been rationed in excess of the real number in the band. For instance, in 1883 the Blackfeet appear to have drawn rations for 800 or 900 more than there really were in the band; and one or two other bands are in precisely the same position. I would like to know whether there is any system by which the agent of the Government can tell the exact number. Mr. Denny, the Indian agent at Macleod, says:

"I found that a great deal of cheating had been going on in rations; 3,000 had been drawing rations, when there only ought to have been 2,200."

That appears to have been going on for some time. Further, he says of the Sarcees, of Calgary, that they have been drawing rations for a much larger number than there really were in the band. Another agent reports that some two or three families have been drawing rations who have been living in the United States for ten years. Another agent reports that the number in the band that he had charge of was much over-estimated; that is, that they had been drawing rations for a much larger number than there really were in the band. I would like to enquire whether the First Minister's attention has been drawn to this matter, or whether any steps have been taken to check these practices. There must be either gross negli-

gence on the part of the agents or gross frauds on the part of the Indians. I would also draw the First Minister's attention to the fact that the agents have reported, over and over again, that the supplies are of very inferior quality. Mr. Wadsworth has several times pointed out that the supplies are of inferior quality, and that the sacks of flour weighed only 90 or 92 pounds, instead of 100 pounds, and that it is lumpy and bad. If the Indians are getting inferior supplies, a poorer quality of flour or bacon than the contract requires, that is a fraud on the Indians as well as on the Government; and the middle men who furnish the supplies must have been guilty of the very grossest misconduct during the last three or four years. I would like to know whether any steps have been taken to punish the parties furnishing these inferior supplies, or to check them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would simply say that originally, as the hon. gentleman knows, there were occasional frauds; that is, the Indians, when in large bodies, managed to get more supplies than they were entitled to. That evil is gradually correcting itself; the Indians are now on their reserves, in a great measure, and the system has been adopted of supplying each family with a ration ticket, which must be produced when they are paid, so that there is no danger of fraud in the future. The hon. gentleman says there is fraud on the Indians because the food is imperfect. It cannot be considered a fraud on the Indians, because they have no right to that food. They are simply living on the benevolence and the charity of the Canadian Parliament, and, as the old adage says, beggars should not be choosers. But the Government attempt to get the article they advertise for, and they are pretty successful, on the whole. Even in Ontario, the hon. gentleman has seen and heard of contractors sending in inferior articles, which were afterwards condemned. Up there, when they are sent to a distant post, they cannot be condemned; they have to be used. I do not think there has been any unwholesome food given, although it has not, perhaps, come up to the standard. Mr. Wadsworth is an active and zealous officer, I believe, and he reports that last year all the supplies were satisfactory.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It seems to me there must be something wrong somewhere, though I am not prepared to say where it is, or who is to blame for it. For instance, in the band of the Bloods, it is reported there are 2,200 Indians. According to the vouchers from the Department, we have supplied the Bloods for the last five months of 1883 with \$48,744 worth of beef alone, and all this was obtained from I. G. Baker & Co. I do not know whether they are butchers or traders, or what they are, but all this was supplied by them. That appears to me a large sum for supplying 2,220 Indians, and I find by the reports there were not 2,220 every month. In some months there were 1,300, and in others 1,400, and the greatest number in any month was 2,200. Yet we have given them for five months \$48,744 worth of beef alone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will not starve.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What I am afraid of is, that this will not all reach the Indians. What check has the hon. gentleman? When we turn to the vouchers, we find that the Department has no check, excepting the receipts of the farm instructors, and I say that the class of men sent there as farm instructors are not a class to be entrusted with granting receipts for these enormous amounts. Voucher 436, 1st of October, 1883, \$10,000 worth of beef for that month; voucher 381, 30th of September, 1883, \$10,434 paid to Mr. Baker; voucher 325, 31st of August, 1883, \$9,014 paid Mr. Baker for beef; voucher 542, 31st December, 1883, 70,512 pounds beef, at 13½ cents, \$9,518; voucher 494, 30th of November, 1883, 68,869 pounds of beef, equal

to \$9,300. The five months aggregate \$48,744, to feed 2,220 Bloods.

Mr. FARROW. That is not very much.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not talking about whether it is much or not; I am giving the figures. I say it is much, but that is not all. Not only did they get beef, but they got bacon and other supplies. I am not blaming the First Minister, but I say the system is not a good one. These vouchers are all certified to by the farm instructors. It is an unsafe thing to leave the furnishing of such an enormous quantity of supplies to the destitute Indians to be certified to by the farm instructors, and the farm instructors alone. There is no real check, except the check furnished by the honesty of these men. I find, at the same time, while on the 31st July we were supplying the Indians with beef, at 13½ cents a pound we bought for them 12,438 pounds of bacon, at 23 cents a pound. I may say to the hon. gentlemen that there is no voucher at all for one month of the last six months of 1883. The hon. gentleman knows that the Indians object very decidedly to the use of pork, and I cannot see what interest the Government can have in giving the Indians a thing they do not want, and paying double the price for it. The Indians say that by supplying them with this bacon or pork, they become diseased. Pie-a-Pot complained that a large number of his band, from being compelled to use this pork, bought at 23 cents a pound, became unhealthy, and many died from the effects.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was a lie of Pie-a-Pot.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Can the hon. gentleman explain why we should give these Indians pork at 23 cents a pound, when we could supply them with beef at 13½ cents a pound. The same thing occurs with respect to the Blackfoot Indians. They are estimated to number something over 2,000. In some reports and for some months the bands are estimated at 2,000; for other months the number is down to 1,200 and 1,600. For the last six months of 1883, according to the vouchers in the Department, we supplied them with fresh beef to the extent of \$56,168; and during the same time we purchased pork for them at 23 cents a pound. There is another thing to which I wish to direct the First Minister's attention. In voucher 837, 31st of January, 1884, with respect to the Blackfeet, they obtained, according to the voucher, on that day, 22,250 pounds of beef, at 14½ cents. The voucher contains an entry to the following effect: Destitute Indians, Blackfoot Crossing, average daily rations, 871; and upon the same date, 31st January, 1884, by voucher 836, that same band got 26,560 pounds of beef, at 14½ cents, \$3,785; and the following entry is on the voucher: Destitute Indians at Blackfoot Crossing, average daily rations, 1,290,—the one voucher signed by J. E. Edward the other by J. E. Macdonald, farm instructors. Why should there be, on the same day, to the same Indians, two different accounts for fresh beef? In the month of February precisely the same thing happened. Voucher 840, 29th of February, 1883, these Blackfeet at the Crossing obtained 16,727 pounds of beef, at 14½ cents, \$2,383.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better let this item pass, as it is close on Sunday.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think not. I am perfectly convinced, from the hon. gentleman's own reports, that the grossest possible frauds are perpetrated by the middlemen. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow this item to stand, as it is an item which requires some discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All right.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I want to call his attention to the statements in his own reports. I do not know that he

has read all these reports, and it is of the first possible consequence that his attention should be drawn to them. I have two different vouchers upon the same day of the same month to the very same band of Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; they are divided into two bands.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I will refer the hon. gentleman to the month of February. I find one voucher, No. 840—that is the number on the outside of the voucher, in pencil mark—and I find that there is an account, dated the 29th February, 1883, for 16,727 pounds of beef to the Blackfeet at the Blackfoot Crossing; and on the same day there is another voucher for 26,956 pounds of beef to the same identical band of Indians at the Blackfoot Crossing. It may be, as the hon. gentleman says, that this band of Indians has been divided into two, and the supplies have been given to them by two different agents. If that is so, it only happens with regard to those two months, because, during the whole of 1883 the supplies are certified by one official, and generally by the farm instructor; but in January and February, 1883, there are two sets of vouchers, certified to by two different individuals. I do not know what the explanation is, but I think it is a matter that requires some explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is nearly twelve o'clock.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then let the item stand.

Mr. BOWELL. The First Minister said he would let it stand several times. He said so fifteen minutes ago.

Mr. CAMERON. He did not say so fifty times.

Mr. BOWELL. I said he said so fifteen minutes ago.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the First Minister said so, I did not hear him, or I would have stopped at once. I apologise to the First Minister for going on, but I did not hear him.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878.

Mr McCRAVEY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to legislate during the present Session so as to provide for the proper enforcement of the Temperance Act, 1878, by furnishing the necessary funds for the prosecution of persons violating the provisions of said Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be impossible, I think, at this stage of the Session to legislate on this subject.

### BONDED MACHINERY IN USE.

Mr. McMULLEN, asked, Whether there is any mill or manufacturing machinery that has been imported into Canada and put in mills or manufacturing establishments and still held in bond by the Government? If so, the names of the mill or mills in which the machinery is, the date of its importation and the several amounts due for duty, and how long due?

Mr. BOWELL. I am unable to answer that question fully, but there are two or three establishments in which the full amount of the duties has not been paid, but is now in course of collection. There is one at Brantford, one at Weston, and the Magog one, and there is still a balance due at St. Croix. These are the only ones I am aware of. The Commissioner has sent for the information. I am informed that all these matters are in course of final settlement.

#### THE FISHERIES.

Mr. VAIL (for Mr. FORBES) asked, Is it the intention of the Dominion Government, during the continuance of the free fishing arrangements allowed the American fishermen, to pay the fishermen of the Dominion, a bonus equivalent to the duties paid on fish shipped to the United States by Canadian shippers?

Mr. McLELAN. In view of the fact that the whole question of the fisheries will be considered at an early day, this particular branch of the subject has not been decided upon.

#### THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST— COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES.

Mr. ROSS (for Mr. ROYAL) asked, Whether commissioners have been appointed to investigate the individual losses made during the last outbreak in the North-West and caused by the Indians? If not, whether the Government intend to make some appointments for that object and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No commissioners have been appointed as yet, but the whole of that question is under the consideration of the Government.

#### THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST— RELIEF OF DESTITUTE FAMILIES.

Mr. ROSS (for Mr. ROYAL) asked, Whether measures have been taken to come to the relief of families whom the last troubles in the North-West have left destitute and even without the first necessaries of life?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has taken steps, and has relieved some of the sufferers, and is taking steps to prevent starvation in regard to the people who have suffered during the late outbreak.

#### ONTARIO BOUNDARIES.

Mr. MILLS asked, whether the Government intends to invite Parliament to ask for Imperial legislation in the matter of the boundaries of Ontario, this Session? Whether it proposes to take any action, and if so what it is to be?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter has engaged, as might be supposed, the attention of the Government. With respect to the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba, there can be no difficulty. The Government are quite prepared that an Act should pass for that purpose. In respect to the northern boundary of Ontario, which boundary divided Ontario from Keewatin, that is yet unsettled, and the hon. gentleman will see that there is a question involved in that as to what is or ought to be the northern boundary of the Province of Quebec. There is no chance of there being any Imperial legislation until the next meeting of the Imperial Parliament. The Canadian Government, in the meantime, desire to open negotiations, or rather to have communication with the Province of Manitoba, the Province of Ontario, and the Province of Quebec, for the purpose of settling forever not only the boundary between Manitoba and Quebec, which is practically settled, but the northern boundary of Ontario and the northern boundary of Quebec; and, after communicat-

ing with these several Governments, to get from the Imperial Parliament, at its next Session, some legislation settling these three questions forever—what is the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario—that is to repeat by Imperial enactment what the decision of the Privy Council has been—to settle forever what is the northern boundary of Ontario, separating it from Keewatin, and what is the northern boundary of Quebec, dividing the Province of Quebec from the lands belonging to the Dominion of Canada lying to the north of that.

#### DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government received any and if so, how many communications and at what dates from Bishop Grandin relating to North-West affairs and not brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We only saw this morning this and the following questions of the hon. gentleman, put on Saturday, and will be ready to answer them tomorrow. It is the same with regard to the question of the hon. member for Chateaugay (Mr. Holton).

#### DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICES OF THE VOLUNTEERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House will to-morrow resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to recognise the services of the members of the enrolled militia force actively engaged in suppressing the half-breed and Indian outbreak in the North-West by giving each, in addition to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled under the Militia Act, a grant of land upon certain conditions or of scrip, redeemable in land as the case may be, and that the grant should be made in such form as would be conducive to the actual settlement of the public lands of Canada.

2. Resolved, That in order to give effect to the foregoing resolutions the Governor General in Council be authorised to grant to each member of the enrolled militia force actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the Indian and half-breed outbreak, and serving west of Port Arthur since the 25th day of March, last, including officers, non-commissioned officers and men. A free homestead of two adjoining quarter sections (comprising an area of 320 acres in all) of any even numbered section of unoccupied and unclaimed Dominion lands in Manitoba or the North-West Territories open for homestead and pre-emption entry, subject to the condition that the grantee or his duly constituted substitute, shall have selected and entered the two said quarter sections in the Dominion Land Office for the land district in which they may be situated on or before the first day of June, 1886.

Provided that the said grantee or his substitute, as the case may be, shall perfect the entry made as above provided by commencing actually to reside upon and cultivate the land within six months from and after the 1st day of June, 1886, and shall thereafter continue to reside upon and cultivate the said land for the period, and in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed by the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883. Provided further that no substitute to be selected by a grantee shall be a person who is not eligible under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act to obtain entry for a homestead. Provided further that in case a substitute be selected by a grantee as hereinbefore provided, the land shall be entered in the name of the substitute, and upon compliance with the conditions in that behalf prescribed by the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act the patent for the two quarter sections shall be issued in the name of said substitute.

3. Resolved, That any person entitled, under the foregoing, to select and enter either by himself or by his substitute, 320 acres of land as a homestead in the manner and subject to the terms and condition hereinbefore prescribed may, in lieu thereof, if he so chooses, receive scrip for eighty dollars (80) which shall be accepted in payment of any Dominion lands open for sale, or in payment of pre-emptions or of rents of Dominion lands leased for grazing or hay cutting purposes, but any person choosing to take scrip, as hereinbefore provided, shall notify the Minister of the Interior of his choice on or before the 1st day of June, 1887.

4. Resolved, That all grants of land or scrip, as the case may be, issued in accordance with the foregoing provisions, shall be made by the Minister of the Interior upon a warrant in favor of the person entitled thereto issued by the Minister of Militia and Defence, which shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior under clause 21 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883; and further, that all scrip which may be issued under the third resolution as above, shall be subject, in all respects, to the provisions of the said clause 21 and also of clause 22 of the Dominion Lands Act.

5. Resolved, That the entries to be made and the patent to be issued hereunder shall not be subject to the dues and charges exacted in the case of ordinary homestead entries.

## SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will, unless the hon. gentleman objects, go on with the Bill granting subsidies to railways. It is simply the resolutions, with one slight change.

Mr. BLAKE. The Bill is not yet distributed, and I have not had an opportunity of looking at it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, if the hon. gentleman objects, I cannot go on with it.

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

## WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of the report of the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would explain what alteration this will make in his estimate of the revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware it will make any material difference. I have not the figures with me, but I will give them to the House when we go into Committee on the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

## SUPPLY—THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

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

Mr. WELDON. The importance of the matter I propose to bring before the House is my apology for calling attention to it at this period of the Session. I wish to call the attention of the House to the manner in which the Government have dealt with the termination of the Washington Treaty, and to show by facts laid before the House, that the Government in their conduct with respect to the abrogation of the articles of the Washington Treaty, have been guilty of delay and neglect. Their conduct may be characterised as having been gross and inexcusable in the like manner as the *Toronto Mail* characterised the action regarding the North-West. The value of the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces is so well known to this House that I need not dwell upon it. Sufficient it is to state that by the award made by the Halifax Commission we were granted about \$5,000,000 for ten years during which the treaty was in force. This subject, Mr. Speaker, is not only of importance to the Maritime Provinces, because it is not only in the waters that wash the Atlantic coast, where our fisheries are situated, but even in the Pacific there are countless millions of fish, so that to both the east and the west of this Dominion, this is a matter of great importance. Perhaps I cannot better characterise those fisheries than by using the words of the late Chief Magistrate of the United States, who spoke of the richly stocked fisheries and sealing grounds of British North America. You are aware that articles 18 to 25 of the Washington Treaty relate to the fisheries, and those articles provided, amongst other things, that the Americans should use our fishing grounds, that we should have the benefit of their fishing grounds, and that fish should be admitted into both countries respectively free of duty. By the 33rd article of that treaty, it was provided that two years' notice should be given by either country, in the event of a desire to terminate those articles. We are all aware that notice has been given of their termination, and I wish briefly to refer to the course pursued by the American Government, and the course pursued by this Government, with regard to it; and to show that despite

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

repeated applications to the Canadian Government, despite the fact that their attention was repeatedly called to it, the matter was allowed to slumber until no advantage could be gained to Canada. On the 10th of January, 1883, Senator Fry, of Maine, introduced a resolution into the Senate of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On the 16th of January, 1883, the Hon. Mr. West forwarded a copy of that resolution to this Government. On the 2nd of February, a resolution was passed by the Senate of the United States; it was then referred to the House of Representatives, and on the 27th of February, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations was accepted by the House. As the question may arise as to what took place at that time, I will call the attention of the House to the language of Mr. Rice, of Massachusetts, who was, I believe, a member if not chairman, of the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"I think if the gentlemen from Minnesota will hear the explanation which I will briefly give, it may, perhaps satisfy him on all points, with reference to the propriety of the adoption of this measure. By the Treaty of Washington certain sections were devoted to rights given in British waters to American fishermen. The amount that the United States was to pay for the privilege was to be settled by the Halifax Commission. The sum that was to be awarded by that commission paid for that right for the term of 12 years and no longer. The sum awarded by the Halifax Commission was \$5,500,000. We must now give notice, by the first of next July, of the abrogation of these clauses of that treaty, and provisions contained in the treaty for the abrogation of those clauses, and nothing else. So that the matter stands by itself or else we enter upon another term, for which England may demand ample payment from the United States, according to the enormous and unjust awards of the Halifax Commission for privileges which nobody in the United States, who has investigated the subject, consider worth keeping. The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, unanimously reported this resolution. It was adopted by the Senate without any objection; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, having fully examined the matter, unanimously instructed me to move the adoption of the resolution by the House, which I now do under that instruction. With this explanation, I trust that no objection will be made to the consideration of the resolution, which I am very sure, I can satisfy everybody, ought to be adopted, to avoid liability to further payment of an extortionate sum to Great Britain, for that which is not considered worth anything to us by parties who are interested in the matter and who have examined into it."

This was also communicated to this Government. On the 27th of February, 1883, that resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives, and on the 3rd of March, it received the approval of the President. On the 19th of March, after the resolution was finally passed, Mr. West enclosed copies of these resolutions to the Government. On the 28th of March, the late Colonial Secretary, Lord Derby, wrote the following:

"MY LORD,—I have the honor to transmit to you, for communication to your Government, a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office, forwarding a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, reporting that a joint resolution for the termination of the fishery clauses of the Treaty of Washington, has passed the Senate.

"I shall, no doubt, receive an expression of the views and wishes of the Dominion Government in regard to the matter.

"I have, etc.,  
"DERBY."

Although the Colonial Secretary intimated his wish to obtain the views and wishes of the Canadian Government in regard to the matter, no response was made to the Imperial Government. On the 2nd of April the Government forwarded papers, which were sent to Earl Granville, which contained the extract from the *Congressional Record* which I have already read, and, on the 2nd of April, Lord Derby forwarded a copy of a further despatch from the Foreign Office. Now, the despatch written from Washington on the 27th of February, 1883, by Mr. Saurin, acting for the legation, is as follows:—

"WASHINGTON, 27th February, 1883.

"MY LORD,—With reference to my despatch of yesterday's date, I have the honor to report that the Senate joint resolution for the termination of articles 18 to 25 and 30 of the Treaty of Washington, was yesterday read a third time in the House, and passed.

"I enclose, at the same time, a report from the *Congressional Record* of a speech made by Mr. Rice, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs,

explaining the reasons why the United States Government is anxious to denounce the fishery clauses.

"They are briefly that, in their opinion, the fisheries are not worthy the sum awarded by the Halifax Commission, and that, as the term of years for which compensation was awarded expires next year, the United States would, were no steps taken to free themselves from this obligation, be liable to be again called upon to pay largely for privileges which they do not consider worth keeping.

I have, &c.,

"The Earl GRANVILLE, K.G.

DUDLEY E. SAURIN."

On the 3rd of May following, Lord Derby addressed a letter to the Marquis of Lorne, in these words:

"DOWNING STREET, 3rd May, 1883.

"MY LORD,—I have the honor to transmit to you a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office, enclosing a note from the United States Minister at this Court, informing Her Majesty's Government that a formal notice will be given, on the part of the United States Government, on the 2nd of July next, for the termination, after two years from that date, of articles 18 to 25, inclusive, and article 30 of the Treaty of Washington, of the 8th of May, 1873.

"Although the articles in question will remain in force for two years after the notice is given, your Government will, no doubt, agree with me in the opinion that it is desirable that no time should be lost in taking into consideration the course which it will be best to adopt in regard to the fisheries question, on the termination of the articles of the Treaty relating thereto.

"Her Majesty's Government will be glad if your Ministers will favor them with their views in the matter, as soon as they may be in a position to do so.

"I have, etc.,

"DERBY.

"Governor General, the Right Hon.

"The Marquis of LORNE, K.T., G.C.M.G."

In that was enclosed a letter from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, dated the 25th of April, 1883:

"FOREIGN OFFICE, 25th April, 1883.

"SIR,—I am directed by Earl Granville to transmit to you a copy of a note from the United States Minister at this Court, to the effect that he has been instructed by his Government to give notice, on the 2nd July (the 1st falling on a Sunday), of the termination of articles 18 to 25 inclusive, and article 30, of the Treaty of Washington, of the 8th May, 1871.

"I am to request that in laying this paper before the Earl of Derby you will state that although, after notice is given, two years must still elapse before these articles cease to have effect; it appears to Lord Granville expedient to take into consideration, without delay, what course it will be best to adopt, with a view, if possible, to avoid a recurrence of irritating disputes in connection with the fisheries question, and I am to suggest that in the first place it might be well to communicate a copy of Mr. Lowell's note to the Canadian Government, and to ascertain what views they entertain upon the subject.

"I am, &c.,

"PHILIP W. CURRIE."

"The Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office.

You will observe that not only Lord Derby, the Colonial Minister, but also Earl Granville, the Foreign Secretary, expressed the opinion in clear and emphatic language that no time should be lost in considering what measures should be taken, in view of the termination of these articles, and that the views of the Canadian Government on the subject should be obtained. Yet, notwithstanding the explicit terms in which the views of the Imperial Government were thus expressed, so far as we can ascertain from the papers which have been brought down, the Canadian Government were silent on the matter; no notice was taken of these papers; nothing appears to have been done on behalf of our Government. Parliament met here in the following January. In the debate on the address, my hon. friend the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) called the attention of the Government to the matter in the following words:

"There is an omission or two in the Speech to which I must refer. The Fishery Exhibition is mentioned, and the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the reply have spoken with great and lively admiration of the success of that exhibition and of the triumphs which Canada there achieved. But we have some fishery interests which are to be promoted in other ways than by attending exhibitions; there are some fishing clauses in a treaty, which clauses have been denounced, and which are to come to an end at no remote period; and I think some reference to that circumstance and to an intention to take the House into the confidence of the Government as to the course proposed by

them, and to indicate what the Government have done in view of the approaching termination of the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty, would have been at least of as much consequence as the paragraph which has been inserted in the Speech. It is very well known that within the last two or three years more particularly the chief market for our fish has been the United States, and it has become of very pressing importance that we should know what the results are to be of the termination of these fishery clauses. It is of importance that the treaty should not terminate without an earnest effort in advance to make proper arrangements, so that there shall be no gap, if it can be avoided; and I will add that it is of great consequence also, and the times appear to be more propitious now than in former days, that in those negotiations due attention shall be paid to arriving at some mode of restoring freer trade relations between us and our neighbors than have for some time subsisted."

On that occasion the only reply my hon. friend received from the right hon. Prime Minister was an attack on the members here for having opposed that treaty in 1871, and for having called him a Judas Iscariot for securing such a treaty. Shortly afterwards, when attention was called to the matter, we find that on the 30th of January, 1884, Lord Derby wrote again to the Marquis of Lansdowne:

"MY LORD,—With reference to my despatches of the 3rd of May and of the 28th December last, I have the honor to request that you will move your Government to take an early opportunity of placing me in possession of their views as to the course to be pursued in consequence of the approaching termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington.

"In connection with this subject, you will no doubt have observed the suggestion contained in an early part of the Message of the President of the United States, communicated to the two Houses of Congress on the 4th of December last."

Before stating whether any notice was taken of this despatch or not, I would refer to that portion of the President's message relating to the fisheries. President Arthur, in his message to Congress on the 5th of December, 1883, used the following language:—

"Notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington was duly given to the British Government and the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of the treaty will accordingly cease on July 1st, 1885. The fisheries industries pursued by a numerous class of our citizens on the northern coasts of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, are worthy of the fostering care of Congress whenever brought into competition with the like industries of other countries, our fishermen, as well as our manufacturers of fishing appliances and preparers of fish products, have maintained a foremost place. I suggest that Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries and the means of opening to our citizens under just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

Showing that if the American Government had been approached to use their influence to obtain a renewal of the treaty, they would no doubt have been willing to use that influence. That was referred to in the despatch of the 30th of January, 1884, with the request that the views of this Government should be presented at as early a date as possible to the Imperial Government. That Government had in the previous year pointed out that it was important that no time should be lost in endeavoring to make some arrangements, but while perfectly ready and willing to enter into negotiations, they were desirous of consulting the Dominion Government and obtaining their views with regard to extending the treaty or making other arrangements which might be mutually satisfactory and beneficial to both countries. On the 28th of March following, my hon. friend the member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), who I regret is not here to aid me in putting this matter before the House, moved a resolution calling the attention of the House to the subject. My hon. friend, in his speech on that occasion, showed clearly the advantages that would accrue to this country, especially to the Maritime Provinces, by a continuation of this treaty, and urged that some effort should be made for the purpose of getting an arrangement if possible with the United States. At that time the despatches were referred to, but had not been laid on the Table. My hon. friend on that occasion moved:

"In view of the notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of

the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken, at an early day, by the Government of Canada, with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States, the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries; and that in any such negotiations Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government."

That resolution was voted down on that occasion. The Government had not only done nothing but did not desire to open any negotiation at all with the United States, which appears to have been the condition of affairs. Congress had opened on the 4th December, 1883, and continued in session until 7th July, 1884, and during three months of this period our House was in session. No steps were taken, however, during the Session or afterward to open negotiations. Matters remained in this state until the 4th December last, when the following despatch was sent by the Colonial Secretary:

"In view of the fact that the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington will expire on the 1st July next, I have the honor to inform you that Her Majesty's Government are desirous of obtaining at as early date as it may be possible, some definite expression of the views of the Government of the Dominion of Canada as to the course which they may wish to be pursued, in negotiation with the Government of the United States, with the object of arriving at some satisfactory arrangement with that Government in order to avoid the risks and complications which might arise from the fishery question being left in an unsettled and undecided state. You will, therefore, be so good as to lay this despatch before your Ministers and to request them to favor me at their earliest convenience, with such an expression of their views upon this important subject as they may be in a position to supply."

This was written the 4th December, 1884, and appears to have had no response until the 26th December, 1884. On that date, His Excellency the Governor General, after acknowledging receipt of the despatch, explained the delay in replying to it by the absence of the First Minister, and goes on to say:

"3. I have in the first place to point out that these articles have been abrogated by the Government of the United States in compliance with a vote of Congress, without, as far as we are aware, any intimation of a desire on the part of that Government to substitute for them any other arrangement, and without any specific disclosures of the reasons which have induced it to adopt such a course, beyond general and unofficial expressions of dissatisfaction with the result of the award under which the United States were required to pay a sum of five and a half millions of dollars for the privilege of fishing in the waters to which their fishermen were admitted under the Treaty of 1871.

"4. A course similar to that which has now been adopted was followed by the Government of Washington in regard to the Treaty of 1854, which was abrogated in like manner, to the detriment of the commercial relations which had been established between the two countries while it was in operation."

At that time the Government had the letter of Mr. Saurin, of the British Legation, the speech of Mr. Rice, of Massachusetts, and the President's Message, showing the reasons for inducing the Government of the United States to adopt the course they did. The great object of the American Government was to place themselves in such a position with regard to the Washington Treaty that they would not have to pay anything for the use of our fisheries, but not in such a position that other negotiations might not take place.

"5. In the face of these circumstances my Government does not consider that it would be consistent with the respect which it owes to itself to appear as a suitor for concessions at the hands of the Government of the United States. It is moreover certainly open to question whether its negotiations on this subject are to be approached at all, they will not be approached with a better prospect of success if they are commenced and conducted with the Government which will assume office next spring, rather than with that by which the articles have been denounced and which could not reasonably expect to terminate such negotiations before the end of its official existence."

This was written 26th December, 1884. Instead of applying to the then Government while Congress was in session, although they knew Congress would, by law, rise 4th March, 1885, and that it would not be in session later in the year, unless an extra Session were called by the new President, which was highly improbable, the Government took no action:—

Mr. WELDON.

"6. The expiration of the fishery articles, although no doubt it will produce some dislocation of this branch of the commerce of the Dominion, will only replace it in the position which it occupied between the expiration of the Treaty of 1854 and the commencement of the Treaty of 1871. Each party will be restricted to its own waters, and steps would be taken to protect from trespass those of the Dominion which are admitted to be of far greater value than those of the United States. It is probable that a considerable portion of the catch of the Canadian fishermen would find its way, as it did during the period referred to, to the same markets as now, but carried in American vessels, the owners of which would purchase the fish from the Canadian fishing vessels whilst afloat and enter them at their own ports free of duty as their own catch for resale in the West Indies and elsewhere.

"7. In another respect, however, the action of the United States Government is no doubt likely to leave inconvenient and perhaps embarrassing results, though not to Canadian fishermen. The fishery clauses will cease to operate on the 1st of July, 1885. At that time vessels belonging to the United States will be engaged in fishing in Canadian waters.

"These vessels will have been equipped and fitted out for the season's fishing, and will have made all their arrangements in the belief that they would be able to prosecute their business until its end."

Here the Government assumes that these vessels are equipped and ready to set out. But the Government of which these men are the constituents had given ample notice that the treaty would terminate on the 1st of July. Why should our Government undertake to assume that the American fishermen were ignorant of it and would trespass on our fisheries, being convinced that not the slightest attempt would be made to prevent them? Our Government had been notified that the treaty would cease, and it became their duty to give notice that every man who entered our fisheries would be a trespasser and to have taken steps to protect our fisheries against trespass.

"If these vessels were upon the day following that upon which the articles ceased to operate, either captured for trespass, or compelled on pain of seizures to desist from fishing in Canadian waters, considerable loss would be occasioned to the owners, and much ill-feeling created between the two countries. The Government of the Dominion has no desire to be instrumental in producing such a state of things, and I am able to inform your Lordship that should such a course be acceptable to the Government of the United States, we shall be prepared to agree to an extension of the operation of the clause in regard both to "free fishing" and "free fish" until the 1st of June, 1886."

Mark the words. A proposal was made, and they were willing to agree to an extension of the operations of the treaty both as regards free fishing and free fish up to 1st June, 1886; and at the time when they were making that proposal they were doubtless aware that Congress, which had alone the power to grant it, would not be in session, and that the executive had not the power.

"If this were to be done their expiration would take place between the fishing season of 1885 and that of 1886, instead of in the middle of that of 1885, and the result of avoiding those complications of which I have already spoken.

"8. The delay thus gained would, if the United States were to show any desire for the discussion of the commercial relation of the two countries, give time for such a discussion and the Government of the Dominion would have no object in restricting its scope to the subject of the fisheries. It is, indeed, a matter of notoriety that the Dominion has consistently expressed its readiness to become a party to an arrangement which might have the effect of affording increased facilities for international commerce between itself and the United States. It has given the best proof of its sincerity by taking under its existing Customs laws, powers of which Your Lordship is aware, to admit upon favorable terms by proclamation of the Governor General, those products of the United States which were included in the Treaty of 1854, whenever a similar course in regard to the natural products of the Dominion may be adopted by the Government of Washington. It regretted at the time the termination of the Treaty of 1854, which it believed to be advantageous to the interests of both countries, and it would be fully prepared on receiving from the Government of the United States an intimation that negotiations would be likely to produce useful results, to enter into such negotiations in an amicable spirit.

"I think it my duty, in conclusion, to make Your Lordship aware that in a letter to Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, dated the 23rd inst., I asked him to be good enough to inform me whether such an *ad interim* arrangement as I have indicated in paragraph 7, was likely to be agreeable to the Government to which he is accredited."

No such letter is brought down and I am not aware that any answer was made. This proposition was made by the Colonial Office mentioning, and putting forward the fact, that no steps have yet been taken. The next communication is a despatch from Mr. West, dated 23rd April, 1885. This does

not appear to have been the first communication between the two Governments, for we find that Mr. West on 12th March, 1885, addressed a confidential memorandum to Mr. Bayard.

"The fishery clauses of the Treaty of Washington of 1871 will expire on 1st July next. It has been represented by the Canadian Government that much inconvenience is likely to arise in consequence, unless some agreement can be made for an extension of the period."

It was represented to the Canadian Government that much inconvenience would be likely to arise in consequence of the abolition of the fishery clauses. We have a letter addressed to Mr. West on the 23rd inst. We assume that Mr. West had a copy of the despatch of Lord Derby. There it was mentioned not that it would be inconvenient to Canadian fishermen but would cause inconvenience to American fishermen, the very men who were surrendering the privilege were to be called upon to submit to inconvenience. The point is put forward by Mr. West as follows:—

"When the time comes (1st July next) American ships will be actually engaged in fishing within the territorial waters of the Dominion. These vessels will have been fitted out for the season's fishing and have made all their usual arrangements for following it up until its termination in the autumn. If under these circumstances the provincial or municipal authorities in Canada were to insist upon their strict rights and to compel such vessels on pain of seizure to desist from fishing, considerable hardship would be occasioned to the owners, and a feeling of bitterness engendered on both sides which it is clearly the interest of both Governments to avert.

"It seems therefore desirable in order to avoid such possible complications, that both Governments should come to an agreement under which the clauses might be in effect extended until 1st January, 1886.

"If this was done the existing state of things would come to an end and a date between the fishery season of 1885 and that of 1886, and an abrupt transition at a moment when fishery operations were being carried on would be thus avoided."

It seems to me that there is a concession made on our part,—and I assume that the views put forward by Mr. West in his memorandum are expressed on behalf of the Canadian as well as the Imperial Government. I do not think it shows a want of respect of this Government to come to the conclusion that the very first thing done on the 12th March, within less than three months of the termination of the fishery clauses of the treaty, was an application by this Government to have the time extended not for the benefit of Canadian fishermen but in order to prevent American fishermen being inconvenienced. This point is referred to by Mr. Bayard in a memorandum which is also brought down among the papers. That memorandum after referring to the legislation points out:

"The legislation passed by the Congress of the United States' Act of March, 1873, for the execution of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, has been repealed by the joint resolution of March 3, 1883, the repeal to take effect July 1, 1885. From that date the effects of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington absolutely determine, so far as their execution within the jurisdiction of the United States is concerned, and without new legislation by Congress modifying or postponing that repeal, the Executive is not constitutionally competent to extend the reciprocal fisheries provisions of the Treaty beyond the 1st July next, the date fixed by the action of Congress."

Mr. West's memorandum of 12th March, 1885, suggests the mutual practical convenience that would accrue from allowing the fishing ventures commenced prior to 1st July, 1885, to continue until the end of the season for fishing of that year, thus preventing their abrupt termination in the midst of fishing operations on the 1st of July. I am perfectly justified in saying that the First Minister and the Government must have been fully aware of the effect of the termination of that notice; also that on 1st July, under the constitution of the United States, Congress would not be sitting, it was highly improbable that after 4th March Congress would be in session, and if no action was taken by Congress the Executive, to use the language of Mr. Bayard, is not competent to extend the reciprocal provisions of the treaty. If those negotiations had been entered upon at an earlier period—for there is nothing to show that the late United States Government

and President Arthur were not as favorable to Canada as are the present President and Congress—the matter might have been taken into consideration by Congress and the privileges extended, the loss of which must seriously affect the Maritime Provinces, and thus place the fishermen on the same footing as American fishermen, and that fish caught by Americans in Canadian waters should not be carried into the United States free without our fish being also carried in free. But the opportunity was lost; it was allowed to slip by and nothing was done. The matter was taken up after Congress had prorogued and separated. Mr. Bayard wrote to Mr. West as follows:—

"It has been, moreover, suggested on the part of the Province of Newfoundland and of the Dominion of Canada that in view of the mutual benefit and convenience of the present local traffic, consisting of the purchase of ice, bait, wood, and general ship supplies by the citizens of the United States engaged in fishing from the inhabitants of the British American fishing coast, the usual operations of the fishing season of 1885 should be continued by the fishing vessels belonging to citizens of the United States until the end of the season of that year, and that the local authorities of Newfoundland and of the Dominion of Canada, in a spirit of neighborhood should abstain from molesting such fishermen or impeding their progress or their local traffic with the inhabitants incidental to fishing during the remainder of the season of 1885, and all this with the understanding that the President of the United States would bring the whole question of the fisheries before Congress at its next session in December, and recommend the appointment of a commission in which the Government of the United States and of Great Britain should be respectively represented, which commission should be charged with the consideration and settlement upon a just, equitable and honorable basis of the entire question of the fishing rights of the two Governments and their respective citizens on the coast of the United States and British North America.

"The President of the United States would be prepared to recommend the adoption of such action by Congress with the understanding that in view and in consideration of such promised recommendation there would be no enforcement of restrictive and penal laws and regulations by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada or of the Province of Newfoundland, against the fishermen of the United States resorting to British American waters between the 1st July next and the close of the present year's fishing season; the mutual object and intent being to avoid any annoyance to the individuals engaged in this business and traffic, and the irritation or ill-feeling that might be engendered by a harsh or vexatious enforcement of stringent local regulations on the fishing coast pending an effort to have a just and amicable arrangement of an important and somewhat delicate question between the two nations.

"Public knowledge of this understanding and arrangement can be given by an exchange of notes between Mr. West and myself, which can be given to the press."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this memorandum no copy of Mr. West's memorandum appears to have been furnished; but on the 22nd of April Mr. West sent a despatch to the Government here enclosing a copy of this memorandum which I have just read. On the 22nd of April the Governor General acknowledged the receipt of this, and in referring to it said:

"I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd inst., enclosing a copy of the memorandum submitted to you by the Secretary of State upon the subject of an understanding which the Government of the United States desires to establish with that of the Dominion, in view of the approaching expiration of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington.

"I have referred Mr. Bayard's memorandum to my Government, and I hope to be able to communicate further with you upon the subject in the course of a few days.

"I may, however, in the meanwhile express the hope that you will convey to the Secretary of State the assurance that his proposal will receive most careful consideration, and that the Government of the Dominion is sincerely desirous of placing its relations with the Government of the United States both in regard to the question of fisheries and in regard to all questions affecting the commerce of the two countries upon a footing advantageous and satisfactory to both, and likely to avoid, as far as circumstances will admit, all risk of misunderstanding and annoyance to the individuals concerned therein."

You will observe that the memorandum of Mr. Bayard simply accepts a proposal of Mr. West that the Americans should have the benefit of the Canadian fisheries without the alternative that the Canadians should be allowed to utilise the American fisheries; it does not at all refer to the matters referred to in the 30th article of the treaty. On the same day, the 28th of April, the following despatch is sent to the Colonial Office:—

"I have the honor to forward for your Lordship's consideration copies of a letter which I have received from Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, and of a memorandum enclosed therein by the Secretary of State of the United States Government, upon the subject of the approaching expiration of the fisheries clauses of the Treaty of Washington. I also enclose copy of my reply to Mr. West.

"I have referred Mr. West's letter and the memo. to my Ministers, and I shall communicate further with your Lordship in a few days, as to the course which the Government of the Dominion may propose to adopt in the matter.

"I have already made your Lordship aware of the reasons which led me to believe that the abrupt termination of the fisheries clauses of the 1st of July might be followed by the seizure of American vessels found after that date within the territorial waters of the Dominion would be attended with the utmost inconvenience, and I expressed the hope that it might be found possible to effect an arrangement under which the operation of the clauses, both in regard to free fish and free fishing, might be extended to January 1st, 1886, and that before the commencement of another fishing season a permanent agreement might be arrived at between the two Governments."

Here you will observe the hope is expressed that arrangements may be made with regard to free fish and free fishing. This is immediately after the announcement put forward that Congress alone had power to make that arrangement, that the Executive would be powerless; and this is to be done after the 1st of July, when it was too late to make any arrangement:

"Your Lordship will observe that Mr. Bayard is of opinion that without new legislation by Congress the Executive is not constitutionally competent to extend the operation of the clauses in the manner proposed; and that he suggests that in order to avoid the inconvenience which was anticipated, the usual operations of the fishing vessels belonging to citizens of the United States should be allowed to continue without interference on the part of the local authorities, either of the Dominion or of Newfoundland, until the close of the season.

"This Mr. Bayard purposes should be done upon an understanding to which expression might, he thinks, be given by means of notes exchanged between Mr. West and himself, and published in the press to the effect that Congress should be moved at its next Session to agree to the appointment of an international commission of which the Government of the United States and Great Britain should be represented, and which should be charged with the duty of endeavoring to arrive at a final adjustment of the entire question of the fishery rights of both powers.

"While the desire of the United States Government to avoid, in view of a satisfactory adjustment of a question likely to occasion serious international complications, all possible sources of irritation in the meanwhile, will, I believe be fully appreciated in the country. It is impossible to exclude from consideration the fact that some hostile criticisms are likely to be provoked by any arrangement under which, while persons connected with the fishery interests of the Dominion would find their fish and fish products liable to the reimposed duties on entrance in the United States, the same access as heretofore to Canadian waters would be enjoyed by the fishermen of the United States. Mr. Bayard's proposal is, however, framed in terms which leave no doubt as to the desire of this Government for an amicable understanding with that of the Dominion, and I venture to recommend that Mr. West should be authorised to continue, subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Government, the negotiations which have been thus commenced, and also, if the opportunity presents itself, to extend their scope so as to include the consideration of commercial relations, other than those arising out of the fish trade between the Dominion and the United States."

Now, you will observe that when it is said that the American Government were desirous of coming to an amicable understanding with the Government of the Dominion—at that time not a single favor or concession was granted by the United States whatever, but the proposal conveyed in Mr. West's memorandum of the 12th March, was simply that American fishermen should be allowed the privilege of fishing in Canadian waters while no corresponding privilege was allowed to Canadian fishermen. There is no doubt that the Government were quite right in expressing the view in this despatch that a fairly hostile criticism might be made of this arrangement. The next despatch of any importance is dated the 17th May, 1885, and is addressed to Lord Derby:

"My Lord,—In reply to your Lordship's enquiry whether the Government of the Dominion was prepared to concur in the memorandum by Mr. Bayard, of which a copy was forwarded to me by the British Minister at Washington on the 23rd of April, I had the honor to inform your Lordship by telegram on the 17th instant, that upon the understanding that Congress would be recommended to agree to the issue of a commission for the object suggested by Mr. Bayard, no cruisers would be sent by my Government to protect the Canadian fisheries or to interfere with American fishermen, but that it might not be possible to prevent col-

Mr. WELDON.

lisions between Canadian and American fishermen, or to control the action of individuals attempting to enforce provincial laws against foreign intruders. I added that my Government was prepared to do anything within its power to discourage such proceedings, and that I believed this could be done effectually, and I went on to say that I presumed that the American Government would act in the same manner in regard to Canadian fishermen resorting to the territorial waters of the United States.

"2. Such an arrangement would, as your Lordship suggests, be of a temporary nature, and would be agreed to upon the understanding that it should not prejudice the equivalents which might be hereafter demanded in negotiations for a more permanent settlement.

"3. With regard to the latter, I have already intimated to your Lordship that my Government would regard favorably a proposal by which the scope of the negotiations for the settlement of the fishery question might be enlarged so as to include the discussion of reciprocal concessions calculated to give increased facilities for trade between Canada and the United States.

"4. If it were to become known here that such proposals had been made and were entertained, it is probable that the suspicion with which, as I have already pointed out to your Lordship, the arrangement now under discussion will in some quarters be regarded, might be to some extent removed. The arrangement will unquestionably be looked upon, particularly by persons connected with the fishery interests of the Dominion, as being of a very one-sided character."

It is characterised by the Americans themselves, and everyone who reads the documents will see that, in view of the privileges we give to the Americans, the arrangement is of a one-sided character:—

"Mr. Bayard has explained that in consequence of the joint resolution of 30th March, 1883, the expiration of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington will absolutely determine upon 1st July of the present year, and that without due legislation by Congress modifying or postponing that repeal, the Executive is not constitutionally competent to extend the reciprocal provision of the Treaty of Washington beyond the date fixed by the action of Congress. It follows that the reimposition of the duty on Canadian fish products entering the United States after that date cannot now be prevented. If under these circumstances American fishing vessels are permitted to use the territorial waters of the Dominion without molestation after the 1st of July without any understanding more specific or binding than one to the effect that the President is to bring the whole question of the fisheries before Congress at the next Session in December, and to recommend the appointment of an international commission for the purpose of considering and if possible arriving at a settlement of the entire fishing rights of the two Governments, a recommendation which may not be more successful than a somewhat similar recommendation made to Congress by the last President."

You will perceive here, Mr. Speaker, that they say the duty must be imposed, and all they give is a promise by the President that he will bring before Congress the subject of the appointment of a commission, which proposal may not be more successful than was a somewhat similar proposal made to Congress by the previous President. It goes on to say:

"It should be clearly understood that the Government of the Dominion has become a party to such an arrangement from a desire to remove as far as in its power every obstacle in the way of arriving at a lasting and mutually advantageous settlement between the two nations, and to maintain those neighborly relations which at present exist between them, and not as would appear to be suggested by a passage in Mr. Bayard's memorandum. In view of any present benefits or inconveniences accruing to Canada from the non-continuance of the present local traffic connected with this particular industry."

Then the Government point out clearly that we are to get nothing except a promise that the President will recommend a commission which they themselves say may not be more successful than the like recommendation made by the previous President—but it must be clearly understood that Canada is a party to the arrangement. If the Americans are willing to issue a commission in 1885, why were they not willing to issue one in 1884, when the proposition was supported by the then President, as it is understood the recommendation to Congress will be made by President Cleveland? The Government were in 1883 and in 1884 in a position to apply to Congress on this subject, for I do not think the political complexion of Congress has been changed since that time. The Democrats then had a majority in the House of Representatives and Republicans controlled the Senate, and they are in the same position to-day. December will be the earliest period at which the Message of the President can be submitted. When we find that the Pre-

sident of the United States was willing in 1883 to recommend the appointment of a commission, which must necessarily be of a joint character, it is obvious that our Government have done nothing whatever, and have therefore failed to do justice to those Provinces which are dependent on the fishing industry. It was only at the last minute that negotiations were entered upon. Although the Americans may attempt to belittle our fisheries and say that the advantages they give us in return are large, yet the suggestions thrown out by the late President and the succeeding President show the value of our fisheries—and it is obvious that they place a much higher value on our fisheries and upon the fishing industry than is placed on them by our own Government.

"6. Your Lordship will have observed that although Mr. Bayard in his memorandum invites the Government of Canada to consent to an agreement under which there is to be no enforcement of restrictive laws or regulations by the authorities of the Dominion against fishermen of the United States resorting to the territorial waters of Canada between 1st July and the close of the present fishing season, he does not offer any assurance that a similar forbearance will be exercised by the authorities of the United States in regard to Canadian fishermen who may have occasion to resort to the territorial waters of the United States. It may be the case that this omission is owing to the fact that in the United States as in Canada the action of the local authorities is to some extent independent of that of the Federal Government, and that Mr. Bayard therefore does not feel justified in offering to give on the part of his Government the same engagement as that which he invites from the Government of the Dominion in this respect. The telegram which I have the honor of addressing to Your Lordship on 17th inst. stated clearly the extent to which the Government of the Dominion felt itself justified in guaranteeing to American fishermen the immunity from interference for which Mr. Bayard has asked."

I call attention to this clause. It will be seen by the Treaty of Washington and by these articles which are abrogated by the notification served in July, 1883, that the advantages were reciprocal, that American vessels had a right to enter Canadian waters and Canadian vessels had a right to use American waters to fish if they thought proper. At the threshold of these negotiations an offer was made to throw over our fisheries to the American Government without securing a right to send Canadian fish into American markets. The despatches show that if the Americans refused to grant this boon, the Government would still be willing to grant them the right to fish in Canadian waters:

"7. A report upon the Provincial Acts of Parliament by which the procedure of the Maritime Provinces in regard to such matters is regulated, is in course of preparation by the Minister of Justice.

"8. It would, I think, be desirable in view of what I have stated above that no time should be lost in carrying out the exchange of notes proposed by Mr. Bayard for the purpose of informing the public of the nature of the provisional agreement which may be arrived at, and I believe that much satisfaction would be given to persons interested in the commerce of the Dominion if it could be made to appear upon the face of these notes that the agreement expressed in them had been arrived at under circumstances which afforded a prospect of the renewal of negotiations, the reciprocal development and extension of trade between the two countries."

Then this Government for the first time became alive to the importance of the question, and although it had not answered despatches sent by the Imperial Government, and although it had allowed the matter to remain in abeyance year after year, it urged in March that immediate action be taken, and it attempted to secure a promise of improved commercial relations. We will see how the suggestion in regard to commercial relations was treated by Mr. Bayard. This was the subject of a communication made to the American Government. Mr. West endeavored to get the Government of the United States to consent to the arrangements including something with regard to reciprocal trade relations. On 20th June Mr. West wrote to Mr. Bayard as follows:—

"MY DEAR MR. BAYARD,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your confidential note of yesterday's date concerning the proposed temporary arrangement respecting the fisheries, which I am authorised by Her Majesty's Government to negotiate with you on behalf of the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, to be effected by an exchange of notes founded on your memorandum of 21st April."

You will recollect that this is the memorandum of Mr. Bayard to which I referred:

"The two confidential memoranda I handed to you on the 13th instant, contain as you assume, the acceptance by the Dominion and the British American coast Provinces, of the general features of your above mentioned memo. with the understanding expressed on this side, that the agreement has been arrived at under circumstances, affording prospect of negotiation for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British North America; a contingent understanding, to which, as you state, you can have no objection, as you regard it as covered by the terms of your memorandum of 21st April."

I should have called attention earlier to the despatch of Mr. Bayard to Mr. West of the 19th of June in which he says:

"I assume that the two confidential memoranda you handed to me on the 13th instant embraces the acceptance by the Dominion and the British American coast Provinces of the general feature of my memorandum of 21st April, concerning a temporary arrangement respecting the fisheries, with the understanding expressed on their side that an agreement has been arrived at under circumstances affording prospect of negotiation for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British North America."

"To such a contingent understanding I can have no objection. Indeed I regard it as covered by the statement in my memorandum of 21st May that the arrangement therein contemplated would be reached with the understanding that the President of the United States will bring the whole question of fisheries before Congress at its next Session in December, and recommend the appointment of a commission in which the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain should be respectively represented, which commission should be charged with the consideration and settlement, upon a just, equitable, and honorable basis of the entire question of the fishing rights of the two Governments and their respective citizens on the coasts of the United States and British North America."

Mr. West's communication continues:

"In authorising me to negotiate this agreement, Earl Granville states, as I have already had occasion to intimate to you, that it is a temporary one, and that its conclusion must not be held to prejudice any claim which may be advanced to more satisfactory equivalents by Colonial Governments, in the course of the negotiations for a more permanent settlement. Earl Granville further wishes me to tell you that Her Majesty's Government and the Colonial Government have consented to the arrangement solely as a matter of good will to the Government and people of the United States, and to avoid difficulties which might be raised by the termination of the fishery articles in the midst of the fishing season, and also that the acceptance of such a *modus vivendi* does not by any implication affect the value or the inshore fisheries by the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland.

"I had occasion to remark to you that while the Colonial Governments were asked to guarantee immunity from interference to American vessels resorting to Canadian waters no such immunity is offered in your memo. to Canadian vessels resorting to American waters, but that the Dominion Government presume that the agreement in this respect would be mutual, as you accepted this view, it would I think be as well that mention should be made to this effect in the notes under the reservation as above indicated, in which I believe you acquiesce.

"I am prepared to accept the understanding on behalf of British North America and to exchange notes in the above sense."

Mr. Bayard writes:

"Undoubtedly it is our clear and mutual understanding that the arrangement now made is only temporary, and that it proceeds from the good will of our respective Governments, and solely to avoid all difficulties which might otherwise arise from the termination of the fishing of 1885 in the midst of the season."

He then goes on to state that the same immunity should be extended to British subjects and British vessels engaged in fishing in the waters of the United States as were granted to American subjects fishing in Canadian waters. On the 22nd of June he writes:

"In compliance with your verbal request of this morning, that I should restate part of my note to you of the 19th, I repeat that the arrangement whereby a *modus vivendi* on the fishing question has been reached, rests on the memoranda and correspondence exchanged; that your memorandum of the 13th instant expressed the understanding on your side that the agreement has been arrived at under the circumstances affording prospect of negotiation for development and extension of trade between the United States and British North America; that I not only had no objection to such an understanding, but, in fact, regarded it as amply embraced in our proposal to recommend a commission to deal with the whole subject in the interest of good neighborhood and intercourse, and that the recommendation of any measures which the commission might deem necessary to attain those ends, would seem to fall within its province, and such recommendations could not fail to have attentive consideration. Having thus not only admitted the proviso of your memorandum in your own language, but gone further and pointed out that no limits would be set, so far as I was concerned, to the proposals to be brought

forward in the suggested commission on behalf of either party, I do not see how it is possible for me to give any stronger assurance that the understanding has been reached under circumstances affording a prospect of negotiation for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British America."

You will observe that while that is to be the understanding, he is very careful to not introduce in the exchange of notes, the words so urgently pressed on him by Mr. West, making clear that the intention was to carry out the arrangements not only with regard to the fisheries, but not, or at least doubtful, with regard to reciprocal trade relations. From this correspondence we apparently made the offer in the first instance, that we would allow the American fishermen in our waters without asking the slightest concession on their part, on the reason put forward in the despatch of the 26th of December, that it would enable our fishermen to go under cover of American fishermen so as to sell to American vessels and have them carried in free of duty. The point seems to be that this was out of consideration to the poor American fishermen. They would be allowed to continue through the season, because they had the belief that they would be allowed to do so until December, although their own Government knew that the treaty ceased in July, and they were fishing without law or license and were liable to seizure. To prevent this impression from being removed from their mind, our Government graciously conceded that point to the American Government. I find that by the American Fishery Bureau return for June, that there were 50 mackerel schooners out of 216 that went out fishing in Nova Scotian waters alone; and 289 out of 460 cod-fishers, fishing upon the banks, adjacent to British territory, upon the inshore fisheries of which they would be dependent for bait. In discussing this matter, I want to discuss it as briefly as possible, but I feel it my duty to my constituents and my Province and the Maritime Provinces generally, to bring this matter fairly before you, and I could show you that this matter was regarded by the American press in itself, as a one-sided operation. I would call attention to the remarks of one paper, which has taken a great interest in Canadian affairs. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Boston Herald* on the 19th of last month, giving a fair historical account with regard to this treaty and the different contentions of the English and American Governments, written, I believe, by an American now residing in Montreal, and also to an article in that paper of the 27th June:

"This benefit is bestowed practically without an equivalent in one part. It is true that under the agreement Canadian fishermen are to have the same right to fish along the coast and bays of the United States, that is accorded to American fishermen on the shores of Canada and Newfoundland but it hardly needs to be pointed out that this concession on our part is one of theoretical rather than practical value."

"The other advantage which Canadians may obtain is the opportunity of selling us bait and other supplies to those of our fishermen who desire to obtain these commodities, but this they could do if no extension of the treaty had been made and it can hardly be counted as an offset to the benefits we receive."

Again referring to the course pursued and evidences of good will, adds:

"We are sorry to add, it is a grant which if it had been made to English fishermen by an American Government would have called forth angry protests from a great many people of this country."

I charge upon the Government that by their delay in endeavoring to get through these negotiations, instead of being in a position when that Government asked for fair concessions, instead of being in a position to ask fair concessions, our fishermen are handicapped by the duty imposed on them in a way of which an illustration may be seen any day in the harbor of the city I represent—two cargoes of lumber, one going to the United States free of duty, and the other paying duty, which tells severely against New Brunswick trade. That, however, cannot be

Mr. WELDON.

helped, as it is a treaty arrangement, under which we gave the navigation of the River St. John to the Americans, so that American lumber cut by American citizens is sent free into the United States, while Canadian lumber has to pay duty. Now the position in which we are placed is not by virtue of a treaty, but by what is, according to the Government's own despatches, a one-sided arrangement, under which Canadian fishermen trading with American ports are handicapped by a duty, whereas American fishermen, taking fish from the same waters, are allowed to take them in duty free. On this subject, the *St. John Telegraph* of the 7th of July had an article which says:

"We recently referred to the one-sided arrangement by which the Ottawa Government concedes the season's fishing in our waters to Americans, while the latter impose duties upon our fish products entering their markets. The organ of the Government here then said it was doubtful if the duties imposed in the States would be injurious to our fishermen! To this feeble attempt in defence of the jug-handled arrangement, a correspondent at Deer Island, gives the following reply as to its actual working:—

"The *Sun* says it is doubtful if duties imposed on our fish by the American Government will affect our fishermen injuriously. On Wednesday, July 1st, a Canadian fisherman took to Eastport a few pickled fish, was offered 75c. per barrel of 200 lbs.—the usual price this season—but was notified that if he landed the fish he must pay duty at the rate of 3c. per lb. He was affected badly. Under present regulations our people are not allowed to carry into Eastport herring for sardines without paying a duty of 3c. per lb, or about \$5 per hoghead; but American boats, manned by Americans, can come here and buy and take in free of duty. This throws numbers of our people out of employment, several of whom have already declared their intention of being naturalised, so as to hold the privileges formerly enjoyed by them. Such are the facts."

"Another correspondent writing from Campobello, which is opposite Eastport, says:

"During the forty-five years that I have been residing in this place, the outlook never was so bad and discouraging for the fishing business as at the present time in this place. The unusual scarcity of all kinds of fish at this season, and the unprecedented low price, of all kinds, are some of the causes, but not all. What has been gleaned from the *Montreal Gazette*, of June 19th, to which you referred in your last issue, has left the impression here that the Americans will have the full privilege of our fishing grounds, and we will be virtually shut out of their markets by the high duties imposed on fish. The fishermen could patiently labor, and hope for a recovery from the general depression in their business, but this outcome of Tory rule they think is most too much to bear. It is reported here that one large boat was seized at Eastport, and also that a man was caught landing about one dollar's worth of fish at the same place, and had to pay one dollar and fifty cents in duties, and thus, after being legally fleeced he returned home minus fifty cents. The air is filled with vengeance against Macdonaldism, and the American fishermen. It is a great pity that any Government should lead its subjects into sheer ruin."

With regard to this industry, for the last 20 years some 17 or 18 sardine factories established in Eastport afforded a large trade to the fishermen of Passamaquoddy and to those engaged in fishing in the bay of the county which my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) represents; and these parties are obliged to pay 1/2 c. per pound on these fish, which virtually deprives them of a market entirely. Such is the position in which we are placed. Without discussing the arrangement, what I say is, that if any arrangement was made, it was the duty of the Government to have made attempts to secure it two years ago; it was not to be left until the legislative powers of both countries had ceased to act—until the Congress of the United States had risen, and the time had arrived when our own Legislature, though still in session, was supposed to have risen. The Government should not have allowed this matter to drift along, saying we will not make any concessions. When the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) this Session urged that the Government should take steps to negotiate with the American Government, the reply was made that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), had refused in 1878 to negotiate with the United States Government. But they continued to do nothing to the last moment, and it was shown by their own despatches and by the confidential memorandum from Mr. West, that the proposition came from the Canadian Government, and was a voluntary offer made to the American Government, without the slightest offer of concessions from the latter; and whatever concessions are granted are admitted

by the Americans themselves to be of no practical benefit to us. Now, I turn to another phase of this matter: that is, the negotiations with Newfoundland. We are well aware—if the report is correct, and I have no doubt it is—that this year Sir Ambrose Shea was sent by the Newfoundland Government to Washington. Whether previous negotiations had taken place with Washington or not, does not appear; but the first thing we discover by the papers was that Newfoundland had imposed retaliatory duties. On the 18th of May the Acting Deputy Minister of Finance telegraphed to the Provincial Secretary of Newfoundland to ascertain if the Government there had taken any action with regard to differential duties against Canada. On the 19th of May the reply was that if Canada imposed duties on the produce of their fisheries an extra duty was imposed on pork, flour, butter, tobacco, kerosene oil, and corn meal from Canada—otherwise, all would remain as before. A copy of the Act passed by the Government of Newfoundland was sent to our Government on the 22nd of May, and was received by the Government here on the 1st of June. Matters were allowed to drift until the 26th of June, when the Colonial Secretary of Newfoundland telegraphed as follows:—

“May we assume fish and fish products will be duty free in Dominion after 1st July?”

Evidently feeling sure that this Government would take some action. The reply of the Minister of Customs, on the 30th of June, was as follows:—

“Fish will be dutiable on and after 1st July. Question of interchange of commodities with Newfoundland will be considered after Parliament rises.”

Apparently that did not satisfy the Newfoundland Government, and Sir Wm. Whiteway, on the 2nd of July, telegraphed to the Premier:

“Our Revenue Act last Session sent Deputy Minister of Finance; please reply to it; under it our Government having no alternative but collect extra duties on certain Canadian products. If you collect duties on our fish products, this operation will disturb trade relation in the Dominion. I would therefore urge necessity immediate action, and not deferring as proposed by Deputy Minister to Colonial Secretary. Our Government very anxious our trade relations with the Dominion should not be disturbed. Your deferring action will cause transfer trade to United States. One steamer from Montreal just arrived; another expected; delay therefore serious. If you propose admitting our fish duty free, please answer promptly that we may have power to act.”

We know then that a deputation visited Ottawa from Montreal composed of parties connected with the present Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What do you mean by that?

Mr. WELDON. I beg pardon; supporters of the present Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; some of them were the other way.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), as well as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), were willing to forego their usual Sunday trip in order to assist the deputation; and on the 4th of July the Government, through the Minister of Customs, telegraphed to the Colonial Secretary of Newfoundland:

“Duties on fish suspended to allow time for negotiations. Please send commissioners for the purpose.”

Now, what I say is this: The people from Montreal do not consider that they make us pay 60 cents duty on flour in the Lower Provinces for the sake of Montreal, but when Newfoundland retaliates, when the shoe pinches in Newfoundland, the Newfoundlanders can send us fish free, so that the

Montrealers may send them flour free. We, in the Maritime Provinces, have Newfoundland fish coming in free to compete with our fish, and in the United States we are handicapped by duties on our fish. All through this business there has been nothing but blundering. The opportunity for obtaining a fair and reasonable arrangement with the United States was allowed to slip by. From the disposition evinced by the late President of the United States, I believe he would have assisted in this matter equally well with the present President, and then there would have been opportunity to negotiate with the United States Cabinet, and have passed through Congress and our Parliament, if not a permanent, a temporary arrangement. There is another point to which I propose to refer but briefly, because it is a matter more of interest to Ontario than the Maritime Provinces. Article 30 of the Washington Treaty provides as follows:—

“It is agreed that, for the term of years mentioned in article XXXIII of this treaty, subjects of Her Britannic Majesty may carry in British vessels, without payment of duty, goods, wares or merchandise from one port or place within the territory of the United States, upon the St. Lawrence, the great lakes, and the rivers connecting the same, to another port or place within the territory of the United States as aforesaid; provided that a portion of such transportation is made through the Dominion of Canada by land and carriage and in bond, under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon between the Government of Her Britannic Majesty and the Government of the United States.”

Citizens of the United States may, for the like period, carry in United States vessels merchandise in the like manner. To that article, also, the notice has put an end. It seems difficult to comprehend what that means. The Customs regulations of 1884 have been cancelled, and it is very difficult to know what that is. No doubt great fears are entertained that it might interfere with the ordinary transit through the United States. No doubt the time the matter was discussed in Congress it was evidently intended that the article relating to *in transitu* goods should remain unrepealed, but the question arises under the Customs regulations; and we find in the papers that the collector at Chicago refuses to clear out Canadian vessels. We find in to-days Montreal *Herald* a letter from Mr. Fairchild to the collector of Customs of Oswego, dated the 11th July:

“SIR,—Referring to your letter of the 8th instant, in regard to the internal effect of the circular of this Department of the 2nd instant, of which instructions were given to the Customs officers, in the matter of transportation of merchandise through Canada by routes part rail and part water, your attention is invited to the following statement of facts under article 29 of the Treaty of Washington: ‘Transportation by all railroads from one point in the United States to another through the Dominion of Canada, and from one point in Canada to another through the United States, is authorised, under article 30 of said treaty. Transportation through the territory of both Governments by routes partly by rail and partly by vessels on the great lakes and connecting waters is authorised. [See synopsis 2171.] By an Act approved 3rd March, 1883, Congress directed the discontinuance of the 30th article referred to from and after 1st July, 1885, and notice to that effect was promptly given Her Majesty’s Government through our Department of State immediately after the approval of the said Act. The circular of this Department of the 2nd instant simply directed the Customs officers on the northern frontier to continue shipments of merchandise passing through Canada under transit manifests between American ports, by routes part rail and part water, and instructed them to hereafter treat goods arriving at their ports by such routes as importations from foreign contiguous territory, that is to say, that such goods upon arrival should be entered. Of course, if merchandise so arriving is of domestic production, it will be admitted to free entry on presentation of proofs and in the manner prescribed by law and regulations. Merchandise arriving by all-rail routes will be treated as heretofore, the 29th article of the treaty not having been terminated. That portion of your letter relating to the use of the Welland Canal and incidental ports for the transportation of cargoes by means of the Welland Railway will be further considered by the Department.’”

I merely refer to this; but there is one thing they have paid a little attention to is the article of fish, and that is the giving to Americans the benefit of fishing in our waters without our receiving any corresponding benefit from the Americans; and while they have been doing this, this article regarding the transportation through Canadian and American territory has never been referred to or notice taken of it. I think the Government have been guilty of great

dilatoriness in neglecting to attend to this matter. They were warned by the British Government in 1883, their attention was called to it in 1884, on the floor of the House, but they left the matter to the last moment. If the Government had said they had made every effort by negotiation, and had brought down correspondence to show they had made attempts to get that treaty renewed, which is of such great importance to the Maritime Provinces, and if they had made vigorous efforts to protect our fisheries, we would have had nothing to say, and the American fishermen, if inconvenienced, could only lay the blame at the door of their own Government; but the Government allowed matters to drift on in this way without doing anything. We have already seen that the great harvest lands of the west have been laid open to waste and desolation through the supineness of the Government; we now see the great harvest of the ocean being surrendered to the Americans. Great dissatisfaction exists in the Maritime Provinces with the conduct of the Government; but, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, they are loyal. No standard of rebellion will ever be raised there; they are descendants of loyalists, and true to their country, but there is no doubt great dissatisfaction exists, and this course of the Government will tend to make the seeds of dissatisfaction deepen into discontent, and a desire to sever from the Union, and cause many to leave the home and flag under which they live, to seek in a foreign country for those privileges denied them in their own.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have been charged with a great many things, but I thought we might, at all events, get some confidence from the Opposition on this subject. On this question, at all events, we have been guilty of no laxity; on this question we have succeeded, almost hoping against hope, in getting the American Government to agree, in the first place, to have a joint committee to settle the fisheries questions, and then to go into negotiations for a reciprocity treaty. The hon. gentleman seems to suppose that we can do as we like, that we can choose the right time, and that, whenever we like to make advances to the American Government, they must yield, and that we are guilty of laches because we did not, in 1883, two years ago, go to the American Government with cap in hand and on bended knee and ask them to withdraw their resolutions. Now, the United States is a great nation. There are two branches of the Legislature, and, with the sanction of their President they came to a solemn decision—and they had a right to come to that decision—to give two years' notice to put an end to the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty. They had a right to do that. True, they did not give their reasons for doing it, but they did it. True, as the hon. gentleman says, Mr. Rice, a member in the Senate or House of Representatives, I do not know which, made a speech. Well, the hon. gentleman made a speech, but that is not a matter between the two nations. All the two nations could know was that the United States gave a notice that the fishery clauses were to be put an end to on the expiration of the two years. We could not help that. We were sorry for it. We would have preferred that they should have been continued, that they should fish in our waters and we should fish in theirs, that we should have free fish and free fishing, and that, at some convenient time, there should be another arbitration, to decide what were the equivalents to be paid to us for the superiority of our fisheries over theirs. But they gave their notice, and when were we to remonstrate? The hon. gentleman says we were too tardy. Were we to go to them the day after, or the week after, or the month after they gave the notice? Great nations are not to be treated in that way. It would have been only courting a repulse; it would have been only courting a snub, to use a familiar but effective word, for us to say: True, as a matter of national policy the executive and

Mr. WELDON.

legislative powers have united in putting an end to the fishery articles; but we beg of you not to do so; we beg that you will not do so. We might expect the answer. But the hon. gentleman says that a favorable disposition was shown by President Arthur, and we might have, perhaps, commenced negotiations then. Well, President Arthur put in a paragraph, as President Grant had on a previous occasion put a paragraph into his Message, recommending to the consideration of Congress the question of a reciprocity treaty; but we know what was the result on both of these occasions. President Grant sent down a memorandum, which was settled through the intervention of Mr. Brown, who was appointed by the late Government and who battled energetically and ably in favor of it, and produced some able papers on the subject, but they contumeliously turned their back upon him and took no notice of the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They did not exactly turn their back upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They did nothing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There were only three days left to the close of the Session, and they put it off to the next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And in the next Session they did not take it up.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Exactly. President Arthur put in a paragraph which the hon. gentleman has quoted, saying that, as the fishery articles have ended, perhaps there might be an opportunity of arriving at reciprocal relations. That was not three days before Congress rose; that was at the opening of the Session; but no notice whatever was taken of it; not a speech was made on it; not a motion was made about it, either by the influence of the President or his Cabinet, or by any of the friends of the Cabinet or of those who were in favor of reciprocity; not a motion was made in any way to encourage reciprocity. They passed it by with contumelious silence. We had to accept the situation. We knew that we could live without reciprocity; we knew that we could not help the termination of the fishery articles; we knew that we would have to return, if the Americans so pleased, to the condition of things which existed between 1854 and 1871; we knew that we had stood it from 1854 to 1871, and that we could stand it again. There was no single day or hour or month in which the Government, with any prospect of success, could go to the United States and ask them: Will you alter your whole policy and allow the fishery treaty to be renewed; will you allow another arbitration to be taken, as to the superior value of our fisheries, in order to allow us another chance of getting five millions and a-half out of you; will you change your policy at our request, and leave things as they were before? It is too childish; such a course would be puerile, would be unworthy of any Government, would be unworthy of any Executive which has any respect for itself, and could have no result but certain failure. The Government may be pardoned for going very far indeed for the purpose of gaining a material advantage, but when the fact of going and beseeching and praying for it was the very way to defeat your object, there was no use in causelessly, uselessly and purposelessly abandoning the dignified position of saying: We had a treaty; we liked that treaty and would have liked to continue it; you have chosen to end it; good-bye; we can do without it. But I say it is a very great pity that the hon. gentleman has chosen to bring the matter up now. I must do him the justice to say that his speech is not, in my opinion, whatever that may be worth, harmful to the discussion of this matter with the United States, but it is a

great danger to bring on a discussion of this kind, because in the discussion things may be said which may thwart in the future prospects of negotiations with the United States; speeches of individual members may be quoted, as the speech of Mr. Rice has been quoted, and they cannot know the comparative value of speeches here any more than we can know the comparative value of speeches made in Congress; and so statements made by any hon. member may thwart the chances of any negotiation with that Government.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Rice occupies a very important position—chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but I remember when Mr. Sumner, a much more important man, was the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and yet, we met him on the Washington Treaty, and he was opposed to it from end to end, because he said that, if it were not carried, Canada must fall into the arms of the United States. It may be remembered that several questions were asked by hon. gentlemen opposite, as to when we were to bring down the papers on this subject, and that I stated from time to time that I was applying for leave to bring down some of the papers. I have applied for leave, and all I could get permission to bring down have been brought down. When I speak of asking permission, I mean permission to bring down papers which were international papers. There has been secret, unofficial correspondence between the two Governments, and we have had to get the consent of the American Government to some of the papers being brought down. I am, therefore, to a considerable degree, hampered in my freedom of statement, and in vindication of the course of the Government, by not getting that consent; but I have a general permission to state the general course of the negotiations. Now, Sir, the American Government had given notice that the treaty was to be ended. It would certainly have been childish and undignified to ask them to change their policy, unless we had a good reason to give them. Then the other question was, that of reciprocal trade relations, which, though not the same subject, might still be a cognate subject, and it was of considerable importance to Canada to mingle the two subjects, and try, by using one as a lever, to introduce the other. Now as regards an application to the late Government on the fishery question, any man who knows anything about American politics must know how futile that would have been. True, President Arthur, as a mere flourish, put a sentence in his Message, which was not regarded, but we knew perfectly well that Mr. Blaine, who, as Secretary of State, at that time covered the Foreign Affairs of the United States, was strongly opposed to any concession about the fisheries.

Mr. MILLS. Blaine went out on Garfield's death.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not immediately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Blaine was a candidate for the Presidency; he was supported by the whole Republican party; Mr. Blaine was the nominee of the President, as far as the President can have a nominee, and Mr. Blaine was the head and front of the protectionist party in the United States, and he was hoping and trusting to get his election by keeping up protection in the United States, and by keeping out the products of all the world, Canada excluded, from the American market. Not only that, Sir, but when Mr. Frelinghuysen was Secretary of State—Mr. Frelinghuysen was a gentleman for whom I had a great respect when he was alive, and I have a great respect for his memory now, because I had the honor of considering him one of my best friends. But he was a protectionist to the utmost extent; he was resolved to keep the United States trade for the United States people; and, Sir, in the spring or summer of 1884 he had, in answer to a deputation from the Gloucester fishermen, solemnly declared that the Government of the United States would adhere to the ter-

mination of the treaty, and that under no circumstances would that treaty be renewed. That statement was known, and we knew that it was of no use to go to the United States Government, or to the United States Congress, and ask them either to withdraw the cancellation of the treaty, or to enter into negotiations for a reciprocal treaty; it was useless, it was folly, it was humiliation, without even the reward that humiliation sometimes has, of getting "the dirty shilling." We could not get the shilling, and we might have the humiliation. The question, therefore, stood in that way. But as it occurred to us last autumn that we might, perhaps, incidentally, insert a wedge, and during the administration of President Arthur and the administration of the Foreign Affairs by Mr. Frelinghuysen—I think I am at liberty to say this: Mr. Frelinghuysen is dead, and we cannot get his consent, of course, to the correspondence, but I am at liberty to state the general results. We knew perfectly well that if we stated that we wanted the fisheries treaty to be renewed, that we wanted a treaty of commercial reciprocity, that there was no use in trying; but it occurred to us that we might put the matter to that Government—not the present Government of the United States, but to that Government—we might say to them: Well, the treaty will end 1st July, 1885; that is, in the middle of the fishing season. Your men will be fitting out vessels, and we cannot expect that those rude fishermen may know everything, and may know when the treaty ends. They are fitting up their vessels, and if they are in our waters up to the 1st of July, it will cause them great irritation if their vessels are seized on the 2nd day of July. We took that as a means of opening the subject. We did it, I think, in a diplomatic way, so as not to ensure either a refusal on the part of the Americans or to cause any embarrassment on either side. Unofficial communications were conveyed through Mr. West, and he asked Mr. Frelinghuysen whether there was any use in our going into the subject, in our asking for a reconsideration of the fishery matters—whether there was any use in making an official proposition, or any use in talking about reciprocity arrangements. The general result was that Mr. Frelinghuysen stated that it was impossible, and that all he could do, or that the Government of the United States could do, was, just prior to the 1st of July, to issue a proclamation, warning the American fishermen to avoid coming into our waters. We accepted that answer, because we knew from the previous statements of Mr. Frelinghuysen that there was little or no use in entering into negotiations. I think the hon. gentleman quoted from the Governor General's statement in his despatch, that perhaps we would have a better chance under the incoming Government, who have four years before them, rather than the outgoing Government, in going into negotiations with them. The moment that we knew a new Government was formed, we set to work. The British Ambassador drew the attention to it of Mr. Bayard, the present Secretary of State, and, of course, the Minister who is in charge of the Foreign Relations of the American Government—we called his attention to the previous unofficial correspondence with Mr. Frelinghuysen, and from that it grew by degrees from a quite confidential and unofficial series of letters—all of which, of course, we saw here, and all of which we weighed—until it arrived at the unexpectedly happy result we now find in these letters, in which, so far as the present Government of the United States is concerned, we have now the expression of their desire, in the first place, to deal with the fishery question, and, in the second place, to enter upon the great subject of the extension and development of trade between the two countries. Sir, at the time that we commenced these negotiations I never thought we would have got so far; I never really thought we would have got the Americans to take a step towards what we all reasonably desired—although we did not pray for it; we will not pray for it; we will not say it

is essential to our prosperity—but I say we got the Government of the United States to agree, as the papers show, to a commission being issued, under which the fishery question can be dealt with; and, with the question of our fisheries, the wider question of the development of international trade will be gone into. Now, Mr. Speaker, we were quite well aware of the difficulties of the question; they are candidly stated in these papers. We stated that we knew it would look like a one-sided bargain. We knew perfectly well that there are certain interests that will feel that it is so, and that they are to some extent prejudiced. But our first proposition was, as the papers disclosed, that inasmuch as the treaty ended on 1st July, when the fishing season had, for some time, commenced, and it was in active prosecution, we suggested—and remember, we did not suggest it to the present Government only, but it was a suggestion to the last Government as well—that, for mutual convenience and to mark our neighborly feelings, so far as we, in Canada, were concerned, we would agree that the term should be extended from 1st July. That was refused by the late Government, but the offer was repeated by us. The hon. gentleman has said, in his speech, that we put it on the ground that it would be a great convenience to the poor, honest, innocent American fishermen, instead of for the convenience of our own fishermen. It is quite true we put it on that ground. If we go to the United States for the purpose of trying to make an arrangement, we should scarcely hope them to agree to our proposition, if we pleaded that it was to suit the convenience of our fishermen. We put it on the ground that it would greatly meet the convenience of their fisherman if they were allowed to fish during the remainder of the season, from 1st July to 1st November or 1st December, as the case might be. That would be the course pursued by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), if he were a negotiator, instead of a member trying to make a point against the Administration, and forgetting the interest of his own Province and of the whole Dominion. We put it that the American fishermen had been fishing in our waters for twelve long years, that they had had the value of our fisheries from the beginning of the season, and would be fishing there on 30th June, and on 1st July all their vessels would be seized. It was a reasonable ground on which to approach the United States. Does the hon. gentleman want to have a treaty with the United States, or does he prefer to make a flourish before the fishermen of his Province, or to make, perhaps, a speech to the fishermen in the neighborhood of St. John, when he goes down there at the end of the season. Does he prefer the interests of his Province to the interests of the Dominion—those interests which are now trembling in the balance—all those great interests which may affect the whole Dominion. Why, I believe we were told a short time ago that the trade of St. John would be ruined unless certain things were done, thus killing our chances, so far as the people of St. John could kill them, with the United States. The hon. gentleman has not gone so far, but his remarks lead in the same direction. It is of very great importance that the Government of Canada should be sustained in their action by this House, by the representatives of the people, in their honest, straightforward and earnest attempt, which has gone further towards success in negotiations than any attempt since 1873, and gone further towards a return to reciprocity and reciprocal relations. This is a question which affects the whole Dominion. We have done a good deal, I must say, for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, for some of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have done a great deal for some of them—I think for all of them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not for the fishermen of New Brunswick.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is New Brunswick mad, as he should be. He persistently fights the battle of New Brunswick, and no one, perhaps, fights it more energetically and earnestly and thoroughly than that hon. gentleman. What have we given up? We have simply stated that so far as the Canadian Government is concerned they would not send a fleet down to fight the American fishermen, that they would not have a recurrence of the trials and convictions and irritations that were caused before the Treaty of Washington, if they could avoid it. The Canadian fishermen, from all I can learn, will be quite willing to have a renewal of the treaty; they will be quite willing, if they had their fish admitted free into the United States market, to allow American vessels to fish in Canadian waters. It is not because the American vessels are really driving them off their grounds, or really depriving them of their catch of fish, or really diminishing the catch every year, that they offer opposition. They do not oppose it on that ground, or otherwise we would not attempt to renew the treaty by which the Americans would continue to go upon the Canadian fishing ground. They argue as reasonable men: Why should the Americans be allowed to come and fish in our waters when our fish are excluded from the American market? But they do not object, and would not object to the Americans coming within the three mile limit, if Canadian fish were admitted free into Boston, Portland and other American markets. This shows that their catch is not diminished in quantity, but that they have not access to the American markets. I admit the whole of the force of that argument. But our answer would be this: That it is of great consequence to you, the fishermen of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec to get your fish into the American market, duty free; that that market should be open, and in order to get that promise from the United States Government, in order to obtain an engagement that they would enter into negotiations, is it not worth while to allow the American vessels to come into our waters, as they have done for 12 years, and fish from 1st July to 30th November, or whatever may be the close of the season? That is the whole sacrifice made. The American vessels will come into our waters as they do now. There will be no more sacrifice of Canadian interests by American vessels after 1st July than there was before that date; they will be in the same position in our waters as they have been for the last 12 years. We acknowledge that it is pretty hard upon you, the Canadian fishermen; but if you want the benefit of the American market, is it not worth while to give the Americans the use of our waters for three months longer, and then sit down with their representatives and endeavor to settle the whole fishery question, and afterwards have a treaty, or endeavor to negotiate a treaty, to open the markets of the two countries to the products of each? That is the way we put the matter to the Canadian fishermen. It is natural they should grumble; but is it not better that something of this kind should be done, rather than that Canadian fish should be kept for all time to come out of the American market? They will have to pay duties for all time on their catch, and is it not worth while to do that much, with the good chances and prospects we have of having some kind of satisfactory negotiation with the United States, not only on the fishing question, or questions which affect fishermen, but on all the products of the country. We cannot expect, as the hon. member for North Norfolk said, and we do not expect, that in any reciprocity treaty there will be an exact return to the lines of the treaty of 1854, but I believe there will be, and that there may be, unless it is thwarted by our own ambitions, or by violent faction, an arrangement by which there will be reciprocal trade in very many articles, the growth of the Provinces on the one hand, and of the United States on the other. I have no hesitation in admitting that it is on the paper, as the hon. gentleman stated, a one-sided arrange-

ment, because the illustrious individual at the head of this Government has put it plainly in his despatch, that we know and feel it is a one-sided arrangement. But it was worth while making this concession for the great purpose I have mentioned, and I am sure any man in this House, who will rise above party, above mere party feeling, and who desires to have extended negotiations with the United States, desires to have free fish, free fishing and a free interchange of products, so far as the two nations can agree—every man will feel that the Government have been acting prudently, wisely and in the interests of the country—that they have taken the proper time, at the proper moment, and just when there was a chance of succeeding. There was no chance of succeeding before, under the late Government, as I have explained. We have now some chance of succeeding, and is it not worth while to make this paltry concession, by which nobody suffers, because I have no hesitation in saying that the fishermen do not suffer, for if they did they would have complained for the last twelve years that the Americans fished in our waters. If we put our fleet on there, we might keep the Americans out, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will defend our fishing rights on our coasts if these negotiations fail. But it is worth while to suspend those strict rights when we have such a great prospect of succeeding. The hon. gentleman alludes to the 30th clause. The American Government have simply decided not to continue that privilege, and it will, of course, affect one or two places in Ontario. It was granted in a spirit of kindness more than anything else, in the Washington Treaty, and they have come to the conclusion that it shall come to an end. We cannot help that, and it would be unworthy to cry about it. They will not yield upon that point. The Americans think that there ought not to have been, originally, such a concession made by the Washington Treaty. They think it hurts their trade, and it certainly does affect their coasting laws which are very rigid and stringent, and I think very unjust. If we could coax them to give up their coasting laws, we would do so, but they have refused. This provision was inserted in the treaty to oblige certain interests, and, I may say, inserted on the strong personal pressure of myself, though the Americans saw that there was no gain by it. They have chosen to close that arrangement, and no remonstrances of ours will help it, although it interrupts the trade of some one or two lines on our upper waters, and it is unfortunate in that respect. Then, as to Newfoundland, I believe it is not necessary to enter into a long discussion of that subject. In Newfoundland they have behaved as you see—we have no right to speak so as to stir up any feeling—but they have behaved, I will say, in an eccentric manner. We have told them, as the House knows, that the House has already put duties on fish coming into our market, and Newfoundland fish among the rest. They have duties on our articles, but they say we should not put duties on theirs, because, although they put duties on ours, the trade from Canada to Newfoundland is very large, while the shipments from Newfoundland to Canada are very small. They say they cannot afford to give up their Customs revenue, and therefore they hope you will not reciprocate with regard to those duties. The hon. gentleman has discoursed about the deputation that came from Montreal. Well, I met that deputation and spoke to them, and the spokesman of that deputation was one of the strongest opponents the Government happen to have in that illustrious city. But there are certain shipments made to St. John's, Newfoundland, from Montreal. Vessels had arrived there with large cargoes, and all would have had to come back at considerable loss. And our statement to Newfoundland was just this: if we suspend it for a moment, it will have the effect of preventing these people from losing a great sum of money; but if we do that, you will have to send a commissioner to deal with that subject,

and if they do not deal with it satisfactorily, we will impose the duties strictly and sternly. We were merely giving a sprat to catch a mackerel; those two or three cargoes can go through without loss to our Canadian people, but you must send a commissioner, in order to come to such arrangements, or we will enforce the law. That is simply the case of the Government, and I appeal to the common sense and patriotism of both sides if, under my explanation—hampered, as it is, by my inability to bring down the whole correspondence—I say I shall be disappointed if both sides of the House do not say that whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Government elsewhere, they have acted, not only with earnestness and speed, but with considerable diplomatic skill, in bringing the matter into the position in which it now stands.

Mr. MILLS. Before the resolution is put, I wish to make a few observations on the question before the House. The First Minister says that he expected the confidence of the Opposition, as upon this question he prided himself on his great skill and success in conducting the negotiations and the correspondence which has taken place with regard to the matter. Well, it does not seem to me that the correspondence indicates any great skill or industry, or any remarkable judgment on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, in dealing with this question. We find from the correspondence that the intention of the American Government was brought immediately under the attention of the Administration. We find that Mr. Fry introduced, in the Senate of the United States, a resolution, with a view of repealing certain articles in the Washington Treaty, as early as the 10th January, 1883; and that immediately after, on the 16th January, the English Ambassador at Washington enclosed a copy of that resolution to the administrator of the Canadian Government. After the resolution was adopted a copy was sent to the Governor General of Canada, and the Governor General communicated with the Secretary of the Colonies, informing him of the despatch and its enclosure, which he had received from the English Ambassador at Washington. Lord Derby called the attention of the Canadian Government to the subject, and asked for an early communication; and it will be observed that the American Minister in England noticed the fact that the Earl of Granville had made no suggestion with reference to the subject of the fisheries and the abrogation of those articles of the Treaty of Washington; and the reason the Earl of Granville took no steps towards a renewal of the negotiations is clear from his communication to the Governor General of Canada. He was anxious to be fully informed of the intentions and views of the Canadian Government on this subject, before any negotiations were opened with the American Government. The reason the American Government proposed the abrogation of those particular articles was sufficiently indicated by Mr. Rice's speech. Mr. Rice is the chairman of the committee on foreign relations; as such he, to some extent, occupies the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs; the views which he expressed are to be taken as the views of the committee, and he there indicated his opinion that the fisheries of Canada were not worth to the United States the amount they were called upon to pay under the settlement of the Halifax commission, and notice was given for the termination of those treaty provisions, with the view of getting rid of the settlement effected by the Halifax commission, and opening the whole subject again. Now, the hon. Minister says that the views expressed by Mr. Rice are of no consequence. I think they are of very great consequence; they show us the motive which impelled the committee on foreign relations to bring this matter before Congress, and the motive which actuated Congress in deciding for an abrogation of these particular provisions of the treaty. There can be no doubt, then, that the Canadian Government were

early informed of the views and intentions of the American Government, and that they were informed, too, by the Colonial Secretary, that it was desirable that they should communicate at an early period to him their views on this subject. If the Colonial Secretary had entertained the views suggested by the Prime Minister, that it was beneath the dignity of Canada to open negotiations with the view of securing a renewal of those fishery regulations, or the establishment of others which would be satisfactory to the two countries, he would not have made the communication he did; but when he informed the Canadian Government that they should avail themselves of the two years that would elapse after the notice was given, for the purpose of renewing the negotiations and re-establishing treaty regulations between the two Governments, it is clear he saw nothing beneath the dignity of the Canadian, or the English Government either, for that matter, in taking initiatory steps for the purpose of renewing those negotiations. And, after all the hon. gentleman said, it is plain to everyone who has read this correspondence and to everyone who has listened to the hon. gentleman that he, in effect, did take the initiative in renewing the negotiations and in abandoning the rights of the Canadian fisheries to the Americans for the time being, for the sake of a promise that at some future period the Government of the United States would be prepared to agree to the appointment of a commission. Now, I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us in what respect we are in a better position now than we were, or would have been if the hon. gentleman had taken action upon the suggestion contained in the Message of President Arthur. That Message did not, as the hon. gentleman said, suggest a treaty of reciprocity, or negotiations for a treaty of reciprocity; it suggested the appointment of a commission:

"I suggest that Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries, and the means of opening to our citizens, under just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

That was what was suggested by President Arthur, and I would like to know whether President Cleveland or Mr. Bayard has done anything more. Is the hon. gentleman in any better position at this moment, after the negotiations he has had, than he would have been if he had accepted the invitation which is indirectly given by President Arthur in his Message to Congress? The hon. gentleman says: It is true President Arthur made a suggestion, but what guarantee had we that Congress would act on that suggestion? What guarantee has the hon. gentleman, at the present moment? Not any. Then he is in no better position. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) refused to renew certain negotiations, with reference to the Treaty of Washington, in connection with the reciprocity treaty negotiated by Mr. Brown.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of that.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly understood the hon. gentleman to say so. At all events, when the subject was under discussion, a few days ago, he gave as a reason, if not to-day, that there was the same Congress, that there was no change. But the Congress under President Arthur was not the one that was in office when Mr. Brown negotiated his reciprocity treaty. On the contrary, we might fairly believe that that Congress might take a more favorable view of the matter; at all events, when the President made the suggestion, there was no impropriety or want of dignity in assuming that it was at least practicable to enter into negotiations to secure a fair understanding, which the hon. gentleman says he is going to do at this moment. I want to know if the chances are any more favorable. There is a Democratic Administration, which is, perhaps, ready to make freer trade relations with this country; but there is a Senate which is in

Mr. MILLS.

less accord with the President than it was with President Arthur; and the hon. gentleman, according to his own statement, does not stand in a whit better position to-day than he did two years ago; he has no better chances of succeeding to-day than he had then; and if it was undignified to have made the offer two years ago, it is equally undignified at the present moment. But the question whether the hon. gentleman could or could not succeed is not the question which is to govern the consideration of this matter. The hon. gentleman might fairly assume that trade relations between the two countries, which are mutually advantageous to each, are likely to be established. The statement of President Arthur shows that the American Government do, after all, attach more importance to the fisheries of Canada than the hon. gentleman says the fishermen of Canada do. He says it is possible something may be said here that may interfere with our chances of success. What could more tend to damage the chances of successful negotiation in this matter than the declaration made by the hon. gentleman himself? He has told us that our fishermen would be quite satisfied to allow the Americans the free use of our fisheries, on condition that they were allowed free access to the American market.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that, but I said they would be willing for the next six months.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman did not qualify his statement when he made it. As I understood him, and I will repeat it; and if he says I am incorrect, I will accept his correction. I understood him to say, and my hon. friends around me understood him to say, that our fishermen would be quite ready to acquiesce in an arrangement with the United States that would admit the Americans to the use of Canadian fisheries, on condition that Canadians were admitted to the American market with their fish. I ask, what is the effect of that statement upon these negotiations? What chance has he to receive any indemnity for the use of our fisheries after a declaration of that sort? He, himself, it is clear from his statement, does not expect to succeed in obtaining compensation, or he never would have made a declaration of that kind. There is damage done to our case, if our fisheries are represented of so little value in the estimation of the people of both countries, as they are represented to be in the declaration of the hon. gentleman. There has been no declaration made on this side that is calculated so seriously to interfere with our claim for compensation as the statement of the First Minister to-day. The hon. gentleman admits the arrangement is a one-sided arrangement. Why, the declaration of Mr. Bayard makes that point clear. He says it is not competent for the Executive of the United States to alter the Customs laws, by admitting Canadian fish into the American market. The hon. gentleman ought to have known that. I venture to say the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) knew it, and many other members know enough about the American system of government to know that that is the case. Why did not the hon. gentleman press negotiations upon this question before Congress rose, while it was still in the power of Congress to deal with the question? He knows it was open to Congress to propose that this treaty should terminate in December instead of July. It was the business of Congress to look after the interest of the fishermen of the United States, and say whether they would repeal or put an end to the treaty during the fishing season. If any inconvenience resulted to the American fishermen from this action, they could only hold the American Government responsible. Why did the hon. gentleman show this special interest for the fishermen of the United States and not show corresponding interest in behalf of our fishermen, by seeing that our fishermen were admitted to the American market? The interests of the American fishermen were the special concern of the

American Government. What specially concerned the Government of Canada was the protection of the fishermen of Canada, to see that no privileges were granted to the fishermen of the United States to which they were not entitled by law, without corresponding privileges being conceded to the Canadians. How do the accounts stand? According to the decision of the Commission at Halifax, the admission of Canadian fish free to the American market is not an advantage sufficient to compensate Canada for permitting American fishermen to fish in our waters, and for that reason the Canadians obtained compensation. If the hon. gentleman had secured free admission of our fish into the American market for the remainder of the season, he would be accepting less, according to the decision of the Halifax commission, than the Americans were receiving. But the hon. gentleman obtained nothing and conceded everything. He made the concession, and made it at a time when it was out of the power of the American Government to concede anything in return. He made a statement not borne out by the facts; he intimated that the Government knew, from correspondence with the United States and from the action of the American Secretary of State, that there was no chance of success in making this arrangement. If that were so, why did he send the despatch of the 23rd December last, asking the British Minister at Washington what chance there was of succeeding. The reply to that despatch is not brought down; the information contained in it is not given us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot get it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says he cannot get it, but the despatch is there, and it is inconsistent with the hon. gentleman's statement—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot help that.

Mr. MILLS. There it is. The despatch shows that the Government of Canada, at that time, did not know—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the country or not at that time. The despatch asks the British Minister at Washington what chance there was for successful negotiation being carried out. If he knew there was no chance, it was not necessary to send that despatch.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 23rd September the new Government had come in.

Mr. MILLS. It came in in March.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the elections were just over.

Mr. MILLS. It was not of the new Government the hon. gentleman was enquiring. He was enquiring with reference to the chances with the old Government and not with the new, and the answer is not brought down. We do not know what that answer is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; we do know.

Mr. MILLS. I say that the hon. gentleman was negligent of his duty; that he did not do what, in the public interest, he should have done; that in this matter he delayed, from day to day, just as he did in regard to the correction of abuses and grievances in the North-West Territories, and that when it was too late he was ready to come to an understanding. It was due to public interests that an attempt should have been made earlier, and if he failed in this attempt the wrong would lie at the door of the President of the United States, and his advisers and Congress, and not at the door of the Canadian Administration. This matter has been considered of sufficient consequence to lead to treaty stipulations twice between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, and there would have been nothing undignified on the part of the Government of Canada in enquiring whether the Government of the United

States were prepared to negotiate another treaty; and especially after the declaration of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, we should have asked the American Government what it was they desired. There was a declaration of the President of the United States that that was the proper way of settling the question. That is clearly set out in President Arthur's Message. Why, then, did not the hon. gentleman seize the opportunity for opening negotiation, with a view of coming to an understanding? He knows that he is not in a better position to-day than he was in then; he knows that if the Senate of the United States was Republican it is Republican to-day. If, because it was Republican, he could not succeed then, what chances has he to succeed now? And he has made this concession for the purpose of putting himself exactly in the position he would have been in if he had undertaken these negotiations two years ago. What have we in prospect now more than we would have had two years ago? What has the hon. gentleman got by all these skilful negotiations, upon which he prides himself so much? What has he secured? A promise that, as far as the President is concerned, he is ready to appoint a commission. The hon. gentleman was told, two years ago, by President Arthur, that he was ready to do the same thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I was not.

Mr. MILLS. He said so in his Message.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not tell us so.

Mr. MILLS. He told all the world, and the hon. gentleman, being a man of the world, received the information, as well as the rest of the world, and the English Government communicated the information officially to the hon. gentleman, and urged prompt action and yet he took no action, he made no reply, as far as I can see, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. My hon. friend says he did it no more than if the Colonial Secretary had been a half-breed. So it would seem. It seems to be his practice to pass over in silence the communications he receives on the most important public business. The hon. gentleman owed it to the people of this country and to the fishermen of this country that he should seek to come to an understanding with the Government of the United States upon a question seriously affecting the interests of the fishermen of the two countries. It was not less his duty than it was the duty of the Government of the United States. Surely the hon. gentleman will admit, at all events, that the Halifax fishery commission awarded fair compensation from the United States. He knows that the United States believed that the Canadian Government received more than the fisheries were worth. He knows that they terminated the fisheries clauses on that account. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Frelinghuysen, in his communication to the English Ambassador, suggested that the United States Government expected a communication from the English Government as to their views upon these articles of the treaty which were about to be terminated, and the Secretary of the Treasury asked the hon. gentleman for his views, in order that the English Government might take the initiative, and yet the hon. gentleman did not communicate with him; and it was not until he was again and again pressed that any action was taken in the matter. Then the hon. gentleman says, in regard to the 30th article, that the American Government had made up their mind to repeal that article; upon that subject they would not yield, and that it was useless to press the subject upon their consideration. I do not think so. I think the interests of our trade, the interests of our shipping, which will be seriously affected by the abrogation, made it the duty of the hon. gentleman to do what was in his power to secure the renewal of the provisions in the treaty, and of those regulations of the United States Executive which

were even broader than the treaty itself. We know that the hon. gentleman has paid so little attention to the 30th article that, when he communicated the effect of it to us the other day, he gave us information which was altogether misleading. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is not in accordance with the action of the American Government. That affects, not merely the short line of railway between one extremity of the Welland Canal and the other, but it affects the transit trade across the Province of Ontario. The vessels that are loaded with wheat at Duluth and carried it to Sarnia, or that were loaded at Chicago or Milwaukee and carried it to Sarnia, or Maitland, or Collingwood, for the purpose of having it re-shipped at some lake ports to the eastward, are now excluded from that trade, and when we look at the treaty in this particular, we find it is not as broad as the commercial regulations of the United States, because the treaty only provides for the carrying of American products from one American port to another, in vessels, with an intermediate transit over some Canadian railway or through Canada; whereas the regulations made by the Executive of the United States not only provided for that case, but for a case of this sort, that flour and grain, and so on, shipped in the west, landed at some Canadian port, carried by Canadian railways to Ogdensburg or to the Eastern States, was also admitted to be carried in part, so far as carried at all, in Canadian vessels. Under the Treaty of Washington only those cases were dealt with where the article was carried at each extremity in a vessel, which was practically an interference with the coasting trade, but the regulations made by the Executive also permitted goods that were intended for the various ports in the United States, and that were taken on board some Canadian railway, to be carried for the remainder of the way through Canada, and through a portion of the United States, by railway. Now, the repeal of those trade regulations not only repeals the 30th article of the Washington Treaty, but also those other regulations which provided for these cases. That is a very serious matter. Take, for instance, the Beatty line of steamers. They have four large steamships engaged in this trade during the summer season. They are all thrown out of employment. So with regard to our shipping on the lakes; so with regard to those ships which carry grain and flour to Maitland or Collingwood, to be carried to Toronto, and put on vessels for the port of Oswego. The trade on the lakes is most seriously affected by the repeal of this article, but it is still further affected by the repeal of these Executive regulations relating to the trade; and yet the hon. gentleman, after two years' notice of the intention of the American Government to terminate these provisions, has not taken, in all that time, the first step for the purpose of establishing new and satisfactory trade relations with the people of the United States. I think the hon. gentleman has not succeeded, as he declared he had, in adopting a course that was or is likely to be to the general advantage of this country.

Mr. McLELAN. I judge that the hon. gentleman does not so much disapprove of the present position of affairs as complain that action was not taken earlier. We were in this position: We had been the last to send a representative for the purpose of negotiating a reciprocity treaty in 1875; we had also declared publicly by our Statute Book that we were ready to negotiate with the United States for reciprocal trade whenever that country saw fit to negotiate with us; but we were in a different position. In 1883, when notice of the termination of this treaty was given, we did not send a delegate, we did not officially go to the United States Government, we did not beg for a renewal of that treaty, but informally, and through the Governor General of that day, Lord Lorne, we suggested to the American

Mr. MILLS.

Government that a commission should be appointed, consisting of representatives of both Governments, to visit the whole coast of British America and of the United States, and to consider the question of the fisheries, and obtain such information as we thought would be necessary, with a view to adopting a new treaty. That suggestion was made to the American Government in 1883 through Lord Lorne—informally, not officially. To that suggestion we had no response. No information, either official or informal, was given to us, that they would respond to that suggestion, or that they would join us in a commission to obtain such information as was desirable to have in negotiations for the renewal of a treaty. Having met us in that way, having made no response, I think we would have been too much in a position of suppliants and beggars if we had again moved without any intimation from them. When we approached the termination of the treaty a suggestion was made which has resulted in the correspondence which has been submitted to the House. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman complains of the action taken, but only that we did not take it early enough. Both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken made that their ground of complaint; and if they will consider that in 1883 we did all that we properly could do in order to open negotiations on the question, preliminary to making a treaty, I think then they will agree that we have done all we honorably could to bring about negotiations in respect to the fisheries and reciprocal trade between the two countries.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not feel like continuing the discussion upon this subject, for the reason that, as it is now before the American Government, I think it is unwise to go into it at any great length, and for that reason, also, I rather deprecate the action of my hon. friend from the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), in raising the question at this time. But I have no doubt that hon. gentleman was inspired by a sense of the duty that he owed to his constituents, and in a matter of so much importance to the people of the Maritime Provinces that is certainly, to my mind, an excuse for ventilating it at this time, although I think the continuance of this discussion, and even the discussion, so far as it is gone, cannot be otherwise than detrimental to the future settlement of the fisheries. Sir, there have been two very grave statements made, one by the right hon. Premier and the other by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which I think ought not to have been made in this discussion, looking at what is ahead of us. My hon. friend from Bothwell stated, if I understood him distinctly, that the Halifax award of \$5,500,000 was far beyond the value of the Canadian fisheries.

Mr. MILLS. No; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did you say about it?

Mr. MILLS. I said the American Government assumed that the amount was beyond the value of the fisheries, and that was the reason why they terminated the treaty. I expressed no opinion as to their value.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad I misunderstood my hon. friend, because it would be of the last importance to us that, either with regard to the value of our own fisheries or with regard to the facilities which we may get, in respect to trade, that matter should not be discussed until it is taken up by the two Governments. Our worthy friend the Premier made a statement which I regretted, if I understood him correctly. I understood him to say something to this effect: That, inasmuch as the Americans were admitted to fish in our waters before the treaty expired, and as we took the fish of our fishermen into American markets free, it was no hardship to us to allow the Americans to continue to fish in our waters, and that it would be sufficient compensation to our fishermen in the future to get their fish free into the United States markets.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that was not my argument. My argument was what the fishermen would think about it. Of course, the Dominion of Canada considers that the fisheries are much more valuable, but the fishermen on the coast do not care so much about that, about having a share in the five millions and a-half, or the one million, or whatever they may get. What they think of chiefly is to get their fish free into the American markets.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. gentleman went so far as to state that they would be perfectly satisfied.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not. You did not understand the meaning of my argument.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It would be better to clothe the argument in such language as that it may not be misunderstood.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I tried to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I drew attention to these two points for the purpose of having clear explanations, so that no misapprehension shall go abroad as to what the opinions are in this Parliament; because I think it would be a matter of deep regret if a misapprehension went abroad from the statement made by the Premier, such as I understood him to mean. I am glad to find that he does not think the admission of our fish into the United States is a fair compensation for the free use of our fisheries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Sir, in considering the imposition of a duty upon the importation of our fish into the American markets, it is becoming a great question who pays the duty. True it is, that, in the first instance, the question affects the fishermen and the merchants who forward the fish, but it is a question for the consideration of this House, as well as for the Americans themselves, what class of people these duties will ultimately affect the most. I am free to admit there are cases where the imposition of duties comes off the manufacturer, and comes off the producer, but there are cases also where it comes off the consumer; and, in my opinion, the scarcity of fish in the United States, and the fact that they require to go abroad, into the more fruitful waters of British North America, leads me to believe that the shortness of supply for the fifty-five millions of people on the other side of the border will eventually operate to place the duties upon the consumer instead of the producer, and that is the opinion I have always held in relation to the importation of fish into the American market. But, Sir, I am free to admit that what the Premier stated is quite true, and that, perhaps, in the opinion of the people who catch the fish, the duty imposed is the great bugbear, when they formerly got their fish in free, as they do not look to the ultimate effect, as to whether the increased price in the markets where these duties are imposed will not more than compensate for the duty itself. Sir, I look forward to a treaty being accomplished in the future between the two countries. I am not one of those who blame too severely the Government for delay in opening up negotiations; and I am not one of those, as the Premier knows, who advocate that we should go at once, hat in hand, to the American Government. I am quite of the opinion that, at the time they approached the Government in respect to the repeal of the treaty, it would have been unwise, it would have been injudicious in us, to go to them, hat in hand, and ask them to make new arrangements. We have not forgotten what occurred in 1867, when the British Government asked us to allow the Ameri-

cans to come in and fish in our waters free. The position taken by the Government of that day was very different from that taken now. We said: No; we cannot allow that to be done; we cannot allow a temporary right of use to grow up in the future, to be, perhaps, claimed as a right, when it was granted only as a favor, and we imposed a tonnage due upon the vessels of Americans, and allowed them to come in within the three-mile limit. Sir, at that time we took no precaution for the protection of our fisheries for the first three years, any more than we have done this year; and the fact of our not taking any precaution, or putting any police force on our waters, for the purpose of keeping the American without the boundary, was that they came to disregard the imposition of tonnage dues, and, finally, refused or neglected to pay them, and the result was, that if it had not been for the energetic action taken in 1869, the probability is that our fisheries would have drifted along, until the Americans would, by this time, have claimed as a right what now they own they are accepting as a favor. I believe the same course and policy pursued in 1869 should have been followed last year, and it is within the knowledge of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there was a strong opinion expressed in this House, and notably expressed by myself, on the occasion of considering the Bill for the division of his Department, that the Minister should have asked for \$50,000 or \$100,000 to place a marine police force on our coast, and thus have shown the Americans that we meant business. What is our position to-day? I hope the Government will not allow the matter to drift along and find, on 31st December, that nothing has been done, and allow the Americans to continue to fish in Canadian waters free, as they practically did up to 1869. What I think the Government ought to do now is this: Make provision to place upon our waters vessels for the protection of our fisheries. The cost will be trifling, in comparison with the importance of the duty, and the moral effect that will follow from the knowledge of the measures we have taken, when we come to negotiate. I do not say this for the purpose of condemning the Government, but to call the attention of the First Minister to the moral effect such a course would have upon any negotiation that may be carried on, if the time came when negotiations were instituted. I desire to state another point, and it is well to do it now, because I hope before the House next meets there will be something of a definite character known in regard, at all events, to the feelings of the United States with respect to the fishery question. My point is this: The hon. gentleman said that no damage was being done to our fisheries by the Americans fishing within the three-mile limit. The hon. gentleman is not well informed on that point. Within the last three, four or five years, a system of fishing has been established by the Americans, which has been most destructive to our fisheries, and will ultimately ruin them, as the Americans have ruined their own fisheries. The Americans come in with schooners and with nets, and with three, four or five miles of nets, sweep a whole bay, taking all kinds of fish, and for every one marketable mackerel, two or three unmerchantable young mackerel are thrown overboard. Complaints have been made by the fishermen of my own county of this practice, and they have asked whether any protection can be obtained. What I desire to impress on the First Minister, looking to the future, is this: Whatever arrangements may be made—if any shall be arrived at—we ought to provide for a recognition on the part of the American Government that the municipal laws of each country should apply to the fishermen, whether Americans or Canadians, whether on the American coast or on our own coast.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear. A good point.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have stated this opinion, because I think it covers a point of vital importance. I do not desire to continue this discussion. If I were to do so, I could say a good deal that would be interesting to the House; but it would be unwise; and I hope hon. gentlemen will not raise controversial points, in view of the fact that the Government, whether guilty of neglect or otherwise, which is a matter of secondary importance just now, we do not desire to see them placed in a position of disadvantage when they approach the consideration of this question with representatives of the people across our southern boundary. I have every desire to see the most friendly relations existing between the United States and British colonies on this continent. I desire to maintain that friendly feeling which will best promote our prosperity; and I repeat what I have said on a former occasion, that I do not desire to see a money compensation for our fisheries; that I do not desire to see the question to be viewed from a purely financial standpoint, but that it should be looked upon as a matter of trade; and whatever the value of our fisheries, and they are infinitely greater than those of the United States, whose fisheries are worthless to us, while our fisheries are of immense value to them, I think the question should be dealt with in regard to trade relations between the two countries. I understood the hon. gentleman from Bothwell to say that we got too much for our fishery rights from the Halifax Commission. I was glad to find that I misunderstood his remarks. The Government of which he was a member, and which conducted the negotiations so satisfactorily, claimed for Canada \$15,000,000, and so far from that being too much, it was not equal to the compensation which should have been obtained. I mention these facts with a view to strengthen the hands of the Government and to try and prevent a discussion which would do no good, and which, if followed up, might lead to recriminations and statements which would weaken the hands of any Administration which had to conduct negotiations with the United States Government.

Mr. VAIL. After the statement by the First Minister, this discussion is narrowed down very much, and if I were to discuss it now, with the papers that are before us, it would be almost impossible to do so intelligently or in such a way as to convince the House and the country that we are justified in making serious charges against the Government, while we would be justified, if the correspondence brought down contained all that has passed between the Government of the United States and that of the Dominion of Canada, in holding those assertions to be true. I would be sorry to say anything that might be construed as in any way tending to embarrass the Government in any future negotiations with the United States Government; but coming from a Province that is more deeply interested in this question than is any other Province, I can hardly allow the debate to close without saying a few words in reply to the remarks made by the First Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The First Minister seems to think the Government had done all that could be expected of them. I am not one of those who think for a moment that this Government should go down on its knees to the United States Government in a matter of this kind. Had the Government of the Dominion, when it was announced that the American Government intended to abrogate the treaty, made a fair open statement to the American Government, and said: Our fisheries are very valuable; you know they are valuable, and that your fishermen place a very high valuation upon them; they have been a source of trouble heretofore, and it is very important that this question should be settled for another ten years, if not forever. We are perfectly willing to appoint a joint commission to consider the whole question, as well as commercial reciprocity. When you are prepared to take up this question, we shall be quite prepared

Mr. MITCHELL.

to consider it, with a view to arriving at a conclusion that will be satisfactory to both countries. Had the Dominion Government done this and nothing more, and done it a year ago, that is one year after the notice was given that the fishery clauses would be abrogated, I would not have been disposed to find fault with the Government. They would have gone as far as it was incumbent on them to go, and if the United States Government did not take the matter up it would be no fault of our Government; but the Government have allowed this matter to drift on, until, so far as we know from the papers before the House, December of last year arrived, and it was not until the 24th of that month that the first despatch was written by the Governor General to Earl Derby on this subject. The first part of that despatch is very statesmanlike, as it set forth clearly that it would be rather derogatory on the part of the Dominion Government to make proposals, after what had taken place in the United States, and considering that the American Government had shown no disposition to open negotiations. But unfortunately for the Government, and, I think, for the country, before closing the despatch, they made this offer to the Government of the United States, and pointed out that they made it because of the great inconvenience which would result to the American fishermen if the treaty should expire in the middle of the season. I hardly think it was the duty of our Government to look after the interests of the American people in that way. In reality, although the First Minister says that the fishermen of the United States know little of what is going on, I can assure him they know all about it. The fishermen of the United States, like those of the Maritime Provinces, are not at all ignorant in regard to matters connected with treaties in which they are interested; they understand their rights a great deal better, perhaps, than hon. gentlemen in this House, who are far from the locality interested. Now, if the American Government had given notice to this Government that the fishery clauses of the treaty would expire on the 1st July, 1885, then we were in duty bound to look out that our rights were not infringed upon after that time; and had we done so, I am satisfied the Government would have been in a much better position next year, after Congress meets, in December next, to have met the American Government, and would have found them in a much better mood to discuss the matter than now. I am afraid the course the Government have taken will lead the American Government and people to suppose that we do not put a very high valuation on our own fisheries, if we are disposed to give them up for what is practically the whole fishing season, because the season in which the Americans derive much advantage from these fisheries does not commence before the last of May, and the really valuable part of the season to the Americans is just beginning now, that is, the mackerel fishery, which they value far above other fisheries. I say, in this regard the people of Nova Scotia have just cause for complaint. I notice that the mackerel fisheries on the American grounds have been largely a failure, and the consequence will be that the price will be high this year; and the Americans will be allowed to come in and enjoy the same privileges as our own fishermen, take their catch to the same market with our fishermen, who have to pay a duty on their catch of \$2 per barrel. When I point out that the value of the fish caught in Nova Scotia last year, by the returns made by the Marine and Fisheries Department, was \$8,760,000, it will be seen that this is a very important industry, so far as that Province is concerned, and that we naturally look with considerable interest on any arrangements which are made with the object of allowing Americans, or any other people, to come in upon our fishing grounds, unless we get something in the way of compensation. The hon. member for Bothwell has stated, and I agree with him, that at present the matter stands in this way: That our fisheries were con-

sidered by the commission which sat at Halifax to be worth over and above the value of the free admission of our fish to the United States, \$5,500,000 for the 10 or 12 years which were covered by that award. The whole thing has been given up for nothing; we get no admission to the American markets, no money, but only the right of fishing in American waters, which our fishermen do not value. Everybody knows that our vessels do not go into American waters, so that that concession amounts to nothing. I am pretty safe in saying that had the Dominion Government last year approached the American Government, and made the offer of free fishing for free fish, they would have granted this and given them the privilege of fishing in their waters in addition; and I think they would have been quite satisfied to allow the treaty to continue for the next six months. I notice that, in the correspondence, our Government do not appear to have a very direct promise from the American Government that they will approach this question of commercial reciprocity. Mr. Bayard merely says, at the end of the correspondence, that he has no objection to submit that question to the commission, or any other question that the two Governments may desire. Well, it is very easy to make that offer, but he does not state that the Government of the United States will suggest to Congress that such an arrangement shall be made, or that the question shall be considered. It is stated emphatically, over and over again, in these letters of Mr. West's, that they shall have power to arrange all matters in connection with the extension of the fishery clauses, but he does not refer to commercial reciprocity till the very end. I hope that something good will grow out of these negotiations, and that we shall be rewarded for the great sacrifices we are making at the present time to the Americans. I know that the Americans do set a high value on our fisheries. I know that everything that took place in connection with the settlement of the treaty in 1871, at Halifax, shows that notwithstanding that the First Minister has stated that the Gloucester fishermen have represented that they did not want the treaty continued, such is not the desire of the great majority of the people of the United States. I know this because I happened to be in Boston in December last, for some time, and I found a strong desire on the part of the Boston people, and I am sure that desire extends to the whole Western States, that the fish of the Maritime Provinces should be admitted into the American markets free of duty, no doubt their fishermen would like to have the advantage of getting their fish into the United States on better terms than the Canadian fishermen, but I am at the same time quite satisfied that the large majority of the people of the United States, who consume fish and are interested in the Canadian trade, would be very glad to see some arrangement made, whereby this treaty should be extended, so as to allow American fishermen to fish in our waters, in return for a market in the United States, and either commercial reciprocity or such a money compensation as would be fair in the interest of all concerned.

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

The committee rose, and, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories .....\$ 680,831 45

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I was pointing out, on Saturday night, before the committee rose, that very large sums were expended in supplies for the destitute Indians. I do not complain so much of the amount as of the fact that

there are evidently irregularities, to use a very mild word, in connection with these supplies. I drew the attention of the First Minister to the accounts rendered to the Government for the supplies of fresh beef and bacon to the Bloods and Blackfoot Indians, and stated that there appeared to me to be very little attention paid by the Government to the mode in which the supplies were given to the Indians or the vouchers certified to by the farm instructors. I find that the Sarcee Indians, a band of about 440, were supplied with fresh beef during the last six months of 1883 to the amount of \$10,150; and the Piegans, during the same time, were supplied with the same article to the amount of \$19,423. During the same time this beef was purchased, I suppose, by contract, at 13½ cents a pound, the Indians were supplied with 10,799 pounds of bacon, at 23 cents a pound, so that you will observe that we were paying for bacon nearly 10 cents a pound more than for fresh beef. It is a well known fact, as the reports show, that the Indians do not care for pork; they complain that it injures their health; one of the Indians complained that a large portion of his band suffered very severely, I think in the winter of 1883, from the pork given to them. I saw, in a western paper, the statement—I do not know whether it was true or not—that this pork was purchased from an individual closely connected with officials of the North-West, and that it turned out to be rusty and inferior. I believe the hon. Minister will find in the reports references to the quality of the pork, and complaints from the Indians that it was injurious to them, they not being accustomed to it. I understood from the discussion on Saturday evening that nearly all the supplies to the Indians are given under contract to the lowest tenderer, after tenders have been advertised for. I find an account from I. G. Baker & Co. for waggons and ploughs. I have not been able to find that they had any contract for the supply of waggons and ploughs in 1883. I find, by one account, that on the 20th June, 1883, Baker & Co. supplied one of the officials of the Department for the Indians with 12 ploughs, at \$28 each; 10 sets of harrows, at \$20 each; 5 waggons, at \$120 each. I do not know on what authority these articles were got from I. G. Baker & Co. I am told, however, that the price of the waggons is nearly \$10 in excess of what waggons of the class supplied by Baker & Co. could be obtained for by the Government in the markets there. I believe there is no wagon that goes into the North-West which could not be bought at a much less figure. I find in the voucher an entry in red ink, that these articles were got without any authority, by some official; that the attention of the Department had been drawn to the fact, and that the Department had ratified the purchase of the official. It is a loose way of doing business, that the officials should have the right to purchase supplies, relying on the good nature of the Department to recognise the purchases. In July the same thing happened. Mr. Galt, one of the officials of the Department, appears to have, without authority, purchased articles of the class referred to from I. G. Baker & Co.; and in the voucher there is a long memorandum indicating that the articles were purchased without any authority; that subsequently the matter was referred to the Department, and the Department sanctioned the purchase. It is quite impossible for the Head of the Department to know anything personally of what is done, but must trust largely to the officials in charge at the North-West. What I desire to impress upon the Government is the fact that these enormous supplies should be obtained under the authority of some responsible officer, and that officials, generally, should not be allowed to make purchases. In this last account I find that there were 8 ploughs, at \$35 each, \$7 more than the price charged the month previous; I find that the harrows were purchased at \$31.50, \$11.50 over the price of a month before from the same firm. Upon these several purchases in July, of the same class as those purchased in June, there appears to be an excess paid in July of \$159.50.

There are 6 sets of harness, at \$62, \$372, and there does not appear to have been, so far as I can gather from the documents, any authority for this purchase. Why they were purchased I do not know. Another thing to which I drew the attention of the First Minister on Saturday night is this: There are a number of complaints in the reports, notably in 1882-83, and, I think, in the earlier part of 1884, of great irregularities on the part of the officials. It appears one or two have been dismissed, but there does not appear to have been any investigation as to the extent or nature of the irregularities, so far as I can judge from the report. Has the Minister's attention been drawn to these irregularities, and has there been any investigation into them? One can easily see that if the agents in the North-West see fit to engage in irregularities—and I do not say they do, except as far as one can judge from the reports—if they engage in the business of stealing, and are simply dismissed, that is practically no punishment. If there have been irregularities on the part of any agent, the attention of the other agents ought to be drawn to his misconduct by an investigation being held and punishment inflicted. In 1883 Mr. Wadsworth, whom I met in the North-West, and believe to be an efficient officer, as far as I can judge—he appears to be an active, vigorous, intelligent man—reports that he could not get any account whatever of the supplies sent in by the contractor or the Government. In this report, speaking of the Sekoskoots reserve, he says he could get no account of the supplies sent in by contractors or the Government. That is an extraordinary condition of affairs. That no account should be kept of these supplies, that there should be no way by which irregularities or misconduct can be traced, is an extraordinary condition of affairs. Mr. Wadsworth, in his report of 1883, draws the Minister's attention to the fact. Has an enquiry or investigation been held under that report? Mr. Wadsworth further says, in the same report, that the flour delivered at that reserve was of an inferior quality, and of light weight. It may be said the right hon. gentleman did say that the Indians were getting this as a donation and should not be particular; but all the same, the country is paying for it; the country has contracted with that contractor to supply us with a fair quality of flour, for the purpose of giving it to the Indians, and they should be compelled to supply the proper article and the full weight. Some of the sacks, Mr. Wadsworth reports, only averaged 93 pounds, and contained inferior flour. With respect to Poundmaker's band, Mr. Wadsworth says the flour was inferior and of light weight. So I could go on, and point out where the same reports are made to the Department, that the supplies given to the Indians are inferior in quality and light in weight. I drew the First Minister's attention the other night to the fact that in several of the bands—in four or five of them—the grossest frauds had been perpetrated, either by the Indians or through the negligence of agents, in paying for rations to numbers far in excess of what the bands contained. The hon. gentleman, I understood him to say, had drawn the attention of the officials to that, and that condition of things did not now exist. That is quite satisfactory, because it is quite enough for the country to pay for the rations of the real number of Indians without paying for 800 men more than there are in one band. Mr. Wadsworth, with respect to Farm No. 11, at Battleford, says: That the books of the farm did not agree with the books from the Indian office, the entries in the one class of books as to quantities received not agreeing with the entries in the other as to quantities delivered. It does not appear where the discrepancy existed, and to what extent the Government were defrauded. In the Sekoskoots reserve, Mr. Wadsworth says that, at Farm No. 14, the farm storehouse is used as a depot for supplies, but that neither at Battleford nor Fort Pitt could he get any account of the supplies sent in by the contractors or the Department.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

If things had been kept regularly, there should have been no discrepancy, and Mr. Wadsworth, making his annual inspection, should have had no difficulty whatever in discovering where the discrepancy lay. It appears that he was utterly unable to do so, and he draws the attention of the Department to these grave irregularities. He says:

"At Farm 15, Frog Lake, in the books there were discrepancies between the amount of goods received from Farm 14 and the amount charged in the books of Farm 14. 38 sacks of flour only averaged 93 pounds per sack."

If the First Minister's attention has not been drawn to these irregularities, and no doubt it has been, an investigation should have been had. Then, in 1884, Mr. Wadsworth said, in regard to Poundmaker's band:

"I took an inventory of flour and other supplies. The flour was of inferior quality, and weighed only 98 pounds to the sack."

All these things go to indicate that there is something wrong in the management of the Department in the North-West. I am not at present prepared to say whose fault it is, but when the attention of the Department has been so pointedly called to these grave irregularities, it was the imperative duty of the Government to have a full investigation, and to have the parties who committed the wrong punished. I also wish to draw the attention of the Minister to this: Mr. Dewdney, I believe, is the Lieutenant Governor and Indian Commissioner; and I find, in some accounts, that Mr. Dewdney—whether as Lieutenant Governor or Indian Commissioner, I do not know—charges the Government with table cloths and table napkins, and with washing blankets, and with 152 yards of cotton and 109 yards of cotton, and with painting, varnishing and cleaning the Government House carriage, and with some cooking utensils. Is it our duty to pay for these things? It seems to me they are the private affairs of the officials in charge. There are many other items that I would like to discuss, but it is useless at this late stage of the Session. They cannot possibly receive that attention they ought to receive, and the First Minister cannot give them that attention which they eminently deserve; consequently, I shall not pursue the investigation of these points any further.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to call the attention of the officers of the Department, and of the chief of the Department, to the manner of receiving the tenders for Indian supplies. I can quite understand that, before the Canadian Pacific Railway passed through that country, it was almost a necessity that the furnishing of these supplies should pass into the hands of foreigners, who had their establishments located in that far western country, and that they alone, perhaps, could furnish those supplies with accuracy and promptitude; but things have changed very much in two years, and my attention has been called to this matter by many of our merchants, and manufacturers, and others, in the chief commercial cities, who have stated that the manner of letting the supplies, to be delivered at the reserves, was not, perhaps, the most judicious way of letting them, and was not calculated to secure the greatest amount of competition, or one that would lead to the business falling into the hands of our own people—a thing which, I believe, is to be very much desired. I think that in tendering for the supplies to be delivered at the different reserves it would be much more desirable if the tenders were made for the delivery at Winnipeg, Moose Jaw, Calgary, or other given points in proximity to these reserves, and the question of transport were made an entirely different tender. By that means the necessity of a middleman would be done away with, and our merchants in Toronto, Quebec, Montreal, or elsewhere, could put in their tenders. They could get the tariff rates of the railway and could deliver their goods at those points, and our own forwarders, our own farmers in that section, who had their teams, their horses or their oxen, could deliver these goods to the different

reserves, and the business would thus be kept within our own people, and we should dispense with the necessity of a foreign middleman. I do not bring this forward as blaming the Department at all, because I understand the necessity there was for adopting the practice before the railway existed; but now that we have the railway and the means for giving facility to people to tender in smaller lots, to deliver at points on the railway, where they can calculate the cost, it would possibly have the result of getting a better class of goods at a cheaper rate, while keeping the business within our own country and giving to the farmers and settlers and pioneers of that country a chance to do the transport. I call the attention of the Minister to this, not in a fault-finding spirit, but to see whether he does not think it better to adopt this plan than to tender in large lots for delivery on the reserves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has been a matter of consideration, and the opinion of the officers of the Department is, that it is premature to commence that system. It is quite true that along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway goods can be sent, but the great mass of the Indians are not along the line of that railway, but some 200, 300, or 400 miles away from it. In the case of supplies to the Indians along the Saskatchewan, for instance, sending them along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway is sending them to the wrong place. They are sent to Winnipeg, and then by water, by the boats of the Hudson's Bay Company; and so with regard to other points. It is impossible to adopt the plan proposed, unless you organise a whole system of transport. I am satisfied that the transport to the numerous points would be an enormously expensive thing, and instead of saving, you would lose a large sum of money by altering the present system. Now, the local merchants at Winnipeg and at the other points are beginning to tender, and they can manage it infinitely better themselves, because they know the ways of the country. You must call for tenders for transport if the Government desire to have a transport system. You cannot have a tender for every point along the railway. There must be a general system of transport, and that would be a very cumbersome and expensive thing; but a Winnipeg merchant tenders for goods to go, say, to the Black-foot, from Calgary, and he has to deliver them at the Black-foot Crossing, or other points, and he can make his contracts easily; he can hire the local people and get teams very much cheaper than the Government could do. By-and-bye the system may be changed, but at present I am satisfied that it would increase the cost. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Cameron) has quoted Mr. Wadsworth's report. Mr. Wadsworth is a very good officer, and it is his duty to inspect the different reserves and report upon them. These reports show that there is a good system of inspection. They are all followed up, as a matter of course, like the reports of an inspector of any institution. The inspector reports irregularities, and these reports are made for the purpose of calling the attention of the officers of the Department to them, and they are looked into carefully. If there happens to be a deficiency in some of the flour sacks, if they are two or three pounds under weight, that is charged, of course, against the contractor; he will have to make it up. If he sends articles which are inferior, it is the duty of the Indian agent to reject them. Sometimes the article is a good and wholesome article, but it is under the standard. Obviously, they cannot throw it away, and they make a deduction in the charge. If it is unwholesome or improper to be received, it is rejected. I must say that the contractors have been very fair, so far as I can learn. If there are cases where they do not give the proper standard, why, they have got to account for it, that is all. But as the hon. gentleman admits, it is obviously impossible to discuss it at this time, to go over the articles item by item, and

answer every possible charge of apparent irregularity that may be supposed to be found out in the accounts. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that, so far as I can learn, the inspection is very rigid; and the action of the Department is also very rigid, to see that any irregularities that are proved to exist are accounted for. With respect to the farm instructors, the Indian agent is in charge of each reserve. Some Indian agents have two or three reserves, but they are small. There is a farm instructor, and he has an assistant, and sometimes the farm instructor receives the supplies. The Indian agent cannot be everywhere, but these farm instructors are intelligent men, and sometimes they see to the rations. There is no doubt, until lately, there was a great deal of duplication of the rations. The Indians are very cunning in that regard, and they sometimes disguise themselves and come twice. But that is being cured. When we no longer meet with large bands, and when the agent and the instructor know every man, woman and child on the reserve, that kind of irregularity will shortly disappear. Of course, it is inevitable, in a new country, where large bands of Indians come and go, but that they will try to defraud, and sometimes successfully. It is hardly possible to avoid sometimes giving one man more than he ought to have.

Mr. MITCHELL. In reply to the hon. Premier, I think for once he is not quite as logical as usual. Now, there is no reason in the world why the monopoly of this thing should be given to the foreign merchants at Benton, or to the merchants at Winnipeg. There are merchants and manufacturers in the eastern part of the country that are contributing towards the expense of opening up that country, and making railways there, that feel, and very naturally and properly feel, that if there are supplies to be contracted for and delivered, the contracts for these should be given in such a way as that they may have an opportunity of participating, which they cannot now do. If there is an arrangement by which these supplies go up to the more distant reserves north of the Saskatchewan River, why not tender for their delivery at Winnipeg, and let the transport to the Saskatchewan be a separate contract altogether? Then, as regards the reserves in the vicinity of Calgary, there might be four or five leading points along the line of railway, where the supplies might be delivered by contract, and then the merchants could deliver them there. I do not see why, if it can be done in two or three years, it cannot be done at once. In connection with the charges in the Public Accounts, if my right hon. friend had heard the comment I have heard, and of which I am just now the exponent, he would probably think it might be as well to commence the reform at once. I can assure him it is not a pleasant thing for our merchants and manufacturers, who are contributing to the construction of this railway, to find half a million or three-quarters of a million of dollars going to a foreign company, who are monopolising the business of that country, when our own people are excluded. For my part, I am not satisfied with the explanation of the Premier at all. If the thing could be done in two years hence it can be done now, and I think it would be well for him to consider the propriety of having the matter looked into, with a view of carrying out that system, which I am sure the whole country will approve of, at as early a day as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot hold out any hope that it will be done in two years. It would be impossible; it would take as much to pay for the transport, if the Government were to adopt that policy, as it would for the food. The truth of the matter is, the manufacturers all over the country would have no objections to sending the goods to the places that are convenient for them, and then throw the whole trouble and expense upon the Government. It would be quite impossible. The hon. gentleman speaks

about the Saskatchewan and Calgary. I quoted these merely as examples. But there are upwards of 200 reserves, and that we should, by changing the system of transport, adapt a system of transport to every one of these 200 reserves, is impossible. It is easy for the manufacturers now to find out, when tenders are called for, for goods to be delivered at several points, to make their arrangements. Now I fancy that the teams for transportation will be plentiful, because that is the only means really for supporting the half-breeds. There is no buffalo. Those who will not settle down on their farms must use their teams. Any contractor can get the teams, and they can do it much more satisfactorily than the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. Surely, if the contractor can get over the difficulty of delivery, there can be no practical difficulty in the way of tendering for the transport. I can see no reason why it cannot be done. I admit there is less trouble in the present way for the Department, but I think it would be much more satisfactory for the public if the other system were adopted.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. This is a kind of business I have had something to do with heretofore, and I have always found that the cheapest and safest way was to contract with the first man to put the goods where you want them. If you pass them through half a dozen hands, half a dozen men are responsible, and the goods never arrive so safely. When you say to a man: I want you to put this flour at a certain place, you have one man responsible for it. You can do it cheaper and better, and much safer, than if you contract with several parties.

Mr. MITCHELL. With all due deference to the Minister of Railways and the right hon. Premier, I cannot see, if there is a million dollars' worth of supplies to go into that country, why the tenders should be placed in such a way that two persons can get the whole of that money. If the Premier and the Minister of Railways say that it is better to have the transport and supply in one hand for the delivery at one point, I admit it is less trouble for the Department. But what is the difficulty of dividing the delivery at these several points into a dozen different tenders? There will be more competitors; there will be as many competitors for each one of these tenders as there would be for the whole, and the consequence is, that the Government will get the advantage of the competition. They have to pay large profits to middlemen now, which they would not do in the other case.

Mr. POPE. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows enough about the question. But what I desire to point out to the House is, that it would be the greatest possible mistake to have half a dozen men responsible for the same work, when the responsibility can all be placed in the hands of one man. If we are going to have half a dozen men to deal with it, we have half a dozen men to look after. There is no reason to believe it would be a cheaper system. Men tender all over the country, and unless they can place the supplies there, they cannot tender as cheaply as others. The hon. gentleman wants to add to the difficulties and responsibilities of the Department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am surprised at the speech of the Acting Minister of Railways and his statement that I want to add to the difficulties of the Department. It is an amazing statement. I appeal to this House whether, in any course I have taken, I have sought to add to the difficulties of any Department; on the contrary, I have endeavored to raise my voice in an opposite direction. I have refrained from saying things that would add to the difficulties. Others would not have shown the forbearance I have shown. The Minister of Railways, who seems to embody all the wisdom and experience of the House and of the country, says I

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

know nothing about the matter. A large book might be written of what he does not know, although I admit that, generally speaking, he is pretty well informed. He says that if a man could deliver a part, there seems to be no reason why he should not deliver the whole of the goods required? Take a manufacturer who weaves cloths. He does not want a tender for cloth and 1,000 barrels of flour, 50 sides of leather and other articles. He cannot do it. The goods have to be sold to middlemen. But if there were 1,000 yards of cloth to be delivered at Calgary, or Winnipeg, or Moose Jaw, or any point within reasonable distance of the main line of travel, surely the cloth could be placed there at a less price than it could under a tender for an enormous number of articles, which can only be put in by Baker & Co., and the Hudson Bay Company. Our merchants are ready to do some of this work. I am surprised at the Minister of Railways pitching into me. I admit that he knows something more of the public business than I have done recently; but I also know something of the business of the country.

Mr. POPE. I am not at all surprised at the hon. gentleman pitching into me, because that is his practice. But I do say that the man who makes cloths should not tender unless he could place the goods at the point required, otherwise his tender would be good for nothing. I admit that the manufacturers would not tender; men who purchased cloths from them would tender.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman wants a middleman in the transaction. That is what the hon. gentleman is after—he wants a third profit. I want to save that profit to the country and the business for Canadians. I am sure the First Minister will have to adopt the plan I have mentioned, for public opinion will demand it.

Mr. MILLS. There would be difficulty in the Government organising a transportation service to carry the different supplies to Indians in the North-West Territory. But I do not feel certain that a transportation service organised by the Government would be necessary. When Baker & Co. were employed by the preceding Government, they not only furnished supplies but they were the Government bankers. There was no Canadian settlement within 800 miles of some of the points. There were only two companies with which arrangements could be made for furnishing the necessary supplies to Indians in the western portion of the territory. The condition of things has very greatly changed within the last few years. Beef could now be supplied from some of the ranches, and tenders might be obtained from some of those parties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So it is.

Mr. MILLS. Then, as to flour. Wheat is grown in almost every part of the Territories. On the North Saskatchewan there is sufficient produced not only to supply the population there, but also the Government with all they need for the Indians in that district. I see no reason why it should not be purchased from the residents, and the cost of transportation saved. I suppose the Government intend to give them an opportunity to furnish such supplies. It is of great consequence that the Minister should submit to Parliament a statement showing the distribution of the money. The Government have employed a large number of farm instructors. Some are doing well, and are succeeding in making some bands of Indians self-supporting. Whether the Indians do well depends largely on two conditions: the character of the reservation, and the character of the instructor placed over them. If there is a good instructor, and progress is not made, it is probably owing to the location being a bad one, and the Indians should be induced to settle on another reserve, while there is yet abundance of land in the North-West. With respect to the item for cloth-

ing, I suppose it is to supply Indian chiefs and head men with clothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Are any other parties to receive clothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is correct in supposing that this item does not include the clothing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some explanation about these Indian schools. I should like to know how many schools have been started, and whether or not they are in the hands of the various Christian denominations?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that it has been found very difficult to get these Indian children to attend, and the teachers are obliged to hold out, as an incentive, the giving them a little food, such as biscuits or bread. They go for the bread and nothing else, and then the teachers endeavor to do something in the way of education. The increased vote is for salaries and aid in the erection of school houses, \$11,600; the average salary of teachers is \$300. Thirty-one new schools are proposed to be established, and the salaries for these will cost \$9,300, and the remaining \$2,300 will, it is estimated, be required for aid in the erection of new school houses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have heard statements made by one of the agents, to the effect that this system was a comparative failure, for the reason stated by the hon. gentleman, that it was difficult to get the children to attend.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt the children will not attend at school all day, unless, as I have said before, some inducement is held out to them. I may say that the schools are not generally conducted by the different denominations, but in some cases they are. The Catholics have schools, and they are assisted wherever they have a considerable number of children attending, and so are the Methodists. These, I believe, are the two denominations which are really pushing education among the Indians, in connection with and with a view to religious instruction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My own impression is, that they are the very best possible instructors, and will do the work more cheaply and more assiduously than teachers employed in the ordinary way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Wherever a religious body establishes a school, they are, of course, allowed to do so; we are very glad to get their aid. The body send certificates of competence with the teachers. They will not establish schools unless they know they are going to get scholars. The Department grants \$300 to the teachers, when the number of pupils is less than 42, and \$400 when the number is over 42; the religious body may contribute as much more to the teachers as they like. The schools of the Department are not under the control of any religious body.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the teachers required to know the Indian tongue, or only English? I have heard from parties in the North-West that a good many cases have occurred, in which pupil and teacher found themselves confronted, and neither understood one syllable of what the other said.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Wherever teachers who are linguists can be found, of course they are eagerly sought for, and are preferred; but we find it impossible always to get competent teachers who can speak the Indian language. They must commence, first, at trying to teach their pupils English, as best they can. I do not know that there is any other way of doing it. For \$300 you cannot get a man who can speak English and Indian as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You cannot get them here, but as my hon. friend has just remarked, in the North-West many of the half-breeds, as the First Minister knows, are men of considerable education. I have been rather surprised at the number of half-breeds whom I have met there who are quite fairly educated men, and from whom I suppose it would be quite easy to supply a reasonable corps of instructors for the number of schools we are to establish with such a grant as this. There is another point requiring explanation. If I understood the First Minister, he stated that he was locating a number of these schools at one place—as many as four, I think, at such places as Edmonton and Battleford. It occurs to me that that might lead to considerable inconvenience. I understand that the policy of Government is not to encourage Indian reserves to form in the vicinity of large or even small towns, where the Indians are much more disposed to fall into idle and dissipated habits than elsewhere, and unless there is some reason for it, the policy seems to me dubious, to place several Indian schools at a point already occupied by whites. But perhaps the hon. gentleman means that they are in the agency.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I meant in the district. For instance, in the whole Province of Manitoba there are to be eleven schools, and in the Birtle district four.

Mr. MILLS. With regard to these Indian schools, I do not know what the hon. gentleman has done; but I know that the understanding the former Government had with the various religious bodies was, that it would not pledge itself to continue to support denominational teachers for an indefinite period of time, but always reserve to itself the right to establish schools of its own whenever it deemed it expedient to do so. I do not know whether that continues to be the rule of the Department or not. But it seems to me that it is of not a little consequence to establish at an early day an Indian instructor of superior education, competent to give instruction in a normal school, either in Manitoba or in the North-West Territories, and paid by the Government out of the Indian appropriation. In that way the Indians or half-breeds to be employed as teachers in these schools could be trained. It would cost the Government but a very small sum, and in a very short time it would have a staff of competent teachers to properly instruct the Indians. My own impression is, that a large number of these schools are of very little consequence, and that the Indians are making little or no progress in education. There have been instances, such as those mentioned by my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), where the teachers only understood English or French, and Indians new nothing but Cree, the consequence being, that nothing said by the teacher was intelligible to the pupil, and nothing said by the pupil was intelligible to the teacher. I think, if the plan I suggest were adopted, a sufficient number of competent teachers could be obtained, at comparatively little cost, and the schools could be greatly improved; and there might be denominational co-operation in the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. MILLS. I think we ought to have some explanation of the increase of \$14,316 in the vote for farm instructors' wages. Are the farm instructors now residing on the reservations, have the Indian farms, apart from reservations, been wholly abandoned, and to what extent have the farm instructors been successful in making the Indians self-supporting?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The sum estimated for 1885-86 required to pay the force is \$37,010. The reason such a large additional force is required is to be found in the fact that after the object of the old farms had been accomplished, it became evident that instruction in farming

must be given on the reserve, and now, in nearly every case, the instructor is on the reserve. Formerly, the object was to make a model farm, quite free from the reserve, so that the instructor could not be supposed to be under the control of the Indian band at all. It was found that that did not quite succeed, as the Indians would not come to the farm. So the system has been altered, and the instructors have been put upon the reserves. Then, about maintenance, which is the next item, the increase is \$12,262. The maintenance for each man for twelve months is, as nearly as possible, \$135, and the maintenance for the current year contemplates the employment of forty-nine persons. This will make \$56,015.

Dominion Lands—Amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, etc..... \$70,000

Mr. MILLS. Why continue charging to capital account this sum?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is charged to capital, and the sales credited to capital.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that be done, there is no objection. But that is not the course the Finance Minister declared he intended following. The First Minister is correct. That was the arrangement said to be made, and no doubt ought to have been adhered to; but what shall I call it?—official exigencies or party exigencies have caused the Finance Minister to alter that excellent regulation, and he charges this to capital account and credits the other to revenue account.

Mr. McLELAN. The expenditure is made for the benefit of the future. It is necessary to survey largely in advance of settlement, and the practice has been adopted of charging this to capital account.

Mr. MILLS. We have heard for some time reports of very large areas having been surveyed since 1878, by the Government, although any one who will look at the map will see that the area is not so great as is represented; and if the amount of surveying has been done that is represented to have been done, a good deal must have been done two or three times over. I have never been able to see myself the utility of surveys in tracts of country not likely to be settled for years to come. It is one of the duties of the Government to watch the direction in which settlement tends, and to adjust the surveys, for the time being, to the wants of colonisation and settlement. This has not been done, and the result is, that lines which have been established have been obliterated, and surveys once made require to be made again. It would be interesting to know, seeing that the Government have such an immense area surveyed, far beyond the requirement of settlement—an area so extensive that, according to their own statements, it would require more than 2,000,000 people to occupy the whole territory, with the ordinary allotment allowed under the present area regulations—where the Government proposed to make surveys, and how it is, if the system of surveys has been carried on in such a way, there is still necessity for further surveys being made. If these surveys had been along the lines of the rivers and in sections of the country accessible to the population, it is clear that a very much smaller area surveyed than that which has been marked out by the surveyor would have been adequate to the requirements of settlement. But the hon. gentleman, notwithstanding the very extensive area that has been surveyed, still finds it necessary to continue surveying further. It would be important if the hon. gentleman would inform the committee where the Government propose to carry on surveys during the present season.

Mr. McLELAN. There are four parties surveying in British Columbia, fixing the latitude and longitude on the  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

lands in the railway belt, and projecting the outlines upon which the sub-division work can be completed; and there are several points in the North-West where it is proposed to have surveys, and several trails are to be surveyed. The hon. gentleman thinks it is unwise to survey so much in advance of settlement. If you were sure that no settlers would go in advance of you it might be well to hold your hand, but settlers spread all over the North-West, and it saves expense to have the school lands and the odd sections marked out in advance of settlement; but if they are not, and the surveyor has to estimate the value of the improvements made by a squatter, it adds to the expense of the survey.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, before the surveys of an isolated settlement can be made, there must be an astronomical survey made, with the utmost exactness. I was, however, calling attention to the very large area which the present Government has surveyed, and to the fact that that area of the surveys for several years appear to be in excess of the actual work done, according to the various maps brought down. It is only necessary to look at the longitude and latitude of these places to see the length of a degree; and a good deal of that must have been surveyed two or three times over, before the amount of surveying could have been done which has been reported to the Department. The hon. gentleman says it is necessary that surveys should be made in advance of settlement, but there is no difficulty in telling the direction in which settlement is tending. When the people of the North-West supposed the railway was going in the direction of Battleford the settlement went in that direction, by the Little Saskatchewan out to Rapid city, and even to Prince Albert; and when it is found that the railway is going in another direction, the settlement will go in the same way. There must be some reason for settlers establishing themselves in isolated localities. I do not object to the Government surveying such localities, and surveying them as early as possible, but I do object to the large amount of money which has been expended upon districts which are not fit for settlement and are not likely to be settled for years to come. Take, for instance, the Beaver Hills, which were surveyed some years ago. There are no settlers there, and there are none likely to be there for years to come. The district is not fitted for present settlement, and yet the same minute survey has been made of that as of other districts. If more care and judgment had been shown by the Department in marking out the work for the season, there would be fewer cases of surveys of that sort.

Mr. McLELAN. Whenever we find the direction in which settlement is tending, we endeavor to follow it, and the maps which I produce now show the amount of work which we have done during the past five years.

Dominion Lands—Land Board at Winnipeg..... \$31,220

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a new officer, the superintendent of mines. Who is appointed to that office?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Pearce.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The former inspector?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an office which requires special qualification. I believe that Mr. Pearce is an able officer and showed considerable zeal—in fact, almost too much zeal, sometimes—in prosecuting his duties as land inspector; but what are his special qualifications as superintendent of mines? Has he been educated as a mining engineer, or has he had any special knowledge which would enable him to act intelligently in this capacity? I believe he has not received a very high education as a geologist,

but he has some special requirements that fit him for the position, and he has been found to be an active and energetic officer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that in appointing an officer as superintendent of mines, at a salary of \$3,200, we ought to get an officer who possesses practical scientific knowledge. I do not know that there are in the North-West as great mineral developments as in some other parts of the Dominion, but it is a huge territory, and it is to be hoped that very valuable mineral deposits will be found there. Now, if we have not got a person of the requisite qualifications in our own country, it would be desirable to import one. It is very difficult for anybody who has not a special education in that direction to render good service in a post such as this.

Mr. McLELAN. Very much of this gentleman's duties will be, for a long time, in the regulation of the boundaries and the settlement of disputes. Perhaps, in course of time, when large mines are developed, it may be desirable to have a man of scientific knowledge, with respect, principally, to the mining business. Mr. Pearce is a practical surveyor of great experience in the North-West, and is eminently qualified for this position.

Mr. MILLS. I have no doubt that Mr. Pearce is a very good officer as a Dominion land surveyor, and is a thoroughly trustworthy man; but I do not know whether he is a good mining engineer or not, or whether he is acquainted with mineralogy. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he has not the qualifications necessary in a superintendent of mines, and I should have thought the hon. gentleman would have gone to the Geological Department for an officer to fulfil the duties of that position. The hon. gentleman's own statement just now is, that he has simply to survey the boundaries and the mining locations.

Mr. McLELAN. This has no connection with the important Department of the Geological Branch, to which a mining geologist is now being added. Mr. Pearce will be specially required for a number of years to settle disputes between miners, and to lay out locations; and having considerable knowledge of mines and minerals as well, he will do for that position. If anything more is required, we can go to the Department of the Geological Branch.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see any necessity for having an officer to survey mineral locations. Certainly, there is no reason why a man should be appointed specially to mark out the boundaries of mineral locations; and as to mines, and everything relating to them, it clearly belongs to the Geological Branch, and should be referred to that branch.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Pearce has a direct and general knowledge of mines; he is a surveyor, and a very intelligent man, and must have had a good deal of experience in that regard. As my hon. friend has stated, his duties are not merely to survey mineral locations; he has got to lay them out. Under regulations, the mines of coal, gold and silver, are of different areas. These have got to be surveyed, and the royalties have got to be collected, especially in the gold washings. He has got to lay out lots and to settle disputes between miners, who are rather a rowdy set. It is understood, from all that is known, that there is a great deal of mineral wealth in the Rocky Mountains, which we are just now making accessible, and he will have to lay out those auriferous regions according to the regulations, and see to the leasing of them, and, I presume, to collect the rents.

Mr. MILLS. A Government bailiff.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps that would be the more proper name.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the First Minister tell us what the policy is going to be with respect to such

deposits of valuable minerals as may be within our own territory?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say now. I will send for the regulations; they are all printed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have always thought that a good deal more might be made in new countries out of these deposits than in older countries. I have always thought that in the department of mines the next generation, at any rate, might, under a proper system, reap a considerable amount, as is done in other countries; and that we have been inconsiderate in our policy with regard to rental and royalty from many of the most valuable mineral deposits in the country. As the First Minister knows very well, those, in a great number of cases, do not go to enrich our own citizens, but they fall into the hands of foreign parties. There is very good reason why we should, with the example of other countries before us, retain some reasonable royalty on these deposits. Concerning the land board at Winnipeg, I am at a loss to understand why the Government should ask for salaries for secretary, short-hand writer and accountant. The probability is, that the traffic in Dominion lands will be rather less than more for some time to come.

Mr. McLELAN. The work in the office is increasing from year to year, although the sale of land may not increase. The correspondence connected with all the claims that have been taken up for several years has been accumulating from year to year. The expenditure of the Winnipeg board has so much increased that a short-hand writer is necessary, and one has been appointed. It is proposed to check the accounts sent to the Winnipeg office at that office, instead of sending them to the Department here, and it is therefore proposed to place an accountant there.

Mr. MILLS. Who is inspector of agencies now, in place of Mr. Pearce?

Mr. McLELAN. The position is not filled yet.

Mr. MILLS. Has Mr. Pearce been appointed superintendent of mines?

Mr. McLELAN. He was appointed in July, 1884.

Mr. MILLS. With respect to the item of \$3,000 for salary of inspector of colonisation companies, I should like to know what the inspector has to do. The report of the Department shows that very few settlers have gone upon colonisation companies' lands, especially during the last year or two. It appears that more settlers would have gone into the country if no colonisation companies had been organised.

Mr. McLELAN. The colonisation companies have expended large sums in endeavoring to get settlers on their reserves, and they have expended large sums abroad in advertising the North-West; and I know a very considerable number of settlers has gone upon their reserves. The inspector visits those reserves, and makes enquiries as to the number of settlers upon them. The companies are very often in error as to the number of settlers, and we have to rely upon the reports of the inspector.

Mr. MILLS. I believe the larger proportion of the expenditure made by the companies has been in paying officers. The companies have found that settlers are not willing to take up their land, and the promoters of the companies have been disappointed in the result of their investment. It is a gross waste of public money to maintain an office, for the holder of which there is no employment. It would be very much better if the Government would find some other position for the inspector of colonisation companies, and abolish the office altogether.

Mr. WATSON. Settlers fight shy of colonisation companies. Colonisation companies in the North-West are

simply bodies of men banded together to bleed intending settlers. I know one colonisation company in connection with which a person by the name of Dobbin claims to have a right to settle two or three townships in south-western Manitoba. He took \$30 each from several persons for securing land patents, and it afterwards appeared that he had no right to the land, and that incorrect descriptions were given. Those companies have been a curse to the country, and it is an injustice on the part of the Government to encourage them. We do not consider that they have advertised the country or assisted it. They try to pick up immigrants at Winnipeg or other points, and to induce them to settle on their lands. And such persons would, at all events, have homesteaded Government land. Then they receive a certain portion of the odd-numbered sections. These settlers have to pay for them, and they pay more to the colonisation companies than they would have to pay to the Government, and I do not think that it aids in the settlement of the country, but rather retards it. The money paid to the inspector of colonisation companies appears to be money thrown away.

Mr. McLELAN. The gentleman to whom the hon. member refers is not connected with the colonisation companies.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; that is the point, that this Mr. Dobbin had no right to act in that way, and there are others there who have no right to be there. Then there are colonisation companies which have failed, and their agreements with the settlers have not been carried out, and they are looked upon as a means of bleeding the settlers, who, of course, believe the statements of men who set themselves up as agents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this new item, "special services, \$6,000?"

Mr. McLELAN. That is for furnishing the offices with safes and other furniture; and the expenses of removing offices, and other things of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What offices?

Mr. McLELAN. The offices of the different agencies.

Mr. WATSON. Where are these land guides to be employed?

Mr. McLELAN. Wherever it may be found necessary.

Inside Service ..... \$30,000

Mr. MILLS. I would like to know why this \$30,000 for inside service is specially charged to Dominion lands instead of to the ordinary expenses of the Department.

Mr. McLELAN. There are certain considerable expenses for extra clerks at head office, at Ottawa, publishing maps, advertising, and other similar expenses connected with the outside service. It has been required for several years, and voted in this particular way.

Mr. MILLS. There is no reason why it should be so charged, as this work is just as much a part of the functions of the office as that of the Surveyor General or other officers. There is no reason why it should not be charged in the regular way.

Mr. McLELAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman would not advise that these men should be put on the permanent list, as it is hoped when the surveys are further advanced that we will require a less number of these extra and temporary men, and therefore they are charged in this way.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly I do not understand that any person is to be permanently on the staff, when his occupation is gone, and this is simply to conceal increased expense. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a great deal of correspondence with regard to patents, and it would be just as reasonable to charge all the expense in connection with patents as a special charge to Dominion lands in this way, as it is to make this a special charge.

Mr. WATSON.

Dominion Lands Agencies..... \$41,278

Mr. WATSON. Will the hon. gentleman inform me who is the Dominion lands agent at Prince Albert, or who has been agent for the past year?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. McTaggart is the agent.

Mr. WATSON. For the past year?

Mr. McLELAN. I think nearly a year.

Mr. WATSON. Has one Louis Smith been employed in that branch?

Mr. McLELAN. He was, at one time.

Mr. WATSON. How long ago?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know the length of time. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULLOCK. Perhaps the hon. Minister would not only ascertain when Louis Smith's services were discontinued, but when he was engaged and what his duties were?

Mr. McLELAN. I will endeavor to get the information.

Geological Survey..... \$60,000

Mr. HALL. There were some explanations to be given in reference to changes in the Department.

Mr. McLELAN. The force at present employed is as follows: Dr. Dawson, employed on the west coast of British Columbia; Mr. Bowman, in the interior of British Columbia; Mr. McConnell, in the Rocky Mountains; Mr. Tyrrell, in the North-West Territories; Mr. Ingall, on Lake Superior; Mr. Lawson, on the Lake of the Woods and Rainy Lake; Mr. Coste, in Ontario, in the Madoc and Marmora regions—he has lately been appointed as a specialist in mining; Dr. Bell, in the Hudson Bay, where he went on the expedition to explore the coast, and whence he is expected to return overland; Mr. Low, on Lake Mistassini and Rupert River; Mr. Ellis, in the Eastern Townships—he has lately been appointed as a mining geologist; Professor Bailey, in New Brunswick; Robert Chalmers, in the counties of Restigouche and Gloucester, New Brunswick; Mr. Fletcher, in the counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysboro', Nova Scotia; Mr. Willmott, in Ontario and Quebec, in collecting mineral statistics and specimens for the London exhibition; Mr. Weston, in the Eastern Townships, collecting fossils; and Mr. Adams, in Lake St. John.

Mr. HOLTON. Notwithstanding the statement just presented to the committee by the hon. Minister, I think it is very much to be regretted that the report submitted to Parliament last Session by the Geological Survey Committee was not long since acted upon by the Government, and the exceedingly important and valuable suggestions embodied in it adopted. Those suggestions, it is known to everybody, were in the direction of much-needed and called-for improvements and reforms; and it is a surprise to me, as I know it will be to the public, that attention has not been given to them before this by the Government. When this matter was before the House last year, no personal references were made by those taking part in the discussion, for the very good reason, I presume, that up to that time no charges had been made against any member of the staff of the Survey, and the report had not yet been submitted to Parliament. To-day, however, things are in a very different position. That report has been before Parliament and the public for more than a year, and the matter has been the subject of very considerable discussion in many newspapers for months. I feel, therefore, that it is now my right, as well as my duty, to invite a full consideration of the condition and management of the Survey, even if in that consideration are involved unpleasant reflections upon its chief officer. The committee alluded to investigated the matters which had been referred to it by this House in a thorough and impartial manner, all of its members being,

in my belief, actuated by no other desire than to secure such changes and improvements as would ensure its becoming, as it ought to be, one of the most useful Departments in our public service. As the result of that investigation, it is generally well known that the Geological Survey is in a deplorable inefficient condition, and that the value of what it is accomplishing for the country, from a useful and practical point of view, is by no means commensurate with its cost—that it is, in fact, almost nil; and basing my assertion on the evidence adduced before that committee, and upon facts since brought to light through the press, I do not hesitate to say that this unfortunate condition of affairs is chiefly attributable to the director. To the scientific attainments of that gentleman I do not propose now making any reference; for there I would probably be incompetent to judge; but I do say, on the same evidence I have referred to, that his peculiarities of temper and disposition, his contempt for all authority superior to his own, as well as for many of those who, unfortunately, have to acknowledge his authority, his apparent want of knowledge of the needs of this country, his very peculiar notions of the real objects of the Survey and of the duties of its director, and generally his utter lack of administrative ability and qualifications, render him peculiarly unfit for the important position he occupies. As the immediate result of his incompetency the generous sum annually voted by this House for the purposes of the Survey amounting to nearly \$100,000 is well nigh wasted, and in addition to this we have to consider the enormous loss constantly accruing to the country through the inability, indisposition or neglect of this official to do what should be done by him for the development of our vast mineral resources, and for the direction of public attention to them both at home and abroad. Whenever, in past years, reference has been made in this House to the management or defects of the Survey, Government have apologised for the director, by saying that he had come to Canada with a wonderful record of success, achieved in a similar survey in Australia, and that his appointment had been strongly urged at the time, and, at all times subsequently, warmly approved by the late Sir William Logan. With regard to Dr. Selwyn's connection with the Australian Survey, a careful examination of the public records of the Victoria Assembly has revealed to me the fact that his career in that country was, in every respect, as utter a failure as it has proved in this, and that it resulted there, as it certainly will result here, and from very similar causes, in the absolute demoralisation of the service. I find that the Victoria Assembly took hold of the matter in 1867, discussed it very fully, and finally voted the supplies for the Survey, conditionally upon their recommendations being carried out by the director. I find, also, that in 1869 the Survey there was abolished, but that it was almost immediately afterwards reorganised under a new management, and that the services of Dr. Selwyn were then transferred to Canada. As for Sir William Logan's subsequent confidence in the head of the Canadian Survey, I can throw some light upon that, by reading from a letter addressed to me by a prominent and respected citizen of Montreal, a gentleman who was the intimate and confidential friend of the late Sir William Logan, and with his permission I read the letter. He says:

"With reference to conversations had from time to time with the late Sir William E. Logan, I have a distinct recollection of his having referred to Mr. Selwyn, his successor, in very flattering terms. Then he, Sir William, showed me some beautiful specimens of geological maps traced, he said, by Mr. Selwyn. Sir William expressed himself as fortunate in having such a successor. But I regret to add that some weeks after Mr. Selwyn's arrival here, Sir William spoke to me of him, Mr. Selwyn, with doubt and fear, and once at his own house, on Logan's farm, he said to me, in speaking of his successor, 'I made a great mistake.' Indeed, I was grieved to perceive the annoyance the appointment caused Sir William."

I again say I regret the inaction of the Government in this most important matter, and would express it as my conviction, as I know it is the belief of the majority of those who take an interest in the work of the Survey and are desirous that its efficiency should be restored, and its labors directed to more useful and practical ends, that no reform and no improvement can be looked for until the control of the service is placed in other and more competent hands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister in charge surely owes it to himself and the House and the Survey to take some notice of the remarks of my hon. friend. It has been a matter of common complaint, from one end of this country to the other, that very small results indeed have accrued to the public of Canada from the many hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been expended for the last ten or twelve years on the Geological Survey. I am not prepared to say who is in fault or who is not, because I have not had time to examine into the matter, but I believe a committee was recommended to look into the question, composed of gentlemen on both sides, and that that committee reported, after full examination, very adversely to the management of the Survey. In asking for this vote, it becomes the Government to say whether they have examined into the matters brought to light by that committee, and what conclusions they have come to. No doubt, rightly or wrongly, the public opinion is that we have had very little value indeed from the expenditure on the Geological Survey, and that it is high time steps should be taken to make this vote more valuable to the people of Canada, who have to pay for it.

Mr. McLELAN. The recommendation of the committee was that some practical turn should be given to this Survey, and the Government have enforced that view on the officers. The Government have, besides, appointed two mining engineers to the staff, to devote their attention solely to practical matters.

Mr. HOLTON. I do not wish to repeat what I have already said, but I assure the Minister the slight improvements he promises, on the recommendation of the committee, will satisfy nobody. I would recommend the Minister to read the report over carefully, and he will find ground for a great many other improvements than those he has mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a good deal, as my hon. friend says, in that report, which the hon. Minister has not yet had his attention called to. A very curious state of things—I speak from memory—was revealed as to the relations between the head of that Department and a number of his subordinates, and statements were made which show that Department to be in state approaching utter disorganisation. There was not only no confidence but violent recrimination and great distrust among various important members of the staff. That kind of thing cannot go on in a Department of that sort, where the officers ought to work in full harmony with each other, without detriment to the public service.

Mr. HOLTON. It is quite true, the committee of last Session, of which I was a member, did make a recommendation which the Minister now says the Government proposes to act upon. But the committee referred to the deplorably inefficient condition of the service, a condition which I believe has not, in any one particular, been since amended. The committee basing its report in that respect on the evidence given before them by Dr. Selwyn, reported that the sum before then voted, the same as that now asked, \$60,000, was amply sufficient for the purposes of the Survey, and indeed sufficient to enable it to carry out some of the improvements suggested. Now, I understand that on the 26th March last fourteen of the officers of the Survey were notified that their services would be dispensed

with on the 30th April, on account of the exhaustion of the funds. I think that is a point which the Minister should explain.

Mr. McLELAN. I am informed that there were some six or seven whose services were dispensed with, being temporary clerks and other employés of that sort.

Mr. HOLTON. But why is it that the funds were exhausted, and that their dismissal was necessary for that reason?

Mr. McLELAN. I think there are some bills unpaid yet, of last year, and that the expenses will be reduced this year. It is expected that the \$60,000 will pay the outstanding bills and meet the expenses of the coming year.

Mr. HOLTON. What were these outstanding bills, and why were they not included in the Estimates of last year?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to say.

Mr. HOLTON. My information is, that fourteen were dismissed. I have the list of them here.

Mr. McLELAN. I know there was a proposition, in the expectation that we would adjourn before the end of the year 1884-85, to make this vote \$50,000, and to ask for \$10,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, but the adjournment did not take place, and this has been left standing.

Mr. HOLTON. There is another matter to which I wish to call attention. In speaking, last year, on behalf of the Government, the First Minister gave us a promise, after excusing the expenditure for Indian curiosities in the past year, in regard to which there were some complaints, that no more money would be expended this year in that way, but that the whole of the money would be expended on the Geological Survey. I find, on reference to the Public Accounts, that notwithstanding this promise the large sum of \$2,500 was paid to Herschfelder & Co., of Toronto, for Indian gim-cracks, which, I am informed by those more competent to pronounce upon them than I am, are not worth the money expended on them.

Mr. McLELAN. I think, probably, that expenditure was incurred previous to the attention of the First Minister being called to it by the committee.

Mr. HOLTON. I find a large amount was incurred for the publication of what may be a useful, but what I consider a useless book, the vocabulary of certain Indian dialects in British Columbia.

Mr. BOWELL. It is important, from a historical point of view.

Mr. HOLTON. I have no doubt it is to the Minister of Customs, but I doubt if it is to anyone else. I observe, also, and to this the Auditor General refers complainingly, in his correspondence with Mr. Selwyn, that a sum of \$1,250 was paid to one of the employés, Professor Macoun for a collection of plants, which, according to the Auditor General's statement, was largely made up by Professor Macoun, when he was in the service of the Survey. These sums taken together would have gone a very long way to pay the salaries of those unfortunate young fellows who were summarily dismissed a few months ago. Then there is a very important point on which I think the Minister ought to give information, even if the item has to be postponed. I refer to the expedition last year to Lake Mistassini. My information is, and it has been stated in the press and elsewhere, that this expedition proved a failure and resulted in the loss of \$7,000 or \$8,000. That, I think, the Minister should explain. I would also like him to explain why it is that Mr. Bignell, who had charge of that survey until within a few weeks, has been dismissed, and has been replaced by Mr. Lowe. That has been a matter of comment in the

Mr. HOLTON,

Quebec papers chiefly, and I should like to have the information I ask for.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the full information on this point. I understood from the hon. gentleman that we would have a discussion on this on concurrence, but my general understanding of the matter was that Dr. Selwyn recalled Mr. Bignell because he believed he was not energetically performing the survey, and gave the work to another, Mr. Lowe, being a permanent officer.

Mr. HOLTON. I do not wish to detain the House further by asking for a discussion on concurrence, but I should like to have the Minister's promise to give us the full information at that time.

Mr. McLELAN. I will give all the information I can.

Mr. BOWELL. In reference to the purchase from professor Macoun, I know, from my personal knowledge and long acquaintance with that gentleman, that the plants which were purchased were, in great part, what he had been collecting for years and years, long before he was connected with the Government, when he was at the head of the Grammar School in the town of Belleville and when he was professor in Albert University. Whether or not any portion of that collection was acquired when he was on the Government survey, before he was employed permanently, I am not prepared to say. Professor Selwyn does not deny that a portion of them were obtained during that survey, but he says:

"I fail to see on what ground you assume——"

Because it was an assumption on the part of the Auditor-General; he does not give any evidence of the fact, but merely asks the question, and says what part was obtained on Government journeys should not have entered into the calculation of value; and Dr. Selwyn says:

"I fail to see on what ground you assume that anything obtained on Government journeys did enter into the calculation of value."

From which I should infer that, if any portion of the collection was made during Mr. Macoun's trip, in 1869 or 1870, that did not enter into the calculation. I can say this for Professor Macoun, and I am sure the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), if he had as intimate an acquaintance with him as I have, would know that he would not put the slightest plant, obtained while he was in the Government employ, into a collection which he would sell to the Survey Department. I can also say, personally, for Professor Macoun, that he has had an opportunity of selling these specimens to the American Institute at Washington, and that he declined to do so, preferring that they should remain in this country; and I have good reason to know that he would have obtained a larger amount of money than that which he received from this Government. Those who know Professor Macoun say that he is one of the most upright and honorable men in the country.

Mr. HOLTON. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs, of course, understands that I have no desire to reflect upon Professor Macoun. I simply wish to have an explanation of this vote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is a very large and important item. Great and practical results may arise from an intelligent application of the geological surveys; and with that view I would like to ask the Minister if it is his intention to direct the Geological Survey to make an investigation into the origin, source, and extent of the Tufa deposits near Montreal.

Mr. McLELAN. I have examined the points at which they are working this year, but I could not answer the hon. gentleman's question. I will call the attention of the Minister to it on his return.

Mr. MULLOCK. I happened to be a member of the committee that made the report referred to, and I endorse what has been said as to the work of the committee and the time they devoted to the investigation. While joining in the report, of course, I do not bring to bear upon the subject any personal technical knowledge in regard to the matter. But looking at the report of the director for this year, I would call the attention of the Minister to the form in which it is presented. The committee last year pointed out that but very few copies of the report were printed for distribution—I think only a few hundred altogether, and they were placed in the hands of a favored few. Now, it was recommended by the committee last year that the annual report of the Geological Survey, embracing, as it does, an account of the work of the Survey between the Atlantic and the Pacific, should be made up for popular distribution, into subdivisions. It can easily be seen that whilst this volume itself may be of immense value as a record for Canadians of scientific mind, the people themselves also desire to derive some advantages from this expenditure, and in order that they may do so they should be able to obtain copies of the reports applicable to the sections of country in which they are interested. Acting upon that principle, the committee last year recommended that there should be a very considerable sub-division of the volume. It might, for example, be made up somewhat as follows: There might be in each volume a chapter devoted to the economic minerals generally of the Dominion, and that chapter might be attached to each volume; and then, instead of having, as we have to-day, a volume of perhaps 800 pages, it would be divided into several parts, or at least into two, one part dealing with Manitoba and the North-West and the other dealing with the older Provinces. Great interest is being taken in the development of the mineral wealth of the north shore of our inland lakes, and in the region of the Rocky Mountains, and persons interested in that part of the country may not be interested in the development of the easterly portions of it. It was, therefore, a recommendation of a practical character, which I think might have been taken advantage of. I would call the attention of the Minister, also, to the extent of the researches of the Survey during the past year, researches extending beyond the objects of the Act establishing the Survey. I do so, not that they may hereafter limit their researches in the direction to which I intend to refer, but rather that the Act itself should be amended. In the Act of 1877 the objects of the Geological Survey are put forth. Section 2 of that Act is as follows:—

"The objects and purposes of the Survey and Museum shall be, to elucidate the geology and mineralogy of the Dominion, and to make a full and scientific examination of the various strata, soils, ores, coal, oils and mineral waters, and of its recent fauna and flora, so as to afford to the mining, metallurgical and other interests of the country, correct and full information as to its character and resources."

Section 3 also states the objects to the same effect. Now, there is nothing in the Act authorising the Survey to devote any part of the public money towards making a topographical examination of the country, for the mere purpose of a geography. At the same time, it must be apparent that it is a legitimate expenditure of the public money that these parties should make such an examination, in order that it may be utilised in making up a geography of the country. Although last year they devoted a considerable part of their time to the preparation of topographical sketches, which will afterwards be of great use in the preparation of maps, still this is an application of money not at present authorised by the statute. If the Government, on further consideration, think that this is a proper way of expending the public funds, then the Act should be amended in that respect. I would also ask the Minister a question in reference to the great carboniferous deposits in the North-West. As he well knows, lignites and coals are found at the foot of the Rocky Mountains—on the third plateau—

in the Laramie formation, I am told there are evidences showing that the coal bearing Laramie formation extends beyond the present localities in which coal is found. For example, it is stated by scientists that there is evidence that this formation exists in the vicinity of the Lake of the Woods, Lake Winnipegosis, and various other parts of Manitoba. But I am not aware that the Geological Survey has made any investigation there. If it has, the results do not appear in the reports of last year. I would ask the Minister if the Survey has directed its investigations in the direction of researches in districts in Manitoba, with a view to ascertaining whether there is any scientific evidence showing the existence there of the coal bearing Laramie formation.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware. I will make enquiries.

Mr. MULLOCK. In the report of the director for 1884, he sets forth the expenditure of public money, and he mentions items embracing partly expenditures on capital account and partly expenditures on current account. It would be well that there should be a sub-division. On page 24 of this volume there are items including pay for salaries and wages—which is a proper item—and also an item being expenditures for survey, including travelling charges, purchase of horses and equipment. The purchase of horses and equipment is a very considerable item. A glance at the Public Accounts shows that the cost of equipment for each party amounts to a very considerable sum. The gross amount for that year, including travelling expenses and equipment, reach \$13,941.61. That ought to be sub-divided, one part showing that portion of the expenditure which would represent the annual outlay, and the other payments on capital account. The investments on capital account are of a permanent character, and we should have credit for the purchases; and if horses, for example, are re-sold, the receipts should be taken into account. What became of the horses bought during last year? Were they kept over to the following year, or were they sold? If they were sold, what became of the money? It is true we are not embarrassed with that question in regard to all the horses, for it appears in this scientific volume that four horses were stolen, and the director has not yet found them. I do not think, however, it is necessary, in a scientific volume of this kind, to enter into details of this kind, and it would suffice to make such a statement to the head of the Department. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), I have had a little opportunity of meeting the director during the current year, and I had much pleasure, under his guidance, in inspecting his Department. As to whether he is able, scientifically, to discharge those onerous and high duties which devolve upon him, I do not express an opinion; but I have much pleasure in saying that no one is more attentive or more desirous of pleasing those who seek for information than he appeared to be during my visit. I call the attention of the Minister to an omission in this book. It ought to set forth a faithful record of the doings of the Survey, and the statute requires that it should do so, not only for the general education of the public, but in order to call attention to practical results. It, therefore, should bear on the face of it evidence of wide researches, and where, beyond all question, there exists large and valuable deposits of minerals in our own territory, references should be made to the fact. I have it on the authority of an hon. member of this House who, not only outside of this House, but from his seat this House, stated that very valuable deposits of gold and precious stones are to be found in the rivers in the North-West, which are open for inspection, and where gold and precious stones can be collected by any person at any time, if he is not too lazy and indifferent to help himself. The hon. gentleman was asked, on the floor of this House, upon one occasion, whether he was not indul-

ging in a little metaphorical language when he referred to that mineral wealth. The hon. gentleman said no; he was speaking of the literal state of affairs; and it was literally true that in the North-West to-day the rivers were glittering with gold, silver and other precious metals, and that all one had to do was to help himself. There is no account of that in this record. I will give an exact quotation from the hon. gentleman's remarks, and perhaps the director will add it to his book, in order that it may produce practical benefit. I hope also the Minister will get the member for West Toronto—if it is not a secret—to inform the director where these deposits are, in order that the information may be published in the next volume, and we may all be able to help ourselves. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) spoke as follows, about the rivers in the North-West:

"There are mines of gold, of silver, of copper and of precious stones. All you have to do is to go and pick them up. The gold lies here in the beds of the rivers, shining in the gladness of the noonday sun, and all you have to do is to pick it up and put it in your pocket."

If hon. members will refer to *Hansard*, at page 1946, they will see that the hon. gentleman said that this statement was literally correct. It is a most extraordinary circumstance, that a volunteer member of this House should be able to discover and give to the public, free, important information which has not been furnished by the Survey which, we are maintaining at considerable expense.

Department of the Secretary of State—To pay certain Clerks amounts granted under provisions respecting optional subjects..... \$270 83

Mr. MILLS. What is the explanation of this item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These officers pass examinations for these optional subjects, \$50 being allowed for each one passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what scale?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not more than \$600. If an officer is a third-class clerk at \$400, and passes four optional subjects, he receives \$200 more; two subjects, \$100 more, and so on.

Dominion Police..... \$4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the number been augmented?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; they were augmented last year; \$3,000 of this sum is required to complete the service for the year, and \$1,000 for special service.

Mr. BOWELL. The amount *per diem* has also been increased.

Gratuity to widow of late C. McManus, guard at Kingston Penitentiary..... \$670 30

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances under which this is granted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand, the guard was entitled to this amount, and a cheque was made out, but not delivered to him, when he died.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How was he entitled to it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The retiring allowance under the law is one month for every year's service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection is, that in the case of guards in the penitentiaries we have hitherto allowed them one year's salary. I will not contradict the hon. gentleman, if he speaks of his own knowledge; but my recollection is rather strong, that one year has been the outside, heretofore.

Mr. MULOCK.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rule in the Civil Service has been that a civil servant is allowed a month for every year, up to ten years, and then he comes under the Superannuation Act; but I cannot speak, of my own knowledge, that that rule obtains in the penitentiaries. I can say, however, that there is no person more economical in his way than the present Minister of Justice, and when he allowed this, he must have made up his mind that it was right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the allowance, if it is in accordance with the allowances which have been made in former cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will ascertain the facts.

To pay G. F. Baillairgé for services in connection with the investigation at St. Vincent de Paul, held in 1884..... \$550

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the nature of this, and who is this gentleman?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is the Deputy of the Department of Public Works. He was selected by the Minister of Justice to make an investigation at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, into complaints which had been made; he was there for some time; he made a report to the Department of Justice, and this amount is compensation for those services.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This gentleman, as a matter of course, was drawing his usual salary from the hon. gentleman's Department all the time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The services may have been, and, I dare say, were, of considerable value, but we have had a number of instances, within the last year or two, of gentlemen employed in various Departments being detached on work that did not specially belong to them, and receiving pay for it, and other persons being paid to do their work; and it appears to me that the practice of paying an officer in full service special allowances is both liable to abuse and objectionable in itself. How long was this gentleman employed in the investigation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Several months, going and coming, and besides he had a great deal of work at night, in compiling the evidence and making his report. It was a very elaborate and a very confidential work; and the Minister of Justice asked me specially to allow Mr. Baillairgé to do it. He had to come back frequently to attend to his work in the Department, and then go back; and he had often to work at night, also, when he was at headquarters; so that the amount of money which is asked for these services is not a large amount, compared with the very great quantity of work he did at that time. Of course, as the hon. gentleman says, the officer is paid besides for his ordinary work; but, as the hon. gentleman is aware, when an officer is employed on a special service, the custom has always been to give him an additional amount to compensate him for the extra labor he has to perform.

To pay Dr. Sutherland, surgeon of the Manitoba penitentiary, for services rendered to lunatics confined in said penitentiary..... \$ 290

Mr. WILSON. I would like some explanation of this. I see that the surgeon there is paid \$600 a year for attending to the inmates of the Manitoba penitentiary, and this amount is to be paid to him in addition. It seems to me this sort of double pay is hardly fair. If you are not paying him enough, you ought to increase his pay; if you are paying him what is right and proper, he should attend all the inmates of this institution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, but he is not quite aware of the circumstances. The lunatic asylum of Manitoba is kept up at the expense of the Provincial Government, and Dr. Sutherland, as surgeon, is paid by the Province; we have nothing to do with that; but outside of the Province, in the North-West Territories, we have a good many lunatics, I am sorry to say, and the Dominion Government has not yet built a lunatic asylum outside of the Province, and we have made an arrangement with the Province to maintain those lunatics in the provincial asylum, we paying so much a head; and this is an allowance to the doctor of the Manitoba lunatic asylum for his services in looking after those patients.

H. J. Morgan, 400 copies of the Dominion Annual Register..... \$ 1,200

Mr. CASEY. I have not received a copy, and many of my friends say they have not received copies. I do not see why we should spend such a sum for this book. Certainly it is not worth \$3. It is a small affair, a mere compilation, and not compiled by Mr. Morgan. I do not see why we should pay \$1,200 to a man who is already in the employ of the Government, for work he is supposed to do in his spare hours, but which is really done by other people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose it is a matter of consequence who prepares or writes the book. The question is, will we subscribe for it? It may be it is not well to encourage this book, but I think the editor should get notice, and not be put to the trouble of making it up. The hon. gentleman says \$3 is a large sum. So it would be, if the book were one that could be largely circulated; but there are only a comparatively few people anxious to get copies of it, and if we are to have it, we must keep it up by a subscription of this kind. I think, on the whole, the compilation is fair. The yearly annual of political events in Canada is perfectly colorless; it shows no indication of party spirit in any way.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman sees it through the same colored spectacles as the author. It does not seem colorless to the rest of us. It seems to us we are paying public money for a book which is, to a great extent, a political publication, a book nominally but not really composed by Mr. Morgan, and in some cases those he has engaged to compile it have not, I am told, received their share of what he has been paid for the work. As to the necessity of annuals of the sort, if it is deemed to be necessary to have a publication of the kind it would be cheaper to keep a clerk for that special purpose, and pay him for compiling, and departmental printers for printing a perfectly colorless account. Although the hon. gentleman's contention may be quite correct, that he should be paid for this year, as he has gone on with the understanding that the book would be bought, it should be intimated to him that this sort of speculation should be given up.

Ontario Law Reports..... \$251.32

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is an amount here of \$251 for law reports. I suppose we are getting them annually, and I should like to know what this item is for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt it is to complete a set somewhere, either here or in the Supreme Court, or perhaps in the Department of Justice.

Deputy Speaker's salary..... \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should we be asked to pay \$2,000 for a Deputy Speaker? I think we ought to have a full explanation. I do not know whether the Speaker himself ought not to be called upon to explain this item of \$2,000. I am bound to admit that, this particular year the Deputy Speaker has done more to earn his salary, perhaps, than even Mr. Speaker himself, but I look upon the whole thing as decidedly objectionable, and

as introducing a very vicious system. I do not think that, in this House, under ordinary circumstances, there is the slightest use for having a Deputy Speaker. Our previous rules gave us ample opportunity for relieving the Speaker of his duties in the Chair and elsewhere, and I think the whole business is uncalled for.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has spoken too late. The House has affirmed the necessity of having a Deputy Speaker; it has affirmed the necessity of relieving Mr. Speaker from the continuous labor and risk to his health caused by his sitting continuously in the Chair. The hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to say one word against the salary of a Deputy Speaker, this Session, at any rate. They tried him to the utmost; in fact, it was cruelty to animals; and they drove him into a fit of the gout, by sitting in committee for two months.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman is responsible for getting him the fit of the gout, because he had it immediately after he got the position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two kinds of gout. There is the rich man's gout and the poor man's gout.

Mr. WILSON. He had the poor man's gout before he got the salary, and now he has the rich man's gout.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is not only responsible for getting him the gout, by making him a rich man, but by insisting on sitting day in and day out on the Franchise Bill. I think the Deputy Speaker has good cause for asking compensation from the right hon. gentleman, personally, for his arbitrary conduct, but he has no right to ask it from the House and the country. I objected to the appointment of a paid Deputy Speaker, and I wish to record my objection again. His position is very different from that of the Speaker. The Speaker never has occasion to vote, except when the House is in committee, or to express his views, and is so utterly apart from the political contests of the House that it is very seldom that any suspicion of political leanings can rest upon his position in the Chair; and it goes without saying that any such suspicion is out of question in the present instance. The Deputy Speaker, however, except when he is in the Chair, takes part in all the bickerings of the House, and he is in receipt of a salary of \$2,000, conferred upon him by favor of the Government. We all have an idea why the necessity arose for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker this Session. The hon. Premier could not have foreseen that the Session would be so long. It could scarcely have been on account of the amount of work to be transacted that the appointment was made. But we know that there was disappointment felt among Nova Scotian members because some one from that Province was not taken into the Government in place of Sir Charles Tupper, promoted to a higher sphere. And it was supposed that this was done to afford gratification to those members without the risk of opening a constituency. Public business did not require the appointment. It might have been necessary to have one or two members always on hand to take the Chair, when it was necessary, even during the laborious debate of the Franchise Bill, and that would not have been objected to. Members would have been willing to take that position, in view of the greater prominence it would have given to them. The Chair is ably filled on the present occasion by another hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is a foster brother.

Mr. CASEY. Others might have been found to do the same thing. I may say that the Department has clothed a gentleman of no long experience in parliamentary practice with permanent authority as chairman of committee, which I think might have been better distributed amongst several

of the more experienced members of the House. His decisions are clothed with something of the authority that attaches to the decisions of the Speaker in the Chair; for we have to regard the decisions of the Deputy Speaker with more respect than those of gentlemen who may casually fill the Chair. The decisions of the Deputy Speaker have not always been consonant with the decisions that we have been in the habit of obtaining from the Speaker in the Chair, and this variety does not conduce to the soundness of parliamentary practice. For all these reasons, I object to the passage of this item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would it follow as a matter of course that in the case of the elevation of the present Speaker to a higher position, the Deputy Speaker would become the Speaker of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. PATERSON. That gentleman is not present in the House, and I did want to take this opportunity of saying a few words, but it is not so pleasant to say them when the person is not present.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). It depends upon what the words are.

Mr. PATERSON. I wished, without reviewing the conduct of the Deputy Speaker, particularly to point out one thing where it seems to me that in exercising the duties of Deputy Speaker and permanent chairman of committees, it is very desirable to have a gentleman with a good deal of parliamentary experience. These positions have been filled in years gone by by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and other gentlemen of large parliamentary experience. Sometimes questions arise in which it is necessary that a person of a very cool mind and temper, while possessed of the requisite knowledge, should be presiding, in order that proper effect might be given to parliamentary proceedings. I remember one case in which I considered I was placed at a disadvantage, and which there was a course of procedure that did not tend to bring credit upon the House—in fact, prevented the proper expression of the House from being had. It is perhaps in the remembrance of some members that when an appeal was taken from the Deputy Speaker to the House, upon one occasion, he reported to Mr. Speaker what I thought was not exactly the point of difference between the committee and the Deputy; and when the Speaker took the Chair I attempted to point out to the House what I thought was the difference, when, as I found by studying the practice, the Speaker very properly ruled that I should not do so; I found, by looking up the practice, that I should have argued that point with the chairman before the Speaker was called in, and that the committee should have agreed upon the point that was to be submitted to the House. Well, upon another occasion a circumstance of the same kind arose, and I rose to follow the constitutional practice, to have it understood and have it argued before informing the Speaker what the point of appeal was that was to be submitted. When I was, properly, as I thought, within my right, and speaking within my right, hon. gentlemen opposite misapprehending the purpose for which I had risen, thinking, perhaps, that I was desirous of speaking despite the chairman's ruling, made such a noise that it was impossible, perhaps, for the Deputy to catch exactly the point I was at. But it did seem to me that it was only proper that sufficient order should have been maintained, and that I might have been able to state what I wanted to say, and which I am fully convinced, from a study of parliamentary procedure, that I was perfectly right in saying; but instead of quelling the noise, the Deputy Speaker, while I was upon my feet, rose from the Chair, paying no attention to what I said. The

Mr. CASEY.

Speaker took the Chair, and I asked him then if I might be permitted to point out the question, and as he ruled that it was too late, I was left without remedy. Now, I considered that the Deputy Speaker at that time stated to Mr. Speaker the appeal to Mr. Speaker different from what I believed the appeal was. He put it in such a form that I did not consider the appeal was in that direction, nor did I consider the appeal was taken on that point, and the result was, that members on this side, who had appealed from the decision, were put upon record as voting for a proposition that they did not want to vote for. As put before the Speaker, it might fairly have been contended that it was proper that the Deputy Speaker's ruling should be upheld; but I contend that it was not put fairly, and in doing that those who had taken the appeal were put in a wrong position. I take this opportunity of saying that. I know that, perhaps, through the heat of discussion which we passed in committee, and when, from long hours, and a nervous system strained and taxed to the utmost, probably I said, and other members said, things that would have been better unsaid. But, after all, I do think—and I would say it if the Deputy Speaker were here, I would say it in all kindness—that at certain times the decisions were such as he could hardly maintain from the authorities. And on one occasion I did consider that he deliberately insulted me; I felt that I was deliberately insulted when I was making a speech in committee, when I was speaking pertinently to the point, when I gave a few figures that I had given in a speech on the second reading of a Bill, between two and three o'clock in the morning, when there were not more than 20 members in the House, and when I was giving those figures again in committee, as I had a perfect right to do, the Deputy, of his own motion, read a decision from English parliamentary procedure, where a member addressing the House was ruled out of order because he was repeating himself, and when I asked upon what occasion it was, Mr. Deputy Speaker did not give me fully to understand; but in looking at it I saw that this was a person who had spoken two or three times on a personal explanation; it had not the slightest application to the position in which I was. There was no rule, there was no parliamentary procedure that justified him in rising of his own motion to rule me out of order. When the decision was given, I felt so aggrieved at it that I did not feel like proceeding under the circumstances. I have only said this much because I think a proper sense of dignity impelled me to say it. I have no doubt, as the First Minister has said, the patience of the Deputy Speaker was taxed. It was a rather trying time for us all. The Deputy Speaker should show the fullest desire to maintain dignity and exercise caution in giving his decisions, for it is well understood that the Chair has much influence when the duties are discharged in that manner. I am speaking without any heat at the present time. I did feel, on certain occasions, aggrieved, and I felt that if the Deputy Speaker had possessed a little more parliamentary experience he would not have prevented my making some remarks which I desired to make on that occasion, and on other occasions, and he would not have told certain members speaking on this side, even an ex-Minister, to sit down—take your seat—in that peremptory, commanding tone, which tends to irritate. If the Deputy Speaker was laboring under bodily infirmity, I desire to make every allowance for that; but, nevertheless, I felt I would like to make these few observations, and I would have felt more at liberty to speak if the Deputy Speaker had been in his place. There is a wide distinction between the position of the Deputy Speaker and that of Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker is removed from party conflicts that take place on the floor of this House, and in the discharge of the duties of that office we have an officer that it is a pleasure and an honor to conduct our deliberations under. But the Deputy Speaker is in a different position. He is at liberty to take

part in debate; he votes on every question that comes up; the tendency is to keep alive strong party zeal, that is common to us all engaged in our duties on the floor of Parliament. I trust I have made every statement in a proper spirit, and that the hon. gentleman, if he would agree with me that at the time he was a little hasty in giving his judgment, would remember that the position he occupies is one of very great power, and if anyone has a right to look to the presiding officer for protection, fair play and justice, it is a member of the minority in this House, while, at the same time, I do not desire to do anything that would be unjust to the majority.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot permit this item to pass without entering my solemn protest against the increased expenditure proposed in granting payment to the Deputy Speaker. In looking over the different items in connection with the officers of the House, we find that there is a very large annual expenditure and it is desirable that the representatives of the people should carefully consider the question, not only as to endorsing the appointment, but as to passing this item of \$2,000 as salary to the Deputy Speaker. I wish to draw attention to the amounts paid to the four officers connected with the House. We have a clerk, at a salary of \$3,400, and a superannuated clerk, who is walking around the streets of Ottawa, at a salary of \$2,379.60, which makes in all for the office of clerk \$5,779.60. We have an assistant clerk, at \$2,400, and an assistant clerk, who is superannuated, and who is striding the streets of the city, at \$1,543.93, which makes \$3,943.92. These items make a total of \$9,723.53 for two clerks and two superannuated clerks. The Speaker of the House receives a salary of \$4,000, and the Deputy Speaker \$2,000, which, with their sessional allowances, makes a total of \$8,000; or a total for the four officers of \$17,723.88. I think that is a very large sum. It is high time we should consider the items in connection with those expenditures, in order to see if they cannot be reduced. I have not a word to say in criticism of the conduct of the Speaker of the House; I can fully endorse the remarks of the hon. member for North Brant, with reference to the course he has taken in regard to any remarks I may have offered in taking a humble part in this House. There were occasions when the Deputy Speaker showed a little too much one-sidedness and venom in discharging his duties. He would have got through his duties with considerable more grace under other circumstances, and the Deputy Speaker would have more efficiently filled the position if he had possessed the characteristics of Mr. Speaker to a larger extent. However, possibly, after the Deputy Speaker has had practical experience for a number of years, he will discharge the duties better; but from the very large following possessed by the First Minister, some member might have been picked out who was a little more level-headed than the Deputy Speaker. I could not allow this item to pass without entering my solemn protest against the increased expenditure. The position was unnecessary. There are many hon. members who efficiently discharged the duties of chairman, and feel proud of the honor; but there was a desire on the part of the Government to make some position for this hon. gentleman, and so they made the position of Deputy Speaker. It was a very convenient mode, because it did not render it necessary for the hon. gentleman to appeal to his constituents. Thus it became necessary to create this office in order that the hon. gentleman might pocket the respectable sum of \$2,000 without running the risk of losing his seat. I presume that was the reason why he was appointed. It is establishing a very bad precedent. Every Government will now want to have a Deputy Speaker. If ever my friends obtain office, I trust they will wipe out this statute, as a matter of justice to themselves and never consent to appoint a Deputy Speaker until there is more evidence of its necessity. I admit that the Session

has been somewhat long, and that, perhaps, under very protracted sittings one member would have been tired of occupying the Chair during the entire discussion. Still, we notice that when Mr. Speaker was not in the Chair, several of the hon. members occupied it very efficiently quite as efficiently as the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. EDGAR. I am not going to discuss the propriety of the appointment of an officer to hold this position. Of course, during this Session, and if all Sessions were going to be like this Session, it might be necessary. But I am much afraid that the House did not make the best selection from amongst its members for that position. I have no personal grounds of complaint, because I did not often trouble the House, and when I did I was not ruled out of order; but I could not help feeling exceedingly pained at the manner in which the Deputy Speaker conducted himself, especially to those who are his seniors in practical experience. I particularly remember the occasion when the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), who was addressing the House in his usually pleasant, agreeable and orderly manner, was called upon by the Deputy Speaker in a way and manner in which a man might speak to his dog, but which he would not use to another hon. gentleman "to sit down, Sir! sit down, Sir." If he is to be continued in his position, I hope for the credit of the House and for the comfort of all its members, he will take a leaf out of the book of the hon. gentleman who usually fills the Chair, and try to imitate, not only his courtesy of manner, but his uniform fairness of decision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to vindicate the conduct of the Deputy Speaker. The House selected him, and I think they made a good selection. Strange it is, that while these hon. gentlemen are complaining of his impatience, and going so far as to challenge his impartiality, I believe the opinion of the majority of this House is that he extended unusual forbearance to the gentlemen of the Opposition. I believe there never was a case in which the rules of Parliament were so considerably broken, so purposely and ostentatiously broken, as during the debate referred to; and when the hon. member who last spoke says that the Deputy Speaker used strong language towards the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., he must remember that that hon. gentleman refused to obey; he was acting in a most unparliamentary manner, by refusing to sit down when told. There is no rule so fixed as that when the Speaker or Chairman in Committee of the Whole House rises, the member who is speaking must sit down, whoever he may be. There was a good deal of excitement in those days, and I am rather sorry that there should have been a revival of this discussion, but I merely repeat that I believe the opinion of the majority of this House is that the patience of the Deputy Speaker was exemplary, I might almost say, heroic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman's words to pass unchallenged, as regards the conduct of the Opposition. The Opposition were in discharge of their clear duty and parliamentary right in resisting one of the most outrageous pieces of tyranny that ever was attempted to be put on the Statute Book, and they were most abundantly justified in every thing they did. I was not present on the occasion of the unhappy altercation to which the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) alluded; but if any man in your place, or any man in the Chair, addressed another member in the terms which my hon. friend from Ontario has just repeated, he was using a very unfortunate form of language to be used by one hon. gentleman to another, and I trust it will never be repeated. If it be repeated, the consequences will be exceedingly unpleasant to the person using it.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this \$2,000, which is asked by this vote, based on the services rendered during the present Session, or is this to be the figure which the House is to be asked to vote in future Sessions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. This is a permanent figure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. That being the case, we cannot measure the payment simply by the length of the present Session. If we take the Session of 1884, which, I presume, is a better precedent to go by than this exceptional Session of 1885, I find that during that Session the House sat in all 65 days, and was in session during those 65 days 366 hours and 30 minutes. I find that in that time the House was only in Committee on Ways and Means and Supply, in all, 14 days, and during a portion of the time in those 14 days the Speaker was in the Chair, while the House was not in committee. A fair estimate, as I am told by some hon. gentlemen who were present, would be to allow one-fifth of those 14 days as the time occupied by this body in the House with the Speaker in the Chair, and not in committee. Now, I may say that the House sat in those 14 days 112 hours, and if you take from those 112 hours one-fifth of the time, being the time in those 14 days that the House was not in committee, and during which hours you would not have required a Deputy Speaker, it leaves the remainder 90 hours and 10 minutes as the gross time this House was in Committee of Ways and Means and Supply during the Session of 1884. Now, I think it is fair to assume that the length of the Session and of committee work of the kind I have referred to is a fair indication of what will be the length of like kinds of work for some Sessions to come. That being the case, it is now proposed to attach to the office of Deputy Speaker the sum of \$2,000, for discharging the duties of sitting in the Chair and taking no part as a member of the House, except in the capacity of chairman; and for sitting in the Chair for those 90 hours and 10 minutes he is to be paid \$2,000, or at the rate of \$22.22 per hour. I believe that is a high rate to pay, for many persons in this country. Now, it is to be borne in mind that the Deputy Speaker, as a member of this House, is sent here to discharge certain parliamentary duties; and for those duties, which he is supposed to discharge, he receives the ordinary sessional indemnity. To a certain extent, those whom he represents are necessarily disappointed, because he cannot give that attention to debate and to committee work which he would be able to give if free from the duties of Deputy Speaker. An Act has been passed creating this office, and that Act does not state what the salary is to be. This year we are told it is to be \$2,000, and it is to be \$2,000 in future years, until the House otherwise decides; but that will depend upon an annually recurring vote, and the amount is open to discussion on each occasion. The case is not like that of the Speaker, whose salary is fixed by statute, I believe. It seems to me we are making a mistake in placing this large sum at the disposal of the Deputy Speaker, considering that in addition to that amount he receives a sessional indemnity; and whilst he is serving the country as Deputy Speaker he is not serving the country as member, except in so far as the office of Deputy Speaker must be filled by a member. For these reasons, I think the expenditure is unnecessarily large, even if the office is necessary. I would not venture to offer my opinion on that point; but certainly the testimony of many members of experience is that the Deputy Speakership is an unnecessary appendage to this House; its many disadvantages were pointed out when the Bill was under discussion. I do not wish to recall any of the painful occurrences which have been referred to. I had a grievance myself, but I believe in forgetting such things, as much as possible; in

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

fact, I will not let the sun go down on my wrath. But I have a feeling of sympathy for my companions. I can forget wrongs to myself, but perhaps I cannot so well forget when I see my friends suffer. However, I hope the discussion to-night will have a beneficial effect; and as we are soon to part, I do not wish to add anything to the acrimony of the debate. It only remains for me to endorse the tributes which have been paid to the presiding officer of this House, and to express my entire satisfaction with its choice of a Speaker.

Mr. CASEY. In my first remarks I studied to avoid any particular reference to the conduct of the Deputy Speaker, because he was absent, but the point has been raised since, and the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has seen fit to say that he does not propose to vindicate the conduct of that gentleman before this House. I should like to know why he refuses to vindicate that conduct?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was not necessary, I said.

Mr. CASEY. On that point there is room for a very large difference of opinion. It is totally lacking in respect to this House to say that the conduct of a gentleman whose conduct has been attacked by members on this side of the House does not need to be vindicated. If this House is not to consider his conduct when it is voting his pay, I should like to know when his conduct is to be considered? With regard to that conduct, I am still restrained by the fact that the hon. gentleman is absent. Perhaps we should discuss the matter just as fully in his absence as in his presence; but one's natural feeling prevents one from doing so. I will merely say, then, that he has, I will not say consistently, but usually, when any warm debate has sprung up, conducted himself in the Chair in such a manner as to create the most strained relations between himself and the whole Opposition in this House. Whether he decided rightly or wrongly I am not discussing, but the manner of his decisions, and his disrespectful address to his senior members—and most of us are his seniors—were such as to create very strained relations. The right hon. gentleman says he approves of his conduct; he considers that his patience was heroic. If he approves of his conduct, he approves of disrespect to the whole Opposition in this House. I am not speaking now with personal animus, because, like my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) I did not come into personal collision with him. But as others have said, I have felt disrespect—what, outside of this House, would be called insult—to fellow members, even more keenly than if it had been addressed to myself. The right hon. gentleman would lead us to believe that it was inevitable—that our conduct was such that nothing else could happen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Some hon. gentlemen on the back benches call "hear, hear," in a sneering tone. Will they explain to me why there has not been any friction between the Speaker and the Opposition, or why there has not been any friction between any gentleman who has been casually called to the Chair and the Opposition? Will they explain why this gentleman who has been called to the Chair, not by the free choice of the House, but by the will of the right hon. leader of the Government, alone has created these strained relations. If they explain these questions, they will explain away the puzzle; otherwise, it can only be explained by the supposition that the hon. gentleman was overcome by his position, that he felt the enthusiasm of his position, and his duty to the right hon. gentleman who appointed him, so strongly, that he fell into this state of constant antagonism to the Opposition members of the House. Sir, we have endured from him language and

manners which we have never had to endure from any Speaker or Chairman, in this House at any time during the fourteen Sessions that I have sat here, and which we are not going to endure in silence. I only hope these errors and faults are not inherent in the hon. gentleman—not necessary parts of his constitution as a Deputy Speaker, but that a little more experience and a little more appreciation of how parliamentary business should be conducted, of how it is conducted when he is not in the Chair, will lead to a change, and that, perhaps, next Session or the Session after—I do not see why not next Session—the relations between the Deputy Speaker and the Opposition may become as pleasant and smooth as those between the Speaker and the Opposition, and that he will learn from this absolutely necessary though painful discussion of his conduct in the Chair, how his conduct is regarded, and how he can make it as acceptable as that of his superior officer is. I say this without any reference to the hon. gentleman personally, because I admit there is the most marked contrast between the conduct we have to complain of in the Chair and his thoroughly courteous and pleasant manner out of the Chair. I only hope he will assimilate his conduct in the Chair to his conduct out of the Chair; and if he does, there will not be the slightest ground for dissatisfaction with it on this side of the House.

Mr. HESSON. I think my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) overlooks the fact that the Deputy Speaker was equally severe to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I think the good nature of every gentleman in this House was drawn on very severely on that occasion, and my hon. friend must not forget that he had the privilege at any moment to leave this House when unpleasant things were being said. The hon. gentleman was not compelled to remain in the unpleasant position of listening to debates which he could withdraw from. If there has ever been a Session of this House since I have been a member that required the best of patience, good nature and gentle conduct, it was this Session, and I think the experience of my hon. friend the Deputy Speaker has been such as no gentleman on the other side would probably wish to undergo, during the eight or ten weeks when we had that unpleasant discussion on the franchise. Hon. gentlemen on that side could go to sleep, could withdraw to their rooms or play draughts, or do anything to amuse themselves or relieve their minds, while my hon. friend had to listen to the most unpleasant discussion before Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but they know it is a positive fact. Now, they complain that the Deputy Speaker found it necessary on some occasions to keep them within the reasonable limits of debate. He had occasion to draw the attention of the House to the fact that members on both sides were departing from the decorous course of debate, and if he had occasion to call hon. gentlemen on that side to order more frequently and to reprimand them more frequently than on this side, it was because they occupied very much more time. If hon. gentlemen opposite had said as little as we did, they would not have been called to order so often. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but some of them taxed ours and their own strength very severely in making 71 speeches; and it was certainly a much more severe tax on my hon. friend, who was compelled to sit there during all that weary discussion.

Mr. COSTIGAN. When the objection was taken to this item at first, I did not think the discussion would last as long as it has. I did not then know that the object was to make a personal attack upon one of the kindest and most courteous members of the House. I did not think that the attack that was made when that hon. gentleman's name was mentioned for the position he now holds would have been repeated; I thought that hon. gentlemen opposite,

having once said what I then thought was a little too much, and that having said many severe things about that hon. gentleman during the Session, the propriety of voting his salary might be discussed on its merits, and that at least those personal allusions to the hon. gentleman might very well have been left aside. I was pleased to know that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) did feel, in the absence of that hon. gentleman, under certain restraints, and would not say what he would if the Deputy Speaker were present. What he would have said had that hon. gentleman been so unfortunate as to be present I cannot imagine; he would certainly have wounded his feelings very deeply, and therefore I feel glad the hon. gentleman was not present. Now, there is no cause for the attack made on the Deputy Speaker at all. Every fair-minded member of this House, every one who witnessed the scenes that took place, every one who knows the duties that the Deputy Speaker has to perform, will see that he had a very difficult task indeed to discharge, and hon. gentlemen on that side must know that they made it most difficult for him to discharge those duties. It will not be difficult to recall to their minds this fact, that they resisted his authority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I say yes. I think I am quite correct in saying that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; you were not here.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Several hon. gentlemen on that side of the House refused to be called to order and allow the question to be put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I say yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. When?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On several occasions. During the several weeks the House was in committee on the Franchise Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name one.

Mr. COSTIGAN. From the time the hon. gentleman was appointed, there was a prejudice on that side against the appointment, and hon. gentlemen opposite showed it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; and I know it, and I feel it just as much as the hon. gentleman does. Allusion has been made to the difference between the Deputy's conduct in the Chair and the Speaker's. Well, the Speaker's patience was not tried as the Deputy's was. The Speaker had no occasion to come in contact with the hon. gentlemen who carried on that series of long speeches against time, with the laudable object, it has been stated, of preventing the passage of a measure objectionable to them. The hon. the Speaker was not called upon to listen to that. A great portion of the discussion took place while the House was in committee, and the Deputy Speaker presided. He was the one who had to sit there and listen to the long speeches; he was the one who had to endeavor to keep hon. gentleman opposite within the rules, and during the excitement which some times ran high. Hon. gentlemen were disposed to ignore his authority. Some of those who have spoken have very wisely and kindly refrained from making personal remarks—I think it would have been better if they had all done the same, and confined themselves to the discussion of the item. The Deputy Speaker displayed the greatest amount of patience, of perfect control of temper, and I think any one would be unreasonable who would, taking everything into consideration, try to find fault with him and prejudice

the public against the manner in which he discharges his duties.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). When the Deputy Speaker was appointed there was no prejudice against him on account of his nationality. The Minister of Inland Revenue is entirely mistaken when he states that, at his appointment, there was a prejudice on this side against him. The hon. gentleman says he feels it. I do not know whether he feels it or not. It is of no consequence; all I can say is, that so far as we are concerned, we had no prejudice against him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He was a popular man at the time.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I had always found him a courteous, genial person, and I believed, if we were to have a Deputy Speaker at all, that the hon. member for Halifax would make a good Deputy Speaker. We were opposed to the creation of the office, and we protested against that; but, in our own minds, I believed if we were to be saddled with a Deputy Speaker, he would make as good a Deputy Speaker as could be found on the other side. But it is quite a different matter as to how the Deputy Speaker acted when in the Chair. I quite admit the patience of any man would be tested to a considerable extent in a long discussion, existing over two months. We did not complain of that, but on the gruff and uncourteous manner in which gentlemen on this side were treated during the discussion. A man's patience may be severely tried, but that is no reason why his conduct should be ungentlemanly in the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was not.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There was no necessity for his being rough in his treatment of hon. gentlemen on this side, as he was occasionally during that long discussion. I know we had reason to complain, and we complained more than once with energy, that he would give a ruling on a point one way one day, and the next day on the same point give exactly the opposite ruling; and when, occasionally, there would be a ruling against hon. gentlemen on this side, there would be, on precisely the same point, a ruling in favor of hon. gentlemen on the other side. We complained that the Deputy Speaker did not treat us with that consideration and courtesy with which he ought to have treated us. We complain, with reason, that gentlemen of experience and knowledge, gentlemen who have been in this House almost before he was born—who had been here, at all events, 25 years—were treated with the greatest possible disrespect. We complain there was an exhibition of temper the Deputy should not have exhibited. I have not a ground for complaint against the Deputy Speaker myself, because I take impertinence from no man. If I am allowed to defend myself, I do defend myself; personally, I had no complaint against Mr. Daly's ruling in my case. But I say it is an extraordinary thing that, in this instance, so many of our friends on this side have complained, and I think with reason; and that, since Confederation, we have never had any ground of complaint against the Speaker. Since the present Speaker has occupied the Chair no man on this side has complained, or has had any reason to complain, and if he was not a modest man and a lawyer, and was not present to-night, I might say what I shall not say in regard to him. But we are justified in expressing our opinion as to the Deputy Speaker. The majority of Parliament have seen fit to pass the Bill and to make the appointment, and that has passed beyond the region of discussion; but we have a right to express what we feel, and what we could not help feeling, as to the manner in which we were very frequently treated by the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CURRAN. I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing my heartfelt sympathy for the Speaker  
Mr. COSTIGAN.

of this House. I cannot conceive what he has done to draw upon himself the enconiums of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He has done what is right.

Mr. CURRAN. And, no doubt, in his heart of hearts, he exclaims to-night, *Timeo danaos et dona ferrentes*.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is that? Explain.

Mr. CURRAN. A gentleman on the other side says: What is that? I know thoroughly that he is totally ignorant of its meaning.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Translate.

Mr. CURRAN. However, as I am not here to give him a course of instruction, I do not intend to translate it. I simply rise to make a few remarks in addition to the admirable speech which has been made by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. I am glad to know that Mr. Daly is acknowledged, in this House and out of this House, as an Irish gentleman, and that he has acted as Deputy Speaker in a manner becoming the nationality to which he belongs and this House of which he is so distinguished a member. Although the last speaker has said that there is no prejudice in this matter and has been none against the Deputy Speaker, the speech delivered, on the occasion of his appointment, by the leader of the Opposition, when he spoke of him as a gentleman who had never occupied a prominent position in this House and had never rendered himself worthy of being elevated to his present office, shows that then there was a prejudice against him, and I think it existed from the fact that he belonged to our race as much as from anything else. That is what I have felt, and I thought then it was unworthy of the hon. gentleman who made the attack upon him, and who, more than once, had spoken of himself as one who belonged to our people. I say that, during the course of the long debate, which must have been trying to the patience of any man, the Deputy Speaker of this House displayed exemplary good nature and a spirit of justice—more than a spirit of justice—towards those who were wasting the time of this House and wearing out the patience of their fellow members. It was one of those things which we witnessed this Session for the first time in this country, and which I hope we have witnessed for the last time, when we found men getting up, and, hour after hour, wasting the time of the representatives of the people. On this side of the House I was one who spoke, and the Deputy Speaker called me to order. I did not complain of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No doubt you were out of order.

Mr. CURRAN. Perhaps I was. I bowed to the decision of the Chair. But I should be unworthy of the position I occupy if I did not defend a gentleman who has been publicly abused and spat upon, not only in this House, but throughout the Opposition press of this country, simply because they have organised a dead set upon a man who is entirely above their attacks, who is an Irish gentleman, and has always conducted himself as such.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that is a speech to his credit, but if he does, he is much mistaken. It would not do him credit on any hustings, to say nothing as to its being made in the Canadian Parliament. It does not merit any reply at all—to bring in such statements, and so utterly without foundation.

Mr. CURRAN. So utterly without foundation?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). So utterly without foundation.

Mr. CURRAN. The attack was made so utterly with-  
out—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). So utterly without foundation. So utterly impossible is it for the hon. gentleman to prove what he said, of a prejudice existing against Mr. Daly because of his nationality, that I defy him to do it, and yet he has not hesitated to state that; and yet I tell him he cannot prove it.

Mr. CURRAN. I will prove it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would not like to be in the position in Parliament that I was not able to offer some proof for my statement, at any rate. As far as I am concerned, I have no prejudice against the Deputy Speaker, nor did I speak against him from that spirit. I re-echo what has been said by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), as to the opinion I formed of Mr. Daly in social intercourse outside; and what has taken place here has not marred that social intercourse, nor has it marred it, as far as I can see, on his part. I am speaking without prejudice of a person whose qualities, I think, were kind and courteous, and I am speaking in the hope that this may not be without fruit in future years. There is no one who will desire more than the members of the Opposition to see all proper respect paid to the Chair, and while I want to make every allowance for patience being taxed, I want to repeat, that if a chairman is unfortunate enough—it is a great misfortune, no doubt—to be unable to control his temper in a sufficient degree to speak to members who may be transgressing in a way that no gentleman should speak, if he must say, in peremptory tones: Sit down, Sir; sit down, Sir; I will not hear you; I have ruled; I think that will tend to bring discredit upon our proceedings and to arouse unpleasant feelings.

Mr. BOWELL. What should the Speaker do when a gentleman will not sit down when he rises?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Speaker should say, as our Speaker does: Will the hon. gentleman please take his seat. Then it would be done at once. As to the patience of the Deputy Speaker being taxed, hon. gentlemen speak of Mr. Daly as a member of the Conservative party in the House, and not as an impartial Deputy Speaker. What difference is it to the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker what length of time the discussion occupies?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The pay is going on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No presiding officer will attempt to dictate as to the length of a speech or to manifest displeasure as to the length of a discussion. The presiding officer is not in the position of other hon. members, and when hon. gentlemen opposite speak about his patience being exhausted, they must remember that it is the duty of the Deputy Speaker to allow the fullest, fairest and longest discussion—only to see that proper order is maintained. I can remember more than one occasion when the First Minister was himself terribly out of order, and yet the attention of the Deputy Speaker had to be called to it before he took any notice of it. If I were to refer to the record, I could show you where we had a ruling of the Deputy Speaker in one direction on one occasion, and within a short time after a diametrically opposite ruling on this point. Now, I say these things without feeling the slightest prejudice against the hon. gentleman. I have no prejudice against him, and as to meeting him socially outside, there is no change in my feelings towards him. All I want is that he should act in a judicial manner, and give to the minority the same privileges and the same rights that are accorded to others. I have felt, Sir, that it was not on all occasions given to us; and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to remember that they must not talk about his patience being taxed; they are speaking of

Mr. Daly, a member of the Conservative party in this House, but we are speaking of Mr. Daly, removed from political partisanship in the House, and occupying the impartial position of Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CASEY. I should not have said anything more on this subject if my hon. and Irish friend from Centre Montreal (Mr. Curran) had not raised the national question; but when one Irishman rushes into a fray there is almost always another Irishman to follow him. If that hon. gentleman had been here when an Irish gentleman—yes, a more representative Irish gentleman than even the hon. member for Halifax—occupied the Speaker's Chair in this House, when that Irish gentleman was attacked in the most abusive manner by hon. gentlemen opposite; when the Minister of Customs moved that his seat be vacated, when the First Minister said that he was bought up, and was no more independent than one of the pages in the House, when that Irish gentleman was thus attacked, I say that if my hon. friend had been here then he would have felt what it was to have a representative Irish gentleman attacked on account of his conduct in the Chair. I say that I felt it as an Irishman, and I resented it, and resent it still. I do not complain of the fact that Mr. Anglin was attacked in connection with the printing contract, which was a fair subject of criticism, but I complain of the manner of the attack, and I think it was most unfortunate for my hon. friend from Montreal to have spoken about attacking an Irish gentleman, and to have raised the race question; for if he raises it, I think the Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin can have as many Irishmen at his back—

Mr. CURRAN. Not as many as Burns.

Mr. CASEY—as any other Irishman in the Dominion of Canada. We did not put him in the Chair at the Table; we put him in the Chair of the House, and that is more than the Conservative party ever did for a representative Irishman. Sir, we all recognise the claim that the hon. Deputy Speaker has, of being an Irish gentleman, and nobody has ever denied it; we only complain that on some occasions he has, perhaps, allowed his Irish temper to run away with him. There is no intention to insult the hon. gentleman or to hurt his feelings, as was stated by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, in his very generous defence of a friend and colleague; but I think, if he has as much ability as we suppose him to have, instead of allowing his mind to rest upon any injury to his feelings, he will apply himself to learn the lessons of this debate.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says he regrets that my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) was not here on a former occasion, when a distinguished Irishman occupied the seat of Speaker of this House, having been put there by the hon. gentleman's party; and he referred to an occasion when the party to which I belong made an attack upon that gentleman, and alluded to the Minister of Customs as having led that attack. The hon. gentleman should have gone a little further and he should have explained that the present Minister of Customs was the mover of a resolution of censure upon the Government for having given the contract to the then Speaker of the House. There was no personal attack at all upon the Speaker. The vote was a vote of censure against the Government for having entered into a contract, contrary to law, with the Speaker of the House; and so strong was the case that the Government of the day, who had given Mr. Anglin this contract and made their supporters vote that motion down, sustain themselves with the pledge that as soon as it was done they would send Mr. Anglin to a committee, and would execute him for the crime for which they had acquitted themselves; and they did it, and turned him out.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in his remarks to the committee, has cast a slight upon the action of this House. He found fault with the action of the Deputy Speaker, and said it was uncourteous and ungentlemanly. The hon. gentleman should not have made those remarks, and should retract them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think I used the word "ungentlemanly."

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker was called to the Chair; a statement of the question was put to the House, and the ruling of the Deputy Speaker was sustained by the House. The hon. member for Brant is therefore showing not only disrespect to the Deputy Speaker in his action, but also to the House, which supported the Deputy Speaker in his position. I think the hon. gentleman ought not to put this House in that position, and he ought to retract what he said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HESSON. That is exactly what I say. No hon. gentleman's "Oh, oh," or laugh, can make me take back anything that I say. I say this House has a right to some respect from members who address it, and when it supports the ruling of the Deputy Speaker, that ruling has no right to be attacked. I put that case strongly, because I feel that on that rests the whole foundation of this charge, whether the Deputy Speaker acted rightly or wrongly in the judgment of the House. My opinion is this—and I might also speak as an Irishman—that I have known the hon. gentleman seven or eight years, and have found him not only a gentleman, but an Irish gentleman. When I say that, I say a good deal, because we know that an Irish gentleman is always courteous to friend and foe alike. What respect did the hon. member for South Brant show to the feelings of the hon. gentleman? That hon. gentleman said that the Deputy Speaker was there as Deputy Speaker, and not as Mr. Daly. Would the hon. gentleman expect the Deputy Speaker to sit there like a stick, without feeling? The hon. member for Brant knows perfectly well that he himself, on one occasion, when an hon. gentleman rose to say something, called out to him to sit down, in a most brutal manner—"Sit down," he said, "sit down." If the hon. gentleman has forgotten it, hon. members on this side have not. Was that courtesy?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I felt a little sorry for that, and stepped over and spoke to the hon. gentleman immediately; and we are the best of friends. I was not in the Chair.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman must remember that other members want respect paid to their feelings as well as the hon. member for Brant. I trust the hon. gentleman will remember that in future debates. I rose more particularly to show that the hon. member for Brant was throwing discredit on the action of this House when he said the Deputy Speaker acted unfairly, and yet his ruling was sustained by the House.

Mr. CASEY. A few words in regard to the Anglin case. The hon. gentleman has stated correctly the nature of the motion—that it was, motion of censure on the Government. That was technically the motion; but the whole of the speeches made on that occasion were directed against the Speaker personally, those hon. members pointing with the finger and making most distinct and personal references. The hon. gentleman said that the Government induced the House to vote down the resolution of censure, by a promise to send the case to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and there have him executed. The hon. gentleman states that most incorrectly. It was stated on behalf of the Government during that debate that they considered the matter one for investigation by a com-

Mr. COSTIGAN.

mittee. It was not said, it would have been absurd to say, that the hon. gentleman was to be executed when his case was investigated before a committee. The Government did not know what the precedents in the case were, and not until after the committee had sat for several days did they come to a decision. I moved the resolution for reference to the committee. I was opposed in that view by the present Minister of Customs, who held that censure should be passed upon the Government without further enquiry, and spoke against an investigation. I opposed that view in a speech before I made the motion, and said this was not a case for immediate censure but for investigation. I was in favor of investigation first, and afterwards of censure, if it was shown to be necessary. My view of the case carried in the House at that time—I do not think it would now—and an investigation was held. It was found that the hon. gentleman was technically in the wrong. He went back to his constituents, was reinstated in his seat, and this party showed its appreciation and respect for him by reinstating him as Speaker of the House, where he held the respect of the whole House during the time he occupied that position. That is the history of the Anglin case, and it does not show, as the Minister of Inland Revenue thought to make it appear, any disrespect on the part of the Liberal party towards Hon. Mr. Anglin.

Mr. BOWELL. I only wish to say that part of what the hon. gentleman has said is quite correct; but the record does not show that I made any personal attack on the Speaker of the House. I did attack the Government, not only by resolution but by speech, setting forth the facts as they appear in the public records, my motion being a condemnation of the Government for what they had done in making a bargain with the member for Gloucester. I said nothing personally against Mr. Speaker, and I do not think the record will show that I did so.

Quarantine—Payments for immigrant patients,  
Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals..... \$15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of this?

Mr. POPE. We made arrangements with the Winnipeg hospital for the admission of these patients at 45 cents a day, I think.

To take measures for extirpating the disease of  
sheep scab in part of Province of Quebec..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has the hon. gentleman been doing about this?

Mr. POPE. We found that sheep scab was prevailing very much in some of the counties of Quebec. We have been quarantining some, and we had to slaughter a good many. We were threatened that if any more sheep arrived in London they would be liable to be scheduled, so we have taken very active measures, and shall continue to do so, in the way of careful inspection and otherwise, to prevent this.

Mr. FISHER. Has there been any of this disease outside of the prairie district?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. In what counties?

Mr. POPE. In Terrebonne, in Laprairie, in Chambly, Napierville, and another county.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1886.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the services of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1886; and in accordance with the provisions of the "British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 11th July, 1885.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the Message, with the Supplementary Estimates, be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:10 a.m., Tuesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the report of the official *Debates*, said: I may say that this report has now almost become ancient history, as it was presented on the 22nd of May, so that if hon. gentlemen will look at the Votes and Proceedings of the 22nd of May, they will find the report, the adoption of which I move. The report first recommends that the \$130 which has hitherto been paid to Mr. Matthewson to keep in repair the caligraph writing machines, shall no longer be paid, as the amanuenses are sufficiently familiar with the machines themselves to keep them in order; so that I suppose there will be no objection to that clause, at any rate. The next proposal is that hereafter the members of the House shall receive but two copies of the bound volumes of *Hansard* instead of five, as they got last year. The most important proposal, however, is that the form of the *Hansard* volume shall be changed, and instead of having it in royal quarto, as it is now, the proposal is to make it an octavo volume, printed in brevier type instead of long primer, that is a smaller type, making it a very much more convenient volume to handle. Another proposal in the report is, that the official reporters, who are now employed by the year at an annual salary, and who are regular officers of the House, shall be employed, if the Government shall so determine, during recess, without extra remuneration excepting their travelling expenses, if they shall be sent anywhere during recess for such reporting as the Government may have to do of a special kind. Looking at what has been paid during the last three years for outside reporting, the average has been about \$4,000 a year, and the suggestion is that that amount be saved by the employment of the reporters in that way. The general result of the change, if it is made, is that we expect to save, without reference to the employment of the reporters, about \$4,000 a year, and if the reporters are employed, assuming that the same amount of outside reporting is to be done in the future, the saving will be about \$8,000 a year. But I think it right to say that at this moment we are paying a very high price indeed for the printing of *Hansard*. When the *Hansard* was determined upon, the printing of it not being included in the contract for

the printing of Parliament, special tenders had to be asked for. There was only one establishment in the city, that is the parliamentary printers, who were able to do the work, and they tendered for the printing at 60 cents per 1000 ems; I believe the contract price which they get for ordinary work is—I am speaking from memory—28 cts, so you will see that the price paid is more than double what we are paying for our ordinary parliamentary printing. Of course, there is this to be said, that under any circumstances the printing of the *Hansard* is worth more than ordinary printing, because the work is altogether night work. The copy goes from the reporters' office to the printing office, and the first sheets have to be distributed in the House early next day, so that practically all the work is night work, and is necessarily somewhat more expensive than ordinary day work would be. My own estimate is, however, that in the new tenders which are about to be asked for, for the parliamentary printing, at least 50 per cent. will be saved on the printing itself, that is, the composition and press work; the paper would be about the same price, assuming we pay the same price by contract that we are paying now; but a material saving will be effected in that way. These are the changes that are proposed. The daily edition will be exactly as it is now, circulated in the same way, and the *Hansard* will be in every respect, precisely as it is now, excepting that the form will be changed, and the number of copies each member will receive will be two instead of five, with the suggestion that the reporters shall be employed during recess, as they are now paid an annual salary instead of being paid solely for the Session.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings.) I am very sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. friend who has moved this motion. I believe that the *Hansard* has got to be a very expensive piece of furniture, if I may call it so. It has cost this House and the country a good deal more than appears on the face of it. I ask any hon. member who was in this House years ago, before the *Hansard* was established, how many speeches we had that lasted six hours? How many books were read from the Library? How many newspapers were quoted? Let hon. members who were members of the House before *Hansard* was established go back in their minds and think this over. We are doing a great injury to hon. gentlemen. Some of their heads, hearts and kidneys are getting affected by the long speeches. We have not the time and we have not the inclination to sit here and listen to five or six hour speeches from any man, I care not who. I say we have a right to be charitable and stop them. Some hon. members have read books and have uttered words that ought not to be uttered in this House, against the personal character of members, in order to get them into *Hansard*, and from there into their county papers. It is time this was stopped. If we are to have *Hansard*, let us allow the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, and the Finance Minister, and the hon. member who answers him take their own time; but after that, the *Hansard* reporters should not be allowed to report any speeches extending more than one hour. There is not an hon. member who can stand up one hour and speak without books, papers, documents or written speeches. How many in this House can do it? I am unable to point to one who can stand up here and speak for one hour without documents. Few men can speak more than 15 minutes without taking up documents and quoting from them, or getting up speeches in their bedrooms. I am satisfied that the majority of the members will put a stop to it. I am convinced we have strength to wipe *Hansard* out. Why should we not do so? It is not alone a matter of \$50,000. The hon. member for Cardwell put it very nicely. He is a printer. He says we will save so much on the printing and so much on the reporting. Travelling expenses are to be allowed to the reporters, and we know that it often costs as much to send

an officer of a Department to do a piece of work as it is to get the work done in the locality. Not much is going to be saved in that direction. All matters of expense are very nice when they come before Parliament. It is not only the amount the people have to pay for *Hansard* but the length of time that has to be spent here by hon. members. This House is not blessed with rich men, with few exceptions, and members cannot afford to spend five months here. Their business and families require them at home. Unless the Government and the Opposition will agree to some arrangement as regards the length of the debates, I am satisfied *Hansard* will be voted down. If not, we can carry a motion in the direction of shortening speeches. Let us be charitable to those men with their long, insulting, unpalatable speeches, speeches that are not fit to be read. Now, as to the reports of the speeches. I go to the speeches of the Provincial Parliament of Ontario, and I say unhesitatingly the reports of the *Mail* and *Globe* are ten times better than the reports of this House. I say they are better, for they circulate among the people, and I contend the people of Ontario are better informed about matters before the Provincial Parliament than they are informed about the business of the Dominion Parliament. Before *Hansard* was established, those two papers gave the people reports and they were read throughout the length and breadth of that great Province—I cannot speak of the other Provinces. They did not, I will admit, report all the different speeches read by hon. gentlemen. Not a bit of it. They did not report when members read from books got from the library. They gave the gist and the truthfulness of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen. I hope that something is going to be done. We cannot afford to live here five or six months in the year. Had it not been for *Hansard* and the little unfortunate trouble we had in the North-West, and the fact that the Finance Minister had to go away, we would not have been here five or six months, but we would have been at home and been able to pay our honest debts and the interest on money we owe, and other obligations for which we are responsible. I repeat that we will take this matter into our own hands whether the Government like it or the leader of the Opposition likes it, and we will manage it. We are going to do it, and we have men to do it. If you want to wipe it out vote against the motion of the hon. member for Cardwell, and then you will settle the matter and we will not be here for five months next Session, and you will not have to listen to speeches and written documents. The *Globe*, the *Mail*, the *Citizen* and the *Free Press*, and the Montreal papers will not be able to get the books and they will not report them, and they will not pay for telegraphing them, and if they do not appear next morning they will not appear three or four days afterwards. The leader of the Opposition furnishes the *Globe* with three or four speeches of six hours long which occupies it during the Session. I have pity for the leader of the Opposition in making these speeches—his health cannot stand it. I move to wipe out that which I believe to be the cause of the long speeches.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) By voting against this motion the hon. member will not abolish *Hansard*. He will simply continue it at the increased cost. The proposal contained in the report is to diminish the expense. If the hon. gentleman desires to abolish *Hansard* he should move that it is inexpedient to continue the official report of the *Debates*.

Mr. CASEY. I did not catch the amount of saving that is expected to be made.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) I stated that the saving by the change of form will be about \$4,000, and by the employment of the reporters during the recess about \$4,000 more.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. gentleman to state that when the present contract was out, *Hansard* could be  
Mr. WHITE (Hastings).

printed much more cheaply than now. Has he made any estimate of what the saving will be?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) My impression is that the saving in printing afterwards ought to be between \$5,000 and \$6,000.

Mr. CASEY. A very considerable saving. I think, under the circumstances, *Hansard*, even if it is not reduced in bulk, will probably, in the near future, become a less expensive institution than it is at the present time. As for the proposition to make the reporters permanent officials, and to use them for official reporting outside of Parliament, I am inclined to think favorably of it, because we have seen in the Public Accounts, the enormous cost of reporting the proceedings of commissions, etc., by outside reporters. There was the case of the arbitration with regard to Section B, where many of the sittings were held here in this city, so that in the event of employing the *Hansard* reporters there would have been no travelling expenses at all, and speaking from memory, I think the cost of the reporting in that case was something like \$8,000. Other cases of that kind must arise, and I think the probabilities are—in fact there will be almost a certainty—that there will be a very large and important saving, taking the year round, in reporting the proceedings of arbitrations, etc. If the *Hansard* officers were made permanent officers for the whole year at a salary, and if we could direct them to do this work without extra cost to the country, I believe their travelling expenses in cases where the reporting would be done outside of Ottawa would be a trifling item compared with the present cost of engaging outside reporters. With regard to the question of the continuance of the *Hansard*, which has been raised by the hon. member for Hastings, I wish to say a few words. That gentleman has taken a very decided stand against the *Hansard*, and he certainly cannot be blamed for adding much to the length of *Hansard* during this Session, and cannot be expected to feel any great personal interest in having the speeches delivered in this House, correctly reported. For the converse of that reason, as one who has occupied a considerable space in *Hansard* this Session, perhaps it would be well for me—

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Let us understand the matter; if you have any insinuations, out with them. Say whatever you have to say against me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman must have a very bad conscience, indeed, if he fancies he sees insinuations against him in every allusion that is made to him in the House.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Speak out fully; none of your insinuations.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman must keep order and cease his rude remarks across the House in the first place; and in the second place, I may tell him that I made no insinuations, and that he must have a very bad conscience, a bad digestion, or a bad liver, if he thinks I alluded to him in any such sense as he thinks. What I said was that he contributed so little to the *Hansard* that he probably took no great amount of interest in the subject personally, and that as I spoke a good deal I might be regarded as unduly favorable to the *Hansard*, for that reason. However, I must take that risk, and say that however much some of us may have erred in the length of our remarks; however wrong we may have been in that respect, I believe *Hansard* is an institution which we cannot afford to dispense with. It may be regulated, and the length of our speeches may be regulated if you chose, but, apart from that, *Hansard* is a necessary institution. The hon. gentleman says it leads

to lengthy speeches and to reading speeches. I think it was a most unfortunate thing for his friends that he should call attention to the growing habit of reading speeches, because that habit is almost entirely confined to his own side. I do not remember any hon. gentleman on this side who has read a speech this Session, but we have heard read, verbatim, a speech of three or four hours by a Minister of the Crown, taken volume by volume out of the hon. gentleman's hat, and sent out to the *Hansard* room. It went on in that way until we were all lost in amazement, and to parody the language of Goldsmith:

"—Still the wonder grew,  
That one small hat could carry all he knew,"

on that subject. This growing practice, which has not yet become general, I am sorry to see introduced, and I think it well to rebuke it. I was glad when the hon. gentleman referred to it, and I hope the rebuke will be accepted. As to the great length of the *Hansard* on account of the debates on the Franchise Bill, I think that is more imaginary than real. The greater part of the extracts which were read were quoted in the night sessions or during the early hours of morning, when the speeches were necessarily rather rambling, and I would point out that, at such times the *Hansard* was not burdened with the extracts read, because scarcely any of them were put in *Hansard*. I know that on one occasion, a three hours' speech was made in that debate which, by striking out the extracts and giving only a reference to the books, made only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  columns of *Hansard*. I think this was the proper course under the circumstances, when the extracts were too voluminous, not to record them in *Hansard*, and thus prevent any great extension of that debate in its columns. The cause of our having a voluminous *Hansard* this year was the tremendous amount of business which we have had to do, and the fact that it was discussed more fully than usual. As every hon. gentleman knows, we have been in the habit of allowing business to go through here without sufficient discussion. That has been a fault on both sides. This year we desired to discuss matters more thoroughly, and the lesson to be learned from the unusual length of the Session, is that the Government should not give us too much business in one Session, and should give us as much of it as possible in the early part of the Session, when it can be thoroughly discussed. Experience does not point to the abolition of the *Hansard* at all, but to a revolution in the manner of conducting the business of the House, by the Government endeavoring to bring down the business early, so as to have it discussed at a time when we generally have nothing to do, and in that case we need not have more than a three months' Session in future, and yet the business of the country would be fully discussed. I say that the newspaper reports cannot be relied upon to give a full and fair report of what is said in this House. The newspapers of neither party report even their own friends with any degree of fullness, except in the case of some great speech which is specially reported verbatim. I say that the newspapers would not adequately report the debates of Parliament, and no man in the House could afford to trust his reputation as a politician to the reports which appear in the party newspapers. I say the papers do not report the members of their own party at all fully and they report their opponents unfairly, and an authoritative record of what is said in this House is quite as important as a record of what is done. This is a consideration which applies to every member in the House, and if it applies to private members, it applies with still greater force to members of the Government, and party leaders generally, of whose statements there ought to be an authoritative report so that their position may be known, and so that they may be held to account for what they say. For all these reasons, I must adhere, as I have always done, to the idea that we should have a *Hansard*. The question of having it economically managed is quite another thing;

that is a question for the Printing Committee, and they have certainly this year shown some desire to secure economy. But I must object to the cutting off of the number of copies hitherto given to members. I do not think five copies are at all too many for any member. I believe every member of this House feels that he can very well apply the five copies—that there are at least four persons in every constituency in Canada occupying sufficiently important positions, and sufficiently posted in political matters to be entitled to receive a full report of what is done in the House. If we only get two copies, we can only give one to a friend and that is certainly a stingy allowance. I regret also that the proposal to give bound copies to the newspapers has been dropped. I think economy could easily be effected in another direction to allow this to be done; and it would be a great convenience to the newspapers to have them. For all these reasons, while I agree with one of the proposals of the Printing Committee, I have to differ from those to which I have referred, and I differ *in toto* from the proposal that the *Hansard* should be abolished.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The result of the present Session has convinced me, that *Hansard* is at all events a very expensive gratification to many of the hon. members of this House. I am one of those who believe that almost any subject can be fairly ventilated in an hour or an hour and a half; yet we have witnessed during the present Session the spectacle of hon. members of this House occupying its time all the way from two hours up to seven and eight hours in the discussion of subjects which to any fair and reasonable mind could be discussed and decided in much less time. It is not alone that we have to place in the Estimates a large sum of money for the mere publication of the *Hansard*, but the length of time that this Session has dragged out in consequence of the existence of *Hansard* and in consequence of hon. members wishing their lengthy speeches and the long extracts they read placed in *Hansard*, makes it something more than a mere expense to the country—makes it a very serious inconvenience to hon. members of this House who have anything to do at home. I am quite willing to concede that in the future, it may be, *Hansard* would be a very valuable document to refer to, containing a report of the legislation of this country and very many useful things for future generations; but, Sir, we have to legislate for the present as well as for the future, and I have every confidence that in the press of this country the speeches of hon. members of this House that are worth reporting will be reported fairly and well. Without saying anything further, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Cochrane:

That all the words after "That" be omitted, and the following inserted instead thereof: the publication of *Hansard* be hereafter discontinued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was rising when my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) rose to make his motion, in order to suggest to my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White) not to oppose this motion now, for this reason: We do not know what the House of Commons may decide, and, if *Hansard* is to be maintained, it is better to adopt this report, because its object is to reduce the expense; then on the second Order of the Day—the further consideration of resolution 37 reported from Committee of Supply, which is the vote for *Hansard* for next year—the motion of my hon. friend from Brockville can properly be made. Speaking for myself individually, after what I have seen of the increasing volumes of *Hansard* year after year, and especially the immense edition we shall have this year, I must say I am not favorable to the maintenance of *Hansard*. I think it is an expense that the country can dispense with to advantage. If we continue as we are doing every Session, we shall after a while have a new library. This year I do not know how many volumes we shall have, and the expense is very large. I will not say a

word of the speeches that have been uttered in this House; we must suppose that the speeches of hon. members of this House are worth reporting, but I am sure the country will believe that if we had not a *Hansard* the Sessions would not be so long, and there would not be so many speeches. Therefore I would recommend my hon. friend from Brockville to postpone his motion until we come to the vote for next year, because even if we reject this report the vote of money would remain.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). Would the hon. member for Cardwell give the House an approximate idea of the expense of the *Hansard*, including salaries, during the present Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened to the suggestions the hon. Minister of Public Works has made to the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) and I must say I do not approve of them for two reasons. The hon. gentleman says that if this motion is withdrawn and the original motion to adopt the report of the committee is carried, that will reduce the expense; but does he not see that if the motion of the hon. member for Brockville is carried there will be no necessity for the motion of the chairman of the committee? It will wipe it away. Does he not see that he places the supporters of the hon. gentleman behind him in a false position? If the amendment is withdrawn and the motion of the hon. member for Cardwell is carried, the House will be in the position of practically endorsing the continuance of *Hansard*. They do another thing: If the suggestions of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the hon. member for Brockville that he should move to abolish *Hansard* as an amendment to the vote in Committee of Supply, what position is he putting his friends behind him in? They will have to vote against going into Committee of Supply, which would practically defeat the Administration. At all events, that is not a fair and square way of dealing with this matter. I like the motion of the hon. member for Brockville. I express no opinion as to the course I will take upon it; but it is the fair and square way of dealing with this thing. Now, I will say a word for the *Hansard* people. I must pay them the tribute of saying, so far as the reports of my speeches are concerned, that never, from the first time they have started to the last, with one slight exception, have I had occasion to call attention to any inaccuracy; I think the work is well done, and if we are to have a *Hansard*, I doubt if we could find a more efficient set of men than the gentlemen we employ to-day; but we know that the volumes have swollen to an enormous size in consequence of the time taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite, and with a few exceptions on this side as well. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I think they will admit that three-fourths of the time of the Session has been taken up by their long speeches. I know it is not palatable to the hon. gentlemen on that side, and perhaps not to some on this side. I am looking for the six-hour men. I see one of them is out now. I will say this, that I believe *Hansard* has prolonged this Session two months at least, and if we are to have a recurrence of these lengthy Sessions, what between the Government being unprepared to bring down their measures and the Opposition being determined to obstruct them, when they do bring them down, we have lengthened this Session until it is nearly six months long. I presume it will be that length before we get through with it. Hon. members talk of adjourning Saturday. My impression is, the way business goes on, we will not get away Saturday week. How many gentlemen listening to me will be content to come back here as representatives in Parliament, if the precedent set this year is to be followed in future years? If we cannot get men to come, under such circumstances, and if we know where the fault lies—and one fault is the fact that hon. gentlemen are so fond of seeing themselves in

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

*Hansard*, that they take hour after hour getting their speeches ready and delivering them; in place of presenting their views to the Chair succinctly and clearly, they give us essays and extensive extracts which go into the *Hansard*, and the speeches are then published in pamphlet shape and sent through the country as campaign documents.

Mr. SPROULE. It helps the newspapers.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman ran a daily paper, he would find the prolongation of the Session affected his pocket to the tune perhaps of thousands of dollars, and I feel it in my pocket. If we see an evil in this thing, we ought to remedy it. There has been a crying evil this Session that we ought to remedy. Means should be taken to cause hon. members to make fewer speeches, but good speeches, to make their points in a business like way, and not speak for hours in order to fill up page after page of the official *Hansard* so that they may send their speeches to their constituents.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman have the goodness to state who it was who read the essays in the House. Only one essay was read in the House this Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. There were two essays read this Session.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I heard but one.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was one on each side of the House. There were speeches, useless, long speeches, with extracts from books and papers, and prepared speeches made with no other object than to delay business. This evil exists on both sides, and we ought to remedy it. I regret to say that I will vote to abolish *Hansard*, but I see nothing else to be done, and I hope the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) will adhere to his resolution, and test the feeling of the House on this point.

Mr. MILLS. I do not concur in the views expressed in the resolution of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), nor do I admit the correctness of the views expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). The official reports of the *Debates* of this House we have had for some eight or ten years, and the same motive that has operated on the minds of hon. gentlemen this Session operated on the minds of hon. gentlemen before, and if the *Debates* have caused the Session to be lengthened this year, it operated quite as strongly in former Sessions as in this. That does not account for the length of the Session; it had nothing whatever to do with it. I utterly deny that any considerable number of hon. members, I doubt whether a single member of the House has made a longer speech than he would otherwise have made, in consequence of the debates having been published in the *Debates*. If the *Debates* have lengthened this Session by two months, how is it that it had not that effect in previous Sessions? We have had a Session of ten weeks. How is it we have had a Session nearly three times that length now? It is not because we have the *Debates*, because we had it before; it is because of the character of the measures introduced by the Government and the time they were brought forward. We were here nearly ten weeks before the measures of the Government were submitted. The time when Parliament should have risen was the time Government measures first began to be laid on the Table. I say it is the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches who are responsible for the length of the Session, and not the official publication of the debates. The only measure introduced this Session on which there was a long discussion was the Franchise Bill. I believe ten weeks elapsed between the time when the committee rose until we went into Committee of Supply again. The House sat from day to day considering the measure. Why was the discussion so long? It was because the Government sought to force the measure

through, before there was an opportunity of informing the country of the character of the measure. We pointed out at the time the objectionable character of the measure, that the opinion of the country had not been taken upon it, that the course taken by the Government on that measure was an unconstitutional and arbitrary course, one that struck at the very foundation of government in this country, and yet they persisted in that measure. We had no opportunity, we were denied the opportunity of informing our constituents of meeting them face to face on this measure. We had no way of imparting information to the country, except in that indirect way by discussing the measure from day to day in the House. The time taken by the Government in the consideration of the measure was sufficient to enable them to carry through the entire business of the Session, if they had chosen, but they were not ready. They were anxious for the protraction of the debate, and when the debate was over we saw the House adjourn again, time and again, because the Government had not made such arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway, with whom they are proposing to deal, or whom they are seeking to conciliate, or some other company whose support they are seeking outside the House. That caused the length of the Session. Hon. gentlemen undertake to shift the responsibility from their own shoulders to the shoulders of members of the House, and say it is because hon. members want their speeches to appear in the *Debates*. I do not believe that is true; it is a calumny upon the members of this House; but I do say it is important there should be an official report of the debates.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS. Hon. gentlemen say no, but I will call attention to the manner in which the debates are reported by the press of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I find the *Toronto Mail* has attributed to me, upon the subject of Excise duties, remarks I never used. The *Toronto Mail* makes me say:

"Hon. David Mills said there was no sufficient reason for placing of additional burdens upon people by increasing duties upon whiskeys. It was evident to him that as the distillers took an unusual quantity of liquors out of bond, they must have been informed in advance of the intention of the Government to increase the duty."

I never said anything like that. Yet I find that repeated in the *Mail* two or three times over and quoted in several Tory journals; and I find the following article in the *Montreal Witness* based upon that report which put words in my mouth I never used:—

"The Hon. David Mills, if truly reported, will have to be added to the list of persons unfit to represent a Canadian constituency. Although he voted on the Scott Act question against permitting the sale of beer and wine, he must have done that, as Mr. Goldwin Smith would put it, under pressure from the fanatics of his constituency, or else, differing from Mr. Smith, he thinks whiskey a more wholesome beverage than these, and one that ought to be encouraged. He actually complained of the increased burden the spirit tax would lay upon the people. Poor people! stunted of their whiskey. We have heard incessantly of late of the intemperance of temperance reformers. According to Mr. Mills, even Sir John Macdonald is an intemperate reformer, going altogether too far when he adds to the taxation of the poor people's whiskey. We welcome Sir John into the ranks of the fanatics."

Here you have a speech manufactured, words put in my mouth I never used, the report repeated two or three times in the *Mail*, copied in several Tory journals, and then an article founded upon the report in another paper, assuming it to be true. I have not the least doubt that it would be insisted upon, notwithstanding my denial that I had used those words, if we had not an official report which shows that no such language was employed at all. We understand why hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to get rid of the *Debates*. The hon. gentleman made an attack upon the hon. member for West Durham because he occupied six hours in discussing the grievances of the half-breed population in the North-West. The hon. gentleman forgets that Mr. Burke occupied eleven days in discussing the

grievances of the people of India. Was that an improper proceeding? Why did he take up so much time? Because of the number of documents to be cited in proof of the charges he had brought against Warren Hastings. My hon. friend felt it necessary, from the fragmentary information the Government has placed at the disposal of the House, to quote a number of documents for the purpose of establishing the charges he made against the Administration. There was not a word or a syllable in the motion which my hon. friend submitted to the House that was not sustained by the evidence he produced. How did the hon. gentlemen meet that charge? First, by talking beside the issue, by speaking against an Administration whose conduct they did not impeach at the time when they were in power, and now by talking against my hon. friend on account of his having made a long speech. We all know why the hon. gentlemen have done this. There is no other evidence that they have, and the country will have no difficulty in understanding why it is that this motion has been made, and that my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) has been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite on account of the speech he made on the North-West question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Really, Mr. Speaker, there must be some order kept, and you were evidently not listening when the hon. gentleman who just sat down was clearly out of order. He quoted a previous debate, and tried to impute motives to hon. members which arose out of that previous debate. The hon. gentleman has no right to make this a party question. He does not know what course I am going to take on this subject, for instance. It has nothing to do with that debate to which the hon. gentleman refers, but it is simply a question whether we should have a *Hansard* or not, it has nothing to do with the political discussions which have arisen in this House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to say a very few words pertinent to the question before the House. I notice that there is considerable feeling in the House in favor of the motion which has been offered by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). I think that feeling is rather apparent, and I regret it somewhat, because I am one of those who, from the first day that official reporting was adopted, in the House, have been in favor of it; and we have felt our way along, and worked along through difficulties which are incident to the inauguration of a new system, in almost any matter, and we have now arrived at a stage I think, of almost perfection in reporting the debates of this House.

Mr. FARROW. Look at the size.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Looking at the size does not say anything against what I am stating, that we have arrived at a state of almost absolute perfection in reporting the *Debates* and giving them to us when they are serviceable and at the time agreed upon. We have passed through the stages of having the *Debates* published and in our hands two or three weeks after the time when they were delivered, when they were practically useless. The *Hansard* Committee seemed to me to have been bending their energies in the direction of making the official reports complete, and they have succeeded in doing so, and have succeeded in enlisting in our service a staff of men who are so capable to discharge the duties they have to fulfil that it is highly questionable if their equals can be found. If we adopt the motion of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), we should be doing a very great injustice towards a very able staff of men who were constituted, and who are, as I understand, permanent officers of this House, and they may be ruthlessly scattered in this way, they may be suddenly dismissed without a word of warning, eight or

nine permanent officers of the House may be treated in that way without any warning, but I feel persuaded that, if the motion of the hon. member for Brockville prevails, if these gentlemen are scattered, not more than one Session will elapse before it will be decided, I believe almost unanimously, that we shall again have a system of official reporting of the debates, with all the difficulties to be encountered again, with the men to be got together again, and I feel that in adopting this motion we would make a very serious and a very great mistake. When a young member of the House, when the debates were first commenced, I supported the proposition at that time, particularly from this view, that I noticed that the press had not sufficient reporters to report the whole of the proceedings in Parliament, I noticed—what no one could fail to notice—that the press gave prominence to the speeches of members of the Government and of the leaders of the Opposition, as could only be supposed, but the great mass of gentlemen who sat behind either the members of the Government or the leaders of the Opposition, were not reported at all, or, if they were reported, the report was necessarily much condensed, and that a party was, in consequence of this condensation, very often made to say the very opposite of what he intended to say. One can quite understand that, when there is such a great condensation, it is impossible to give the sense and meaning of a speech. I did think at that time that, however humble might be the position occupied by members who had been elected, if they saw fit to speak on some subject, it might be that they were as thoroughly conversant with those subjects as even the leaders of the two parties. It might be a local matter on which they spoke, and their utterances were worthy of being placed on record in such a position that they could be referred to. While thinking that in reference to the newer members, I did think also that the speeches of the leading statesmen of Canada, the men who are entrusted with the duty of managing the affairs of this great and growing country, and the speeches of those opposed to them, who watch and criticise their pretensions, should be put on record in order that posterity might be able to read what was said in Parliament, and that the history of Canada should be compiled in that way. I have not changed my views up to the present time. I recognise that there is a feeling almost of bitterness in the breasts of some because we have been retained so long this Session. It would only produce acrimony if I were to say anything as to what I consider the cause of that. The First Minister has stated that it is no cause of this discussion, that this is not a party question, but that we are discussing it on its own merits. But this I will venture to say, without arousing any feeling or leading the mind away from the question, that my own firm opinion is—and I hesitate not to express it—that the existence of *Hansard* had nothing more to do with the prolongation of this Session than anything that hon. gentlemen might choose to mention. With reference to *Hansard* conducing to long speeches by members, my opinion is the very reverse of that. If I may speak from my own sentiments and my own feelings—and one in doing that will not entirely misjudge the sentiments and feelings of others—my opinion is that, if there be one thing more than another that would tend to make a public man careful in the utterances that he makes in Parliament, it is the fact that his utterances are being taken and reported by gentlemen whose duty it is to do so, and who discharge that duty impartially. Sir, my own opinion is the very opposite of those who have spoken in the sense of the *Hansard* prolonging the speeches, and that instead it is my own firm conviction that the tendency is in exactly the opposite direction.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must say that I entirely agree—which is a rather unusual fact—with Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the views expressed by the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Paterson, Brant). I am of opinion that if the House, in its wisdom, decided to abolish the *Hansard* that a single Session would not pass by before it would be again re-established. Indeed, this has already taken place since the principle of the *Hansard* has been adopted; we have seen the *Hansard* abolished and all its staff scattered, and at the next Session Parliament re-established it. I do not hesitate to say that if Parliament decides upon abolition to-day, during the next Session or during the Session next following there will be a majority in favor of the re-establishment of the *Hansard*. Hence, I agree with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I must, consequently, have heard with regret the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, who pronounced in favor of the abolition of the *Hansard*. Still, I agree with him on more than one point, and especially on the fact that the cost of that publication has considerably increased since 1875, in which year we commenced to publish it, as the following figures will show:

In 1875.....	\$12,000
1876.....	11,280
1877.....	15,456
1878.....	19,007
1879.....	19,130
1880.....	16,286
1881.....	24,099
1882.....	26,126
1883.....	28,494
1884.....	38,114

I do not know what the figures will be for the current year, but I presume that the expenditure will be much larger than it was last year. And on this point I perfectly agree with the hon. Minister of Public Works; the expenditure in the past has been too high and even excessive. But because the expenses are too high it does not follow that we should destroy an institution which is in itself useful to the country and Parliament. I believe that instead of destroying it we should, on the contrary, try and amend, improve and perfect the system followed until now. The report made by the *Debates* Committee is an important step in the direction of a sound and good economy. According to the figures given by the hon. chairman of that committee, if that report is adopted there will be a probable reduction, first in the printing of the *Debates*, and again by the employment of the reporters, whose services will be utilised as stenographers before the courts, and again, through the reduction in the number of copies given to each member; there will be, I say, a reduction in the expenses of \$13,000 per year according to the hon. chairman of the committee. Well, Mr. Speaker, that reduction is quite large, and I believe that the House, instead of adopting the motion of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) should unanimously adopt the report of the *Debates* Committee, which is conducive to progress and sound and substantial economy. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we might make further economy besides that which is suggested by the committee, and that economy is embraced in the proposition which I am about to make to the House, and which I hope will be adopted. I believe that instead of reporting *verbatim* the discussion which takes place when the House sits as a Committee of the Whole on the Bills, they should be summarised and boiled down. By this means the *Hansard* for this year would have been considerably diminished. It is true that a great portion of the eloquent effusions which we have heard from the hon. gentlemen opposite during the famous debate on the Franchise Bill would have been lost to us; but I believe that the House would willingly sacrifice that pleasure; I even think that the hon. members opposite, after they reached their homes, when they had an opportunity to read their speeches, would also be willing to make that sacrifice, because I must say that the Opposition has made a real

abuse of eloquence, from the beginning of the Session, and the most guilty of them all is the hon. leader of the Opposition. I find that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has all alone covered 253 pages of the *Hansard*.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Is there a word too many ?

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) The next great offender is the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who occupies 134 pages ; the third is the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), with 119 pages ; the fourth is the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), with 98 pages. Well, Mr. Speaker, by the proposition which I am about to make to this House, if it is carried, if it had previously been adopted, a great portion of the speeches which have been delivered by the hon. gentlemen opposite would have been laid aside ; and, consequently, a great portion of the expenditure involved in the publishing of the *Hansard* would have been avoided. In the third place, I believe it is unfair to have every year a debate on the question whether we should abolish that publication or not. I believe it is unfair towards the officers, the reporters, the translators and their assistants, who, until now, have proved that they would perform their duties in the most efficient and useful manner. Well, every year these officials have the sword of Damocles suspended above their heads, every year they are threatened with dismissal, although they have been for several years in the employ of this House. Mr. Speaker, the principle of publishing the *Debates* has been adopted since 1875, and having been ratified by the present Parliament, it seems to me, in my humble opinion, that that principle ought to be maintained, and that instead of destroying the *Hansard* we should amend it, make it more perfect and improve it in the direction indicated by the *Hansard* Committee. To give effect to the proposition to which I have referred, I beg to move the following in amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Brockville :

That all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following be substituted to the main motion : It is the opinion of this House that the verbatim reporting of the debates taking place in Committee of the Whole on Bills should be altogether dispensed with, and that only a brief analytical report be made instead.

Mr. SPROULE. While I agree with a good deal that has been said by hon. members who contend that *Hansard* has done much towards lengthening the Session and towards compelling us to listen to long and tedious speeches, still I must say that I do not agree with the opinion of those who desire to see the *Hansard* abolished. Some seven years ago when the system was discussed in this House, I was in favor of it, and I was in favor of it for some of the reasons that have been expressed here to-day, and especially those mentioned by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I found that in the press of the country there was a habit of reporting at length important members of this House, while the great majority of the ordinary members of the House were cut off with a few lines that did not convey any intelligent idea of their opinions on the public questions of the day. If evils have grown out of this system I think we should direct our attention towards remedying them. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for Brant, when they say that the staff which we now have in the House has been improved from year to year until at present it is, perhaps, as near perfection as we could expect to have it. I must say that the reporting that has been done during this long and tedious Session is a credit to that staff. I must say also that I believe it is important that we should have some official record of the debates and proceedings of this House. It would be useful to future Parliaments and to future legislators in this country to refer to. It would also be useful for the reason that it correctly conveys the opinions expressed by hon. members in

this House, and they cannot be contradicted in the country. It will be useful also as showing the opinions of members on certain measures that are passed through this House, and it is afterwards almost compulsory to refer to them, in order to find the interpretation of the clauses of various Acts and various measures that have been passed. Now, for these reasons I am still in favor of the *Hansard*. I believe if the proposals made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) were adopted, that is to reduce the number of bound volumes that are given to members of this House, and to cut down the expense in various other ways, we would go a long way towards remedying many of the evils that have been complained of, and of diminishing the expense of the *Hansard*. Then, again, if those reporters are employed during the recess of Parliament in reporting for the courts, for which we have to pay large sums at the present time, a very large item of expense will be saved to the country, and in the other ways suggested by the report, substantial saving can be effected. For these reasons, I must say that I am still in favor of continuing the *Hansard*, only adopting such amendments as may reduce the expense, but still continuing an official report that we can always depend upon. I believe a good deal might be said about the long speeches and the lengthy Sessions, but there is no reason why we should not adopt some plan that would compel shorter speeches being made in the House, and when that is done I think the length of the Session will be reduced, and that the success of the present system will be secured.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), and also to the amendment that was first proposed by my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood). I feel that it is of the greatest importance that we should preserve an official record of the debates and transactions here. These discussions contain a very large amount of valuable matter, useful both to ourselves and to the country. Many of the speeches are the result of days and weeks, and some even of months, of study, thought and preparation. In many of the speeches we have a great amount of valuable statistics, gathered from a great variety of sources ; in other speeches we have collected the opinions of eminent and distinguished men, and the result of scientific investigation and research. Many of the speeches to which we have had the privilege of listening here contain a connected presentation of important facts and events which are transpiring in our own time, or which have transpired in the past. These addresses are full of interest, and possess considerable historic value. Then, Sir, in another class of speeches to which we listen here, we have the results of past legislation considered and reviewed. The policies adopted at different times by different Governments and in different countries, their influence upon society, upon public morals, upon trade, commerce and manufactures, and upon the general prosperity of the different countries affected, are all carefully analysed and compared. All this vast amount of information is furnished us in the speeches which are delivered in this House, and it is so arranged as to be in the most convenient form, both for the present use and future reference I feel that this vast amount of labor should not be lost, that it should be most carefully preserved. Then it must be remembered that many of our debates have additional importance from the high standing and character of those who take part in them. We are glad to know that we have in this House men possessing the strongest minds, the best brain and the most cultured intellects to be found in this country. A large portion of the speeches delivered here, at least in ordinary Sessions, are delivered by men who are the leaders of public opinion in this country, whose views shape the policy which will influence its future destiny. These

are the men who are making Canadian history. In a few years, when we are gone, the historian of the future will review what they have said and done. I feel it is due both to those who hereafter will write and who hereafter will read the history of this country that we should leave them, not only the results of our deliberations here, which will be found embodied in our Statute Book, but that we should also furnish them with the causes which lead to those results, that they might know the reasons which influenced us and the motives which influenced us and the objects we had in view in our legislation here. And that important object can be gained. We can give them that information only by leaving them a true and authentic record of the debates which take place in this House. Reference has been made to the cost of the *Hansard*. I admit the amount of cost appears large, but I consider this a matter of secondary importance. I am willing that the cost of *Hansard* should be reduced so far as it is possible to do so, consistent with preserving a true and faithful record. I am willing, if it is found necessary in the interest of economy, that the daily issue shall be discontinued. I am willing to endorse the report submitted by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), that the number of bound volumes which we receive shall be reduced to two. But I feel this: We have already expended a very large amount of money to establish a parliamentary library. I am not aware that the wisdom of that appropriation has ever been called in question. We are each year voting very considerable sums to maintain that library and to complete and perfect its contents as far as possible. I consider that *Hansard* is about the most valuable and useful work which the library contains, and I do not believe any public library in Canada, much less any parliamentary library, can be considered complete without it. Then it is suggested that the more important speeches delivered, those which are really valuable, will be printed by the newspapers and in pamphlet form, and be by that means preserved. No doubt they would, but they would be useless in that form to the members of this House. They would be without arrangement, classification or index for reference. The records would not be authentic, and disputes would constantly arise as to their accuracy. Then hon. members would have to rely upon their individual efforts for a record, and it is absurd to suppose that any member of this House could follow the debates upon the great variety of subjects which come up for consideration here, and preserve even a summary of the arguments presented which would be of practical value for future reference. Then, one-half or nearly one-half of the present Parliament are new members. After another general election it is impossible to say what further changes may take place. If we attach any importance whatever to the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite some of us who are now here must disappear from the scene of action. But, however, that may be, no doubt many changes will occur. The official record of the debates delivered in this House is the only one available for the use of members newly elected to this House. To them this record is invaluable, for however the representation may change, many of the political issues which they will be called upon to consider, will remain the same. I maintain that no one who may afterwards occupy a position in this House will be able to offer an intelligent opinion and intelligently perform his duties without having a record of the past discussions to refer to. Then I feel that it is due to the Opposition in this House, those whose views do not generally prevail, that the *Hansard* should be retained. It is true that the policy of the Government of the day, the views and opinions of the majority of this House may be regarded as being represented to a great extent in the measures we adopt and which are to be found on our Statute Book. But those measures do not at all represent the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. Very often those

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

hon. gentlemen are entirely opposed to the principles of the measures which we adopt, and I for one feel that it is only just and fair that the views which the Opposition entertain, that the grounds upon which they base their opposition, that the principles for which they often very ably, though unsuccessfully, contend in this House should be recorded and preserved. The principal object which those hon. gentlemen have in view in supporting the amendment is to shorten the discussions in this House. I am in the fullest sympathy with the object which those hon. gentlemen seek to accomplish; but I do not believe that the means which they propose will secure that object. Let us consider for one moment what will be the possible or probable effect of the abolition of *Hansard* upon the class of speeches to which we listen here. In the first place, what will be the effect as regards the class of speeches to which I have already referred, the class which are really valuable, the class which are prepared and delivered with a view of influencing the opinions of hon. members? This class cannot and will not be curtailed. It is not desirable in the interest of this House and the country that they should be curtailed. Take a second class of speeches, those which are not delivered on account of exerting any influence on hon. members in this House, but which are delivered for the purpose of exerting influence in the constituency which the speaker represents. Is it possible that the abolition of *Hansard* will prevent the delivery of those speeches? Every hon. member must know that *Hansard* is not a medium for circulating our speeches among our constituents. It is true that any hon. member may arrange with the publishers of *Hansard* to obtain additional copies of any speech delivered and send them to his constituents. The abolition of *Hansard* would not prevent this being done through the medium of the press. Any hon. member could go to the office of the daily *Citizen* or the *Free Press*. They could have their speeches reported at length, they could obtain hundreds and thousands of extra copies in this way, and distribute them amongst their constituents as easily, as economically, and as conveniently as they could possibly arrange with the publishers of *Hansard*. I cannot see any reasonable hope that the abolition of *Hansard* would have the effect of diminishing the number, or of shortening the length of speeches of this character. Then, Sir, consider its effect upon the third class of speeches—the most objectionable to which we are obliged to listen—those speeches which are expected or intended to serve no useful purpose, which are merely delivered for the purpose of occupying our time or wearying our patience. How can it be expected that the abolishment of *Hansard* would prevent the delivery of those speeches? I believe if there is any hon. gentleman in this House who delivers a speech for the purpose of obstructing public business, possibly with the hope of gaining some political advantage, he would continue to do so, whether we have a *Hansard* or not. I believe, Sir, that that is an abuse of the privileges of this House. I regret that we have witnessed it during the present Session, and that it has been carried to a greater extent than before in the history of this country. I desire as much as any gentleman in this House, to see this practice discontinued. I am willing, if it becomes necessary, to support stringent measures to prevent it in the future. But Sir, I think in order to remedy this evil at the present time, we may rely upon a few simple, but I hope effectual remedies. In the first place, I would rely on the good sense of the members of this House. I would rely on their regard for their own health, or as the hon. member for Hastings has said, on their regard for their lungs, their hearts, and their kidneys. Then, Sir, I believe every hon. gentleman in this House must have some consideration for the feelings and some respect for the opinions of those with whom he is associated; and, Sir, I do believe that those who have taken a

leading part in the obstruction which we have witnessed during the present Session, will find that they have raised themselves in the estimation of this House, or in public opinion throughout this Dominion. I doubt very much that if after the excitement of the Session is over, when they return to the quiet of their own homes, whether they will be able to reflect on the course they have pursued, with very great pleasure or satisfaction. But I rely not only on this, I rely mainly on the good sense and the sound judgment of the people of this country. I believe that when those who by their votes have sent us here, those who bear the burdens of taxation in this country, those who must pay the cost, the largely increased cost which has been incurred through the unnecessary prolongation of this Session, pronounce their judgment upon this practice, they will condemn it in a manner so severe and emphatic as to prevent its recurrence in the future. I regard this, Sir, as I said before, as a gross abuse of the privileges of this House. I feel that it is very desirable to prevent it in future. I do not believe, sir, that this is the proper place or the proper time to speak to our constituents, or to the country. We have the public platforms in this country where we can discuss political questions at any length. We have the public press through which we can convey our views and opinions on public matters to our constituents. I believe these are the proper and legitimate means by which to accomplish this object. I cannot oppose freedom of speech. I desire freedom of speech to be maintained; but, Sir, I believe that discussions should take place at the proper time, in the proper manner, and in the proper place. I believe, Sir, in the freest and fullest discussion of every question which affects the welfare of this country, and the happiness and future prosperity of our people; but I believe that it is entirely compatible with that perfect freedom both of thought and speech that is our pride and boast in this country, that Parliamentary debate should be confined to its legitimate objects, that it should be continued only so long as it is possible to impart information, useful to this House, and only so long as there is a reasonable hope of assisting the members of this House in reaching wise and intelligent conclusions. Sir, I shall no longer detain the House. I feel not only bound to vote against these amendments, but to oppose them with all the possible influence I possess. I feel, Sir, fully in sympathy with the objects which hon. gentlemen seek to attain, but I have no faith whatever that the abolishment of *Hansard* would have the practical effect of shortening discussions in this House as hon gentlemen expect it will. I most sincerely hope this House will reject these amendments, for I feel that that is a duty we owe to the leaders of the great parties in this House, to the prominent men who take a part in our discussions here; it is a duty we owe to ourselves and our constituents; it is a duty that we owe to every member who occupies a seat in this House at the present time, and to those who will take our places hereafter; it is a duty, Sir, we owe to the public, to the people of this country who have entrusted its highest interests to our care; it is a duty we owe to posterity, who must reap the fruits of our legislation, will enjoy its advantages if we are right, and who must suffer the consequences of our errors if we are wrong—that we should preserve the *Hansard*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I shall detain the House for only a few moments in reply to some observations which have been made with reference to the *Hansard*. I may say that, so far as I am personally concerned, I have perhaps less interest in the continuance of *Hansard* than any other gentleman here, because in so far as anything I say in Parliament is concerned, I can always secure the reporting of my remarks if I desire to do so. I think some members of the House are laboring under one error which the abolition

of the *Hansard* will bring painfully to their knowledge, and that is that the press of the country can efficiently report the debates of Parliament. My hon. friend from Hastings refers to the debates of the Local Legislature, as reported in Toronto, and paid a very just and proper tribute to the manner in which both the *Globe* and *Mail* report those debates. But my hon. friend should remember that we are not sitting in Toronto, that we are sitting in Ottawa, and that, in addition to the cost of reporting and the difficulty of reporting, there is the difficulty of transmission by telegraph of all that may be reported for the newspapers. I venture to say, and I speak with some knowledge on a subject of this kind, that the House of Commons will find that, so far from the newspapers furnishing anything like reasonably sufficient reports, nothing of the kind will be done. The press, like everything else, has changed very much within recent years. To-day the mass of the people require what they get in very much shorter pieces than they used to be willing to have it. The newspapers which would undertake to report, from day to day, anything like a reasonably full report of the more important speeches of Parliament—and none but the more important would be attempted to be reported at all—that paper would become unpopular, instead of popular, with its readers. What the public outside want, after all, is not so much what is said in Parliament, as what is done in Parliament, and we find in the United States, even in the large city of New York, that the reports of Congress and of the State Legislature are embraced in a comparatively few lines, simply stating what has been done, or that some particularly prominent member has spoken for a short time upon some particular subject; but anything like a report will not be had; and if it is desirable at all that there should be a report of what is said in Parliament, for the information and guidance of Parliament in the future, it is absolutely necessary that we should have it in the form of an official report. Why, Sir, every important Legislature in the world has its official report. In the Australian colonies, even in the comparatively small colony of New Zealand, there has been since 1867 an official report; and I have here a letter from the public printer there, stating the manner in which the work is done in that colony. It is not long, and I will simply read it as showing that they have adopted practically the same plan there that we have here:—

“The system of publishing the debates officially was commenced in 1867, so has now been in existence 17 years. During that time 48 volumes have been issued, averaging about 750 pages in each, printed in briefer type. The ordinary duration of the Sessions of our Parliament is three months, and I find they generally talk about one volume a month, giving an average of nearly three volumes per Session. The debates are reported *verbatim* and proofs are sent to members for corrections the next day, after which they are made up in book form and published twice a week (Tuesdays and Fridays), a certain number of the sheets being retained for binding in volumes at the close of the Session. Many of the members are inclined to abuse the privilege of correcting their speeches, and take the opportunity of excising, altering and adding to them considerably; but as a rule the corrections made cannot be reasonably objected to. There has been an improvement in this respect of late years—very probably owing to increased efficiency on the part of the reporters. The reporting staff consists of 8—one chief reporter at £500 per annum; 6 at £300 and one at £250. They are, as a rule not employed more than three months in the year, and when the House is not in session they follow other occupations or get engagements as reporters on some of the newspaper staffs. The cost of reporting amounts to £2,550 and printing, binding, etc., £2,700 per annum. It is printed at the Government printing office, the compositors setting it up on the piece work system, at 1s. 3d. per 1,000 ems.”

We pay here 60 cents per 1,000 ems. so that the difference in the cost between our *Hansard* and the *Hansard* in New Zealand can be made up by the saving in the printing. In the other Australian colonies, in Congress, in several of the States of the American Union, in fact everywhere, it is found necessary to have a system of official reporting. The hon. member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) referred to the increasing cost of *Hansard*. Well, Sir, I may point

out that in the first instance the work of reporting was done by contract. Mr. Richardson, who, I think, was the first contractor, employed his own reporters. Well, those who recollect that time will recollect that that proved a very unsatisfactory method; the reports were not so good as they ought to be, and members had great difficulty in making a reasonably fair revision of what was said. In fact, the revising of a speech was a much more serious matter than its preparation and delivery. In that way a considerable saving in the cost was made, because, inasmuch as the printing was not done for several days after the speech was delivered, it was done in the day time instead of at night, as it is at present, and consequently at a much lower cost. One of the evils which would result from the abolition of *Hansard* is this. I believe thoroughly that the experience of one single Session without a *Hansard* will cause the House to reconsider its decision.

Mr. COCHRANE. Let us try it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). My hon. friend from East Northumberland says: Let us try it. If the hon. member had the experience I have, he would know that reporters fit for the work of reporting at these tables cannot be picked up every day. We have had great difficulty in getting the staff we have at the present moment. There is a popular idea, which is a fallacious idea, that every stenographer is a reporter—that every man who learns shorthand can be put at a table and can report speeches. I venture to say that if we had a haphazard staff, such as we should be compelled to get under the circumstances I have mentioned, hon. members would find, from the character of the reports, reason to regret that, when they had a really efficient staff, such as we have to-day, they permitted it to be dispersed. As to the length of the Session being a result of *Hansard*, I do not conceal from myself that there could be no more unfortunate time to discuss the question of *Hansard* than the present moment; but hon. gentlemen should remember that we have had long Sessions before. I believe this Session is only a few days longer than the famous Session of 1858 in the old Parliament of Canada, if it is quite so long. But up to this Session we have had Sessions of reasonable length; no one has complained that hitherto the length of the Sessions has been due to *Hansard* at all; and when I state to you,—what perhaps I ought not to say, but what I will venture to say—that on one occasion, during that long debate, the reports of *Hansard* were somewhat condensed, I had complaints from hon. members on this side that the reports of the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite were not published in full, and I had the entire acquiescence of hon. gentlemen opposite in the condensation of the reports, I think you will agree with me that where talking against time—if it were talking against time—perhaps, I have no reason to say that in this debate—prevails, those who talk against time are not those who desire an official report of their speeches, but those whose patience is worn out by that process. I quite concur in the opinion expressed by one hon. gentleman that *Hansard*, instead of being the means of lengthening the Session, really shortens it by impressing upon hon. gentlemen the sense of responsibility which the *verbatim* publication of whatever they might say ought to impress upon every man who has a proper sense of his responsibility. I think it right simply to utter these few words in defence of the official reporting of the debates.

Mr. DAWSON. I would be very sorry, indeed, to see the *Hansard* abolished; but, I think, without reflecting particularly on any speeches that have been made in this House, without criticising any of them in particular, some of them might have been to great advantage abridged. In the neighboring country a limit of time is fixed, beyond which a speaker cannot occupy the time of the House, and I think it would be advisable to adopt some rule to limit

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

the time here. I think if the leaders of both sides were allowed to make their speeches, without curtailment, the speeches of other members should be kept within a certain limit. That would be of great advantage. An hon. gentleman has said that posterity will learn the history of our times from the reports of our speeches; but I think we would confer a great boon on posterity if we would make them shorter. If hon. members were compelled to condense their speeches, I am sure, in a literary point of view, they would show a great deal of improvement. I concur in everything that has been said with regard to the efficiency of the present staff; they certainly do their duty very well, and I doubt if we could get a better staff. It is only through long practice and experience that they have gained their present efficiency. In sending reports to the press, I think, however, that the corrected reports should be sent, and not the first issue.

Mr. COCHRANE. In seconding the motion, I was impelled to do so from the fact that I have been satisfied for several months that this Session has been unnecessarily prolonged because speeches of hon. gentlemen are recorded in *Hansard*. We have often had it announced by hon. members that they were speaking to the country; but I consider it was waste of time on their part, because they were not speaking to the country in a strain that reasonable people would endorse or intelligent men fail to discover as being mere high-flown sentiment, and not practical, wise or judicious opinions. We heard the hon. member for Cardwell state that a newspaper which would attempt to give a decent report of the speeches would not be read. If, then, the speeches published in newspapers will not find readers, how are they going to find readers when published in *Hansard*? Life is too short for anyone to wade through these long reports. I may not have practical experience in this matter, but I have common sense, and I must say that in many of the speeches we do not find much of that element. We have heard about the benefit to posterity accruing from the *Hansard* reports, but my opinion is that the *Hansard* reports will give to the generation yet unborn a good deal of nonsense, and certainly not impress them with the profundity of their progenitors. If I were convinced before, I am still more convinced now, that it is absurd to have a *Hansard*. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has told us that 10 weeks elapsed before the Government brought down any business. If so, the Government was wrong; but what was the fact after the business was brought down? Hon. gentlemen talked against time for 10 weeks and prevented this House from doing business, making the Session last 10 weeks longer, for mere partisan reasons as nonsensical as they were ill-timed and uncalled for. I am satisfied, therefore, that, had it not been for *Hansard*, we would not have had that 10 weeks of speech-making in the House. We have had an illustration of the waste of time in the debate on *Hansard* itself, for we have had an essay delivered by an hon. gentleman in this House which was written very carefully outside; we have had illustrations without number during the Session of the loss of time caused by *Hansard*. We have seen hon. gentlemen rise here and deliver elaborate historical essays on political economy, Indian affairs, and other things, and I contend this is a practical House; I do not want to be kept here listening to lengthy disquisitions which have nothing business-like to commend them to practical men. I do not want, as a farmer, to be kept here until the haying is over and the harvest past. I have heard the changes rung in my ears, ever since I recollect listening to anything like politics, about the extravagance of the Government, as shown in the public service. But what is the argument of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), when we want to retrench and save \$50,000 a year, which would put up a good public building? His only argument is, he fears there would be

two or three officials taken out of the service, and he utters a wail over that fact. What do we hear, day after day, in the House? I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite, in my riding, declare that this whole building was crammed with officials; that the Government were putting up other buildings for their accommodation; yet, now, when we have an opportunity to save \$50,000 a year, hon. gentlemen oppose the idea. I think it is time the debates were brought to a close. I only intended to second the motion; but when I have a chance to support it with my voice as well, and if it is carried it will save the country \$50,000, I am bound to do it, even though the result may be to turn out several deserving officials.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I rise to say that hon. gentlemen opposing the publication of *Hansard* have not one unkind word to say of the official reporters. We all believe they are men who discharge their duty efficiently. With regard to the cost of *Hansard*, I may say that in 1873 we had a *Hansard* of 1,300 pages which cost \$14,000; then it cost \$30,000 to \$40,000, and now it costs \$60,000. I would just ask hon. gentlemen who are advocating *Hansard* whether, previous to the *Hansard* being introduced into this House, Confederation was not carried. Were not the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions carried, were not British Columbia brought into the Union and Prince Edward Island, and other matters of great importance, just as well as during this important Session? Are we only saving \$50,000? I contend this Session will cost an extra \$250,000, and by abolishing *Hansard* we will save that. I believe, if we abolish *Hansard*, we will get some system that will be a more beneficial system. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says that no paper would publish the reports of the House. I contend that the business done in the Provincial Parliament of Ontario is as important to that Province as the business done here, and the country is well informed on that business. I am satisfied the country would be as well informed on the business of the House if we abolished *Hansard*.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Tassé to amendment:

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Forbes,	McCraney,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Massue,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Platt,
Curran,	Hickey,	Royal,
Desjardins,	Innes,	Taschereau,
Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Tassé.—18.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Allen,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Paint,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gordon,	Paterson (Brant),
Baker (Victoria),	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Beaty,	Gunn,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Hackett,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Pruyn,
Bergin,	Hall,	Ray,
Billy,	Harley,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blake,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Holton,	Ross,
Bourassa,	Homer,	Scriver,
Bowell,	Hurteau,	Shanly,
Bryson,	Jamieson,	Small,
Burpee,	Kaulbach,	Smyth,
Cameron (Huron),	Kilvert,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Inverness),	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kranz,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Labrosse,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Landerkin,	Stairs,
Carling,	Landry (Kent),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Caron,	Langevin,	Taylor,
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Temple,
Casey,	Lesage,	Townshend,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Livingston,	Vail,
Colby,	Macdonald (King's),	Valin,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,

Coughlin,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Macmaster,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Watson,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Weldon,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McDougald (Picton),	Wells,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McGreevy,	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	McIsaac,	White (Renfrew),
Dugas,	McLelan,	Wigle,
Edgar,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville),
Farrow,	Mills,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Fisher,	Mitchell,	Wright.—127.
Fleming,		

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Wood (Brockville):

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Auger,	Farrow,	Mitchell,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gordon,	Paterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Platt,
Blake,	Guillet,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Haggart,	Pruyn,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hurteau,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Smyth,
Casgrain,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmaster,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wells,
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McGreevy,	White (Renfrew),
Dupont,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville).—63.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Allen,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Gunn,	Paint,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Hackett,	Paterson (Brant),
Baker (Victoria),	Hall,	Ray,
Barnard,	Harley,	Ross,
Beaty,	Holton,	Royal,
Bergin,	Homer,	Scriver,
Burpee,	Innes,	Shanly,
Cameron (Huron),	Jamieson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Inverness),	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kranz,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landerkin,	Sproule,
Carling,	Laurier,	Stairs,
Caron,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Livingston,	Tassé,
Casey,	Macdonald (King's),	Temple,
Colby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Townshend,
Curran,	Mackintosh,	Trow,
Daly,	McCallum,	Vail,
Dawson,	McCraney,	Watson,
Desjardins,	McDougald (Picton),	Weldon,
Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Edgar,	McIsaac,	Wigle,
Fairbank,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'd),
Fleming,	Massue,	Wright.—82.
Foster,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HICKEY. I think that, in order to correct the evil that seems in all our minds to exist in this matter, the motion I am about to read will go far in that direction. I move that the following be added to the motion:—

And that no speaker shall be reported longer than one hour, excepting two members of the Government and two members of the Opposition; and that in committee on Bills no speaker shall be reported longer than ten minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know what may be the idea of the mover of that resolution. My own opinion is, that a gentleman ought to be able to say all that he has to say to this House within a short time, and I am sure that if the long speeches which have taken five or six hours had been

delivered in one hour, they would have been much more extensively read, and would certainly have been more extensively appreciated by the public. I am in favor of not making long speeches, I am not given to making long speeches myself lately, because I have seen the evil of it, and I have endeavored to curtail my remarks and to state my views as clearly and as succinctly as possible. But I do not like this manner of picking out two parties in this House. I think it is unfair to what everybody knows exists in this House, a large independent element, which pervades both parties in the House and exists among the followers of the right hon. the Premier as well as of the leader of the Opposition. There exists an independent element, who are not satisfied with the despotism of party, and do not follow party from their own hearts, but from necessity, because they must belong to a party. I think it is unfair to that growing Independent party, and to the growing independent feeling in Canada, that a motion should be adopted which would foreclose the leader of an Independent party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad that my remarks meet with so much approval. I was sure they would, and I think the acclamation which follows those remarks should show the House that the statements I have made as to the existence of a large Independent party and the feeling of independence amongst the followers of both sides of the House should prevent such an amendment from being adopted by the House. I have no particular objection to the amendment, provided they do one thing. They may confine it to two of the leaders of each of the different parties that exist in this House; and, as I stated before, I should judge that, were such a proposition put, from the acclamation with which my remarks have been met, it would be carried. I trust the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment will see the injustice of it. He has often professed to be a follower of the Independent party, though his independence, like that of some others, is probably only in talk; for, when it comes to a vote, I observe that he votes with his party. There is also my hon. friend from the county of Ottawa, who is sitting opposite me. He, every now and then, makes an independent speech, but I am sorry to say he does not often give independent votes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I always vote with my hon. friend from the left centre.

Mr. MITCHELL. Some hon. gentlemen make the same objection to myself, but I think without just cause. If the amendment is limited to two members of each party, I think the Independent party should be included.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I look upon this amendment as a very objectionable one. I voted with the minority on the last motion; but I look upon this amendment as very objectionable. In the first place, I think it will have this bad effect, that when you have speeches in the House simply for the purpose of taking up time or obstructing, members will devote the first hour, perhaps, to making a speech which they will look upon as worthy of being reported, and then will proceed to take up time. I think, also, that to have speeches reported for ten minutes in Committee of the Whole is equally objectionable, on the same ground. You will see that those who have moved against the continuation of the *Hansard* have done so on the ground of the expense connected with it. It will decrease the expense very little if this is adopted. We shall require the same staff, and I presume we shall pay them in the same way as we do now, and it would be very idle to see these gentlemen constantly looking up at the clock in order to see if the ten minutes had elapsed, when perhaps an hon. member had only entered into the important part of his speech. If we are to have a *Hansard* at all, we should have

Mr. MITCHELL.

it with all the advantages which are to be derived from it, and not so curtailed as the amendment now proposed would cause it to be. I shall therefore feel constrained to vote against the amendment, however much I might desire to see the expenses lessened. I think the *Hansard* would be a valuable institution, and I agree with everything that has been said as to the efficiency with which the gentlemen who are engaged do their work, but I have taken the ground I have, simply because I look with some alarm at the increase of the expenditure, not only in that Department, but in almost every other Department connected with legislation, which has been increasing ever since Confederation down to this point. I shall consider it my duty to record my vote in favor of any resolution tending to decrease the expenditure, not only in connection with the *Hansard*, but in connection with every Department of legislation.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Hickey :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain (Soulanges),	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Baker (Victoria),	Guillet,	Pope,
Barnard,	Hackett,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Billy,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hickey,	Small,
Cochrane,	Homer,	Taschereau,
Coughlin,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Curran,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Dawson,	Kaulbach,	Thompson,
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé),	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wells,
Dugas,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dupont,	McCraney,	Wigle,
Farrow,	McGreevy,	Wood (Brockville).—53.
Foster,	Massue,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Moffat,
Auger,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Beaty,	Gunn,	Paint,
Bell,	Hall,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergin,	Harley,	Platt,
Blake,	Holton,	Ray,
Blondeau,	Innes,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bourassa,	Kilvert,	Ross,
Bowell,	Kirk,	Royal,
Burpee,	Kranz,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Landerkin,	Shanly,
Cameron (Inverness),	Landry (Kent),	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Langevin,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Springer,
Campbell (Victoria),	Lister,	Sproule,
Carling,	Livingston,	Stairs,
Caron,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Mackintosh,	Trow,
Casey,	Macmaster,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Valin,
Colby,	McDougald (Pictou),	Vanasse,
Costigan,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Watson,
Daly,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Desjardins,	McIsaac,	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McLelan,	White (Renfrew),
Fairbank,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'nd),
Fleming,	Mills,	Wright.—91.
Forbes,		

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to, on a division.

#### THEFT OF GOVERNMENT BONDS.

Mr. BLAKE. There are certain statements which have been made in the public journals to which I feel it my duty to call the attention of the Government. I see a statement in the *Montreal Witness* of the 13th inst., that there has been

a disappearance of certain Government bonds from the Government vaults, and that during a recent investigation into the management of the Finance Department a defalcation of \$12,000 was discovered in the accounts of a certain official:

"And that bonds to the value of over a million dollars, all signed ready for issue, are said to have lain in the vault, to which every officer of the Department had access, without any check upon him."

As a result, the Government have now to make good \$25,000 to the Bank of Montreal, which had made the advance to the dishonest officials. I think the hon. gentleman will see that these are rather disturbing statements, and it would be well to have some authentic statement on the subject communicated to the House and to the country.

Mr. BOWELL. The Department of Finance has no information of any robbery of any kind having been committed, or of any defalcation, that I have been able to discover. I heard this rumor last night, and one of the members of the press gallery sent me a note to ask if there was anything in it, and I at once sent to Mr. Toller to ascertain if there was anything in it, and he informed me he knew nothing about it.

#### SPIRITS TAKEN OUT OF BOND.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call attention to a statement to the effect that certain distillers were in Ottawa urging that spirits taken out of bond by them previous to the 9th July should only pay the old rates of duty:

"They allege that, through some bungling on the part of the Minister of Customs, the new Excise duties came into force three days before the increased Customs duties began to be imposed, and that between the 6th and the 9th of the present month large quantities of imported liquors were taken out of bond at the old rates of duty."

I ask the Minister of Customs whether that statement is correct?

Mr. BOWELL. I believe that statement is substantially correct, as regards taking the liquor out of the bonded warehouse from the Customs bonds. The difference between the two orders that was given was simply this: The Deputy Head of the Customs gave instructions not to accept any entries. The Commissioner of Customs did what he always has done in the past—instructed the telegraph officers not to transmit any message affecting the tariff; and the result, I suppose, was, that two or three days after the motion was made to go into committee some merchants who, like business men, thought that some change would be made, made their entries. I suppose, as the House has affirmed the principle that the duties should take effect from the 6th of the month, the date that the motion was made to go into Committee of Ways and Means, the parties making the entries will be asked to amend the entries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Minister of Customs mean that the importers who have taken goods out of bond will be required to amend?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I called attention at the time that these resolutions were going through, to the statements which had been made as to the quantity of spirits which were alleged to have been taken out of bond in the Province of Quebec, and I asked the hon. gentleman to obtain the information as to the amount which had been taken out immediately prior to the 6th.

Mr. BOWELL. I informed the House that I would, as far as possible, ascertain what had been taken from bond during those days. On the 6th, 7th and 8th, the duties paid amounted to \$54,000, and, in the city of Montreal, \$139,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that refer to Customs goods, or to Excise?

Mr. BOWELL. To Customs goods exclusively; there were no Excise entries made, for the simple reason that the Department refused to accept them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the point which was taken had reference to two distinct matters—one, the point which the hon. gentleman has just given information about; and the other, as to the quantities of exciseable spirits which had been taken out between the 1st of July and the 6th, in the Province of Quebec. Of course, I am aware that this matter does not belong especially to the Minister of Customs, but more particularly to the Minister of Inland Revenue. But I called attention to the statement that between the 1st and the 6th of July a large quantity of spirits, in addition to the Customs goods, had been reported to be taken out in the Province of Quebec, and I asked to be informed what quantity of spirits had been taken out of the warehouses in that Province between those dates. It is very desirable that we should have that information to-night or to-morrow.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will get it to-night.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the hon. gentleman opposite whether it is the intention to introduce a measure with reference to grants of land or money to railways?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it was promised that we should have a measure with reference to colonisation companies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I stated there was going to be a measure.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I would just call the attention of the Government and the House to a return which has been brought down to-day, being one of the returns moved for very early, with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the answer to which was made by the secretary of that company on the 30th May, 1885, and it is only brought down to-day, after all the measures with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway had been brought down to the House, and although it was lying in the office of the Minister during the whole period when these measures were under discussion.

#### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Publishing Debates..... \$47,500

Mr. BAKER. I desire to ask the Chairman of the Debates Committee if it is the intention of the committee to recommend that an additional sum be paid to Mr. Boyce, who revises the reports. I find that his salary is only \$800, and we have had a six months session. From my own knowledge, I am aware that he has been at his office from early in the morning till early the next morning. The amount of work he has performed is sufficient to entitle him to some recognition in a substantial way, for the extra service he has performed during this Session.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The matter has not come before the Debates Committee in any way.

Mr. BLAKE. It ought to receive the attention of the committee. Of course, all the officers of *Hansard* have had much more than the usual work; but, as regards the chief officers, we get their services for the whole year, and the compensation is based on that theory, and they must take the rough and the smooth together; but when the reviser's salary is fixed at \$800 for such labor as he has had to discharge, in view of the length of the Session, the question of granting an additional amount should receive consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I quite concur in that view. This Session is equally as long as two ordinary Sessions, and no doubt the amount of work has been very large. I consider the remuneration paid is quite inadequate.

Mr. HAGGART. I observe that this item is increased by \$10,950, as compared with last year, for the publication of the *Hansard*. I move that the amount be reduced to that of last year, \$36,144.

Mr. SPEAKER. The supplementary estimate for this year is for the same amount as last year.

Mr. BOWELL. The expenditure last year was about \$34,700. The supplementary estimate provided for another \$10,000, in order to pay the difference of the expense in connection with the reports of the *Debates* for last year.

Mr. BLAKE. In view of the report of the committee, if the statement of the hon. member for Cardwell is correct, it will not be necessary to expend so much money. The committee did not themselves make a recommendation with respect to a large and important portion of the report—probably as they did not deem it to be within their province. I entirely approve of the suggestion which is embodied in the report, with respect to utilising the services of the staff of reporters for executive and administrative work during the year. My own opinion is, that a very much larger economy may be obtained than that which the committee has suggested; and for this reason: I believe there are a very considerable number of departmental investigations, not unimportant, which are proceeded with in a very imperfect manner at the present time for the want of short-hand reporters. We know, also, that there are investigations in regard to the Customs, and in regard to Excise matters. These are of high consequence. Very important private rights are involved and questions of character are also involved. From motives of economy, short-hand reporters are not employed—I am not saying that they should be employed at the regular rates which have to be paid to them; but by saving the time of the higher officers, who are or ought to be engaged in those enquiries, involving, as I have said they do, questions of character and of important private rights, those investigations would be enormously facilitated by the use which might be made of our admirable staff of short-hand reporters. I believe the public service would be very greatly served by them. No one who has not been conversant with the very imperfect manner in which justice was administered before short-hand reporters were appointed to the courts of Ontario, as compared with the manner in which it is now administered, would be able to form any conception of the superiority of this method of making enquiries, and particularly when it happens, as it does happens very often, that in the last resort the decision is with the Minister, who has not heard the evidence taken, and that he should have an accurate *verbatim* transcript of what was said by those on both sides in the investigation is, I will not say important, but I say it is essential to the formation of an accurate judgment on the matter submitted to him. I maintain this because it involves rather an extension of the duties which will be cast upon the reporters. Of course, I understand that under this plan the charges to the public are not to be increased at all, with the exception of whatever travelling expenses may be necessary, in order to bring the reporter to where his work will be. I think it right, also, to observe that I do not understand it to be intended that the reporters shall be debarred from making the usual charges for such copies as may be desired for private individuals, at the expense of those private individuals. That arrangement is one which holds in other cases, and it will give them some measure of remuneration, however moderate, and it will prove an advantage to the public service that they should have that, because people work a little better under the stimulus of material considerations of that

Mr. BLAKE.

kind than under the thought of nothing but an amount of extra work.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The public pay for everything.

Mr. BLAKE. The public will pay nothing more. The public pays \$2,000 a year to each of those officers; that is all. If they go to some point under the orders of a Department and take evidence, the actual travelling expenses will be allowed. That is all that is proposed to be charged. I believe we have an opportunity of effecting very considerable improvement in the conduct of an important branch of the public service by utilising the services of the reporters by these means, which will not involve any further public charge, but which may fairly be taken out of the charges for *Hansard*. It will be necessary, in order to carry that out that an account be kept of what the various charges will be for the services of reporters when employed one way or the other during the recess, and that service will have to be charged against the Department and credited to the amount charged against the *Official Debates*. It will be a public convenience arising from the system of the *Official Debates*, and therefore will have to be deducted from the public charges on that account. It will not be an increase of charge, but a utilisation of the officers we find it necessary to have for the *Official Debates* on other important public services, and therefore properly to be charged to those services which receive the benefit of their work.

Mr. HAGGART. In accordance with the notice I gave, I move, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, that the sum in the Estimates, of \$47,100 for 1885-86, be reduced to \$36,144, the amount voted for the *Hansard* of 1884-85. I find that the sum voted for *Hansard* for 1884-85 was \$36,144 and that in the Supplementary Estimates of this year, for the purpose, I suppose, of paying the expenses of *Hansard* on account of the length of the Session, there is a vote of \$10,936. Now, if it is the intention to have a reduction in the expenditure on *Hansard*, the amount should be reduced to the normal expenditure during the year. It was said last year, when the motion was made for the purpose of dispensing with *Hansard* altogether, that the parties were engaged, that we could not discharge them on that account, and that the amount, it was hoped, would be sufficient for all the expenditure required. I find now there has been an increase of expenditure of over \$10,000, and notwithstanding the observations made by the hon. gentleman who introduced the report of the committee, I think the expenditure should be reduced, instead of providing for an increase of nearly \$11,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The actual amount which *Hansard* cost last year was \$38,114.84, but the official reporters were not paid the larger salaries which Parliament, by resolution, decided should be paid to them, and which began to be paid them for the first time this year. The cost of *Hansard* for last year, if the salaries which Parliament has agreed now to pay the staff had been paid last year, would have been about \$45,000; and the saving which we expected to effect in the direction I have stated will be about \$4,000. I think if the hon. gentleman would make it \$40,000 instead of \$36,144, we might get through another year at that price.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. member for Lanark correctly apprehends the reasons for the extra vote. I do not understand that the extra vote, beyond the main vote, has anything whatever to do with the length of this Session. Whatever of *Hansard* may be abnormal, owing to the length of the Session, will have to be voted separately. I understood that the extra vote was due to the resolution of last Session, increasing the cost of the staff.

Mr. BOWELL. Partially so.

Mr. HAGGART. The item says it is to recoup amount expended since 1st July, 1884, in closing *Debates* account of

Session of 1884, \$10,036, with a lapsed balance of \$1,262.43 on the 30th of June, 1884.

Mr. BLAKE. That is last year. Now, I am not prepared—I never have been prepared—although I voted last year, and voted to-day against the continuance of the *Debates*, for reasons with which I need not trouble the House—I have never been prepared to oppose any expenditure required in order to have the *Debates* efficient. I think that when a majority of the House say that there is to be an official report of the *Debates*, it is necessary to have an adequate official report. While I believe this vote is excessive, and while I fully expected that the hon. gentlemen who have been responsible for the expenditure of the country would have proposed, after the report of the committee was adopted by the House, that it should be reduced, I think the hon. member for Lanark has erred too much on one side, while I believe the hon. member for Cardwell errs in suggesting too small a reduction. I think if we utilise the services of the official reporters in the manner suggested, at least \$6,000 might properly be due to that circumstance. We cannot, of course, in one sense, regard that as a saving in the *Hansard*, but we may in another. It is really, and it ought to be, a transfer of the vote, so that instead of its being \$6,000 for the *Hansard* it ought to be \$6,000 for the use of the official reporters in work which it is suggested they might perform, or \$4,000, as the hon. member for Cardwell says, for work now done at the public expense by other reporters. I say, then, we may save \$4,000 in that way, and we may save another \$4,000 on the specific vote, by the reduction of the cost of printing and the number of copies as stated by the hon. member for Cardwell.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I desire to take the opportunity offered by the motion now before the House to call the attention of the *Debates* Committee on the expediency of granting a bonus to the gentlemen employed as translators. Everybody admits that the members of that staff are very efficient and that they do their work with great alacrity. This year, if I am well informed, the *Debates* will reach such enormous proportions that they will cover no less than 3,400 to 3,500 pages; which is more than double last year's edition, which only contained 1,400 pages. These gentlemen only receive \$1,000 per year, and when they accepted that salary they had to calculate on a Session of three months or four months at the most. As the Session will last about six months this year, I believe that under the circumstances the committee ought not to hesitate to recommend the granting of a liberal bonus to the translators.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) I believe that the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) apply perfectly well to the present circumstances. The French translators are only appointed for the Session, which does not generally exceed three or four months. The present Session has lasted nearly six months, and most assuredly it was not what they had in view when they accepted the position which they occupy as sessional clerks—because, they are sessional clerks—they are not on the same footing as the reporters, who are employed the year round. I believe that for this reason, this should also apply to the proof-readers.

Mr. HAGGART. At the suggestion of the hon. member for Cardwell, and with the permission of the House, I would amend the motion by inserting "\$40,000" instead of "\$36,411."

Resolution, as amended, concurred in.

Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories ..... \$680,831 45

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire of the First Minister what amount he expects to be obliged to expend on Indian affairs during the year 1886. These esti-

mates were prepared, as everybody knows, prior to the unfortunate disturbances in the North-West. In 1884 an expenditure of about \$1,100,000—I speak from memory—was incurred for this service, and in the year which closed on the 1st July last, so far as I can judge, the expenditure must have very largely exceeded the amount asked for. It is doubtful whether the hon. gentleman will be able to confine the expenditure within the sum here named; and as we are now in the year 1885-86, I would like to know distinctly, as far as he can form an opinion, what he expects the expenditure will really be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is almost impossible for me to give any specific answer to that question. I do not anticipate, however, that the expenditure will be larger than the estimate. I do not think there will be any greater destitution in the coming year than there has been in the past. On the contrary, I think there will be a very considerable increase in the quantity of food raised on the different reserves. After all, we must consider that the disturbances on the Indian reserves have not extended very largely through the country. Of course, there must have been an interruption, to a lamentable extent, in the industries of the Indians of the North Saskatchewan; but that does not apply to the main mass of the Indian population. There has been also a great deal of disquietude. The Indians, like other masses of population, have been roused by the reports they have heard, and the false messages continually sent to them, as to the extent of the outbreak and the success of the half-breeds, which rendered them disturbed and discontented, and prevented them working steady on their reserves. But, on the whole, the reports are favorable; the Indians fairly apply themselves to the cultivation of the ground and to the raising of crops, principally of roots, but to no considerable extent of cereals. Therefore, I do not think there will be any greater destitution next year than there is now, while I am happy to believe, from the reports received, that the supplies raised by the Indians themselves will be considerably in excess of those raised last year. I believe, if it had not been for these local disturbances, the quantity would very largely exceed that of last year. I am getting reports now almost every day, and before the House rises I hope to be able to give a general statement regarding the different reserves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would not have made the remark, but for the fact that in the Supplementary Estimates for the year just passed the hon. gentleman demands \$324,850 in addition to the sum here asked for, making, in all, \$1,100,000 odd; and although I do not suppose the expenditure will exceed the sum expended in 1884-85, yet he would certainly require more than \$1,000,000.

Mr. MILLS. I would again call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the importance of having detailed statements showing the amount of produce raised on each reservation, and the amount the Indians receive at the various places, by way of gratuity, in order to prevent famine and starvation. It is only in that way that you can fix public attention on the work done by each individual farm instructor. It seems to me of great consequence that every farm instructor should feel that the eyes of the country are upon him, watching the result of his individual efforts. Of course, we should notice those who succeed and those who fail. When a farm instructor does not succeed, the first thing to consider is, whether the Indians have a reservation suited to agriculture, and if they have, whether they would do better by having the inspector changed. When the farm instructor feels that public attention is fixed upon him, his success will be much greater than if he is allowed to consider that he is merely a public official, and that the result will be the same, whether he succeeds or fails; and if he fails to induce the Indians to engage in agricultural pursuits, where the circumstances are favorable, he ought to be replaced by another man. Of course, the greater the success the less is the

charge upon the public Treasury. It would also be of greater advantage to the Department, and would add to the comfort of the hon. gentleman himself, if he had individual reports made and laid before Parliament, so that, when the Estimates are voted, we may see what each man is costing the country, and who is in charge of each particular Indian band.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I told the hon. gentleman the other night, I think, when discussing the same question, that I quite agreed with him, and I gave instructions at once to have the reports prepared, so far as they are to be found in the Department, respecting the work of each individual band, and I propose to lay them before the House during the present Session. I do not know if that can be done very perfectly, but it will be done as well as the information at headquarters will allow. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it should appear in the Annual Report of the Indian Department, so that the conduct and the results of the labor of the different officers would be laid before Parliament. That will be a great additional check and an incentive to improvement. I also agree with the hon. gentleman that the office was not made for the farm instructors, but for the Indians, and wherever a farm instructor is not found to succeed, he is dismissed. Though he may have every desire to do his work, he may not be capable of impressing his individuality and his power of teaching on the Indians. Even in the case of ordinary school teachers, a school master may be really a good scholar and yet not have the power of conveying instruction to the pupils. We have, without any remorse, removed men who, either from temper or want of ability, were unsuccessful in getting on with the Indians. They are not made civil servants; there is no permanence in their appointment. We can always get rid of a man who has not been successful; he will pay the full penalty of want of success, by being removed; but if he is a respectable man, and has done his best, a small gratuity will be given him. It is important to get men to hold this appointment who are accustomed to the Indian character, and have been in the country some time. At first, those could not be got, but now we can get men sufficiently acquainted with the Indians to have influence with them and be able to impart knowledge to them. If they can learn the language, so much the better, but I do not think the process of learning the Indian language has gone on so rapidly as we would wish. There is a difficulty in moving the Indians from the reserves. Their reserves were originally given under treaty, and it is with great difficulty we can get them to give up reserves. Originally, these reserves were chosen to meet the views of the Indians. They had to be coaxed into a treaty, and selected their own locality, the lands where the bones of their ancestors lie being their favorite reserves. We have, with success, induced them to change, and to surrender that immense area running along the South Saskatchewan, one mile on each side, which they were to have for ten years. That was found an almost insupportable barrier to the settlement of the country, and the Indians have been induced to surrender that very large section and to take up separate reserves. These Indians are Blackfeet and Bloods, but though belonging to the one great nation, they do not get on very well together, and we have to put them on separate reserves. With respect to the discussion raised by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), about the tender for agricultural implements, I have a note stating that the Department calls for these articles, John Deer ploughs, the Chatham waggon, and the Paris lump sugar, delivered at different points in Manitoba and the North-West, and therefore there is competition between those who have better means of transport than the manufacturers. The hon. gentleman called the attention of the committee to an advertisement of the Chatham waggon

Mr. MILLS.

that crept into the forms of tender, but it did not appear in the advertisement in any way, so that the puff, if it were a puff, did not go to the public. It only went to those who were competing for these waggons.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman state what kind of surveys are to be made in British Columbia, in what part of the railway belt they are to be made, and what the Government intend to accomplish by those surveys?

Mr. McLELAN. They are arranging for a general survey of the belt.

Mr. MILLS. Surely the hon. gentleman does not intend to survey the whole of the belt in British Columbia within this year?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. MILLS. Where are the surveys to be?

Mr. McLELAN. We intend to take observations and to run lines which will be the base of the whole system of surveys.

Mr. BLAKE. Where are these base lines to be run?

Mr. McLELAN. They are taking observations so as to fix the points of latitude and longitude. Having established astronomical points, they will be able to survey the whole belt, and I think the principal surveys this year will be from Port Moody eastward.

Mr. MILLS. Is the hon. gentleman doing anything more this year than making an astronomical survey to fix the latitude and longitude, or is he going to do a good deal more of the survey? Does this astronomical survey connect with the survey east of the Rocky Mountains, or is it an independent survey?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to say. I shall be able to give that information more fully when the Supplementary Estimates are before us.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman agrees that the discussion shall take place on the Supplementary Estimates, I will postpone some remarks which I had to make, especially as a return on the subject has just been laid before us, which I have not been able to read.

Mr. WATSON. The Acting Minister proposed at this stage to answer my question in reference to the appointment of Louis Schmidt.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the information here.

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

#### After Recess.

To pay gratuity to the widow of the late C. McMannus,  
guard at Kingston penitentiary ..... \$670 30

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister was to ascertain what the rule was with regard to that particular item.

Mr. BOWELL. When this officer resigned, in April, 1883, it was proposed to give him a gratuity of one month's salary for each year's service. He went into the service in 1853. Before the gratuity had been voted he died. Then the usual gratuity of two months' salary was given to the widow, and the Minister of Justice recommended to Council that the balance of the full amount of the gratuity of one month's salary for each year of service should be paid to the widow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister ascertained that the rule was for two or three years, as the case might be; that it did not stop at one year?

Mr. BOWELL. No. The rule has been, that where an officer retired from ill-health, and was not of sufficient age to

be superannuated, he is given a month's salary for each year he has been in the service. Sometimes they are not given the full amount, while in other cases they are simply given one year's salary as gratuity—sometimes only six months. This was the ground of the recommendation in the present case by the Minister of Justice.

#### ORDERS DISCHARGED.

The following Orders were discharged :—

House in committee on Bill (No. 4) to provide for the distribution of Assets of Insolvent Debtors.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

House in committee to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting the remuneration of revising officers, and of their clerks and bailiffs, who may be appointed under the Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Mr. CARLING moved the discharge of Order for second reading of Bill (No. 151) respecting the Ocean Mail Service.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to say that I trust the intimation of the First Minister, which he made the other day, that this course would be taken, is not to be understood as meaning that there is any understanding with Mr. Allan that he is to make arrangements for the construction of fast steamers, upon the theory that this contract proposed to be ratified by this Bill is thereafter to be ratified, or upon any arrangement for some other and different contract. I have already stated, and I do not desire to enter into the discussion now, that it is of great consequence that efforts should be made, if a fixed subsidy is to be given, to secure the services, at a comparatively low price, of other lines, and that it is of perhaps still greater consequence to make arrangements by which fast steamers of the various lines would be utilised. While agreeing entirely in the view that we should not proceed to ratify the proposed contract this Session, I hope that the time which will elapse between this and next Session will be utilised so as to frame a satisfactory proposition, based on the suggestions which have been thrown out, rather than that the House should be asked to ratify next Session this proposed contract, with some minor improvements, which may be made in consequence of the disfavor in which the proposed contract is generally viewed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say is this, that this matter, when Parliament meets again, will stand just as it stands now.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

#### SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions :—

1. That it is expedient to provide that there shall be paid to the senior puisné judge of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, residing at Quebec, if the Chief Justice resides at Montreal, or to the senior puisné judge residing at Montreal, if the Chief Justice resides at Quebec, an annual salary of \$1,000, in addition to his other salary.

2. That such salary shall be paid out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

He said: The object of this Bill is to place the senior puisné judge of the Superior Court in the same position with regard to salary as the Chief Justice. It is known, Sir, that practically there are two systems of jurisprudence and judiciary in the Province of Quebec, the centre of one being in Montreal and the centre of the other in Quebec. They have a different judiciary in Quebec and a different bar. It so happens that there is only one Chief Justice of the Superior Court, but from the peculiar constitution of the courts in the Province of

Quebec, if the Chief Justice of the Superior Court belongs to one bar and presides over one bench, the senior justice in the other district holds the position and performs the duties of a chief justice; in fact, the senior puisné judge is in every regard, excepting as to title, the Chief Justice of the Superior Court for the particular district in which he may be. It is proposed, therefore, that he shall have the salary of a chief justice. It is proposed that if the senior judge of the Superior Court presides in Montreal, he shall have the salary while the Chief Justice is in Quebec, and *vice versa*. It is so reasonable a proposition that I think it is only necessary to state it to get the assent of the House. There are only two Chief Justices in the Province of Quebec, while we have four in the Province of Ontario. I need not speak of the merits or demerits of the senior judge of the Superior Court of Montreal. I simply move the resolutions on the general question that there are, in fact, two Chief Justices, one presiding in Montreal and the other in Quebec, and that, as they perform the same duties and are under the same responsibilities, he should have the same salary.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain what special duties, additional to those performed by the other puisné judges of this court, the senior puisné justice performs?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The senior judge of Montreal at this moment, performs all the duties that a chief justice performs elsewhere. He presides in the court, he takes the initiative, and acts otherwise as a chief justice of a court would act—the hon. gentleman quite understands the duties and position of a chief justice, as contra-distinguished from those of a puisné judge. He guides and controls, so far as a chief justice guides and controls, the general practice in a court. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, reminds me that in the Province of Quebec he has to regulate the work of the judges of the Superior Court throughout the Province. If a judge is ill or is away, and it is necessary to make arrangements for the performance of the duties throughout his district or section of the Province, he selects the judges, and there is thrown upon him the responsibility for the performance of those duties.

Mr. BLAKE. I had supposed, and I think it has been stated on former occasions, that those duties, which are not unimportant, the duties of arranging who shall perform the work among the puisné judges, are duties which are performed by the Chief Justice of that court, and not by the senior puisné justice in Montreal. I thought that the Chief Justice, wherever he presided, performed those duties. I think the senior puisné justice has no statutory title to perform any of those duties, and I had not heard that he performed any extra duties beyond those performed by the junior puisné judges of the court. In fact, the hon. gentleman, in explaining his position, seemed to be in exactly the same predicament as a certain great clerical dignitary, who, on being asked what were the functions of an archdeacon, said his functions were archidiaconal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought of that story.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; I thought when I saw the hon. gentleman's smile, that his explanation must have reminded him of it.

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi). It is true that before the Session of 1884 of the Quebec Legislature, the functions of the Chief Justice in the district of Montreal were performed there by the senior judge by courtesy and gratuitously, and had been so performed for many years, but in 1884 the Quebec Legislature passed an Act declaring, in express terms, that whenever the Chief Justice resided in the district of Quebec the functions of a chief justice should be performed by the senior puisné judge at Montreal, and *vice versa*; so that we have direct

legislative authority for the arrangement which at present exists in the district of Montreal, and those functions have been discharged since the month of June 1884, by the senior puisné judge.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they archidiaconal functions?

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi). Well, his functions are, perhaps, not very onerous, but they are very responsible. He has the duty of presiding in the Court of Review, and generally in the Superior Court in the district of Montreal. Beyond that, he has entire control of the judicial force in the district of Montreal. It is not, since the passage of that Act of the Quebec Legislature, confined to the Chief Justice; the senior judge in Montreal has his specific duties to perform, and it is only right that Parliament should provide for the payment for those duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to raise any question as to the propriety of this addition to the salary of the judge in question; I do not know anything about the matter which would warrant me in objecting to this step; but I would call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that he, if I am not mistaken, has again and again held out hopes to a deserving class of judges in the Province of Ontario that he would raise their salaries, and I think the whole question of the salaries of the judges ought to be considered at the same time. I think those gentlemen who are acquainted with the duties performed by the county judges in Ontario are of opinion that those gentlemen are very greatly underpaid. We are going to increase their duties by the legislation of this Session, and I think that when steps are being taken to raise the salaries of the judges in other Provinces, the case of those gentlemen ought to be considered.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the position of the county court judges ought to be considered. In days past I have been considered by the county judges their special friend, because I have raised their status and their salaries to their present position; but I do not think that that matter is at all connected with this subject, which relates to the salary of a man who is performing the duties of Chief Justice of a Superior Court, and is recognised by law as such. The other question is a separate question. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that at the proper time, which is not this time, in my opinion, the case of the county court judges in Ontario—the common Province of the hon. gentleman and of myself—should be considered. Meanwhile, many of them will be revising officers, and in that position will receive a considerable addition to their salaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the case was up, I thought that the case of men whose claims were denied because you could not consider their case without considering that of others, might fairly be considered on this occasion.

Resolutions considered in Committee and reported.

#### THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST— RECOGNITION OF VOLUNTEERS' SERVICES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 3321) to authorise the granting of land, or scrip redeemable in land, to the members of the enrolled militia force actively engaged in suppressing the half-breed and Indian outbreak in the North-West. He said: I think the House, on both sides, will be in accord with the general spirit of these resolutions. We all agree that the services of our citizen soldiery, who have left their homes and their hearths in order to fight the battles of the country in the North-West, and to restore peace, order and law, where disorder and insurrection existed, should be duly acknow-

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi).

ledged. These resolutions are offered with that purpose; and they are offered with the secondary purpose of opening up that country to the young men of that soldiery who have seen the North-West, who know its advantages, and who may, perhaps, take a liking to the country and desire to settle there. It is of great importance, too, I think, to that country and to the whole Dominion, that a considerable portion of that body should take up their habitation in the North-West, to which they have gone as loyal soldiers and as supporters of the supremacy of the law and of the Government of Canada, as it is constituted. Still, it is more than probable that a very considerable portion of the militia force now on duty in the North-West may not desire to settle there, and may return to their homes; and yet we must make some acknowledgment, in my opinion and in the opinion of the Government, of their invaluable services. Every one of them who happens to settle there has the same rights as any other settler to have a quarter section of 160 acres free, except by paying the entry fee of \$10. We think that besides those 160 acres, which any one of them could get of right as a settler, together with a pre-emption right to a quarter section contiguous to the homestead, they should have that as a second homestead; so that their homestead should be 320 acres instead of 160, and for those 320 acres they should receive their patent, free of all fees or charges. The resolutions provide that they are to have a certain period to make up their minds whether they shall become settlers or not. Those who do not choose to become settlers, but who return to their homes in the older Provinces, instead of getting 320 acres, shall get scrip for 80 acres, simply as an acknowledgment by the country of their services, and the scrip will be received in payment for Crown lands, or as dues for timber or grazing lands. The resolutions provide that in case, after due consideration, the soldier chooses to settle, he can do that in person or by substitute. The present system does not allow of a substitute. A man who goes to settle must himself choose his own homestead, enter his own name, work it for three years, and at the end of three years he gets his patent. It is thought that some of the militiamen coming home may at first make up their minds to settle in the North-West, and then find they cannot conveniently do so. It will give them an opportunity, which is not given to other settlers, of choosing a substitute. They may make what arrangement with a substitute they please. The militiaman has the right to get his 320 acres, free of everything, or transfer it to some substitute; but if he sends a substitute, he is not to keep the land in his own name and have a tenant there, because that is a system liable to lead to an evasion of the present system, which is, that the land should be actually settled by the owner. If he chooses to reside in Ontario or Quebec, or Nova Scotia, he may do so, and he can dispose of the 320 acres to a substitute, who goes out there and becomes an actual settler, the land being entered in his own name, and being himself personally responsible to carry out all the conditions of a homesteader. That is the purview, the intention of the resolutions, the spirit of them, and I am quite sure they will be accepted by the whole House. The resolutions have a two-fold object. First, that there should be a substantial recognition, beyond the mere daily pay of the militiamen who went to the North-West to fight our battle, of their services, by making them grants of land, or scrip, if they do not want to have the land, and at the same time making a distinction between the men who will not settle there and the men who will. The man who does not, but who returns home, gets scrip equivalent to 80 acres; the man who goes there and settles there gets 320 acres. That is the system which, after full consideration, the Government have resolved to press on the approval of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not rise to say a word on the details of the proposal which, I think, will be more fitly discussed

in committee, and I should be sorry to conjoin one of the observations I shall have to make in the committee with the words I have to say on this occasion, which, as the House will understand from the question I put some time ago, is simply to express my approval of the hon. gentleman's proposition, that a substantial reward be offered to the volunteers. I think that our citizen soldiery, to use the hon. gentleman's phrase, occupy a position wholly different from that which the permanent soldiery of other Governments occupy. We cannot ignore the character of their engagement, the circumstances under which they enlist, the material sacrifices they make, when they are obliged to go out on active service, and all of these call on us to join in the endeavor to frame a plan by which there will be a material and substantial recognition of the services they have rendered us in the North-West.

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

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. WATSON. I heartily concur in the proposition of the Government to recognise the services of the volunteers in this substantial manner. I would suggest, however, to the First Minister, that there should be some provision made to the volunteers who have gone to the front from Manitoba, and who already occupy land, and would prefer other arrangements, rather than have to take up more land, inasmuch as a great many of them own 160 acres homesteads, and have pre-emptions of 160 acres. Those pre-emptions, of course, are not paid for yet, and I know that a change made, by which those volunteers would be allowed to get a free patent of the half section they occupy, would be much more appreciated than the privilege of taking up other land. These volunteers would only receive \$80 each, if they did not wish to take up other lands. This scrip is worth about 75 cents on the dollar.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It ought to be worth a dollar.

Mr. WATSON. I may inform the hon. Minister that half-breed scrip is selling in the west at 76 cents on the dollar, and the scrip given to the volunteers would not be worth more. In the case of Capt. Brown, who was shot at Batoche—he was one of Bolton's scouts—that gentleman had fulfilled the conditions of the Homestead Act, but had not received the patent for his homestead and pre-emption, for the simple reason that he had not paid for his pre-emption. In such a case as that, I should suggest that the patent should issue free, as I suggest it should issue in the case of a homesteader who has already received his land.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These resolutions contain a general proposition affecting all the militia. It would be quite impossible to amend them so as to meet every possible case. The case of those who have fallen in battle or in disease consequent on the hardships of the campaign; the case of men who have, through any circumstances whatever, during the course of the campaign, special claim and special reason for desiring variation of these general propositions, will be duly considered. But you can quite see that it would be impossible for us to frame a series of resolutions, and amend them in order to meet every possible case, or even every individual case which may occur within the cognisance of any hon. member. The general principle being laid down, it will, of course, take some little time before this can be carried out. I think it will take this summer. We will have to get the rules from each board duly certified by the commanding officer of the regiment, according to whatever system may be adopted by the Militia Department, and after their claims are substantiated, there will be the warrant to be issued, as a matter of course, under the Dominion Lands Act, the

militia bounty warrant; then the individual has to choose his lot or to declare that he does intend to be a settler. All that will take some little time. That will take this summer and autumn; and, when we get the general principle of granting these lands or scrip in lieu of lands to the main body of the volunteers or militiamen on service, then we can take up the special cases that will be represented to the Department, and you may depend upon it that the House on both sides will have sufficient confidence in the Government to say that they will look carefully at every individual case with the utmost liberality and with due regard to the great services of the men, to the losses in case of death or permanent injury, and to the state of the families of those who have been cut off. I think we had better carry the resolutions generally, leaving special cases to be dealt with specially.

Mr. WATSON. I only mentioned this as a case which might come up, and I am pleased to hear that the Government will give their favorable consideration to such cases. I did not expect that the resolutions would be formed to meet any special cases of that kind, but there should be no objection to make the resolutions meet the case of the volunteers in Manitoba who have homesteads. That would cover a large number of men. There must be 1,500 men enrolled in the active service there, and I suppose half of them are farmers and homesteaders, and probably one-fourth of them hold pre-emptions which are not paid for. That being the case, I think the First Minister could put in a provision for these homesteaders. It is rather general than particular, and I think, if they wish to avail themselves of this provision, they should be allowed to do so. I think these volunteers in Manitoba should receive special consideration when they own homesteads and pre-emptions, and for this reason; they have gone to the front, and this year they will not have any crops in, and they will suffer more than the volunteers who went from the east, many of whom were young men, who, of course, lost their salaries, but not the whole year's profits; but these farmers, who are unable to put in their crops, will lose one year of their farming operations, and I think it would be a fair condition, in return for their services, to provide that those homesteaders who have pre-emptions which are not paid for, and that should be paid for, should receive a patent for the 320 acres.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not understand my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) to propose that these resolutions should meet exceptional cases, but I understood him to make a very reasonable suggestion as to the general ground upon which the resolutions should be based. The First Minister has said that we have to deal with the general principle, and that he will be liberal in dealing with particular cases; but he cannot deal more liberally than the law allows him, and we should see that the law will allow him to deal with these cases. The proposition we are now on contains a terminal statement, to which I do not object, that this grant shall be made in such a shape that it shall be conducive to the settlement of the public lands, and that is the motion on which you propose to give some larger inducements, if only it suits the position of the volunteer himself to settle, or will enable him to give large inducements to somebody else whom he may love or with whom he may make a bargain. But you are dealing with two classes of volunteers. There is a very important class of these volunteers, in point of numbers, who have settled upon land and are homesteaders in the North-West. You cannot say that they are to settle the public lands, because they are already there, doing the very thing you want them to do, and therefore you cannot apply to them the stimulus to make a new settlement that you can to a man from the east, who had gone up there, and is willing, either himself or by means of a friend, to become a settler

in the North-West. The question then is, in reference to that large class, which may comprise in all 1,400, or 1,500 men, of whom a considerable proportion—of course, a large number were from Winnipeg and other centres of population—are homesteaders; and I suppose there are several hundreds of homesteaders among them, whether you will apply to those who are homesteaders and actual settlers the measure of relief by which they could take advantage of your benevolence, would it not be the nearest analogy to the case of the others if you were to say that they might have their pre-emption free, and that that should be their reward? Of course, it is no inducement to tell them they may have another pre-emption. Indeed, they will have only a Hobson's choice; they must take the \$80 of scrip, and that is all you give them. The second observation I have to make is, that the reward in money or money's worth which you propose to give them in scrip is of very doubtful advantage. When my hon. friend informed the First Minister that scrip was now selling at 76 cents, the hon. gentleman said it ought to be worth \$1. It is no use discussing what it ought to be worth; the question is, what it is worth, and the value will be less when you throw some hundreds of thousands of dollars more upon the market. The law of supply and demand must affect the price, and the result of giving this scrip, in addition to the amount of scrip to be issued in satisfaction of the half-breed claims, will be, that the volunteer will not get the \$80, probably not more than \$60 out of the \$80; the public will lose the \$80; and the speculators will get the difference between \$60 and \$80. The speculators in land scrip will make the whole profit. This scrip is \$80 of loss to the State, but it is not \$80 of profit to the volunteer. If, therefore, you are going to give a commodity, which, at the present moment, is worth only about \$60, which, by the very fact of your arranging for a very large additional issue will be probably worth less than \$60 to the volunteer, which will just give a margin of profit to the speculators, and which will give the volunteer something between \$50 and \$60, I think it would be better to give him the alternative of taking a smaller sum in cash; let him take scrip if he chooses, but let him have, if he prefers, that smaller sum in cash, which will be to him more than he will get by means of the scrip.

Mr. MILLS. I think there is no difficulty in carrying out the suggestion made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), with reference to those who have already taken up lands in the North-West Territory. The hon. gentleman knows the plan that was adopted before, when military warrants were issued to the volunteers in 1871. Now, those who did not wish to go into the country were allowed by the Government so much cash in lieu of lands. If the hon. gentleman were to make a similar arrangement, so that the man who is already in possession of a homestead, and who has pre-empted 160 acres, could deposit with the Government his warrant for the 160 acres, and it would be accepted as payment for the lands of which he is already in possession, that would be just as well for the Government and very much better for the individual; because he does not want more land, and it is not in the public interest that he should take more land, when he is already a new settler upon lands that belong to the Crown. It is therefore of consequence to the Government that we should not compel a party to take an additional 160 acres when he is already in possession of as much as he can well deal with. If, then, he does not wish to take an additional 160 acres, it would be better for the public and it would be better for the individual that he should have an opportunity of tendering his bounty warrant for his 160 acres of land to the land agent, and that it should be accepted in payment of the pre-emption of which he is already in possession.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, I am not at all prepared to recommend that instead of scrip there should be money given to the soldiers. They will come and receive their \$50, or \$70 or \$80, and it will be a serious charge on the Treasury; many of these volunteers are young men, and it will be an inducement to them to take the money at once, rather than become settlers. I do not think that we ought to offer an inducement to them against remaining in the country. Young men are young men, and when you tell them: You will get so much money at once if you do not choose to settle, a good many of them will be very apt to take it. But I have already said it is the object of the Government, in proposing these resolutions, first, to make a substantial recognition of the services of the volunteers; and, in the second place, to encourage them to become settlers. They will be most valuable settlers; they are men trained to be soldiers, who have come up there and shown their loyalty, and who will be most valuable stand-bys, every one of them a centre of law and order in the North-West. It will be a great thing to get them to settle there; they will be most invaluable, not only for their services as settlers and agriculturists, but as men who have served the country, and who will be ready to serve it again. Therefore, we ought not, by offering them a small payment in money, to hold out an inducement to them not to return. And there is this substantial objection, that it will be a most serious inroad upon the public revenues to provide for four, or five, or six thousand men—whatever the number may be—who take their money instead of settling upon the lands. The other question which has been raised is a more substantial one, that is to say, that the scrip shall be allowed to be used in payment of all kinds of land. The two regiments that went into the field in the North-West, besides the artillery corps, should stand precisely in the same position as the volunteers from the east. If they want additional land they can have it; if they do not, if they have land enough already, they ought to stand exactly in the same position as the volunteers from Ontario. If they do not want the land they will take the scrip; if they do want the land they can get it, and they cannot only get it, but they have special advantages: the volunteers who went from Winnipeg will have special advantages over their comrades from the east, because they are at Winnipeg; they see settlers coming in, and they can get hold of a substitute for the whole 320 acres. With the eastern volunteers the chance of doing so is not so certain. The militiaman, for instance, going from Quebec, as the 9th Regiment of Quebec, may not find a substitute at all, and he may be obliged to take the scrip for \$80. But the soldiers of the two regiments and the corps of artillery at Winnipeg can always get a substitute, can always make an arrangement, and they have a great "pull," to use a common expression, on their comrades in the east. I do not think we can make a distinction between those soldiers who start from Winnipeg, make a distinction in their favor, as against the volunteers of Quebec, or even Toronto. Then with regard to the issue of scrip: if the hon. gentleman will look at the third resolution, it provides this:

"That any person entitled under the foregoing to select and enter, either by himself or by his substitute, 320 acres of land as a homestead, in the manner and subject to the terms and conditions hereinbefore prescribed, may, in lieu thereof, if he so chooses, receive scrip for \$80, which shall be accepted in payment of any Dominion lands open for sale, or in payment of pre-emptions or of rents of Dominion lands leased for grazing or hay-cutting purposes."

So that if it does not suit the volunteer living in Winnipeg to go and get his 320 acres more, he gets his \$80 of scrip, and that he can pay in upon lands he has bought upon pre-emption. I believe it will not do to draw any distinction; they must be put exactly on the same footing, whether they come from Winnipeg, or Quebec or Halifax.

Mr. WATSON. I do not for a moment suggest that a distinction should be drawn between the volunteers from Winnipeg and the volunteers from the east; far from it. I believe the volunteers from the east should receive fully as valuable consideration as those from the west. But young farmers, who are living on the land, who have all the land they can occupy, and who are not in a position to hire a substitute to hold their land for them, if they do not receive that, they only receive \$80. A great number of these young men are not in the best of circumstances; they may have to pay for their homesteads inside of six months; some of them are past due, and it will be a great relief to these young volunteers who have sacrificed one year's farming operations in going to the front. It is on behalf of those young men I am advocating that they should receive a free deed of the lands they occupy, instead of having to pay for them, as the Dominion Lands Act requires. It should be provided in the Bill that a volunteer who is in occupation of a homestead or pre-emption should have a right to receive a patent for his pre-emption in lieu of those other considerations for volunteers who have not homesteads or pre-emptions. My remarks are not made with reference to individuals in Winnipeg, but simply with regard to young farmers who have gone to the front.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Just consider how that would work out. One of the volunteers has got a homestead, and has agreed to pay \$2 an acre for the pre-emption, and it is proposed to make him a present of the pre-emption. He will get the \$2 an acre, and the man in the east will get \$80. It would never work out.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman is speaking of a man who is to receive \$80 in scrip, and I am talking of a man who has a homestead in the country. I do not see that a pre-emption already located should be worth anything more than one that is to be located. There should not be any difference. This seems to be rather like taking advantage of a man who happens to be so placed as not to be able to take up a second homestead or pre-emption, for in such a case he would only receive \$80 in scrip when another volunteer would have the right to receive 160 acres.

On resolution 2,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am inclined to think it would be better to extend the time a little. I would not care to extend it indefinitely, but 1st June is not a very convenient time. Almost all those persons now bearing arms in the North-West reside in Old Canada, and are likely to return immediately for various reasons. If they should go up to the North-West to select land, it would probably be in the spring of next year, and there would be considerable difficulty in their making a selection by 1st June if the season happened to be wet or the winter happened to be late. The Minister knows well that it will not be convenient for most of those who would like to avail themselves of this opportunity to remain in the Province at the present time, and probably they would not care to go up till next spring.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I gather from the remarks of the First Minister that his real object is to get the settlers. Looking at it from that point of view, I believe that the limited time would tend very much to prevent that object being gained. Most of the volunteers are now on their way home. They made arrangements at home before leaving, and it will not be convenient for them to immediately return to the North-West, and the 1st June will come very quickly in the North-West. I can see no disadvantage likely to arise from extending the time, and I believe the result of doing so would be largely to induce settlement rather than taking scrip. The time being limited, it offers peculiar inducements to accepting \$80 scrip instead of making settlement. The volunteers, being on their way home, can hardly return this

season. Furthermore, I suppose they could go in advance of the warrants, but perhaps it would suit them better to have documents in their possession, showing they are entitled to make the location. If that be the case, a considerable time must necessarily elapse before they can be put in possession of the warrants. Returns must be made by the commanders, and there must be identification and other matters gone through. This will throw it too late in the season. They should start again in early spring, so as to have ample time to look over that very extensive country and make locations. I therefore think it would be far better if the time were extended, so as to give the entire season.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first decision of the Government was to fix 1st January, 1886, as the time within which these persons should make up their minds whether they would take scrip or become settlers; but after due consideration, we thought, using the argument of the hon. gentleman, that the time had better be extended to 1st June, 1886. It is of very great importance that these matters should not be hanging indefinitely, but that we should get the people up there. While we had thought that 1st January was suitable, yet we finally decided that the time should be extended to 1st June. Surely, in regard to those men who have been in the North-West, to give them a whole year in which to make up their minds whether they would take scrip or become settlers, is not an insufficient time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point is not as to their becoming settlers, but as to their selecting particular portions of land.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no objection, with the consent of the House, of changing the date from 1st June to 1st August, which would give them the whole season. We cannot hang this question up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is reasonable enough.

Resolution amended, by inserting 1st August in place of 1st June.

On resolution 3,

Mr. WATSON. I would suggest that at the end of this resolution, the following be inserted:

Any member of the said enrolled militia who has located a homestead and pre-emption shall, in lieu of the grant hereinbefore mentioned, be entitled to get his pre-emption free.

He said: I think it is nothing but fair that such a provision should be made, as it is simply giving them the privilege of keeping land which they have got already, instead of taking other land, which he may have to locate. He could move off and take up the land through another, as he has the right to do, by having a substitute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This provision is impossible. It would be a cause of discontent among all the volunteers, except a few corps in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman says it is only 160 acres, but it is more than that, because the pre-emptions are \$2 an acre, and the Manitoba volunteers would get \$320 instead of \$80, as the others get.

Mr. WATSON. I do not propose that at all. There are no pre-emptions now at less than \$2 per acre, and the hon. gentleman proposes to give 320 acres as a homestead. They get 160 acres free, and why should those who are able to take up a second homestead be entitled to receive \$320, while the man who cannot do that, but has a pre-emption only, receives \$80 in scrip.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the same with an eastern volunteer; if he cannot get the land, he gets scrip.

Mr. WATSON. These men, when able, can come back and prosecute their ordinary callings, but there are many of these other men have lost their whole year's work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Have not the men from the east lost their work?

Mr. WATSON. There are very few of the volunteers from the east who are farmers. I do not think there are half-a-dozen who have neglected putting in their spring crop.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You don't know anything about it.

Resolutions reported as amended.

On motion for concurrence in the resolutions,

Mr. WATSON. I now move that the resolutions be not now concurred in, but be referred back, to make the amendment which I read in committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that is out of order. There can be no increase of this kind without the Crown's consent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is rather a strained construction of the rule. It is a substitute, and not an additional grant.

Mr. MILLS. I submit that this is doing no more than the hon. gentleman has recommended to the House by the resolutions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After receiving the assent of the Crown.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman proposes to give 160 acres of the public domain away, and he has, I suppose, obtained the consent of the Crown to that proposition. Now, these other parties have already homesteads, and they say, instead of compelling them to take up an additional homestead, when they receive this gift of a pre-emption of land the pre-emption lands given shall be those attached to the homestead already taken up. There is no additional charge or burden. It is another 160 acres, but still it is no more.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, it is a little provoking to hear arguments of that kind, when it is so plain. The hon. gentleman wants that every Manitoba volunteer who happens to have a homestead, and if he has got a pre-emption or the promise to pay \$320, for which he is a debtor to the Crown, that he shall get a present of that \$320 instead of \$80.

Mr. WATSON. It is simply to replace the homestead which the hon. gentleman proposes to give by the pre-emption which I propose they should get.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be a direct injustice to the volunteers of Ontario, Quebec and other Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. I take it that the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is simply that it gives to the volunteers in Winnipeg and Manitoba, who happen to have homesteads already, an advantage over the volunteers in all other parts of the Dominion. That should not be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, however, does not affect the point of order; that is another affair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question of order is not a very easy one to decide. The land which is now offered to the volunteers is 160 acres of any lands in the North-West Territories open for homestead and pre-emption entry, and it is now stated in the amendment that it shall be 160 acres which he has himself pre-empted.

An hon. MEMBER. That is not open.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. SPEAKER. No. The question is, can the alteration be made without the special consent of the Crown. I think that the land has been pre-empted as a sort of debt to the Crown, and this would be giving \$160 or 160 acres of land, and therefore I think it is such a material change as should be recommended.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is wiping out a debt.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; it is wiping out a debt of 320 acres by giving \$160.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in all cases, because some of these pre-emptions are \$1 an acre—for instance, in Belt 1.

Mr. SPEAKER. That just shows that there are different cases in which there have been pre-emptions, and therefore it is an addition.

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry that the hon. First Minister cannot see fit to adopt this proposal, and even if it is declared out of order, to get a Message to allow it. It seems to me nothing but fair, and it is taking no undue advantage of the volunteers in the east. They have a right to take up lands in the west, and the volunteers in the west have a right to take up their land. I am very sorry the First Minister puts the construction he does upon this matter. I do not wish to take any undue advantage of the volunteers in the east.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 160) respecting a grant of lands to the militia on service in Manitoba and the North-West.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### RAILWAYS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 158) to authorise the granting of further Subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the railways therein described.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said there was some change.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the third clause we insert the same provision that was put in the Subsidies Bill of last year, that this company cannot become amalgamated with the other.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have just remembered that I told the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) that it was not at all likely that this Bill would come on to-night, and I do not see him in the House. I do not think it would be fair to go on in his absence, and therefore I move that the committee rise, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BLAKE. I see by the papers that the hon. member for Halifax likes the Bill very much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLY—NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

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

Mr. WATSON. I beg leave to call the attention of the House for a very short time to a matter of some considerable

importance, which I expected would be dealt with before this date, but which, for some reason or other, has not been dealt with. I refer to a land grant for the North-West Central Railway, running to Rapid city, from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at Melbourne. I was much pleased, at the commencement of this Session, to see it announced in the Speech from the Throne that branch lines in the North-West should be aided by land grants, and I was also well pleased to see 6,400 acres a mile granted to the Manitoba and South-Western Railway and to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, but I regretted that at the same time the North-West Central Railway was not included. The original charter for this railway was granted in 1880, it being then known as the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. It was to start at a point in township 11, range 13, and was to run in a north-westerly direction to Battleford. The line was approved of in 1881 as far as Fort Ellice. In 1880 a land grant of 3,840 acres per mile, at \$1 per acre, was offered to this road; but, unfortunately, for some reason, the company, like other companies, was unable to proceed, and last Session the name of the railway was changed to the North-West Central Railway, and certain amendments to its charter were obtained by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), who is the president of the road, and who, I believe, has got the road into very good shape, to be proceeded with, if it is given a land grant the same as other railways. One strong reason why the Government should consider this road as one of the important branch lines of the North-West is that it runs over a section of country through which the original line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was located in 1879. In that year the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was surveyed to cross the Little Saskatchewan at Rapid city, and in consequence of that the country in that neighborhood settled up very rapidly and a town sprang up at the spot. Unfortunately, they want railway communication. They had hopes of having a railway, but now, when their expectations seemed to be on the eve of fulfilment, it seems that the Government will not make the free grant to this company, as they have to other companies. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs 22 miles north of Brandon and 18 miles south of Minnedosa, and there is ample room between those two for another railway. Very strong petitions have been presented to the Government, showing why aid should be granted, and as I happen to have a petition here similar to the one presented the other day, with 490 names attached, I will take the liberty of reading it to the House:

"The petition of the undersigned homesteaders along the proposed line of the North-West Central humbly sheweth:

"That whereas the majority of homesteaders located in this district, in consequence of assurance from the Government that the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be built on the 4th base line, between townships 12 and 13, and the publication of Government maps showing this to be its location;

"And whereas the settlers along the line, from Melbourne to Rapid city, assisted largely in the construction of the present grade between these points, by work done on the same, and the furnishing of supplies;

"And whereas, if the work is not proceeded with, these people will receive no compensation, although, in many instances, their claim against the old company amounts to more than \$1,000, which amounts farmers can ill-afford to lose;

"And whereas the injury done to the farms by having the grading made through them can never be repaired;

"And whereas many of the settlers have left, and others will be obliged to leave, if railway accommodation is not soon obtained;

"Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honorable body may see fit to give such aid, by way of free land grants, as will lead to the immediate construction of the said North-West Central Railway;

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

I believe the work between Melbourne and Rapid city cost in the neighborhood of \$100,000, \$42,000 is owing for labor and supplies on the road, about \$12,000 is due the merchants of Rapid city for supplies, and also \$30,000 due to the farmers along the line, between Melbourne and Rapid city. The line was graded two years ago with a good grade to lay a track on; and unless the Government come to the

relief of the company, those people to whom I have referred will be compelled to suffer a heavy loss. When the charter was granted a year ago, changing the name from the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway to the North-West Central, there was a provision put in the Bill which reads as follows:—

"The said Act incorporating the said Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and the Acts amending the same, are hereby continued in full force and effect, so far as the same are not inconsistent with anything in this Act contained and as amended hereby; and the said company, under the name hereby assigned to it, shall have a further period of one year and one-half from the passing of this Act for the completion or putting into running order of at least fifty miles of the said railway, commencing on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at Melbourne, or at such other point as the directors determine, with the sanction of the Governor General in Council.

I believe that one of the objections against giving a land grant to the North-West Central Company is that its line approached too closely to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Manitoba North-West Railway, and that there is not enough room between the two to warrant the Government giving the land grant. That is an unfair construction to put on this matter, for the Government granted a charter and approved of the location of the road some years ago, and in June, 1884, the Government passed an Order in Council increasing the land grant to this road as well as to others. The Government were aware of the location of the road, and approved of Melbourne as a starting point, and since that time have approved of Sydney, still further east, as a starting point, by Order in Council. Melbourne is accepted as the starting point by Order in Council, and you will see that any other point the directors may choose may be taken, provided it has received sanction of Order in Council. As far as Melbourne is concerned, however, the company have the power to start without an Order in Council. I might also state that the following clause is in the charter of the company: "The existing liabilities of the company for work done for the said company shall be a first charge on the undertaking." Under this Bill, the first charge on the new company is the liabilities of the old. It is nothing but fair the Government should come to the relief of this road, as it has done to others. No railway in the North-West stands in a better position, provided the same terms are given to it as to other railways. I know the president has a contract signed by a leading firm of contractors, who are willing to take the land grant and build the road. I believe the reason the president has been able to make such favorable terms is that the road runs through a settled country, that will pay for the operation of a local line, and I believe the settlers will be willing to bonus this company, in order to obtain its speedy construction. From the petition I have read from the settlers, it is evident they are in a desperate strait. They declare unless they get railway communication they will have to leave. It has been suggested the company might receive the land grant if they started further west; but if they did, it would be a great injustice to the people along the line, who have done the work and are anxiously waiting to see the line pushed forward. I might quote from the Rapid city *Standard* with reference to this matter, as showing the views of the settlers in that section of country. That paper says:

"The people along the proposed line of the North-West Central Railway have been deluded, year by year, with false hopes of railway communication; and now that they could be realised, if the Government gave a free grant, are they to be crushed forever?"

Those people feel that the Government have the power to aid them by giving them this free grant; and if the Government do not see their way to do that, those people will feel that they have been broken faith with. There was a petition presented, with a circular attached, on which there were 500 names, and the circular gave the names of 125 homesteaders who had left their homesteads because they

had not railway facilities. I maintain it is just as important to keep settlers in the country as to induce them to come into the country. It has been rumored through the press that there was some reason for the Government withholding this land grant; that one of the directors of the North-West Central Railway Company, the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), because he could not get matters as he wished, was opposing any aid being granted to this company. I hope the Government will not favor any such petition, but will look at the true interest of the settlers, and the pledges these people have received from the Government—even pledges by Order in Council, and repeated by other Orders in Council, which have been passed for years, referring to Rapid city as an objective point of that road, and Melbourne as the starting point. That being the case, the Government having made pledges and promises to these people, leading them to believe that the railway will be constructed along the 4th base line, within two miles of Rapid city, those people believed that the line would be so built. They are still in hopes that they may have railway communication if this land grant is given. This company have only about three months from the present date to commence the work, and have 50 miles in operation to Rapid city. I believe that could be done if they got the land grant, and can be done even at this late stage of the season. I hope the Government will see fit to give the same aid to the company that they have given to others. It might be stated that this section of country is near the North-Western Railway, but there is a range of sand hills, which it is impossible to make a road through, to get to the North-Western Railway. I think it is of the greatest importance that this matter should be attended to this Session. If not, I am afraid that the people will become disheartened. Some have already left and others threaten to leave. From Rapid city to Fort Ellice is one of the finest tracts of country in the North-West, all well settled, with a good class of farmers, some of whom have broken up 200 or 300 acres, and in some cases there are no less than 1,200 acres broken up. If they were receiving \$1 a bushel for their grain, they could take it to the railway, but when they are getting from 45 cents to 55 cents a bushel, it does not pay them to raise grain, when they have to take it so far to the market. The line has been graded for some distance now, and the work will be thrown away, unless it is speedily completed. I hope the Minister will see it to be his duty to bring down, at a very early day this Session, a proposition in aid of this railway.

Mr. McLELAN. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman has formally approved of this road. I had reason to fear that he would have taken a somewhat different course. When the proposition was made to give free grants of land to other colonisation roads in the North-West, conditions were sought to be imposed by the leader of the Opposition, which the Government believed would have rendered them inoperative. The hon. gentleman was not here at that time to aid the Government in carrying those resolutions through, and I was afraid he would not have given his hearty support to a grant for this road. The hon. gentleman is in error in supposing that any hon. member of this House has given any opposition to this grant. It is the policy adopted by the Government and sustained by the House that free grants shall be given to roads which tend to open any district for settlement, or to accommodate the settlers in any former settlement. This road is not wholly in a position of opening up a section of country that has not railway accommodation within a reasonable distance. The difficulties in aiding this road by a free grant of land are, first, that it runs between and almost parallel with the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the North-Western, already built for a considerable distance west, and

Mr. WATSON.

so close to both that it is almost in the position of a competing line with both. It is not for a considerable distance in the position of opening up a new country that is without railway facilities, and therefore it does not come under the provision upon which the Government and the House agreed to grant lands in aid of railways. Then there is another difficulty, namely, that it is so close to both, for a considerable distance westward, that the Government has not low land available for a free grant. It is either within the railway belt, where the Canadian Pacific Railway lands lie, or in the belt of the North-Western Railway, where the lands have been set apart for that road, or the lands have been taken up by settlers, or by persons who have acquired their patents by purchase or homestead. So that for a very considerable distance westward there is a want of lands, not only in proximity to two roads, but a want of lands to subsidise it westward. I have stated to the president of that company that if the road were started further west, or if it were continued upon the site which has been projected without grants of land, when it reached a position farther west, where the company already holds lands that could be appropriated to it, and when it reached a point far enough away that there would be a sufficient distance from the two roads already constructed, then it would be in a position to receive favorable consideration; and I believed my colleagues would be ready to follow the principle that has been adopted by the Government and the House, in reference to that part westward to Battleford. It is in this position: The president of the company took this matter into consideration, and asked me to stay a decision upon the matter, until he could consult with the shareholders, or some persons with whom he was in communication. I have but lately received his reply upon the matter; and having got his reply, the whole question is now under the consideration of the Government, and will be immediately decided.

Mr. HESSON. I have been honored with a good deal of correspondence from friends in the North-West, who settled along that road, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) said, many years ago, when there was a prospect of building the road on the original survey of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The tone of the telegrams I have received is much of the character that the hon. member for Marquette has stated to the House. But I must say that I regret that the hon. member should have brought this question up here. These matters are seldom brought to a satisfactory issue by the efforts of one single gentleman in the House, no matter how eloquent or able he may be, or how much he may be in the confidence of the Government. Had the matter been entrusted to myself, I should not have taken that course. However, as it has been brought before the House, I feel it my duty to say that I must endorse what he has stated, with reference to the feeling of the people in that section of the country. They feel that they have peculiar claims upon this Government, because the road was diverted from the original line, where they supposed it would run when they settled there. It is one of the most settled parts of Manitoba; without any doubt it is the garden of that country. I had almost said. I have here a printed list of something like 100 homesteaders who have vacated their lands after having been settled upon them for two or three years, and others will follow. It is said that at least twenty names have been omitted from this printed list, and that along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for a distance of 100 miles, there are many other settlers who have abandoned that part of the country because they cannot make farming pay. I am sorry to hear the Acting Minister of the Interior say that they consider now that that road is located too close to the Manitoba and North-Western. I have reason to believe, Sir, that a country capable of producing so largely as that country does,

of grain and stock, can be made profitable for another line of railway. A distance of 22 miles from Brandon to Rapid city is certainly far enough for any farmer to take his grain, and it is 18 miles on the other side to Minnedosa, where it strikes the North-Western. Now, the Government having granted a charter for that road, having promised a grant of land of so many thousand acres per mile, I think it now remains for the Government to carry out in good faith their pledges to the people. Had not land grants been made free, both as regards the South-Western branch and the Manitoba and North-Western branch, I do not suppose the managers or directors of the North-West and Central would have complained. But they have just reason to complain, and it is a fact that large expenditures have been made upon that road, some 50 miles of it being already graded, and it will be, to some extent, valueless, and the people of that part of the country are now lying out of the money that they have earned in performing that work. I understand that the contractors and managers of that road have pledged themselves to wipe out that liability. Now, let any member of this House consider for a moment what it means, that people settled in that part of the country, having accomplished a great deal of work on that road, should not only be disappointed in having the road built, but should also be lying out of their honest earnings for work they have accomplished while it was in progress. I trust that the Government will take the matter into their consideration, and that they will see that their obligation to settlers there are fulfilled. If by any chance the company which has undertaken the construction of the road should fail to carry out the undertaking it would be much better that the fault should rest with them than with the Government, for having refused in this case to grant what has been granted in all other cases. It would be wise that the Government should not be responsible for the delay in this work, or for driving away, as it appears it will do, a large number of settlers from that part of the country, who might otherwise be prospering and doing well. I say this because numerous letters and telegrams bearing out the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) have been sent to me; and knowing, as I do, the facts, having been over that portion of the road two years ago, when it was being graded, and knowing the settlers, I feel justified in expressing the hope that the Government will not make an exception in this case, but will carry out the rule of making the land a free grant to them. The Acting Minister of Interior has declared that there are no lands to give. It is sufficient discouragement to gentlemen undertaking this enterprise that they should have to go far away to obtain their land; and the least the Government can do is to grant them lands at as early a day as possible, when they will have a better opportunity of getting them in a reasonable position.

## SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway ..... \$699,384

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose is this sum required?

Mr. POPE. To pay Canadian Pacific Railway balance of arrangement respecting section "B" \$54,000; balance of award, Manning & Co., \$500,000. There is also an amount to pay balance due contractors on section "B."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has section "B" cost, from first to last, including the contract, the award and this sum, and whatever was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on taking it over.

Mr. POPE. As near as I can get at it, the sum will be about \$3,900,000.

Mr. MILLS. This is a fair opportunity to refer to a matter of very considerable importance. The hon. gentleman has just given us information more accurate than he is usually able to give us in regard to the Department of Railways and Canals. We know that that is not the Department for which the hon. gentleman holds a patent. He has a patent from the Crown as Minister of Agriculture and Immigration. The hon. gentleman is sworn to discharge the duties of that Department, of which he is Minister. The hon. gentleman is Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, although there is no Minister in charge of that Department, and we have, all through this Session, been obliged to content ourselves with the most scanty information, because there is no Minister responsible to discharge the administrative duties of the Department. It is true, under our system, it has become the practice sometime for one Minister to act in room of another, but there is always some Minister on whose behalf he acts. By a law passed by hon. gentlemen opposite, it is provided that there shall be a Minister of Railways and Canals, and hon. gentlemen have deliberately set aside the Statute providing for that office, by leaving it vacant for more than two years. The result has been, that we have been unable to obtain the information we require in connection with railways and canals, that information to which the House is entitled before it votes public money. Hon. gentlemen opposite either apparently acted wrongly in dividing the office of Public Works and taking away from the Minister of Public Works these duties. They advised His Excellency to sanction a certain law, and he has done so. They have told His Excellency that the law was necessary, that this office of Railways and Canals was necessary, that it was required in the public interest, and still they appointed as High Commissioner their colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and they left the office vacant from that date to this. It is true he was back here last Session, and took part in the proceedings of the House fourteen or fifteen months ago, but he was here attending his parliamentary rather than his administrative duties. He resigned his office, and from that time to this the office has been absolutely vacant, as before that it was practically vacant. This is a matter which requires the careful attention of the House and the Government. Here we have a Minister of Railways who has, from time to time, told us—what? "I do not know; I know nothing about the matter." The hon. gentleman may be better informed about his own Department, for which he is responsible, but here is a most important Department, for which he has no special responsibility, which involves the expenditure of millions of dollars every year, through which large liabilities are being incurred, and when the House asks for information, it is totally unable to obtain that information. I trust, Sir, that before the House rises the hon. gentleman will not be Acting Minister of Railways, but that there will be a real Minister of Railways, either the hon. gentleman himself, or some other hon. gentleman, who will be able to give the House the information it requires, and that we will not see the Government setting a law at defiance which they themselves placed on the Statute Book.

Intercolonial Railway ..... \$455,432 38

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice here an item for increased accommodation at St. John, \$48,000. Regularly as the year comes round, there is a large sum for increased accommodation at St. John, and it would seem that they ought to have had enough increased accommodation at St. John by this time.

Mr. POPE. This is for equipping the new station, \$10,000; erection of car shed, \$6,000, land for division of street, \$10,000; gates at Mill street, \$2,000; bridge at Dorchester street, \$20,000.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to this crossing at Mill street, that is a very important matter, as that is the main crossing between St. John and Portland, as owing to the cutting down of the grade of the railway, they have cut off access by Dorchester street, which is now utterly useless for that purpose. By the railway, which was opened on Saturday last, the traffic from the western railways will go into the Intercolonial Railway station, and by the bridge. In January last the municipal bodies of both cities made a joint memorial to the Government, calling their attention to this matter of the heavy traffic between the two cities, and how it will be affected by the railway. I think it will be important that something should be done with regard to that thoroughfare, not merely on account of damages to land, but by the danger which will be incurred if matters are allowed to remain as they are. The result is, that there is only one street through which all the traffic between the two cities can pass, if it does not go by the river, and the hon. gentleman knows that vessels and steamers are obliged to stop at Indiantown, above the falls, and cannot get down to the harbor of St. John. I trust the hon. gentleman will see some way of overcoming this difficulty.

Mr. POPE. I am quite aware of the difficulty the hon. gentleman speaks of, but the Government do not feel that they can go to the expense, just now, of a bridge, which would cost a very large sum of money. Consequently, we have decided to use the gates; but I hope that at some time we may find ourselves in a better position to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the hon. Minister will give the matter consideration, because there is real danger of loss of life there, as a line of vehicles is constantly passing from one city to the other. I think self-acting gates, which rise and fall, such as are used on American railways, would be better than the gates which are swung by cranks.

Mr. POPE. We will do everything we can to meet the difficulty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to know how much the St. Charles branch has cost, and how much more will require to be expended upon it? It also appears very frequently in these accounts.

Mr. POPE. I am sorry that we have to admit that it has cost a good deal of money. Up to the present time it has cost \$976,565.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Including this vote of \$117,432?

Mr. POPE. That includes this vote; but I might as well tell the hon. gentleman that he will find a further sum in the Supplementary Estimates, yet to come down, which will increase the cost \$145,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long is that line?

Mr. POPE. Fifteen miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, one can understand that considerable extra expense is incurred on a line that runs into a town. But for 15 miles a total expenditure of about \$1,100,000 is an immense sum. How comes it to be so expensive?

Mr. POPE. The right of way has been exceedingly expensive. In fact, the expense has far exceeded our anticipations, although we have tried to reduce it as much as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman tell what the total cost of the right of way will be?

Mr. POPE. There has been already expended on land and damages \$342,957, and the balance is expected to cost \$115,000. A very large number of the claims have been settled by the board of arbitrators, and many have been

Mr. POPE.

appealed to the Exchequer Court, not on our account, but by the parties.

Mr. WELDON. I have had letters from parties, complaining that although through rates of freight are given for shipment of goods from England to Montreal, or Quebec, or St. John, by way of Halifax, in winter, they cannot get through rates for goods shipped the other way.

Mr. POPE. Up to this time we have not been able to quote, but we have been trying, and we hope to succeed.

Eastern Extension Railway—To pay Nova Scotia Government for repairs on steamer *Norwegian*. \$33,380

Mr. POPE. This steamer belongs to the Nova Scotia Government, and the arrangement was, that we were to pay the expenses of repairs.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). She connects the eastern terminus of the Eastern Extension Railway with ports in Cape Breton, on the other side of the Strait of Canso; during the summer season she plys from Port Mulgrave to Ports Hastings and Hawkesbury. The company that built the Eastern Extension Railway contracted to maintain a steam ferry on the Strait of Canso, and contracted as well to build a wharf on the Cape Breton side as a part of the Eastern Extension. Before the contract was completed, unfortunately for the Island of Cape Breton, the Eastern Extension Railway was transferred by the railway company to the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and from the Local Government of Nova Scotia to this Government. If the railway had not been transferred before the completion of the contract we would have had, ere now, a wharf on the Cape Breton side, in connection with the railway, as contemplated by the contract. In the summer season there is no difficulty in obtaining a wharf at which the steamer may get freight and passengers from the Cape Breton side, but unfortunately it is impossible in the winter season to ship from any port on the Island, on the Strait of Canso, except Port Hastings. A public wharf was built at Port Hastings by the Local Government of Nova Scotia before Confederation, as many other wharves were built before that time, but unfortunately, like all the other wharves built on the north-west coast of the island of Cape Breton by the Nova Scotia Government before Confederation, this is now in a dilapidated condition and requires repairs. Unless that wharf be repaired soon, I am satisfied that the Eastern Extension Railway and the Intercolonial Railway will lose as much traffic each winter season as the repairs will cost. Not only should that wharf be repaired and maintained by the railway authorities in connection with the Eastern Extension, as has been done in connection with other wharves necessary for railway purposes, but the wharves at Long Point, Broad Cove Marsh and Cheticamp, on the north-west coast of the island, should be maintained as well, because they are necessary, in order to enable goods and chattels to be shipped from those ports, as from the others, to the Eastern Extension and the Intercolonial Railway. Application has been made to the Railway Department to repair the wharf at Port Hastings, for the purpose of transmitting freight across the Strait of Canso during the winter season. The estimated cost of the repairs was \$700, and I observe that \$12,400 are asked for the purpose of purchasing from the Prince Edward Island Government a wharf at Cape Traverse, in connection with the Cape Traverse Branch Railway. I would suggest that this Government would not only repair the wharf at Port Hastings, which is absolutely necessary as a winter terminus, but also purchase the wharf from the Local Government, on the same principle as this has been purchased from the Prince Edward Island Government. I assure the hon. Minister of Railways that this would be in the interest of the railway itself, and be a great advantage, not only to the county I have the honor to represent, but to the whole island.

Mr. POPE. I cannot know exactly the position this may be in, or the particular spot where this may be required, until the railway is located. It does not make much difference whether the railway is built or not, so far as the wharf is concerned. If the railway authorities desire to secure the trade of Victoria and of Inverness, it will be necessary for them to maintain the Port Hastings wharf during the winter season.

Fort Frances Canal.—Amount due to Mr. Hugh Sutherland..... \$2,695 69

Mr. FARROW. Is this the same as the Fort Frances locks?

Mr. POPE. It is a balance found by the Railway Committee to be due to Mr. Sutherland.

Mr. FARROW. How much has the whole thing cost the country, and what is it worth?

Mr. POPE. Really, I could not say.

Mr. FARROW. Is it \$250,000?

Mr. POPE. Yes; I should think so.

Mr. FARROW. What is its use?

Mr. POPE. It was intended to be used as a part of the water communication.

Mr. McDUGALL. Does the Minister intend to provide for the enlargement of the St. Peter's Canal?

Mr. POPE. I will bring the matter before my colleagues.

Newcastle, N.B., Post Office..... \$3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the whole cost of that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$33,000, I suppose.

Quebec—Montreal Armouries..... \$13,000

Mr. HOLTON. I would like to ask the Minister if this sum is intended to cover the cost of the completion of the present drill hall in Montreal and for the erection of the armouries, or is it to pay for extras upon the construction of the hall as it already exists?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is besides the drill hall. The armouries are to be built separate, and this was the amount required for the foundation of the armouries. It is not extra work.

Mr. HOLTON. This sum, then, I understand, will not cover the completion of the armouries, but is simply for the foundation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that there is a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for 1885 of \$45,000 for the armouries. This is only for the foundations.

Mr. FISHER. Is that expected to provide efficient armouries—the two sums together?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I am not sure of that. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press me to specify the sum, because contractors base their tenders upon the sum that may be announced. The chief architect makes an estimate of the work for the Minister, and when the tenders are called in I can thus see whether they are reasonable or not, but we never allow the tenderers to know the estimated cost before they are in, and therefore I would ask the hon. gentlemen not to insist upon this estimate.

Mr. FISHER. I meant to enquire whether it was the intention of the Government to complete those armouries.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Examining warehouse at Toronto..... \$8,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought that was already finished.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Far from it. There was a main building, but the business has increased to such an extent that representations were made by the Customs Department that a large additional building was required. We did not think that we could afford to undertake the whole building in one year, and therefore we divided it into three portions. Last year there was a sum of \$25,000 voted for that purpose. The sum we ask for this year, \$12,000, as I explained the other day, is to erect a small building in continuation of the present one, for an engine-house and other purposes. The third portion of the building will have to be provided for later on.

Mr. MULOCK. Last year the House voted \$50,000 for the purpose of erecting a warehouse in the city of Toronto, in which the merchants might store their goods while in bond. We were told last year that the receipts from these merchants would be equal to a good interest upon the investment. I would like to know from the Minister how far those expectations have been realised?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must see that we cannot realise a revenue from that building before it is built. The \$12,000 asked this year must be used before we receive any benefit from that building.

Mr. MULOCK. Have no goods been stored in it yet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I cannot say.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the Minister whether the amount of \$13,600, in the original Estimates, will be sufficient to complete the Post Office and Customs and Inland Revenue offices at St. Thomas. I see that there is nothing further than \$13,600. Will that sum complete the buildings and put them in proper shape, with furniture, etc.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That sum of \$13,500 was in addition to the \$15,000 of the year previous, and I am informed by my chief architect that that sum is required to complete the building.

Mr. WILSON. Am I then to understand that this sum will furnish the Custom house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So I am told.

Mr. WILSON. Will it also enable the Minister to put a sidewalk around the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to lay a sidewalk this year.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that the architect there made representations to the Government that the sidewalk was in a very bad condition. If there were an accident, owing to a defective sidewalk, the Government would be held responsible. If the building is going to be completed and be occupied at once—and it is long since it was commenced—there is no reason why, during the present year, a good sidewalk should not be put down. A strong representation was made by officers in the Customs Department of the building that it was not being furnished in a suitable manner. I regret I was not present when the original Estimates came up, because the Minister of Public Works promised to explain how the clerk of works drew, in one year, \$1,980. Whether he is drawing pay still or not I am unable to say. A man was appointed to the position who was not competent, who was not adapted to the position, and who attended to his duties simply as a matter of form.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must be satisfied that he has once more attacked the clerk of works, as he did last year. He repeated to day what he said last year. If the hon. member had been in his place when the item was under discussion, he would have heard the explanations I gave; and I was ready to give him all explanations possible. When the works were completed the clerk of the works was discharged. Therefore, the

charges made are only retrospective. I am pushing the work forward as rapidly as possible. As regards the sidewalk, it will be put in a condition to be used, but we have no money to expend on new sidewalks, as we have cut down every item possible in the Estimates.

Mr. WILSON. In other parts of Ontario considerable sums are being appropriated for repairs to buildings. The Minister of Public Works has mentioned that he has curtailed the expenditure on public buildings. I am not complaining of that; but I desire to point out that if Cornwall can have matters attended to connected with the Public Works Department, there is no reason why some of the cities should not have their works attended to.

Public Buildings—British Columbia..... \$17,358

Mr. BAKER. Does that amount include the temporary furnishing of the quarantine building at Victoria, even for the accommodation of the caretaker, if nothing more? Does that include an amount for the furnishing of a part of this building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is mainly to pay balance due on contract, and for such additional work as may be found necessary, in order to fit it for occupation.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I think it is very necessary now, or will be in the near future, to put some furniture in that building, to make it habitable.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As soon as that is required by the Department of agriculture, of course we will furnish the building.

Harbors and Rivers—Ontario..... \$53,000

Mr. ALLEN. I rise, not to object to the grant to Southampton harbor, but when we look at the harbors of these waters and their importance, I am glad to see that the Government are spending these amounts, and I am only sorry that they are not larger, both for Owen Sound, Collingwood and Southampton. I think, however, that Owen Sound has peculiar claims on this Government. Our works there were commenced under the most patriotic circumstances. At the time the British gunboats were in the upper lakes we had no dry dock in any harbor in Ontario. One of the gunboats came into the harbor of Owen Sound for repairs, and the commander complained bitterly of the want of patriotism in the people of Ontario for not having provided any means for repairing those gunboats on the upper lakes, and for having to send gunboats to the United States to be repaired in case of accident. Under these circumstances, a public meeting was called in Owen Sound, and the town agreed to give a bonus of \$15,000 to any company which would construct a dry dock in the harbor. A company was formed, and in order to get a proper position for the dry dock, it had to be placed up the river, some 3,700 feet from deep water. Then, we had to give \$15,000 to assist in dredging the river from deep water up to the dry dock, so as to enable vessels to reach it, and the Government of 1870 granted an equivalent of \$10,000 or \$12,000. The Government of that day saw the necessity for the dry dock, and how necessary it was and the convenience of navigation and for repairing ships. The town of Owen Sound has given altogether \$62,246 for dredging that river, and \$15,000 of bonus for the construction of the dry dock. The Mackenzie Government saw the necessity of completing these works, and sent their dredge up there in one season, and gave us \$10,000 in another season, in order to complete them. In 1882 we made a bargain with the present Government, to give \$13,500, on condition that they would complete the work and give sufficient water to accommodate any ship coming from Lake Superior through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal to our harbor. We expect that that work would be complete; but at present it is 2,200 feet from 16 feet of water, and a water-

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN.

logged ship, drawing 16 feet of water, cannot reach the dry dock, but has to be lightened before it can be taken to it. It would require at least \$10,000 to deepen this channel of 2,200 feet long to 16 feet; and I believe the Government, seeing the position we are in, and knowing how liberally we have acted and what we have done for the harbor, should make this grant. Our town is now the third largest shipping port in Ontario. In the last season 1,064 steamers and vessels left our harbor, having a tonnage of 463,366 tons, employing 15,891 men, carrying 26,780 passengers, and vessels valued at nearly \$2,000,000. The town of Owen Sound has paid \$17,669 of Customs duties during the past year. Our town is growing in importance, but our harbor is not capable of accommodating the vessels that run there. The Canadian Pacific Railway steamers run from Port Arthur to Owen Sound, and now pass up the river, above the place where it is dredged, to the wharves; the screws sometimes touch the bottom, and I have been told that last week one of them was broken. Now, having the confidence in the Government that we have, and remembering the promise they have made, I believe they will take the matter in hand, and give us the money required to dredge out the remaining 2,200 feet, so that we can accommodate the ships that come there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, I do not wish to appear as if not answering the hon. gentleman, but he knows that I did not hold out any hope to the deputation that came here some time ago, that the Government were in a position to expend more money there this year, and I have only to say the same thing to-day. I think we have done very well towards Owen Sound, and the people there seem to be satisfied that we have done a great deal for them. I must say that they themselves have also done their share, and I have very little doubt that if, at a future time, we shall require to come to the relief of Owen Sound again and deepen the harbor, we shall find that the people there will put their hands in their pockets and also contribute their share to the improvements. But I think the works are sufficient for the present, and that we can delay doing any more work there for some time.

Mr. ALLEN. The position is such that there is not sufficient water in those 2,200 feet to accommodate the vessels, and if \$10,000 cannot be appropriated, perhaps \$5,000 would be sufficient for the present. The dredges have been lying there all summer waiting for instructions, and I know the people would be very much indebted to the Government if they could see it in their power to grant \$5,000.

Sub-marine cable route between British Columbia and Washington Territory, via Victoria, Clover Point and Dungeness (revote of lapsed amount)..... \$3,500

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Is that payment in full for the laying of that cable?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; this is the balance. It is to cover an appropriation of a similar sum made by Governor General's warrant to provide for making a sub-marine cable to connect British Columbia and Washington Territory directly across the St. Juan de Fuca Straits.

House and Furniture for High Commissioner of Canada, London, England—Balance of furniture, etc..... \$703 17

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister of Public Works say what is included under this item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The etc. covers the alteration of the drainage system. Then there is some painting, some furniture in bedrooms and kitchen, and \$160 connected with the gasfittings.

Fisheries—Additional amount required for fishing bounty..... \$20,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to extend this bounty to boats under 14 feet? People engaged in the Bras D'Or fisheries do not require large boats, but use small boats. I hope the Minister will take this into consideration, and extend the bounties to the smaller boats.

Mr. McLELAN. I may state that the minimum length of keel was 14 feet, for we thought that was as small a boat as was desirable; but the hon. gentleman and one or two other hon. members have brought to my notice special circumstances under which larger boats could not be used. I will make special enquiries into the matter. The Act appropriates a given sum of \$150,000 to be divided amongst the vessels and boats of the fishermen. It was necessary to wait until all claims were in before division could be made. That involved delay, and complaints were made by the fishermen. This year it was decided to adopt a uniform price for the bounty.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the hon. Minister will include the Bay of Fundy boats as well as the Bras D'Or boats.

To pay accounts in connection with the erection and completion of barracks for the use of the North-West Mounted Police at Fort Macleod, Maple Creek and Medicine Hat..... \$25,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost at Fort Macleod is \$16,000, and at Medicine Hat \$9,000, but some of these barracks are in bad order, and have to be repaired. The hon. gentleman must see that the force being increased the accommodation must be increased also. It is impossible, just now, to say whether it will be more at one place than at the other. This matter was under the Department of the Interior. The inspector, Mr. Perry, reports that the workmanship is of the best description for the class of buildings, and the material used of good quality, and that no other person has resources for carrying it on. When we took these buildings, they were mere huts, of the roughest character, and now that the police are to be located permanently in certain places, we have to put the buildings in proper order. I have seen those at Calgary and Regina, and they were kept in the best possible order, but those at Calgary for example, require to be repaired, and I think there is an additional amount for that in the Estimates for 1885-86.

To refund bank imposts collected irregularly.....\$41,048 92

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the circumstance connected with this refund, and to what bank is it made?

Mr. BOWELL. I will read the memorandum which I have:

"By the Act 31 Vic., cap. 11, sec. 2, a duty of 1 per cent. was imposed on the circulation of the banks incorporated by the Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This Act was continued by Act 33 Vic., cap. 12, sec. 9, until the end of the Session of Parliament next after the 1st day of January, 1872. The Bank Act of 1871 (34 Vic., cap. 51) by section 15 repealed the duty as to banks to which it applied, but continued it as to other banks. The Bank Act also, by section 76 continued the Act 33 Vic., cap. 11, in force, till the time above mentioned, as to banks not coming under the Bank Act. As the Act 33 Vic., cap. 11, was not continued beyond that time, it consequently lapsed at the end of the Session next after 1st January, 1872, or on the 14th June, 1872, and the duty ceased to be payable at that date.

"The banks above named, which are not under the Bank Act, continued to pay the duty, the first two until the 31st October, 1883, and the Commercial Bank of Windsor until the 30th April, 1875, and this amount so paid has, under advice from the Department of Justice, and by Order in Council founded on the report of the Treasury Board, been repaid the banks."

For 500 copies of the *Parliamentary Companion*.....\$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a convenient little publication enough, but it used to be only \$1.50 when it was just as well got up as it is at present. I do not see

why we should pay 50 cents more, when the circulation must be more numerous.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the price at which it is sold now, and, I think, last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It used to be \$1.50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When it began, I think it was less than that. I must say that the book now is very complete.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know the book well enough, but it strikes me that the party has marked it up, without rhyme or reason, some 50 cents.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the price paid for this book and for the *Parliamentary Register* is outrageous. You will get just as much information in the *Canadian Almanac*, which you can buy for 12½ cents, whereas you pay \$2 for this book and \$3 for the *Register*. I have examined these books, and the *Canadian Almanac*, and there is more information in the *Canadian Almanac* than in both of them put together. It looks like a perfect swindle.

Mr. FARROW. I am a little inclined to think the same as the hon. gentleman. I cannot see how this work should have increased in price so much. We used to get it for \$1.50, and then it was dear enough, and now it is raised to \$2. If we intend to run things economically, we must begin at the small leaks. It is perhaps a small matter compared, to a great many other items which we have been passing, but I think it is a charge that ought not to be countenanced. I think \$1.50 is quite sufficient, and I think a good deal of profit might be made if the price was \$1. I think it is of very little use to the House, and that it might be published once every two years or once every new Parliament. It is of very little use, especially now that we have an *Annual Register*. One or the other ought to be dropped, and I think it should be this one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The *Register* is \$3 and this is only \$2.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is practically a stereotyped thing. Of course, when there is a new Parliament, there is a great deal of work, and it is reasonable enough, but in the second, third, fourth and fifth years of the Parliament, there is very little alteration from year to year.

To meet expenses in connection with the Chinese Commission ..... \$11,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the total vote; and how is it incurred?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must have a little forbearance in this case, because it is in the Department of my hon. friend the Secretary of State, who was obliged to leave the other day on account of ill-health. This is not the only item. I think the next item of \$4,300, for printing, belongs to this matter. I think another \$3,000 was expended for the printing and cost of translation. If the hon. gentleman wishes to have the total expenditure, I will take note of it, and give it on concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And also how it was distributed, how much went in salaries and how much for other purposes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will have a statement.

To meet expenses of Elections held under the Canada Temperance Act..... \$25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a pretty expensive business to keep people sober.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much does it cost for county?

Mr. BOWELL. Just the same as for a parliamentary election. In a county like Hastings, for instance, where there are three ridings, you have to add the three together.

To meet payments to extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by Parliament..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think before we grant that we ought to see those returns. Many of them have not yet been brought down, and in particular one for which the Minister of Public Works is responsible, because he amended my hon. friend's return for the details of sums paid to certain newspapers, and as good as promised that we should have it. That has never been brought down in full.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, that has been brought down. We had the returns before us at the last meeting of committee.

To settle the claims of the estate of the late S. R. Thompson, and those of Mr. Justice Weatherbee, of Halifax, and Mr. L. H. Davies, M.P., of Charlottetown, for increased remuneration as counsel before the Halifax Fishery Commission, \$8,000 each..... \$24,000

Mr. FARROW. This is a very extraordinary amount. I would very much like to have seen the hon. gentleman, whom I respect very highly, in his place, but he has thought proper to leave us. I have nothing to say against that individual, personally. I think he is a very fine gentleman, a man of considerable ability, and I respect him highly. Now, I understand that he has been paid a certain amount, which, if I am correctly informed, has reached the sum of \$15,000, for the same service; and this is an additional amount of \$8,000, which will make the nice round sum of \$23,000. Now, we were talking last night about hour's work, how much it was an hour, and I will venture to say, without fear of successful contradiction, that if you add up the hours that he put into that work, he would get \$100 an hour. It was complained of here the other night that a certain hon. gentleman got at the rate of \$20 an hour, measured by a certain Session—not this one. Now, here is a man, and he is not a Tory, who had received \$15,000, and this is supplemented by \$8,000 more.

Mr. WELDON. How do you make out that he got \$15,000? He only got \$7,000 before.

Mr. FARROW. I am glad the hon. gentleman put me right, for I do not want to make a wrong statement. That will be \$15,000. It is very strange that he did not make a right charge at first. Generally speaking, lawyers make the heaviest charge at first, and then come down. But he has reversed the order; he first got \$7,000, and now he thinks he ought to get \$8,000 more. He did not get half of his pay at first. Well, this is not all. This man was born under a lucky planet. He has received a great many favors from this Government. This gentleman whom we are giving \$8,000 to is the gentleman who rose in the House, a few weeks ago, his breast filled with righteous indignation, because the public money was expended wastefully. He has been a member of this House for over three years, and he cannot stay till the end of the third Session; yet he has drawn from this Government \$15,000, and \$20,000 for being the law agent of this Dominion Government; that makes \$35,000.

Mr. WELDON. He never got \$20,000.

Mr. FARROW. If I am correctly informed, he got \$4,000 a year for five years.

Mr. WELDON. Show that in the Public Accounts, if you can.

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. FARROW. For the five years in which he was law agent of the Dominion he took out of the coffers of this country \$20,000, which, if it is true—

Mr. WELDON. It is not true, that is the trouble.

Mr. FARROW—makes \$35,000 in all. It is not a Tory who is doing this kind of thing. And this is one of your model Reformers. How much did he receive previously, and how long was he engaged? How much were the whole law expenses in connection with the matter?

Mr. WELDON. We have not heard much from the member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) since he discovered that hens laid larger eggs since the National Policy. He has, however, taken advantage of the absence of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), to attack him. He would not have dared to say what he has said if that hon. gentleman had been here; he took advantage to make statements behind his back. He spoke of the hon. member for Queen's leaving his place in this House. That hon. gentleman came here on the first day of the Session, and stayed till 30th June, when he was obliged to go back to attend to the interests of his clients. Hon. members from Ontario have visited their homes several times, but the hon. member for Queen's never left, from 29th January to 30th June. I doubt very much if any other hon. members have done so.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I have.

Mr. WELDON. I admit those hon. gentlemen are exceptions. The hon. member for North Huron has stated that the hon. member for Queen's obtained \$20,000 from the Government. I have had some little experience about such matters, and I say the hon. gentleman obtained no such sum; but no doubt that hon. member gave full value for every dollar he received while acting as agent of the Minister of Justice. The charge that the hon. member received \$20,000 out of the Dominion Government before he came to this House is utterly without foundation. In regard to this matter, the hon. member for Queen's was employed as counsel in the fishery case with my friend, the late S. R. Thompson, one of the most eloquent and able men who ever lived in the Dominion of Canada. Any one who will read his speech at the close of the deliberations of the Halifax Commission will be satisfied on that point; and I say the award was largely due to the eloquence of my friend, with whom I was associated for many years. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) gave great attention to the case. Those gentlemen sacrificed their business in order to attend to the case, and visited Ottawa and Halifax in regard to it. They performed their duty well. When Mr. Doutré made this claim, it was resisted by the Government. Mr. Davies and Mr. Thompson made no claim on the Government; they took the money offered, although they felt that, under the circumstances, they should have been paid more. Mr. Doutré went further, and commenced proceedings in the courts. The Supreme Court, by a majority, decided that Mr. Doutré was entitled to receive an additional \$8,000. The Government were not content with the decision, but carried the case to the Privy Council, where it was decided in favor of Mr. Doutré. And if Mr. Doutré was entitled to be paid that sum, so was my hon. friend from Charlottetown, and so was my friend, Mr. Thomson, who has gone to his long home. I say the Government have done an act of justice and right in this matter, when not only the highest court of the Dominion of Canada, but the highest court of Great Britain, so far as we are concerned, decided that they were entitled to this amount from the Dominion Government. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island did not ask for this amount, but the Government said that when the highest courts in the land, after full discussion, decided in favor of Mr. Doutré, it was only an act of justice to the

other gentlemen to say that they should be meted out the same measure of justice. I think the Government have done that which is just and fair. I will not discuss the question of whether the decision of the Supreme Court or the Privy Council was right, but those decisions are the law of the land, and the Government did right to bow to them. The hon. member for North Huron may think it a very large amount, and so it may be; but as the law of the land has decided that they were entitled to it, the Government were simply doing an act of justice in paying the same amount to my hon. friend as they paid to Mr. Doure. The hon. member for North Huron attacks my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island in his absence, and he makes an unfair charge against him, because it was not on the application of my hon. friend that this amount was paid, for the Government simply decided that according to the law of the land he was entitled to this amount, with the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this matter arose under the late Government, it may be as well, both in justice to my absent friend and also for the information of the committee, that I should state generally what the circumstances were. I may remind the House, in the first place, that it was not money badly invested, inasmuch as the Canadian Government obtained a verdict of over 4½ millions of money from the American Government—the first case on record, I believe, in which an English colony has succeeded in extracting substantial damages from the United States, and a very marked contrast to the way in which such negotiations, conducted by English negotiators, have heretofore terminated, in any disputes which have arisen between the two countries. It is a great mistake to suppose that these legal gentlemen engaged on behalf of the Dominion Government were only occupied during the time the commission sat at Halifax. I know myself that I have often heard from the late Sir Albert Smith, who, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, presided over the matter, that for a period of two or three years they were obliged to devote a very considerable portion of their time in mastering the evidence and the details which had to be investigated before the commission. As to the sum total which has been paid these gentlemen, I believe it was more than the late Government thought was a fair compensation for their services, but no blame can be attached to the present Government, when, after the protracted litigation in which they were engaged with Mr. Doure, they recognised the claims of these gentlemen. It is quite clear that if Mr. Doure was awarded, first in the Exchequer Court, then in the Supreme Court, and then by the Privy Council, this additional sum of \$8,000, in all reason and justice the other three legal gentlemen engaged in the matter, were entitled to an equal sum. There is no doubt that they severally and individually discharged as important functions in that work as Mr. Doure, and it would be perfectly absurd for the Government of Canada to have paid further costs and further interest, as they undoubtedly would have had to pay, I think. I see that nearly \$4,000 for costs and interest have to be paid Mr. Doure in addition to the \$8,000. It would be an absurd way of saving the public money, to have brought three separate additional suits by three separate parties, as I presume would undoubtedly have been the case after the decision in Mr. Doure's suit.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Government made a loose bargain with those gentlemen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I do not think it was a case in which it was possible to make any bargain. I know that in cases in which I have been a litigant myself, I have had to pay sums quite equal, in proportion to the work done, to the sums charged by these gen-

tlemen. In fact, I have known cases in which, where a vastly smaller sum was at issue, in cases carried to other courts, heavier sums than this had to be paid.

An hon. MEMBER. In proportion?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I mean absolutely, for the work done. These gentlemen were engaged six or seven months continuously at Halifax. I have known cases where very large sums had to be paid for two or three days' work, and if the work had continued for anything like the time they were engaged, the amount would have been much larger than it is. No doubt the sum total is a large sum; it amounts to about \$15,000 apiece, and heavy as the expenses of the suit were, I think myself that it was rather an excessive sum. I have no doubt that Mr. Doure might have been compromised with at a considerably smaller sum, but the Government—and I cannot blame them—thought that Mr. Doure was asking too much; they referred the matter to the courts, and it has been decided against them. No blame can be attached to the Government, nor do I think any blame can be attached to them for claiming what they consider a fair payment for their work.

Mr. BOWELL. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman on one point. The First Minister who refused positively to recognise that claim, was the late Sir Albert Smith.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman said we had refused it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the hon. gentleman is mistaken; I did not.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for St. John said so.

Mr. WELDON. No; I said the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is always a difficult matter to settle what lawyers' bills amount to. I have often thought myself—although a humble member of that profession, having been a student only—that the public at large were grossly abused by the immense amount of fees they were obliged to pay, especially in connection with election expenses, and I have often thought that there should be some tariff fixed with regard to these matters. I do not like to reflect on absent members, but I think that no professional man, with equal practice, has been as regular in his attendance in the House as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. Very eminent legal gentlemen, having seats in this House, are extremely frequently absent—on both sides, no doubt, but especially on the other side. I see opposite me vacant seats, which are usually filled by very distinguished Ontario lawyers, which have been vacant, to my knowledge, for about two-thirds of the Session, whereas my hon. friend, for five whole months, was a most persistent and consistent attendant, as the records of the *Hansard* will show, and as you, Mr. Chairman, can testify.

Mr. FARROW. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for St. John. One charge is, that I would be afraid to say what I have said if the hon. gentleman were in his seat. I would not be afraid to say it, but would have pleasure in saying more. At the outset, I did say that I respected that hon. gentleman as much as I respect any man sitting on the other side of the House; and I have reason to respect him. The hon. member for St. John, no doubt, is an eminent lawyer, but instead of answering my remarks by an argument, he threw an insult across the House. I happen to be a farmer; I probably know as much about farming as he knows about law, and he said we have not heard the hon. member's voice this Session, scarcely ever since I said the hens laid bigger eggs. Now, I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. I never said they laid bigger eggs. The question was brought up by my hon. friend from Brant that Session, and, as a farmer, I said

that, on account of better care, we got more eggs, on the same principle that we get more milk from cows on account of better care. The hon. member for St. John knows nothing about farming; but he is a very good lawyer, if we can measure him by the fees he charges. If you examine the Public Accounts you will find that he has drawn to the tune of \$4,000 or \$5,000. Now, I rose to say that I should be very sorry to charge the hon. gentleman, who is absent, unduly. My information was derived from the Charlottetown *Herald*. I do not know whether it is a Conservative paper or a Reform paper or an Independent paper; but if it will descend so low as to print plain lies about the hon. gentleman, the sooner we know it the better. Now, here is the statement:

"The Charlottetown *Herald* has been counting up how much L. H. Davies, M. P., has cost the country in his twelve years of political life. The following table gives a portion of the rewards received by him for public services: As Attorney General and Solicitor General, \$4,214; as member of the House of Assembly, \$1,311; as solicitor, Land Purchase Act, \$5,718; as counsel for the Crown, \$363; as counsel for the Halifax Commission, \$15,000; as Dominion law agent for five years, \$20,000; as member of the Commons for three years, \$4,000."

But he has not been here three years. Now, has he not lost more time since he went a way than two-thirds of the members sitting in this House? He has got altogether, according to this statement, \$50,680. Show me a Tory who has done better in three years.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman says he does not know whether the Charlottetown *Herald* is a Reform or a Conservative paper; but I think I may say, from that statement, that it is a Conservative paper of a very rabid type.

Mr. FARROW. Is it true?

Mr. WELDON. I will venture to say it is not true. I think the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) has cost the country \$8,000 or \$9,000 since he has been here; I suppose he has drawn his indemnity every year, and anything else he could get; and does he say that he is of no value to the public at large as a member of this House. What would he think if some Liberal paper charged him with drawing his indemnity and doing nothing for it? He has spoken of my name appearing in the Public Accounts. If he looks at that account, he will see that it was money to be paid to other people, and although it was in my name, I received very little of it.

Mr. FARROW. How much?

Mr. WELDON. The amount was \$5,000, and \$4,000 of it went over to England, I receiving, I suppose, about \$500 or \$600. The Government agreed to pay the expense of contesting the Scott Act on the other side of the water, and if I had chosen to go across a larger amount would, perhaps, have gone into my pocket; but I did not go; I said it was not necessary, and although the money was charged in my name, all but a very small portion of it went to parties across the Atlantic. But I reiterate that it is very unfair, in the absence of the hon. member for Queen's, who has been here from the 29th January to the 30th June, day in and day out, for the hon. gentleman to make statements which he would not have ventured to make in the presence of that hon. gentleman.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not imagine that the hon. gentleman will succeed in arousing any great sympathy with the hon. member for Queen's for his long attendance in this House, when we know what part he took in prolonging discussion. It is to be regretted that the gentleman who had the management of this matter, in 1877, had not the understanding with the legal gentlemen employed more clearly defined. I think the hon. gentleman himself had a pretty strong impression that he had paid them fully more than he had expected to give them when he first employed them. I have no doubt the success that attended that commission, whether it was attributed to the legal gentlemen employed or

Mr. FARROW.

not, perhaps raised their ideas as to the value of their services. Mr. Smith had paid them the amount he felt he was responsible for, and the full amount he felt he was entitled to pay on the understanding he had with them, but they asked that that amount should be rather more than doubled. Mr. Doutre claims he spent six months in the work at Halifax, and a month travelling between Halifax and Ottawa, examining papers. This was about the time occupied by Messrs. Doutre, Thompson, Wetherbee and Davies. They all occupied about the same time, from six to eight months, and when this vote passes and the money is paid, we will have paid over \$60,000 for the services of those gentlemen. I think that is pretty good pay. It is not every lawyer, even in the Province of Ontario, who will receive \$15,000 for six months' service. All these gentlemen pressed their claims. Mr. Doutre brought an action, which the Government contested. It was decided in his favor here; the decision was appealed from, and finally the case was brought before the Privy Council, and the judgment confirmed, with costs, amounting to \$12,000. I consulted with the Department of Justice to know whether there was any difference between Mr. Doutre's case and that of the other claimants, and I was told there was none. I made a proposition to the others to settle for \$8,000, the amount awarded to Mr. Doutre, with costs, and they have agreed to accept that.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not rise to call into account the amounts paid to the different legal gentlemen. In fact, I think these charges are exceedingly small, as compared with my experience of law, in not having absorbed half the whole award. But that is not the point to which I call attention. It often happens, in cases of the kind, that the quiet people who do the real work are lost sight of, and those distinguished gentlemen who are prominent in the eyes of the world get the pay. There was a gentleman connected with that investigation whose services were of the greatest value to the people in obtaining this award. I allude to the then Commissioner of Fisheries, Mr. Whitcher. Now he is out of office—probably he was not always very prudent, but in that case he worked hard indeed; and now, when these large sums are being paid for services in connection with this matter, I think we ought to see that Mr. Whitcher, whose services were of great value, should get something.

Mr. SPOULE. I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) displayed a great deal of unnecessary warmth in the defence of his political and professional brother. He threw strong aspersions against the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow), because he dared to protest against the impropriety of paying out what he believed to be an exorbitant sum for services rendered. If we accept the statements of the hon. member for St. John, as to the time these gentlemen were engaged in that service, we must admit they were paid high figures. Seven months for \$15,000 is over \$2,000 a month. What value did they put on their time, compared with that of other men in this country? The hon. gentleman went on to say that Mr. K. H. Thompson was one of the most able men in Canada. I believe he was an able man, and the hon. gentleman repeated, that had it not been for Mr. Thompson we would not have had that favorable verdict. I believe, if the men were paid according to their merits, Mr. Davies and Mr. Doutre would be well paid at \$1,000, while Mr. Thompson's services would be cheap at \$10,000. The hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) would not dare to take the stand he did if the hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Davies) were here. I do not think that any hon. member here is afraid of the hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Davies), or any other hon. member. I do not think it becomes hon. gentlemen to display so much feeling against any hon. member, because he dares to question the propriety of what he believes to be an exorbitant charge.

Mr. FISHER. I am not open to the charge of being a professional man, a professional brother to the hon. gentleman under discussion, but I think I have common sense enough to take exception to the statement of the newspaper, in which Mr. Davies has been accused of receiving so large sums from the Government of Canada. I find, among the items charged against him, that of Attorney and Solicitor General. But he was Attorney and Solicitor General of the Local Government of Prince Edward Island, with which this Government had nothing to do.

Mr. FARROW. So we read it.

Mr. FISHER. At the same time, the hon. gentleman summed up a unit of \$20,000 which the Dominion of Canada had paid to him.

Mr. FARROW. The public money of this Dominion.

Mr. FISHER. However, I presume the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when he did the work of Attorney and Solicitor General of the Province of Prince Edward Island, gave good value for the money he received. At all events, he did so in the eyes of the people of the Province to which he belonged. He was also a member of the Assembly, under which he received a certain amount.

Mr. FARROW. He was solicitor of the Land Purchase Company.

Mr. FISHER. That was a question of local politics, with which the Local Government and not this Government had to do. When the hon. gentleman received, as counsel for the Crown, a certain small sum, it was on account of the Local Government, and not the Dominion Government. The hon. member for Queen's has been also a member of this Commons for three years, but as member of the House of Commons, instead of receiving \$4,000, he would have received \$3,000.

Mr. FARROW. What about the mileage?

Mr. FISHER. He receives his mileage, the same as any other member. His mileage would not amount to anything like \$1,000; and any days he is absent will be deducted. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., was one of several gentlemen who served their country in that case. The Government was forced by one of those gentlemen to pay a certain amount as fees. The hon. member for Queen's did not attempt to force the Government to make that payment to him. The Minister of Marine says he made his demand upon the Government. In conversation with the hon. member, I understood that he never made any demand.

Mr. McLELAN. The claims were made by all the gentlemen on the Department of Justice, and they were referred to my Department. I remember that Mr. Justice Wetherbee, one of the claimants, wanted to bring a suit. I consulted the Department of Justice, and they reported that the whole of the claims stood upon the same footing, and that Mr. Doutré's case being decided, the other cases followed it.

Mr. FISHER. I understand, then, that Mr. Davies did not make a formal application?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I find that there is a report of the 24th January, 1885, with reference to the claims of the late Mr. Thompson, of Mr. Wetherbee, of Halifax, and of Mr. Davies, of Charlottetown, and then there is a petition of right obtained on behalf of Mr. Wetherbee. There is no difficulty about the matter; the hon. gentleman has a right to the money.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly. I do not see that there can be any slur cast upon him for having got this money. As to his earning the money, his capabilities as a lawyer and professional man are such as to place him above reproach.

Mr. WELDON. Referring to the remark of the hon. member for Grey, I did not blame the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) for asking for information in regard to this matter, but I blamed him for attacking the hon. member for Queen's in his absence. I do not blame the Government for resisting this claim. On the contrary, my opinion is, that they were quite right in resisting it, and also, in view of the difference of opinion in the Supreme Court here, they were quite right in carrying it to the Privy Council.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to criticise such accounts as these, and I would call their attention to some other accounts, which should receive similar criticism. I find, for instance, an item in the Public Accounts, under the head of railways and canals, where a member of this House appears as the recipient—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex)—of \$18,960.

Mr. BOWELL. Who is that?

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. member for North or South Victoria, I forget which.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman is entirely out of order. I think the hon. member for Queen's might say: Lord, save me from my friends; because we are willing to vote the money. I call the hon. gentleman to order, because he must discuss that matter, and not any other.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). This discussion was introduced by the member for North Huron, who read from the Charlottetown *Herald* matters which were much less relevant than this. I am as desirous as any one to keep to the question, but I think attention ought to be drawn to the vast amounts which are being paid for legal expenses. It is only fair to say, in regard to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), that the amounts were obtained by him in a case against the Government. He secured them as the solicitor for the section "B" contractors, in their case against the Government. I think, where a man secured \$4,500,000 for the Dominion, he ought to be treated as well as one who secured a verdict for \$395,000 against the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. In justice to the hon. member for North Victoria, the hon. gentleman should have gone further, and made the same explanation which was made by my hon. friend from St. John, in reference to the sum which he drew. On the contrary, being the lawyer who brought the case against the Government, the whole amount was paid to cover all the expenses so charged to him, and he disbursed them. The hon. gentleman asked a question as to the cost of this case. It cost about \$65,000 for lawyers' fees altogether, and costs, including this law suit. Now, there is one peculiarity about the legal profession that I certainly admire, and I regret very much that the same *esprit de corps* does not exist in the profession to which I belong. Whenever an unfortunate printer gets a few dollars, every other printer pitches into him, as if he was purchased, and was the biggest rascal that ever lived; but you touch a lawyer, and it makes not the slightest difference whether he is a political friend or opponent, they all stick together like wax. The hon. member for St. John county (Mr. Weldon) touched upon the question of the money that the hon. gentleman obtained as counsel. I heard the whole question in the committee, when it was up before, and I know the hon. gentleman was not liable to any charge, because he was not acting for the Government directly, although the Government paid the money.

To pay the amount awarded to Mr. Joseph Doutre, for services in connection with the Halifax Fishery Commission.....	\$8,000 00
Interest on same, at 6 per cent. per annum, from 29th August, 1879, 10th October, 1881.....	2,456 55
Costs in Exchequer Court.....	709 75
Costs of Supreme Court appeal.....	402 65
Costs of Privy Council appeal, £170 11s. 6d.....	830 12
	12,399 07

Mr. MACMASTER. I have only one remark to make on this item. This was as important a case as the country ever was engaged in, and it was only proper that leading counsel should be employed and paid fees commensurate with their services. These legal gentlemen were engaged by the late Sir Albert Smith, who made an arrangement with them that turned out to be very indefinite, and by reason thereof the counsel who were engaged pressed their claims for further fees, and the case of Mr. Doutre was taken as a test case. I happen to be familiar with the proceedings—in fact, they are fully reported in the law reports. Mr. Doutre, in that suit, recovered the additional indemnity, in the form of fees, of \$8,000; and the only question that could rise as regards the Government, was this: should the other counsel be paid a similar sum? Now, in my view, and I think it is the view every hon. gentleman must take, it would be difficult to discriminate between the several counsel. There can be no doubt whatever that the late Mr. Thompson was the leading counsel; there can be no doubt that he was a man of the greatest eminence in his profession, and that he left a name as an honorable man that the leaders of his profession might envy. There can be no doubt that he brought all the professional skill and great ingenuity that he possessed to bear upon the prosecution of that trial, and I think that as regards him, at least, it is entirely beyond question that he was entitled to the additional sum. Then would arise the question: Mr. Doutre having obtained judgment for the additional sum of \$8,000, can we reasonably object that the other counsel should have the same sum? I think that, owing to the importance of the case, owing to the length of time occupied, owing to the fact that the decision of the highest court was obtained, this additional sum should be allowed, and should not be questioned in this House. However, a full discussion having taken place, it is not my intention to enter into the details, but merely to pay my humble tribute to the memory and great ability of the late Mr. Thompson.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If the hon. gentleman, who is a distinguished member of the bar, will explain how a client can make anything else than a loose bargain in a law case, he will give us some valuable information.

Mr. McLELAN. The principal objection I have to this vote is that it establishes a precedent. The case was decided on appeal by the fact that large fees had been paid on certain occasions. I am afraid that these four counsel having received \$15,000 each for six months' services, will form a precedent, and that many unfortunate suitors will be made to pay large fees because the Government have paid this large fee.

Printing Commission..... \$864

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. *Cui bono?*

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Blackburn, of London, Ontario, and Mr. Chamberlain, proceeded to different cities in the United States, in order to report on the question of establishing a printing bureau. This vote is to pay the expenses of the commission.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it the intention of the Government to establish a printing bureau?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government have not come to any decision in the matter.

Mr. BOWELL.

Payments of salaries, etc., of members of North-West Council for 1881 and 1883..... \$4,000

Mr. MULLOCK. Will the Minister in charge explain how the amounts come to be paid for past years?

Mr. McLELAN. Previous to 1881 they had not been paid. Considerable correspondence took place, and the Government of the North-West Territories eventually agreed that the elected members should be paid \$400 and the nominated members \$200. It was paid out of the general funds of the North-West Territory, and this is to recoup the fund.

Mr. MULLOCK. What about 1882? Were any sums paid for that year?

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiries.

North-West Mounted Police—To complete service for the year..... \$300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that part of the expenses connected with putting down the revolt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is impossible to prepare an accurate estimate of the expenses of the Mounted Police in connection with the North-West troubles. Accounts from Edmonton and the Prince Albert districts have not yet reached Ottawa; but it is known that the Hudson Bay Company have paid out, on the certificates of its officers, over \$100,000. The accounts are being audited, and they will show the expenditure, distinct from the ordinary charges for maintenance of the force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is in the nature of a vote of credit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The expenditure cannot be approximated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The supposition is, that for everything entered in the Estimates information can be given and a detailed accounts presented. When an account cannot be given, a vote of credit should be had recourse to. This item, strictly speaking, should be treated in that way. I am aware the expenditure on that account must have been heavy.

Department of Indian Affairs—Assistance to institutions..... \$4,850

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this item of \$250, in connection with the establishment of ten scholarships in the Mohawk institute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will explain, in a moment.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Mohawk institute is one maintained by the New England Company, and that company on the Six Nations reserve maintains six or seven schools and an industrial institute. I do not remember any money being previously granted by the Dominion Government. I presume this is a new departure, and I trust it will prove to be one productive of good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was decided by the New England Society, under whose auspices the Mohawk institute is conducted, to establish, in the interest of Indian youths, ten scholarships, five for boys and five for girls, and to give to those pupils attaining the highest number of marks at the public examination for entrance into the high school the opportunity of attending the Brantford Collegiate Institute, and to qualify as third-class teachers. Then, the next amount, \$4,000, is to assist in rebuilding the industrial schools Wikwemikong, Manitoulin Island, which was destroyed by fire.

Mr. DAWSON. There were two of these schools burned down, and I hope the Government will see its way, if not this year, then next year, to give a further grant towards the rebuilding of the other schools.

North-West Territories—To complete service for the year ..... \$320,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The failure of the crops in the Saskatchewan district and Assiniboia, rendered it necessary that much greater assistance should be given in supplies. A Governor General's warrant for \$250,000 was obtained, but that amount was insufficient, and \$70,000 additional is now asked, though it is impossible, because the accounts are not in, to state the exact sum.

Collection of Revenue—Customs ..... \$2,242

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs when he expects to be able to appoint a collector at Sutton. Mr. Dunn has been there for some time; I believe he has ably performed the service, and I have no doubt that the sum now asked is not too high a remuneration for his services. In fact, I have been wondering why he was not appointed permanently before this.

Mr. BOWELL. The appointment, perhaps, ought to have been made some time ago, and it has been more negligence on my part than anything else, because Mr. Dunn has been acting since the superannuation of the previous officer. The matter will be attended to in a short time. I think this is one of the cases in which a difficulty has arisen under the Civil Service Act. That Act will allow you to appoint a collector, if he has never been in the service before; but if he has been in the service, it is regarded as a promotion, and the law makes no provision for promoting a man to a higher place until he has passed the qualifying examination. I think Mr. Dunn, who is a very good officer, is in that position.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope, before this time next year, the Government will take into consideration the advisability of amending a law which compels a man to remain in a subordinate position, and who is otherwise eligible for promotion, simply because he has not passed some wretched examination, while a new man may be appointed, without passing an examination at all.

Mr. FISHER. This is certainly rather an adverse commentary on the Civil Service law. I may say that I know Mr. Dunn; I know that he is doing the work efficiently and well, and I had not understood that he was not able to pass the examination if he had the opportunity.

Allowance for assistant postmaster of Ottawa for performing the duties of postmaster, as provided for in section 11, Canada Civil Service Act, 1882, from 1st April, 1883, to 1st February, 1884, being difference of salary between that of the postmaster and the assistant postmaster ..... \$1,502 09

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a large sum for twelve months' extra work. How does it come to be paid?

Mr. CARLING. This was paid to the deputy postmaster of the Ottawa post office, during the absence of Mr. Currier, the postmaster, through illness. Mr. Currier's salary was \$3,000, and this is the difference between the salary of the assistant and the postmaster.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the salary of the assistant postmaster?

Mr. CARLING. I think it is \$1,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me this is a very unnecessary and not a very well considered position. The assistant postmaster has not been appointed postmaster.

Mr. CARLING. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I do not see the necessity of doubling his salary, which appears to have been done here. It is stated here that that is done under a certain section of the Civil Service Act, but I take it that that

is a discretionary power with the Department, and not a matter of statutory right to the man. It appears to me this is a provision for needlessly increasing the expenditure. No one would object to a reasonable amount being paid to the assistant postmaster while he is doing the duty of postmaster, but so large a sum as this appears to be unreasonable.

Mr. CARLING. The large amount of Government business makes the business of the Ottawa post office very large indeed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should say such a thing as this would have the effect of rendering the gentleman dissatisfied with the salary he is getting.

Mr. CARLING. He is quite satisfied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think it is a correct principle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is a good principle, but it has always been the practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the law ought to be amended, and it ought to be left in the discretion of the department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2 a.m., Wednesday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. GIROUARD. I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the report in the *Globe* of the few remarks I made last Friday. The report is as follows:—

"Mr. Girouard objected to the proposal to subsidise the North Shore road because \$6,000 a mile of the subsidy to the Province of Quebec last year had been withheld. He contended that the whole bonus of \$12,000 a year should be given to the Province before any other question was dealt with. He had voted for the short line subsidy last year, mainly because the Maritime Provinces believed it would be to their interest. But he did not believe the trade could be secured for the Maritime Provinces, and was not prepared to vote \$5,000,000 for that purpose. He did not see any use in the surveys, and would vote against the amendment, as well as against the resolutions. The company was to be given two years to begin the work, and four years to finish it, so there need be no desperate hurry in settling the matter."

I complain of the balance of the report, which is rather extensive:

"He referred to the fact that the Minister of Railways was personally interested in this vote, being the virtual owner of the part of the road to be bonused. The Canadian Pacific had just come to Parliament to assist them to carry out the first contract, yet they proposed now to go into this work, for they were to build the short line, and the same Minister who proposed that they should get assistance was the one virtually who proposed they should be given this new work. He thought the transaction, in this light, was a disgraceful one."

I never said anything, even very remotely, which could warrant such a report. I never made any allusion to the interests of any party whatever, and it seems to me this report has been purely and simply an invention of the correspondent of the *Globe*.

### PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the tenth report on the printing of Parliament. He said: This report

deals with some papers to be printed in the ordinary way. It also recommends that an employé in the distribution office, who has been there for some time, Mr. John Wiltshire, should be made a permanent officer instead of a sessional officer. He has been paid \$250 a year as a sessional messenger or officer in connection with the Department. It is proposed to make him a permanent officer, at \$500 a year. Last year Mr. Hartney was compelled to employ special assistance to do the work, which cost \$129. This proposal involves, therefore, an additional charge of about \$120. Mr. Wiltshire is a practical binder, well acquainted with the work he has to do, and exceedingly useful in the Department. Formerly, in connection with the distribution office, the post office clerks were in the habit of putting up the blue books during the recess, but for the last two Sessions they have not consented to do this work. The result has been that the work of the distribution office has been largely increased in consequence of that fact. Mr. Wiltshire is a particularly suitable man for the work, being, as I have said, a practical binder, and the committee makes the recommendation I have mentioned. The report further recommends a change in the form of the index to the Sessional Papers. I have caused a copy of the proposed index to be placed on the desks of hon. members. Hitherto, the practice has been to make an ordinary index, simply giving the different numbers and abbreviated titles of the Sessional Papers, and then the papers themselves were distributed through the book, giving simply the titles, when they were not ordered to be printed. The result was, that in the Sessional Papers last year 200 pages were occupied simply with titles, and in some cases, leaving only a title on a whole page, it became a matter of considerable profit to the printers. It is proposed to make the index in the form of the sample laid on hon. members' desks. First, the general subject, and then the several papers brought down relating to the subject, are briefly indicated. Then there is the full title of the paper, and whether it was ordered to be printed for distribution or not, and the name of the member moving for it. In this way we have in this index a thoroughly complete statement of the Sessional Papers, and we save the printing of the titles in the way I have indicated. Then, Sir, this report deals with the question of the printing for the future. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the contract for printing expired last year, but in view of the suggestion that possibly a Government bureau of printing might be established, it was deemed wise to obtain with the contractors an arrangement, by which they consented to go on under the contract for one or for two years additional, at the option of Parliament. They have gone on for one year, and we have arranged that they shall go on for the second year; but as the proposal to establish a Government bureau does not appear likely to be carried out in the meantime, it was thought better to advertise for tenders. The printing, as done now, is not at all satisfactory—I do not say that as reflecting on the printers in any way—but the contract is near at an end, the type is worn out, and no prudent business man would think of renewing his plant on the expiry of a contract, and with the uncertainty of having it again or not, and therefore it was desirable that the contract should be renewed. In connection with this matter, the committee recommend the House to ask for tenders for five and ten years, so as to determine which will be the more profitable. It will be open for the committee and the House to accept a tender for one period or for the other, the object being, if possible, to induce people to tender *bonâ fide* for this work, and many might be induced to tender for a ten years' contract who probably would not care to go to the expense of putting up or obtaining buildings and erecting plant in Ottawa for a five years' contract. Then another recommendation in the report is, that the paper to be used shall be somewhat heavier than the paper now being used. I am satisfied that is not going to involve additional cost.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

The price of paper has largely decreased since the last contract was made, and the paper we are getting now, and which is now going into our present work, I believe we are paying for at the rate of about 2 cents a pound more than we could purchase in the ordinary open market, without tender at all, at this time. There is no doubt that we will be able to get a much better article of paper—and the character of printing depends, to a very considerable extent, on the character of the paper—at actually a less cost than we are getting it at now. It is proposed, further, that we do not ask for tenders for the paper for the full period. The getting of paper does not involve in any way the erection of buildings, or anything of that kind, in Ottawa, and it is therefore proposed that the paper shall be obtained each year for the work of the Session or the Sessional Papers. The opinion is—and I concur in that opinion very strongly—that in that way there will be a greater inducement to the several paper manufacturers to furnish a really good article, because, by doing so, a manufacturer who filled the contract thoroughly well one year would have a very strong claim to have it continued for another year. Then, Sir, a suggestion which I venture to make, is this: The committee, of course, have no power to make any recommendation on that subject, but they have had the matter under consideration, and I think they were unanimous in believing that, if it were possible to have tenders for the whole printing of the Government and Parliament embodied in one tender, we should induce a much larger and better competition, and probably secure the work to be better done. One of the difficulties under the present system is this: The Government advertise for tenders; that is a distinct contract. The committee of Parliament advertise for tenders, and that is a separate contract. A contractor may tender for one or the other; one person may be the lowest in one case, and may not be the lowest in the other, and at once he is compelled to make arrangements with the lower tenderer in the other case, so as to secure the contract for the whole. At this moment the public contractor has the whole work, but especially if they were embodied in one tender, they would undoubtedly be sufficiently large to induce persons to come here and tender, with a view of putting up establishments in Ottawa, thus securing in that way that kind of competition which I fear neither one nor the other, standing alone, would be likely to secure for us. These are the recommendations of the committee—except, of course, the last, which is merely a suggestion—and I have the honor to move the adoption of the report.

Mr. TROW. I beg to corroborate the statements of the hon. member for Cardwell, with reference, particularly, to Mr. Romaine, and the alphabetical index of Sessional Papers which he has prepared. Members will find it a source of great convenience in having their papers arranged in this form. I have found Mr. Romaine, in any business I have had to do with him, one of the most practical men in the service, and he has been the means of saving thousands of dollars to the Government by his arrangement of the stationery, and the various appliances he had been instrumental in bringing forward to facilitate the work of the House. As for Mr. Wiltshire, Mr. Botterel tells me that he is a practical man, and the additional sum paid to his annual allowance will be but trifling indeed. I hope that portion of the report will be adopted. I am sorry that the hon. member for Cardwell did not embody in his report the propriety, or the absolute necessity, of printing an additional number—a few thousands, at least—of the Franchise Bill, for general circulation. I am anxious that that should be done by the printing committee. It is a measure which has been under discussion for some time; it should be generally understood by the people, and I hope yet that the chairman of the committee will see the propriety of printing an extra edition for general circulation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to the last suggestion of the hon. gentleman, I may say that the matter was discussed, and it was thought better to leave the question of the additional number of the Franchise Bill to be printed until the Bill was finally passed. It is now passed, and of course it is one of those measures of which I have no doubt a very large edition must necessarily be printed. As to the remarks which the hon. gentleman has made with regard to Mr. Romaine, I should have stated that the work of preparing this index has involved a great deal of trouble, and that it is entirely his own work. There are reasons why, perhaps, I should not say much on the subject, but I think every hon. gentleman will admit that if there is one officer in the public service who not only earns his salary, but who has saved to the country three or four or half a dozen times his salary, the gentleman in charge of the Stationery Department of this House may be said to be that officer.

Motion agreed to.

#### ENQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways—and I regret that he is not here, but this is the only opportunity I will have of bringing it up to-day—to a return which was sent down on the 5th of May last, in answer to an Order of this House of the 24th of February last, for “copies of the returns, as required to be made under the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, and the Acts in amendment thereof, of 1881 and 1884, by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for the fiscal year 1883-84, in each year separately; the number of miles of main line; actual total cost of construction and equipment,” and so on. A number of items of information were ordered by the House. I find that the secretary of the Department says:

“I herewith transmit return, in answer to an Order of the House of Commons, dated 24th February, 1885, relating to detailed returns, as required by Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and amendments, by Grand Trunk Railway Company, for fiscal year 1883-84, and I am to inform you that a supplementary return will be forwarded as soon as the company furnishes the further information asked for.”

What I would like to ask the Government is, whether they have called upon the Grand Trunk Company for that additional information, whether the Grand Trunk has furnished that information, and if the Government have got it, when they will bring it down, in accordance with the Order of this House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Acting Minister of Railways not being here, I cannot give an answer, but I will mention the matter to him when he comes.

Mr. MITCHELL. The fact is, there is no information in this return that is worth anything. The material information is not given. It is like all the information given by the Grand Trunk.

#### SPIRITS TAKEN OUT OF BOND.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to give the information asked for by the hon. member for South Huron, with regard to the quantity of spirits taken out of bond in Ontario and Quebec, from the 1st July to the 6th of July, inclusive. According to the returns, there were taken out in Ontario 18,104 gallons, and in Quebec 28,269; but this does not show the actual facts of the case, because some of the liquor taken out in Ontario, for instance, at Prescott, was taken out for consumption in Quebec, so that the real quantity taken for consumption in Quebec would be 34,269 gallons, and in Ontario 12,104. I may state, also, that the largest quantity was taken out by one man, a merchant who telegraphed to Prescott on Saturday, ordering one or two car loads of whiskey, and again on Monday, doubling the order. I saw the telegram, because it was used as an argument why Mr. Wisner should be allowed to take out an additional quantity. The telegram stated:

“Cannot say anything as to the duties, but will write and give my own impressions.”

That entry was made, but the subsequent entries were refused; but I may state that the total quantity was 46,373 gallons, which does not exceed the ordinary quantity taken out in the same period of other months. But the fact remains, that a larger quantity was taken out at Quebec than anywhere else.

#### MANITOBA JUDICIARY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to provide, for the salary of an additional county court judge in the Province of Manitoba, the sum of \$2,000.
2. That the said salary shall be paid out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

#### QUEBEC JUDICIARY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the resolutions reported from Committee of the Whole, respecting the salary of the senior puisné judge of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec, be now read the second time, and concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 161) respecting the salaries of certain Provincial Judges.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway, chargeable to capital... \$455,432 38

Mr. MITCHELL. I would call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that when the Intercolonial Railway items were going through last Session, a discussion arose about some claims on the Intercolonial Railway. Sir Richard Cartwright referred to the claims of McGroevy, McDonald, McGaw, and some others. Sir Charles Tupper said:

“The principal one was Murray & Co., about \$100,000. The others were comparatively small sums. I suppose \$10,000 would cover them all.”

Mr. DAVIES. Will this close up all claims in regard to the Intercolonial.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the report of the commission.

Mr. DAVIES. Are there any outstanding claims?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; none that have not been considered by the commission.

Mr. DAVIES. Then this pays everything.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This report deals with all the claims against the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to reopen them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, I do not propose to reopen them.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are two or three trifling claims that I have brought under the Minister's notice, and which I received from my constituents. I hope these claims will not not be shut out from consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing can be foreclosed. That is a matter for Parliament entirely.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand then it is quite possible that Parliament may be called on to devote further sums in liquidation of other claims than those before us now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the hon. member for Northumberland refers to small matters, respecting which he has sent a communication to me, they will have to be examined; and it is impossible to say that we will close the door against all such claims. I say that all claims against the Intercolonial have been dealt with by the commission. They have reported on all of them.”

I called the attention of the then Minister of Railways to the fact that these claims have not been dealt with by the arbitrators. I was not in Parliament during the time they enquired into the Intercolonial Railway claims; and after 1882 these claims were forwarded to me by the representatives of the estate of Mr. John Bannon, and by some half dozen others in Northumberland, amounting to \$4,000 or \$5,000 altogether; they were claims that stood exactly on the same footing as others which have been recognised and paid. I called the Minister's attention to this when the subject was under discussion; I called the attention of the Department and the House to the fact that these claims were not enquired into or settled, and the Minister practically stated they would be dealt with and considered by the Government arbitrators with other Intercolonial Railway claims. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that these claims have not yet been dealt with. My constituents insist on an examination and enquiry being held into them by the Government arbitrators. That is all I ask, and I trust the Minister will give me the assurance that those few trifling claims will not be made an exception, more especially when the Minister of Railways, in committee, last year, recognised the right to have an enquiry made into them. I hope the Minister will refer the matter now to the Dominion arbitrators to have the claims investigated, and if just, paid, and if unjust, rejected. At present, my ground of complaint is that these claims have remained unenquired into. Of course blame attaches to me, if I do not press them; and in the interests of my clients and the performance of my duty as a representative, I must ask that they be referred to the Dominion arbitrators.

Mr. POPE. I think the hon. gentleman's constituents must be very unreasonable, indeed, if they complain that he does not press any claim they have sufficiently for them in this House, but as to referring them to the official arbitrators I do not think my predecessor promised to do that. The first thing the hon. gentleman must expect me to do is to have an enquiry as to how the matter stands, and after that determine what course to take.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not say that the predecessor of the hon. gentleman said we would refer them to the Dominion arbitrators. What I say is this, that that is the course which has been pursued in all these other claims and I have the right to ask that the same consideration be given to those. I also say that during the past year no enquiry or progress has been made towards settlement.

Mr. VAIL. I think the hon. Minister had better accede to the request of the hon. member for Northumberland. I have a very vivid recollection of another claim the hon. gentleman had which he persistently pressed until he accomplished his object.

Dominion Steamers ..... \$30,000

Mr. VAIL. I should like to ask if the report I see in the papers is correct, that the Deputy Minister has purchased boilers and engines for the steamer *Druid*, now lying in the docks at Quebec.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. VAIL. Is it the intention to purchase them?

Mr. McLELAN. I have had plans and specifications made, and I propose to call for tenders.

To refund the amount of bank imposts collected irregularly from banks..... \$41,048 92

Mr. BOWELL. I promised the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) to give him the information for which he asked last night. The amounts are: To the St. Stephen's Bank, \$16,879.96; to the People's  
Mr. MITCHELL.

Bank of Nova Scotia, \$20,999.91; to the Commercial Bank of Windsor, \$3,169.10—being a total of \$41,048.97.

Chinese Commission ..... \$11,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for South Huron asked for some information as to the salaries and so on, and the other expenses separated. The information I have is as follows:—Services—that means the salaries—\$5,241.60; travelling expenses, \$3,695.85; sundries, \$2,225.20; all this making a total of \$11,162.65.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is the salary distributed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is between Judge Gray, Mr. Davin, the assistant secretary; then the translation, then copying, then the assistant to Mr. Davin, then the reporter—these are the principal items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much to each?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Judge Gray received \$2,040; Mr. Davin, \$2,047; the assistant, Mr. Macdougall, \$174; the translator, \$415; copying, \$93; Mr. Boyce, assistant to Mr. Davin, \$397.50; and the reporter at Victoria, \$75. Then, besides that there are accounts not yet settled for printing and so on, amounting to \$5,738.50. Thus the whole amount is \$16,901.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without including, of course, the printing account.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A portion of that is in these accounts. There is the printing of the English version, and the printing of the French edition, and the translation, that is included in the \$5,738.50.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand that the \$16,000 will cover all?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will run up to nearly \$17,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will cover all?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, according to the information I have.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does that cover the translating of the printing into French?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

To settle the claims of the estate of the late S. R. Thompson, and those of Mr. Justice Weatherbee, of Halifax, and Mr. L. H. Davies, M.P., of Charlottetown, for increased remuneration as counsel before the Halifax Fishery Commission, \$8,000 each ..... \$24,000 00

Mr. VAIL. Does this cover the whole amount claimed by the parties?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The \$24,000 covers the whole claim of these three gentlemen. They agreed to accept \$8,000 each, and not to claim any interest.

To provide for the payment of the salaries of the members of the North-West Council for 1881; and to recoup the general revenue fund of the North-West Territories for the amount paid out by the Lieutenant Governor on account of members of the Council for 1883..... \$4,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to enquire whether provision has been made, or is to be made, in the Estimates for further funds for schools in the North-West Territories. I have observed a correspondence which has recently taken place in the Territories, with reference to the application of the Act which we are engaged in amending—as to its application only to places in which municipal institutions have been established. I observe a statement made by the acting clerk of the Council that the funds at the disposal of the territorial Government are not adequate to supply, I think

it is, something like one-tenth the demands that are made upon it for schools in the Territories. I was anxious to know whether that subject is attracting the attention of the Government, because it is obvious that nothing could be more lamentable for the future of that country, than that young people should be growing up in ignorance there.

Mr. McLELAN. That matter is being considered, and there is an additional sum for schools.

Allowance for Assistant Postmaster of Ottawa for performing the duties of Postmaster, as provided for in Section 11, Canada Civil Service Act, 1882, from 1st April, 1883, to 1st February, 1884, being difference of salary between that of the Postmaster and the Assistant Postmaster..... \$1,502.09

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last night I called the attention to the abuse, as I conceived it was, which was growing up in this direction. Looking at the phrase used here that such and such allowance is made for performing the duties of postmaster as provided in section 11 of the Canada Civil Service Act, I supposed, and I dare say a good many other members in the House supposed, that that Civil Service Act required that the payment should be made. Now on looking to the Civil Service Act, 1882, section 11, I find that it says this :

"In the absence of any deputy head, a chief clerk to be named by the head of the Department shall perform the duties of such deputy head, unless the performance of such duties is otherwise provided for by Order in Council."

Well, that may be said to have a bearing in principle on the fact that the assistant postmaster is to perform the duties of postmaster when the postmaster is away; that, I suppose, is what he is appointed for. But there is in that, at any rate, no ground why the Government should pay \$1,502 for the services of this gentleman for ten months, in addition to his ordinary salary of \$1,500 or \$1,600. It appeared to be thought by the Postmaster General and by some of his colleagues, that there was some compulsion in the matter. Apparently, there is no direction, even, in the matter; the thing is left wholly and entirely in the hands of the Government. Now, I know perfectly well that this particular item of \$1,500, in itself, is not very large, but it establishes a principle which will be mischievous. The authority certainly, is not in section 11 of the Civil Service Act, 1882; but if there be elsewhere any such provision I think it is well that the attention of Parliament should be called to it, and that the thing should be amended, because I can conceive no ground for an officer's salary being doubled for taking the duties of his chief, who may be dead or absent. I do not object to a reasonable allowance being made, but this thing disorganises the service. I see that Mr. Bolduc, who was assistant postmaster of Quebec, discharged the duties of postmaster for one-half the time, and he gets \$250. The other officer, who performed the duties of postmaster for 10 months, receives \$1,500. That kind of thing is mischievous, and it needs to be looked into. It would be quite right if extra work and responsibility were thrown on officers, that some consideration should be shown them; but it does not follow that an officer in receipt of \$1,500 or \$1,600 a year should get his salary doubled, as is proposed to be done here. The First Minister concurred in the view—although he seemed to suppose it was imperative that such amounts should be paid—that this and the other proposed increases should be amended and brought into proper proportions; and if there were a doubt as to the law, it should be amended, so as at least to leave it optional with the Government to decide what would be a fair and proper remuneration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this case, as the First Minister stated last night, there may be room for improvement. Here are two officers in the same position, acting respectively for the postmaster during his absence or illness,

one of whom receives, for ten months, \$1,500, and the other, for five months, \$250. That is accounted for in this way: The officer who receives only \$250 for the five months has a much larger salary than the other officer, and therefore the difference between his salary and that of the postmaster was much smaller than in the case of the officer at the Ottawa post office who was filling the position of postmaster while the chief officer was sick. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman has said. It looks rather strange that an officer should thus double his salary. No doubt, this matter will receive the attention of the Government, and next Session the law may be modified in order to meet the difficulty. In the Act of 1882, section 49, sub-section 2, it is provided that when the duties of a superior officer or clerk are performed by an inferior officer during a period of three months and upwards, that clerk or officer may, on the recommendation of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the Department, and provided there are funds available from the parliamentary vote, receive in addition to his salary the difference between such salary and the salary of the postmaster whose duties he has performed. The clause is not imperative, but the deputy head having reported the same, and the report being concurred in by the head of the Department, the salary may be so increased. I know both of these officers, and I know that they are efficient officers and properly performed the responsible duties entrusted to them, and they are entitled to have the benefit of this clause in the Act. The only question would be, if this principle is to be maintained, whether the clause should not be amended so that the whole difference of the two salaries may not be granted but only a portion of it.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand this clause it gives that power only when money has been appropriated by Parliament. But what the hon. gentleman is now doing is to bring down a number of grants and to ask parliamentary sanction to them. That is an injurious precedent. I had supposed when the law was passed that it was intended to deal with this matter so as to allow a discretionary power in the hands of the Government, and I can well conceive many cases in which the duties of the office would be light and some cases in which the duties would be very onerous, and a discretion should be left with the Executive with respect to payment to be made. It is proposed to lay down the proposition that, even if there is not a parliamentary appropriation, there should be extra amounts given to officers. That will be surrounded with very considerable difficulties. The efficiency of the service very often requires, no doubt, that a good and faithful officer should be permitted to be absent for a time; I do not object to that, but on the other hand, that is an arrangement which should be very cautiously made. The officers of the service have their regular occasions of absence from their duties, and under the supposition that the staff when it is complete is not more than adequate to the service, it is a positive evil that there should be long absences when there is practically no head to the Department. It is one thing that a man should be able to discharge duties of the head of his office in a pinch, but is he able to discharge the duties of the head of his office, and his own too? If he is, it is because the Department has too large a staff, and if he is not, then the service must suffer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the 49th section of the law, I think, it is provided that in case the superior officer is away for more than 3 months, it is only in that case that the additional salary will be paid. As a rule we give the officers, according to the statute, 3 weeks of a recess during the year, always taking care that too many may not be absent at the same time, and that the public service may not suffer. If a longer absence is desired, of course there must always be an Order in Council

which states the reason why it is granted, and it may be worth while to consider whether an officer, who has leave of absence on urgent business of his own, should not be called upon to provide for the addition to the salary whilst he was away. I think, however, in the case of an old and valuable officer in the service, whose health is breaking down, and whose medical man says that he requires three or four or five months to recuperate, the rule under section forty-nine might be followed, though it may put the Government and the country to a little more expense for that purpose. I may say that this question of remuneration has been noted, and will be considered during the recess with a view of seeing whether we can next Session make such an amendment as to provide a sort of scale for the remuneration of officers performing such duties as we have referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Had Mr. Winstanley another salary besides what is there provided for?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, \$960 and travelling allowances. He was appointed to the position of chief railway mail clerk, Toronto division, the remuneration of which is fixed by statute.

Liquor License Act..... \$60,000

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I should like to enquire what is the exact amount paid to enforce or carry out the License Act of last year, also whether or not any remuneration has been fixed by the Government for commissioners and inspectors, and what becomes of the moneys received from license holders. I observe by a return brought down that the sum of over \$77,000 was obtained from the liquor dealers of the Dominion as license fees. Has that money been paid over to the Government, or retained by the commissioners as part of their salaries or fees?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give the exact amount of the cost of administering this service. I suppose it will be about \$150,000 for last year which includes the amount received from the license dealers. With regard to the amount paid in salaries, of course the salaries vary according to the population or extent of the license district to which the officers are appointed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Who fixes the amount?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Governor in Council. I cannot state the amount of the remuneration paid to the commissioners more definitely than by saying that they each get \$5 a day for attendance and a mileage of 10 cts. per mile to the place of meeting. The moneys received by the different boards as fees have never been paid to the Government; they never were required to be paid. The moneys paid are usually subject to the control of the board, and are used to pay the running expenses of the board. The amount they have received will be taken into account, and where there is a deficiency, this vote will go to cover the salaries and expenses. In some of the larger cities there has been a surplus, but under the provision of the Act they do not get the benefit of that surplus. It goes to the local authorities.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it has cost about \$150,000; would he tell us what good it has done?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In round numbers, it has cost \$150,000. As to the good it has done, that is another matter.

Mr. FISHER. What is the salary of the inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no fixed salary for the inspectors. The salary is regulated according to the extent of the district, the population, and the number of licenses applied for.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the general range of them?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose from \$100, and I think one or two are as high as \$2,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a large salary; it is the salary of a county court judge.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That was fixed by the commissioners in those large places where the revenue and the quantity of work was very large. The sum of \$2,000 is for the whole inspection, and in some places it includes two or three persons.

Mr. FISHER. Do the commissioners fix the salaries of the inspectors or does the Governor in Council?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The commissioners have the right to fix the salaries of the inspectors, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; but there is no uniformity in the salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask a question which arises out of letters which I have received from counties in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force. I suppose that in counties in which the License Act is in force, the duties of the commissioners and inspectors would be largely nominal; but in counties where the Scott Act is in force, their duties will be other than nominal, provided they are performed. A gentleman writes from a Scott Act county, saying with reference to the commissioners:

"They are good men, and sincerely desirous of having the law enforced. They have, however, done nothing since the first of May towards enforcing the Act. We gave them cases, but they refused to proceed, because most of our cases will be imprisonment, owing to this being the offenders' third offence, and they have no funds to meet the costs of the cases."

Other letters from Scott Act counties state that cases have been brought to the notice of the inspector, and he refuses to prosecute. If you are going to pay inspectors in Scott Act counties fair salaries, it is certainly right that they should do something to earn their money; and it would be foolish to spend money in these counties if the commissioners or inspectors refuse to prosecute the cases. These salaries will have to be paid from the 1st of May last till the 1st of next May; it is now the middle of July, and they have not undertaken a prosecution in that particular county yet, the reason given being that they have no funds. As I understand the law, it is that whatever fines and penalties come from convictions go into a fund which is used for paying the expenses of the prosecution, and I think that in all Scott Act counties some definite direction should be sent to the inspectors that they shall do the work the law requires, and that it shall not be entirely optional with them, just at their own will or whim, to take cases and prosecute. Of course until they prosecute and obtain convictions, they will get no funds or fees; but I apprehend that the law as administered will be something like this. In a Scott Act county where convictions are had, a few fines and fees are brought in, and a certain fund is created thereby. Out of that fund the inspector pays the expenses of the prosecution, and at the end of the year makes a return; and what remains of the fund goes to pay the salary of the inspector, and the appropriation we are now making goes to make up any deficiency there may be in the salary. Is that the Minister's understanding of the law?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the view the hon. gentleman takes of the Act is quite correct. It provides that the fee of \$10 which accompanies the application, the fee of \$5 which is afterwards paid, and all fines and penalties that may be imposed and collected, shall form a general fund, out of which the expenses are to be paid; and if that sum be not sufficient to cover the salaries and expenses the deficiency is to be made up by a vote of Parliament. With regard to duties of inspectors in Scott Act counties, my own impression is that the only duty they have to perform, and the only reason for their existence as a staff, is the enforcement of the Scott Act. I think it is their duty to

enforce the Scott Act in Scott Act counties, just as any other officer discharges the duties assigned to him; there can be no doubt about that. The only duty they have to perform at present, I think, is to see that the Act is carried out fairly.

Mr. FOSTER. Just one more question, which I suppose the Minister is prepared to answer. We know that when the test case was appealed and brought before our Supreme Court, for a time nothing was done. Several of the commissioners have since written to me asking whether any instructions were to be given to them to go on and carry out the law. Will the Minister say whether any instructions will be issued to the commissioners and the inspectors in the line of performing their duties as they have done?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Instructions will be issued. I wish it understood that the remuneration paid commissioners and inspectors for last year, will necessarily be the same for the present year. The remuneration for the present year will be paid subject to the consideration of the reduced duties they will have to perform.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 158) to authorise the granting of further subsidies to and making provision for the construction and efficient operation of the railways therein described.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After the first paragraph, I would move to add this clause which is the same as that in the Act of last year for the incorporation of a company:

And for the purpose of incorporating the persons undertaking the construction of the said railway and those who shall be associated with them in the undertaking, the Governor in Council may grant to them, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter conferring upon them the franchises, privileges and powers requisite for the said purpose, which shall be similar to such of the franchises, privileges and powers granted to railway companies during the present Session as the Government shall deem most useful or appropriate to the said undertaking, and such charter being published in the *Canada Gazette*, any Order or Orders in Council relating to it shall have force and effect, as if it were the Act of the Parliament of Canada.

There are two companies. Of course we cannot subsidise two companies, and we want to have power to incorporate one company, so that the two companies may come to some understanding, if possible; otherwise the two would be fighting against each other for the subsidy.

Mr. LAURIER. The difficulty will not be so much to choose between the companies as between the routes. One company is incorporated to build a railway from Rivière du Loup by the Rivière du Loup valley; the other, from a point somewhere in the county of Kamouraska by the way of Rivière Ouëlle. How is the Government to determine between these two routes? We have no surveys of them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, we have surveys. This clause would give the Government a right to incorporate a company to go from the one point to the other, the Government having information about the length of the two proposed routes and the facilities or difficulties of each, so as to decide which of the two is the best. This does not prevent any other company, which may have a charter, from building any railway if they choose; but as this is a special grant, we must be in a position to know where the railway is to go.

Mr. LAURIER. If the Government has all the information, why not make a selection now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government wish to reserve the right to examine again and select the best route.

Mr. BLAKE. This makes it essential the Government should charter a company in order that the subsidy be paid. There are now two companies, and it is proposed to make an arrangement by having recourse to the incorporation of a third. Although I do not know that there will be any

great rush of companies to construct this enterprise, and I think the hon. gentleman will find he will have enough to do dealing with those two without creating a third. He may find it easier to grant a charter than to build the lines. It seems to me that the provision now made in conjunction with the subsidy is a provision for a company to be chartered by the Governor in Council, so that it may be difficult, if not impossible, to give the subsidy to either of the two existing companies. The hon. gentleman said that, of course, the existing companies would build a line under their charter. Of course, they have the power to do that, but they will not have the sinews of war; and we know that it is probable that there will be one line, and not two.

On sub-section 2 of section 1,

Mr. WELDON. When the resolutions were before the committee, I understood that this would be a railway commencing on the south bank of the St. Lawrence, connecting with Montreal. It was clearly understood that the building of a bridge was not to be included, and I would suggest that the words should be inserted:

"For a line of railway on the south bank of the river St. Lawrence connecting Montreal."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see the object of that. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to throw any obstacle in the way of this line. There is now one bridge; there may be two bridges. There are two companies chartered, and I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to leave it as it is.

Mr. WELDON. As it stands now, it would include the building of a bridge, and it was understood that that was to be an independent business altogether; but this would permit the money to be applied to the building of a bridge across the St. Lawrence, which I am sure is not intended.

Mr. BLAKE. It would not only permit the application of the money in that way, but it is imperative. The whole subsidy is to be applied proportionately, and, as it is for a line between Montreal and Salisbury, you must provide for the cost of a bridge over the St. Lawrence out of the subsidy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We might add the words:

A line of railway on the south bank of the St. Lawrence opposite Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE, I should like to understand what is the understanding of the Government as to the mode in which this particular subsidy is to be paid.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of the Government in asking Parliament for this subsidy is stated in the Bill:

"For a line of railway on the south bank of the St. Lawrence, opposite or near to Montreal, to the harbors of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, via Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mettawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury, a subsidy not exceeding eighty thousand dollars per annum for twenty years, forming in the whole, together with the subsidy authorised by the Act forty-seventh Victoria, chapter eight, for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the said harbors of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, which the line above described is found to be, a subsidy not exceeding two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per annum, the whole of which shall be paid in aid of the construction of such line of railway for a period of twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work: The said subsidy to be so granted upon the terms and conditions of and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in the manner specified in the said last mentioned Act in respect of the subsidy thereby authorised in aid of the said line of railway."

This is for that railway. The Government will have to make an arrangement with the company undertaking this work, and will take such means as will secure the completion of the line and its working from end to end. I said the other day that we would take special care in the arrangements with the company that the portion of the line to Salisbury would be completed as well as the other portion. It covers the whole ground.

Mr. BLAKE. I failed to make myself intelligible. I was anxious to show how it was proposed to pay this subsidy. This subsidy, you will observe, is different from ordinary subsidies granted in aid of railways, which are so much per mile, and which are to be paid upon a calculation of the proportionate cost of, I think, 10-mile sections, each section getting its share of the whole. Now, is it intended to apply the same principle to this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the first thing to be done will be to ascertain, of course, what the proportionate cost will be of the different sections of 10 miles long, and you will apply so much of the grant. But then you say the grant is a grant of a special character; it is an agreement to pay \$250,000 a year for 20 years. Now, supposing that form is adopted—because the two forms are open to the Government and the company—one to take a guarantee of interest and the other just to take \$250,000 a year for 20 years. Let us take the first form. Suppose the company says: We want the \$250,000 a year for 20 years. Is any instrument to be executed by the Government, any document which shall be a document of title or of credit, when a 10-mile section is completed, indicating the right of the company to so much of its subsidy? Then on the other hand, supposing they adopt—as they are likely to adopt—the alternative provision: is it intended that the Government shall guarantee as many bonds as are earned for a 10-mile section when a 10-mile section is completed; and then when another 10-mile section is completed to guarantee another lot of bonds, proportionate to the amount? Or how is it to be worked?

Mr. GIGAULT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I highly approve of the route chosen by engineer Davy for the Montreal and Sherbrooke section. This route, passing through the counties of Chambly, Rouville and Shefford, will afford the most advantageous line, and will tend greatly to the development of the resources of the localities through which it will pass. These municipalities are in great want of these new railway facilities, as stated in engineer Davy's report. Here is what he says on the subject:

"The country between Montreal and Sherbrooke, through which the proposed line passes, is greatly in need of railway facilities, a portion being practically undeveloped from want of means of communication."

I regret that the question of substituting to this route that which is offered by the existing railways from St. John to Waterloo has been raised. The effect of this change would be to give a much longer and much less advantageous line than that which was suggested and explored by Mr. Davy, and I see no reason why we should adopt this change, unless it is intended to neglect public interest in order to favor the proprietors of the railways built between St. John and Waterloo. By virtue of the legislation enacted last year we are bound to subsidise the shortest line after causing surveys to be made; the engineers have found that that line is that which goes through the counties of Chambly, Rouville and Shefford. It would be preposterous on our part not to adopt that line. In building that short line we must choose the most advantageous route, and we must also seek to favor the localities which are in the greatest want of this means of communication to develop their resources. This double result will be attained if we act according to the report of engineer Davy. I hope the Government, in disposing of the subsidy which we are about to vote, will choose the shortest line, the most advantageous line, and the line which will be most likely to develop the resources of the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, I may say that one proposal is \$250,000 a year during so many years, and the other is a guarantee

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work. As I understand the project it will be this: That bonds may be sold and the proceeds of the bonds placed in the hands of the Government, and as the work proceeds and each 10-mile section is completed, the amount of money in the hands of the Government would be paid in the same proportion. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that there will be some sections where the work will be heavier than in other sections, and that will have to be well weighed and determined on beforehand, so that there will be no misunderstanding about the amount to be paid. When the work is going on the company may, for example—as the hon. gentleman knows that these things sometimes occur—go on and build an easy portion of the road and ask for an equal amount for that portion which they would have had for a heavy portion; but we could not allow this. We take care that if the easiest portions of the line are built first they will be paid only in proportion to the work performed, or to the heaviness of those sections, always taking into consideration that if the heaviest portions of the line are left to be built last more money will be paid for them than for the first ones.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposal the hon. gentleman makes is not one that is in the Bill as it now stands. Under this Bill the Government is not free to guarantee the interest on the whole mass of bonds which are to be issued for the purpose, that is to the extent of \$250,000 a year for 20 years. The proposal is not in the Bill, and is not authorised by the Bill, and cannot be carried out legally under the Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It comes to the same thing.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg your pardon. If you grant a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company it is the same thing. If you adopt the other mode the result is absolutely the same, and the Government would take care, if they granted a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds, that the bonds should be in the hands of the Government, and the amount should not be used except in the way I have indicated.

Mr. BLAKE. I maintain, and the hon. gentleman will find I am correctly maintaining, that the Government has no power under this legislation to adopt the course the hon. gentleman has informed us the Government intend to adopt. It is one thing to ask Parliament to give power to allow the Government from time to time as 10-mile sections are completed to give a subsidy, on whatever terms it is to be given, whether as one gross sum, or as an annuity for 20 years, or as a guarantee of interest on bonds; and it is quite another thing to say that the Government intend, before one mile of the road has been completed, to give the company a guarantee or bonds on \$250,000 a year for 20 years. The Government thus enter into an obligation to guarantee the interest on the interest, and they do guarantee the interest to the extent, without even 10 miles of the road being built. You may say that we get the product of the obligation. But the bonds may be sold at such prices that it may not be a very good account out of which to pay principal and interest. Whether it is a good obligation or not is, however, beside the question. The question is whether any such arrangement is covered by this Bill? I say no. If hon. members would look at the clause they will see it stated that the subsidy is to be payable on the terms and conditions set forth in the Act. The Act says that the subsidies shall be payable on the completion of sections of 10 miles in proportion to the value of the work done. If the Government give a guarantee, instead of paying the money, they must guarantee payment on the completion of each 10-mile section; but hon. gentlemen opposite propose to

guarantee the whole amount before one mile of the road is built. That is an entirely different financial operation, and one not authorised by the Bill. It is premature to consider whether it is desirable or not, because it is not authorised.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman may be sure of this, that the law will be observed. If my scheme goes beyond the law, we will not go beyond the law. I think that if you may pay \$250,000 a year for 20 years you can guarantee a like sum for a like period on the bonds of the company undertaking the work. We may perfectly well guarantee the bonds and retain them in our hands, instead of paying out the money, and this would come to the same thing. Perhaps my scheme goes a little further than what the hon. gentleman thought; but it amounts to the same thing, for instead of having the money in our hands we would have the bonds, and on these bonds being sold the company would have the money to redeem them.

Mr. BLAKE. A moment's consideration will show a clear sighted man like the Minister of Public Works that there is a very great difference between guaranteeing bonds which we keep in our hands, and guaranteeing bonds to the company and allowing them to go to the public and sell the bonds at a discount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The bonds will not go out of our own hands.

On section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. I ask the Minister why he has made this subsidy \$500,000. I understood from him the other day that it was to be about \$1,000,000, that is \$500,000 to recoup and about \$460,000 to improve the line. Am I correct in that statement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated that the determination and decision of the Government were to purchase the North Shore Railway from the Grand Trunk Railway Company at a certain figure, which the hon. gentleman has stated, and that railway would pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which would assume the debt remaining on the road, that is to say, the debt to the Quebec Government of \$3,500,000 and the amount of the bonds on the road, I believe \$1,725,000. We have asked this sum for the same purposes as last year, which was that failing any negotiations of this kind, or supposing the matter should fall through, the Government may not be without the necessary power.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it proper to have a very clear understanding on that point. I understand the policy of the Government is that there should be a purchase by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the North Shore Railway. Does the hon. gentleman mean to pay off the debt to the Quebec Government; or is the debt to be placed upon the Canadian Pacific Railway or on the North Shore?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Upon the North Shore.

Mr. BLAKE. Am I to understand, then, that the statement referred to by my hon. friend and corroborated by the hon. gentleman, as to the terms of the understanding which has been made, is correct; or that circumstances have occurred to alter the position, because when the hon. gentleman announced the understanding previously, it was definite and absolute. Arrangements have been made, and there was no longer that element of uncertainty which had existed up to a comparatively recent period. It is possible that, supposing this arrangement for buying the North Shore and transferring it to the Canadian Pacific Railway is carried out, this large sum, which is larger than the sum required by more than half, may be expended to accomplish that particular object. Is it that there is still a doubt as to whether it can be done for the money spoken of? And that there is a question whether we may not require to

pay more than half a million dollars more in order to acquire that road; or is it that those negotiations to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which I understood were completed, should by some accident fail, then it is the other plan that is to be adopted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, that is the case.

Bill reported with amendments.

On motion for concurrence in the amendments,

Mr. KIRK. I move the following amendment:—

That the report be not now considered, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the Bill by providing that the work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fred-erickton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the portion of the whole line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think that this is an amendment which should be made, as if it were carried instead of helping the enterprise, it would throw obstacles in its way. Other hon. gentlemen may come forward and ask that work on other portions of the line shall be prosecuted simultaneously. That is not done anywhere; we see no such provision in any charter; no road is undertaken in that way. After the explanations I gave just now, that the contract which the Government will have to make, will be made in such a way as to secure the completion of the line, taking care that the heaviest portions of the line may not be left to be built, and paid with an amount only equal to the easiest portions of the line, but that the different portions may be paid for according to the character of the work to be performed—under these circumstances I hope the hon. gentleman will not persist in his motion. If he does, of course I must ask hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill to vote against the amendment.

Mr. KIRK. I dare say if I had as much confidence in the hon. gentlemen and his declarations as some hon. gentlemen, I would probably be willing to withdraw the motion; but the hon. gentleman knows that I have not got full confidence in the promises of this Government, because I know that many promises and pledges hitherto made with reference to work to be performed in Nova Scotia have not been fulfilled. I know that many grants have been made in this House at the suggestion of the Government, which should have been expended years ago; that lines of railway have been projected and subsidised which should have been in operation to-day, but not a dollar has been expended on them, and the railways have not been built. I think, Sir, with regard to this road that the chances are that the same thing will occur again, and that the grants provided for in this Bill, are just about as likely to be expended as those which have been made in previous years to other lines. For that reason, I have to ask the House not only to sustain the promise of the Government with regard to this measure, but to provide by a vote if they choose to do so—if they choose to vote against it I cannot help it—for the securing for the Province of Nova Scotia that which it is its right to have. We have had promises from this Government, time and time again, that they would make Halifax the winter port; and when I speak in the interest of Halifax, I speak in the interest of the whole of Nova Scotia. I am not here as the representative of the city or the county of Halifax; I am here as the representative of one of the most distant counties of Nova Scotia; but I know that anything that is done in the interest of Halifax benefits my county, and I know that if Halifax were made the winter port, my county would be benefited. For that reason I am anxious that the pledges made by the Government that they would make Halifax a winter port shall be carried out. There are no gentlemen in this House who know the value of those promises better than

the members for Halifax; they have had the benefit of them in more elections than one. We know also that large sums of money have been expended to prepare that harbor for the extension of the railway to the deep water terminus. A large amount of money has been expended in building a wharf and an elevator for the purpose of facilitating the shipment of grain which is to be shipped over the Intercolonial Railway from the great wheat-producing sections of this country; but although these works have cost a large amount of money, and although the elevator has been built for the last three or four years, not one single cargo of wheat has been shipped through that elevator. It is true, a few portions of cargoes have been shipped, but not one full cargo; and I venture to say that if this road is built on the line projected—and the House has declared that it will be—and if the section of the line I refer to is not built, I do not think one of us here will live long enough to see the time when grain will be shipped through that elevator. Therefore the money which has been expended upon it is absolutely thrown away. Besides all this, Nova Scotia is paying her full proportion of the cost of building the Canadian Pacific Railway. This Parliament has voted \$100,000,000, outside altogether of the land grant and the money realised from lands, for the purpose of building a railway from Port Moody to Montreal. Nova Scotia is paying her full proportion of that money; she is paying to-day \$250,000 per annum of interest on the cost of that railway; and what benefit does she receive for it? We pay in interest on that work alone almost all we receive as subsidy from this Government, and we were promised that Halifax would be made the winter port of the country, in order to receive the vast amount of traffic that would come over that great road; and to-day we are asked to vote a sum of money to build a road—in the interest of Halifax? Certainly not. This road, if built, as I suppose it will be, on the line proposed by this Bill, will be of no advantage whatever to Halifax; it will be in the interest of the United States ports, and not of Halifax. When these resolutions were first introduced into this House, there was no mention made of the section of road to which my motion refers; there was no reference made to the line to Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury; evidently it was an afterthought that it should be included at all. The road, when built to Mettawamkeag, will have a connection with Salisbury; and we have no pledge from the Government that this section of the line will be built. The Minister of Public Works, in his speech the other day, pledged the Government to secure the building of the road from Mettawamkeag to Salisbury. When the road is built to Mettawamkeag we have connection, but the Short Line is not complete unless it is built to Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury. Unless this section is built, the road will be of no earthly benefit to the Province of Nova Scotia or to the city of Halifax. It may be built; but what we want is that, since the Government and Parliament have declared that it shall be built by this company, we want to take care that it shall be built as soon as possible. Therefore, I cannot, at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, withdraw my motion, and I shall have to ask the House to divide on it.

Mr. DALY. I cannot allow the observations the hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Kirk) has just made, to pass without saying a few words as a representative of the city of Halifax. I fully believe that the hon. gentleman is actuated by a sincere desire to further the interests of the Province from which he comes; but at the same time, I believe he is mistaken in the mode he is now adopting to show that desire. I believe that the interests of Halifax are very largely wrapped up in the completion of the undertaking to which the Bill now before the House relates. The scheme is one which the people of Nova

Mr. KIRK.

Scotia at large, as well as the people of Halifax, have been looking forward to with interest and with expectations of great profit for many years past, and it is one which we now rejoice is approaching its accomplishment. This Bill, we believe, and the measures the Government will take under it, will tend to accomplish an object the people of Nova Scotia have had at heart for a very long time, that is, that while Canada has been taxing itself, and Nova Scotia as part of Canada has been bearing its proportion of the taxation, for the development of the great west, we in the east wish to participate in the benefits which that great development is likely to produce. We believe a direct connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway system with the city of Halifax will be of great advantage to the whole Province and to that port particularly, and we believe that object can be accomplished by the measure now proposed. To hamper that measure with embarrassing details would, we think, prevent our accomplishing that object. The company will be obliged to seek in the markets of the world the necessary assistance to extend this railway from Montreal to Halifax; and to impose upon that company the necessity of commencing the work on each particular section of the line simultaneously, would, we think, involve the company in embarrassments which this Legislature should not impose upon them. To enact these conditions would render it difficult for any company to obtain the necessary capital for the undertaking. I, for my part, have sufficient confidence in the declarations of the Minister to the effect that the intention of the Government will be fully carried out in any agreement or contract that is made with the company. For that reason, I think, it is unnecessary to hamper this legislation with conditions which may defeat the very object we have in view, instead of promoting it. The hon. gentleman referred to the interests of Halifax. I am very glad he takes an interest in the welfare of the city I have the honor to represent. He stated that many of the promises of the Government have not been fulfilled in regard to this very project which is now before us. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the promises of the Government to the people of Halifax have been amply redeemed with regard to the terminal facilities which have been afforded for the Intercolonial at that port. I know I am understating the figures when I say that over a million dollars have, by the generosity of this Parliament, been granted to the development of the eastern terminus of the Intercolonial Railway, in the building of a deep water terminus with facilities for the shipment of grain which are not surpassed in any Atlantic port of the Dominion. An elevator has been built at enormous expense, and I will inform the hon. gentleman, as he does not seem to be aware of the fact, for he has said that no grain whatever has passed through the elevator that—

Mr. KIRK. I did not say that.

Mr. DALY—upwards of 400,000 bushels of grain have passed through it this year, and parts of two cargoes of grain passed through last year. This is but the beginning of a trade which, when communication exists between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Halifax by this short line, will still further develop itself. It is not correct to say that no grain has been shipped through the port of Halifax.

Mr. KIRK. I did not say that none had been shipped.

Mr. DALY. I maintain that Halifax is our winter port, and enjoys advantages which no other port in the Dominion possesses for the trade. The extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, with the great traffic which it must necessarily control, to our eastern seaboard, is a part of the policy of this Government, and every friend of Nova Scotia should support a measure which will give an opportunity to the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend its system to the Mari-

time Provinces. I, therefore, do not wish to see any amendment introduced which will hamper the scheme or tend to prevent in any way the accomplishment of what we all desire. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the law passed last year, which this measure puts into operation, they will find that the work is to be completed within three years. With that provision on the Statute Book, no further necessity exists for pledging the company to complete the undertaking within a shorter period. I believe when the law comes into force, and we have heard from the president of the company, the Canadian Pacific Railway are willing to negotiate with the Government to undertake the scheme which they look upon as a necessity and a supplement to their system. Halifax will be in a position to rejoice in the fact that this Parliament had the liberality, and this Government the statesmanlike ability to formulate these provisions, and ask Parliament to ratify this large outlay for the benefit very largely of the Maritime Provinces. Instead of captious fault-finding, these resolutions meet with the cordial approval and congratulation of every hon. gentleman from the Maritime Provinces who loves his country.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) has made a statement in which he has intimated that he had no confidence in the Government. I would place more reliance on his attack had not the hon. gentleman intimated to me, on more than one occasion, that he intended, on every opportunity, to drive as many nails as he could into the Conservative coffin. I am glad to see that provision is made for extending the railway to Nova Scotia, with the prospect of carrying it through the Island of Cape Breton to an Atlantic port there. I designate the hon. gentleman's speech as an uncertain sound from a Reform trumpet.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Daly) has pointed out to us what was our duty as patriots. Well, some of us have to perform these duties as patriots in some circumstances and others in other circumstances, from different points of view, and inspired by different notions as to what the duties of patriots are. If it was patriotic, statesmanlike and wise, if this proposed Act is such an Act as should receive the plaudits of every unbiased and independent, unpurchased and unpurchasable patriot, what shall be said of the Government that guaranteed us twelve months ago that they would do the same work for little more than half the money. Where was the patriotism, the statesmanship, the wisdom then? And ever since we have been asking on what calculation the Government now say they will do the work any more than last Session. We have asked what the cost of the line is estimated to be, and cannot find out; we have asked what line is to be built by the subsidy, and cannot find out. We were told by Sir Charles Tupper last Session that this thing was to be done at a capital charge of \$1,890,000. The hon. member for Halifax finds that the Government wholly failed in performing it and telling us in fact, though they will not say so in words, that this was a jump in the dark, a mere guess, because they now come down this Session and say they will require \$3,400,000 to do it. Having proved by that the imperfection of their calculation of twelve months ago, they will not give us bases for giving confidence to their present calculation by telling us on what it is founded; and notwithstanding that the hon. member for Halifax has hardly words strong enough to express the wisdom and farsighted statesmanship of the Government.

Mr. BURPEE. If the motion before the House embarrassed the Government or the company building the road, I would not vote for it, but any person, knowing the circumstances, knowing the situation and locality of the road, must know that it cannot have that effect. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Daly) appears to be exceedingly grateful that this road should be extended down to the Maritime

Provinces. I feel grateful for small favors very often, but I contend that it was the duty of the Government 18 years ago to have built a commercial road to the Maritime Provinces. The Government are only now attempting to do what they have left undone for the last 18 years.

Mr. MITCHELL. No such thing.

Mr. BURPEE. I will except the portion of the country that the hon. member for Northumberland represents, because in order to reach his constituency—and I am proud to see he has such influence with the Government—they left the rest of the Maritime Provinces out in the cold. The hon. member from Montreal stated that the road was not required by the Maritimes Provinces. He is perfectly satisfied to get the Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal and let it stop there, and after that they can distribute the produce that comes over the road to the United States or anywhere else. But the hon. gentleman is very careful to urge upon the Government that the canals shall be improved, so as to facilitate trade to Montreal, and desire the abolition of the tolls on these canals in order to benefit Montreal. We have not only a fair claim to a road being built to the Maritime ports, but, if Montreal has a fair claim to the abolition of the tolls, and the canals being made free, we have an equal claim that the railway should be made free, to a certain extent at all events. However, members of this House generally have not objected to the road being built to the Maritime Provinces. With the exception of the hon. member from Montreal, they have not raised any objections to that road. Unless we get a good road, however, it will be of very little service. We want the best and shortest road, with the best curves and grades. The road which has been selected across Moosehead Lake *via* Sherbrooke, in order to accommodate St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, is about the best that could be selected. I do not say it is the only road, but it is one of the best. I tried to get information as to whether it was practicable to cross Moosehead Lake, but I did not get the information I should like to have had. If it should prove to be impracticable, and they should propose to take the south side of Moosehead Lake, that would not be the best road. According to the reports, it would be 13 miles longer, but I think it will make a difference of 30 or 40 miles. If you cannot go across Moosehead Lake, you would get a better road north of the lake. I hope the road described in the Bill will be carried out. I cannot see any difficulty in regard to this particular portion of the road from Harvey to Salisbury, being built simultaneously with the other portions, and I thought there would be a clause in the Bill which would guarantee that the whole road should be placed under the same contract. It is not there, however, and I shall therefore have to vote for the motion of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk).

House divided on amendment of Mr. Kirk.

YEAH :

Messieurs

Auger,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casgrain,  
Fisher,  
Fleming,  
Forbes,  
Geoffrion,  
Gunn,

Harley,  
Holton,  
Innes,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingston,  
McCraney,  
McIntyre,  
McIsaac,  
McMullen,  
Mills,  
Mulock,

Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Wells,  
Weldon,  
Wilson.—40.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allison,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Bell,

Fortin,  
Foster,  
Gigault,

Pope,  
Riipel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),

Bergeron, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bowell, Bryson, Cameron (Inverness), Carling, Caron, Cochrane, Colby, Costigan, Coughlin, Cuthbert, Daly, Dawson, Desaulniers (Maski'ngé), Desaulniers (St. Maurice), Desjardins, Dickinson, Dodd, Dugas, Dupont, Farrow, Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Gillmor, Girouard, Gordon, Guilbault, Hackett, Haggart, Hall, Hesson, Hurteau, Jamieson, Kranz, Landry (Kent), Langevin, Macdonald (King's), Mackintosh, Macmillan (Middlesex), McCallum, McDougald (Pictou), McLelan, Massue, Mitchell, Montplaisir, Paint, Patterson (Essex), Pinsonneault,	Robertson (Hastings), Ross, Royal, Scriver, Small, Smyth, Sproule, Stairs, Taschereau, Tassé, Taylor, Temple, Valin, Vanasse, Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), Weldon, White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wigle, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), Wright.—83.
---	---	--

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BLAKE moved :

That the Bill be not now considered as amended, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same by providing that the accounts of the subsidised companies shall be subject to investigation and report by the Auditor General of Canada.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anger, Blake, Bourassa, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Cartwright, Cassgrain, Fisher, Fleming, Forbes, Geoffrion, Gillmor, Gunn,	Harley, Holton, Innes, Kirk, Landerkin, Laurier, Lister, Livingston, McOraney, McIntyre, McIsaac, McMullen, Mills, Mulock,	Paterson (Brant), Platt, Ray, Scriver, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Springer, Sutherland (Oxford), Trow, Vail, Watson, Weldon, Wells, Wilson.—43.
---	---	---

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Allison, Bain (Soulanges), Bell, Bergeron, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bowell, Bryson, Cameron (Inverness), Carling, Caron, Cochrane, Colby, Costigan, Coughlin, Cuthbert, Daly, Dawson, Desaulniers (Maski'ngé), Desaulniers (St. Maurice), Desjardins, Dickinson, Dodd, Dugas, Dupont, Farrow,	Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.), Fortin, Poster, Gigault, Girouard, Gordon, Guilbault, Hackett, Haggart, Hall, Hesson, Hurteau, Jamieson, Kranz, Landry (Kent), Langevin, Macdonald (King's), Mackintosh, Macmillan (Middlesex), McCallum, McDougald (Pictou), McLelan, Massue, Mitchell, Montplaisir, Paint,	Patterson (Essex), Pinsonneault, Pope, Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton), Robertson (Hastings), Ross, Royal, Small, Smyth, Sproule, Stairs, Taschereau, Tassé, Taylor, Temple, Valin, Vanasse, Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wigle, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), Wright.—79.
---	--	--

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. BURPEE.

SUPPLY—REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORY.

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

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before this motion is put I desire very briefly to call the attention of the Government to a matter that I consider of vital importance to the Dominion at large, and especially to the North-West Territory. It will be remembered that in the Session of the Imperial Parliament, 1871, an Act entitled: "An Act respecting the establishment of Provinces in the Dominion of Canada," was passed. The second section of that Imperial Statute reads as follows:—

"The Parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any Province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such Province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such Province, and for its representation in the said Parliament."

Now the provisions of this statute are clear. They give to the Parliament of Canada the power of establishing new Provinces in Territories forming part of the Dominion of Canada, and the power of giving such Provinces their due representation in the Parliament of Canada. Under that statute only one Province has so far been established, the Province of Manitoba. Now it will be recollected that in the Session of 1884 of this Parliament, I introduced a Bill with a view of giving representation to the Territories in the Parliament of Canada, and upon that occasion I pointed out to the Government what, in my judgment, appeared to be an absolute necessity for the representation of those Territories in this Parliament. On the introduction of that Bill I discussed the matter at some length. No answer was made by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. During the present Session of Parliament I again introduced that Bill, a Bill that was demanded, as hon. gentlemen well know, by, I think, the almost unanimous voice of the people of the North-West Territory. On the second reading of the Bill I gave the reasons why, in my humble judgment, the people of the Territories ought to be represented in the Parliament of Canada. The Minister of Public Works moved the adjournment of that debate, and it has not been reached again this Session. Now, I may say that since the introduction of that Bill I have more carefully than I formerly did, looked into the power of the Parliament of Canada to grant representation to the Territories, and I have come to the conclusion, whether rightly or wrongly, from a careful examination of the statutes dealing with this subject, the Union Act and the Act amending the Union Act, the second clause of which I have just read, that it is extremely doubtful whether this Parliament has power by Bill to grant representation to the Territories of the Dominion of Canada. Now, upon a question of such importance, a question that this Parliament will be required to deal with, action ought to be taken, and that action ought to be taken by the Government itself. Government has failed to take any action in the matter for the last two or three years; although, as the Minister of Public Works well knows, it was pressed upon the attention of the Government. The Government have taken no steps to grant the representation to the people of the North-West Territories. Now, I say that the power to grant such representation is now not vested in the Parliament of Canada, and steps ought to be taken immediately by the Government to obtain that power. I do not propose to discuss this question at any length, but I desire to say, what must be known to almost every member of the House, that it appears to me of the greatest consequence to the peace, growth and prosperity of the North-West Territories that they should have representation in the Parliament of Canada. I think no man who

knows anything whatever of the affairs of the North-West Territories, who knows anything of the views of the people there of all shades of political thought, but must come to the conclusion that, sooner or later, these Territories must be represented in this Parliament, and the sooner it is done the better it will be for the people in those Territories. Sir, I hoped that the Government of this country would deal with this question during the present Session; and I hoped, in view of the persistent demands that have been made by the people of the North-West Territories for the last three or four years, and in view of the recent occurrences, that the Government would direct the attention of Parliament to this important question, and take the necessary steps to give the people of those Territories representation in this Parliament. Having that in view, I delayed drawing the attention of the House to this question until the closing hours of the Session, but I have waited in vain for the action of the Government. I now wish to point out to the Minister of Public Works that, according to my view of the law, it is doubtful if we have the power to grant such representation; I think there must be an Address to Her Majesty the Queen, praying Her to cause legislation to be passed through the Imperial Parliament vesting that power in the Parliament of Canada. It was stated, I think, by the Minister of Agriculture, during this Session, when submitting the proposition to take a census of the North-West Territories, that such census was taken with a view to representation; but unless action is taken in the matter during the present Session it is very doubtful if the people of the North-West Territories will be represented in the next Session of Parliament. Without trespassing further on the time of the House, I beg leave to move the following amendment:—

To leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following instead thereof: It is expedient, that at the earliest moment, provision should be made for the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada, in such manner as shall to that Parliament seem expedient.

That it is doubtful whether the Parliament of Canada has power to provide for such representation, so long as the said Territories are not formed into Provinces, or otherwise than in the hitherto accustomed method.

That unless Imperial legislation is obtained, additional delays may take place in the granting of such representation.

That it is expedient to address Her Majesty the Queen, praying that she may be pleased to move the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass such legislation as may remove the doubts as to the power of the Parliament of Canada to provide for such representation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman reading the Act of 1871 says he believes there are doubts as to whether the Parliament of Canada could give representation in this House to the Territories. There may be doubts, it may be a matter of certainty, for all I know. The question, for the present, is not that question. This subject has not been brought forward in this form, except by the hon. gentleman, when, some months ago, he had a motion on the Notice Paper and made a speech upon it, after which I asked the House to postpone its consideration, which was agreed to. At this period of the Session the hon. gentleman comes forward with a motion that we shall ask the Imperial Parliament, through Her Majesty the Queen, to give us power under this head. The motion is premature; at all events, Parliament has not pronounced in that direction yet. But it has been decided this Session that there shall be a census of the population of the Territories taken in order that we may ascertain what their population is, where it is placed and whether it is sufficient to form a Province and have representation in this House, if representation were considered by Parliament to be proper under the circumstances. We have just passed the Census Bill, and the Government has been authorised to expend a certain sum for that purpose; but it has not yet passed the other House and has not yet become law. We have not had one minute to ourselves to see what is to be done in

order to put into effect the order of Parliament to make a census of the population in the North-West Territories. We intend taking advantage of the power that Parliament is giving us, and we hope within a short time to take such census. When that is done, we shall be in a position to consider the next step. No one more than the members of the Government desires that the Territories shall be governed with all due consideration and that the people have all the powers, liberties and privileges that subjects of Her Majesty in Canada enjoy. But, on the other hand, we must look to matters as they are. The Territories are not organised into Provinces yet. If sufficient population be found there, and if the people wish to have a Province created, we would be in a position to come down to Parliament and create a Province, as was done in the case of Manitoba. When I visited the Territories last autumn, and matters connected with the Territories were discussed with the leading men of the Territories, at all events where the railways gave me access to them, and in all the towns and villages for some distance from the railway, the question was asked: Do you wish a certain part of the Territories created into a Province? The unanimous answer was: No; we have not the means of maintaining a Province now, and we do not wish a Province to be established, because while we would have the advantages of a Province, we would have also the responsibility, onus and expense of a Province. The wish was expressed that there should be some kind of representation for the Territories. The idea had not taken such a form with the settlers that they could submit it to the Government; but they thought we might devise some means of giving representation, no matter how small it might be, to the Territories. I know that wish was expressed. But I told them: How can Parliament give you representation before the Government know how many people are in the Territories? We want to know whether you are sufficiently numerous to have representation. I therefore told them that I was not in a position to make any promises, but that the first step to be taken would be to have a census of the population taken in order to ascertain the number of people. The estimates as to the population were very different. Some thought the Territories had already a population of over 150,000, others thought 100,000, others again believed that the population was not over 60,000. I have no idea of the population of the Territories; but from the power Parliament has given us to have a census taken, this question will be set at rest in a short time. Then we will be in a position to consider the matter, and to come down to Parliament with a scheme, if the population is sufficiently large to have representation, or if some portion of the Territories has a dense population. The question of representation in this House will require a good deal of consideration, because if the Territories have no provincial rights, if we are to continue to govern them as Territories, the position of representatives would not be exactly that of the present members of this House. That might be a difficulty for the moment, but it is exactly such difficulties that Parliament is called to surmount, and no doubt if the population of the Territories be found to be large enough to have representation, the Government and Parliament will find some means of giving them representation. The population may be found so dense in a certain section that it may be deemed desirable to erect that district into a Province and give it representation accordingly. Holding these views, I think the hon. gentleman is premature in submitting this motion. If the census gives the result I was speaking of, we will be in a position next Session to communicate the matter to Parliament, and see what measures we intend submitting for their consideration; and if the power is required, if we find that we have not power enough under Imperial statutes or under our constitution, then will be the time to ask those powers from the Parliament of England. That Parliament

sits about the same time, and generally to a much later period than we do, and we would have plenty of time to ask the Imperial Parliament, or to ask this House, to pass an Address, seeking the necessary powers, and we would have an answer in good time to give representation in those Territories if needed, just in time for the general elections of 1887. Under these circumstances, I object to the motion of the hon. gentleman, and I hope this House will not consent to adopt it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has given us his views with reference to the formation of the Territories into Provinces, with a view to representation here. That is not the question raised by the motion. It is just precisely because my hon. friend is of opinion that Parliament will probably be disposed to give some of the Territories representation before they are formed into Provinces that he is bringing forward this motion. I entirely agree that the creation of Provinces out of Territories is a question which has to be disposed of only after mature consideration, and when you find that the circumstances in all respects as to population, as to the ultimate centres of population and as to the possibility of supporting the position of Provinces, are favorable, that is a question that we could dispose of before long, one way or the other, in some portions of the Territories. The question my hon. friend presents, is—and I agree with him—that we are at this moment, in all probability, disabled from giving any representation to the Territories unless we get this authority; and what the hon. gentleman desires is, that we should be clothed with the authority to enable us to legislate in such a manner as we may deem to be in the public interest, at the time when we approach the subject of such legislation. The hon. gentleman says it is premature, because we are going to have a census. Well, I remember that when we were discussing the Census Bill we learned that the Minister of Agriculture does not expect the census to be completed by next Session, and he has taken until, I think, the 1st of July or the 1st of August next, on the declaration that it was impossible to complete it earlier, and therefore we are not going to have the census in time to act upon it, if the census is to be a necessary preliminary to this particular step of obtaining authority. Now, this step commits us to nothing more than that it may be in our view in the interest of the country that we should give representation to the Territories, and it is expedient that we should get power, in order to enable us to give that representation. Let us get power to legislate in this way, if in this way we think it good for the country to legislate, next Session, or at a subsequent Session. The hon. gentleman says, and says truly, that Territories represented here would occupy a somewhat different position from the Provinces. We know the particular form of representation which has been fixed by the wisdom of the Republic to the south of us for those populations which are still in the rudimentary condition of Territories, that is, that they are entitled to send a representative, who is more a delegate, perhaps, than a member of Parliament, who has the right to speak, and to all the other privileges of the House of Representatives, but not the right to vote. Other methods of representation might be adopted; I am not saying that would be a satisfactory method, but it is one method which would be open to our consideration. These are questions fit to be thoroughly discussed and debated, when we come to consider how we shall give representation to the Territories, but they are not relevant to the present discussion. The question now is, have we power now to give representation to the Territories. If we have not, or even if it be doubtful if we have it, is it not well to show the Territories that we are not going to lose time in getting the power to secure that representation. For my own part, I see no inconvenience, but a great advantage, in our stepping forward,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

under the circumstances, and during this Session taking this step towards clothing us with the legislative power to do that which I think is essential to the contentment, peace and good government of those Territories.

Mr. ROYAL. I believe the Government and this House have shown the Territories what we intend to do towards the representation of those Territories. I believe the Census Bill which has passed the House is a sufficient indication of the spirit in which we are approaching this important question. That measure is sufficient to show the Territories that this House is prepared to give them representation if there is any necessity for it. But I believe this motion of the hon. member for Huron is premature, for the very reasons he has himself given. The hon. gentleman has never been able to show that there was any necessity for the representation of the North-West Territories in this House—he has not been able to show it by any writing or documentary evidence. I must give credit to the Mackenzie Government for the admirable territorial constitution they gave to the North-West Territories in 1874, and if the population of the Territories is large enough, or is as large as stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, it lies within their powers, it is in their own hands, to organise themselves into Provinces, and thus take advantage of those institutions, when the proper time arrives for them to do so. It is a matter of wonder to me that the hon. member for Huron, at this stage of the Session, after preparing a Bill to give representation to the Territories, should now tell us that there was no legal basis upon which to frame such a Bill. What would have been the result if his Bill had passed? The result would have been that, to a certain extent, we would have stultified ourselves, if we had no constitutional right to pass such a measure. I believe the Government has acted more wisely by ordering the census to be taken of the various parts of the Territories. After the census is taken, we will be able to see whether the present constitution will be made available and taken advantage of by the population of the Territories or not; whether, in fact, there is any necessity to give representation to the population of those Territories, outside of those portions of them which are created into Provinces. I think the hon. gentleman, before drafting Bills or bringing on discussions, which, I believe, are premature, should have commenced with the speech he has just now made, expressing his doubts as to whether we have any right to give representation to those Territories or not. As the Minister of Public Works has stated, there is little doubt about the matter; I believe there is certainty. My hon. friend, the member for Jacques Cartier, who has given study to the subject has expressed the view that we have no right, under the constitution we have, to give representation to any portions of Canada which are not Provinces. Therefore, I believe the hon. member for West Huron, instead of bringing up a premature motion, should have begun, at the commencement of the Session, by expressing his doubts about the constitutionality of his course.

Mr. MILLS. I do not agree with the view expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that those people are not entitled to representation, because they are not sufficiently numerous to be constituted into a Province. The hon. gentleman assumes that the territorial system in the United States, in giving representation in advance of the formation of a State, is not a desirable system to introduce into this country. I entirely dissent from that view. I hold that it is not to the advantage of the country that the people of the Territories should be pressed to assume all the responsibilities of a Province while the population is very small. There are many difficulties that do not occur so long as the territorial system continues. There is the question of subsidy; there is nothing to prevent this Parliament from making appropriations for schools,

and for various other local purposes in the Territory; and there is nothing to prevent this Parliament, when the people become sufficiently numerous to assume the responsibility of an ordinary Province, considering the expenditure made for local purposes on their behalf. In the United States the system of territorial representation has worked most satisfactorily. There is a uniform rule; everybody knows what it is; it is not tinkered with from time to time; and the policy of the country is not changed with every change of Administration. I think that would be a highly desirable state of things to establish here. Our territorial system of government is only adapted to the most initiatory stage of territorial settlement. When the people become sufficiently numerous in a Territory to entitle them, if they were a portion of a Province, to send a representative to Parliament, I see no reason why they should not have a representative in Parliament, without being compelled to assume all the burdens and responsibilities of an ordinary Provincial Government. I think, on the contrary, there would be great advantage in permitting them to do so. What would have been the condition of things in our Territories during the past twelve months if the people residing in that country had a representative on the floor of this House? Whether he would have had the privilege of voting or not is not now an important consideration. If the people had spokesmen here, who would have an opportunity of making Parliament acquainted with the condition of things in the Territory, with the grievances of the people, with the wrongs that were unredressed, with the administrative acts which the Government have neglected to perform, it is impossible to suppose that this Parliament would have allowed that condition of things to continue, without pressing the Administration to redress those wrongs, and avoiding all the expense, the heart-burnings and conflicts which have resulted in that country from the negligence of the Administration, and the ignorance of Parliament with regard to the actual condition of the population. Now, my hon. friend makes a proposition based upon the assumption, which I believe is well founded, that the British North America Act does not authorise this Parliament to give to the people of a Territory representation on the floor of the House of Commons. Now, we ask that the Imperial Parliament shall be moved to give us that power. That does not compel us to immediate action; it gives us the power to act, and then it leaves us to decide whether representation in this House shall be given, and at what time it shall be given. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) has said that while the territorial condition continues, those people ought not to be represented, but that when they are organised into a Province it will be time enough to give them representation; and he says the Government have taken measures to take the census in that country, with the view of deciding whether the people are sufficiently numerous to justify establishing a Province in that Territory or not. I have no doubt in my own mind that they are not sufficiently numerous. It is not desirable to imitate, in this case, the policy that we pursued in dealing with Manitoba. I believe Manitoba would have been better satisfied—her condition would have been more satisfactory, and she would have had a larger population to-day, if the initiatory stage of territorial Government had been adopted in the first instance, until she had a larger and wealthier population to assume the responsibilities of a Province. Holding that view, I support the motion of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). I think it is a rational proposition, and we are not taking the step a moment too soon; the Imperial Government would not legislate in the direction we ask earlier than would be necessary in order to carry into effect the results of the census which we propose to take. And we shall satisfy the population of the Territory; we shall show them that

we are not indifferent to their interests, and we show to the many other people who may be disposed to go into that country that if they go there they will not cease to possess the rights of British freemen, but will have power to elect representatives to promote their interests, to speak on their behalf, and to move Parliament to remedy any grievances of which they may complain.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. GIROUARD. It is consoling to me to find that, after all, my long speech of six hours has produced some good, even where I did not expect to find any. Until that speech was delivered, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) was ignorant that this Parliament had no jurisdiction in the matter of giving representation to the North-West Territories. He was so much convinced that it had, that he introduced a Bill last Session to give representation to the North-West Territories, and, after nine months of study, during recess, he came back again, at the beginning of this Session, with the same Bill, and he was not convinced he was wrong until that long speech was made. Now, however, at a very late hour, he comes with a motion, admitting that this Parliament has not jurisdiction in the matter of giving representation to the North-West Territories, and that application must be made to the Imperial Parliament. During the North-West debates, I believe I was the only one who mentioned that we had no jurisdiction in the matter, and that there were two difficulties to be overcome in meeting the wishes of the North-West population. I believe there is only one opinion in the House, and that is, that sooner or later, and the sooner the better, the population of the North-West must be represented in this Parliament; but, at the same time, I pointed out two difficulties: First, the want of a census, the want of that knowledge of the population which cannot be determined but by a census, but which, notwithstanding the express desire of the Opposition to give representation to that population, was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The second difficulty was the want of jurisdiction or power on the part of this Parliament to give the representation. I suggested, at the same time, that, as our officers were proceeding with the census, this Government would take the initiatory steps to secure the amendment to our constitution from the Imperial Parliament. In 1870, when we amended our constitution, in order to create another Province out of that Territory, it did not require an Address from this Parliament. The amendment was asked by the Government, and that was held to be sufficient; and the same course may be followed between now and the next sitting of Parliament; but I am greatly disappointed to see that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), and especially the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), should urge that we should take the proceeding suggested by the hon. Member for Huron. That hon. gentleman says: Let us go and ask the Imperial Parliament to give us power to give representation to the North-West, without showing what kind of representation, whether with a right to vote or without it, as in the United States, or without showing how many members should be returned; without determining the districts that shall be represented; in fact, without giving any details whatever. I am surprised at this, because it is the very reverse of the doctrine and policy laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1870. At that time, on the discussion of the constitution of Manitoba and the North-West, as it was then proposed, Mr. Dorion moved, in amendment to the proposition of the Government, that all the words after "that," to the end thereof, be left out and the following substituted:—

"The Hon. Mr. Dorion moved, in amendment to the said proposed amendment, seconded by Mr. Mills, that all words after 'that,' to the

end thereof, be left out, and the words 'irrespective of the merits of the measure proposed by the Government of Canada, to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament, for the purpose of confirming certain Canadian legislation, depriving the Parliament of Canada of certain existing powers, and altering the British North America Act, 1867, this House would be wanting in its duty if it did not express its decided opinion that no such Imperial legislation should be asked for by the Government of Canada, except after the details of such proposed legislation shall have been submitted to both Houses of the Parliament of Canada, for their judgment, and Addresses of such Houses to the Queen, praying for such legislation, shall have been passed,' inserted instead thereof."

I hope this will convince the hon. gentleman that his motion is, at least, premature.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman will look at the reason for that motion, if he will look at the papers, he will see that the proposition of the Government was to ask for Imperial legislation without the consent of Parliament. Our proposition was, that Parliament should ask for that Imperial legislation, and that was ultimately agreed to.

Mr. GIROUARD. You asked a little more than that; you asked that no Imperial legislation should be asked for without first having the details submitted to Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. So they were.

Mr. GIROUARD. You ask for no details in this Bill.

Mr. DAWSON. I have just a word to say about this matter. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said that this Bill was intended to give the people of all classes and all shades free institutions in the North-West, by means of territorial government. I approve of a great deal of what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said about territorial government. I think you might have territorial government there that might work very well; but with regard to the Bill of the hon. member for West Huron, I consider it the most unfair measure brought before Parliament. I consider that, instead of giving the people free institutions, it is so worded as to have the very opposite effect. It is well known that a large portion of the people there are Indians or half Indians. This Bill is so drawn as to exclude Indians; it will give to one-third or one-half the population the power of governing the whole. I consider the half-breeds all come under the designation of Indians, and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) would exclude half the community from participating in the privileges proposed to be conferred on the people of the North-West Territories. I believe that if this Bill were carried into operation in the North-West it would prove to be a fire brand of discord, by excluding one part of the people from its operation, and permitting the other part to govern. It would be a return to what was common in the dark ages, by allowing one half of the community to govern, and making slaves of the other half. The hon. member for Bothwell, with his beautiful way of dealing with the Indians, would never allow them to have votes. He would send every Indian back to his reserve, to serve an apprenticeship for three years, before he could be enfranchised. That was his view, as expressed in the debate on the Franchise Bill. I think, therefore, this Bill is entirely premature, and can well lie over until another Session.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Cameron (Huron) :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Anger,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,  
Burpee,  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casgrain,  
Fleming,  
Forbes,  
Gillmor,  
Gunn,  
Harley,  
Holton,  
Innis,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
McCraney,  
McIntyre,  
McIsaac,  
McMullen,

Mills,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Scriver,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Vail,  
Weldon,  
Wells,  
Wilson.—35.

Mr. GIROUARD.

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Abbott,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Barnard,  
Bell,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Blondeau,  
Bowell,  
Bryson,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),  
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),  
Desjardins,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Dupont,  
Farrow,  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Gigault,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Guilbault,  
Hackett,  
Hesson,  
Homer,  
Hurteau,  
Jamieson,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Langevin,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Mackintosh,  
Macmillan (Middlesex),  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald (Pictou),  
McLellan,  
Mitchell,  
Montplaisir,  
Orton,  
Pinsonneault,  
Pope,  
Pruyn,  
Riopel,  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Small,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Taschereau,  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Valin,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
White (Hastings),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wigle,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Wright.—77.

Amendment negatived, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of the Interior—Two mining geologists, as 2nd class clerks in the Geological Survey Branch..... \$2,400

Mr. BOWELL. We propose to reduce that by \$200. They are to be appointed at the minimum of the class, \$1,100 each, which will make \$2,200.

Mr. HOLTON. What are the duties to be performed by these officers?

Mr. McLELAN. They are to attend to the exploration of mines. I think one is now engaged in the east and one in the Lake Superior district. Their attention is to be devoted especially to mining.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the gentlemen to be appointed?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Coste and Mr. Ingall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Acting Minister state whether these gentlemen have received any special technical instruction fitting them for this position?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Coste has attended the mining schools in Europe.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what I wanted to know, because both in Germany and elsewhere there are mining schools of a high character, and if we are going to recognise the importance of having these parties, it is proper that the men appointed should have received a scientific education. Probably, on concurrence, the Minister can inform us as to the special qualifications of the second gentleman appointed.

Mr. HOLTON. I should like to ask the Minister why a special vote is necessary for this service, when it was shown by the special committee last Session, on the evidence of Dr. Selwyn, that this service could be undertaken without additional cost.

Mr. McLELAN. These gentlemen have been for some time, I believe, on the staff, and have been paid from contingencies. I explained the other night that it was proposed to reduce the vote this year by \$10,000, and to vote that \$10,000 separately, in order to finish up last year's work; but from the length of the Session, it was allowed to stand at \$60,000. This year it will be decreased to \$50,000.

Mr. HOLTON. But the vote was not decreased.

Mr. McLELAN. It would have been decreased if Parliament had been prorogued at the usual time, and it would have been only \$50,000 this year, instead of \$60,000, and \$10,000 would have been taken in the Supplementary Estimates to pay up the balance of last year.

Mr. DAWSON. I was not here the other night when there was a little discussion on the subject of the Geological Survey, and I desire to make a few remarks on that subject. There can be no one more ready than I am to give credit to the Geological Survey for all it has accomplished. Its explorations have extended far and wide, and many of the reports of its officers are very valuable. Without wishing to make invidious distinctions, I may say that the explorations of Dr. Bell, in the regions of Hudson's Bay, and the reports he has made thereon, are of national importance. My namesake, Dr. Dawson, has distinguished himself by his researches in the central parts of the continent and in British Columbia, and his very able reports are of value in a practical as well as a scientific view. He has been criticised somewhat adversely for the attention he has bestowed on the customs, language and history of the Indian tribes among whom he travelled, but I think he has done well to notice and record the characteristics of a race fast passing away, or, at all events, changing its habits, and soon to be absorbed or destroyed by the advance of civilisation. His researches in this regard will, I have no doubt, be of value to such scientists as seek to trace the origin and early history of the races who occupied this continent before the advent of the white man; and as the matter came in his way, and could not have interfered with the main object of his surveys, I think he has acted wisely and well in giving us all the information he could obtain about a subject which is, in itself, of very great interest. Professor Macoun, too, has done much, and his reports are replete with valuable information as to the climatic conditions and natural productions of the wide regions he has traversed. He has shown us that extensive sections of the country, formerly believed to be barren and inhospitable, are in every way adapted to the growth of such plants as are needed for human subsistence, and has convinced us that our great inheritance in the north and west is much more valuable than it was at first believed to be, and that the area, either cultivable or adapted to the growth of valuable forests, is of continental dimensions. But, giving the officers of the Survey full credit for what they have done and the earnestness and zeal displayed by many of them, still, I must point to a direction in which some of them allow their zeal to outrun their discretion, and that is in regard to a habit they seem to have acquired of decrying mineral discoveries made otherwise than through the Survey. In this direction, the worthy director is not himself altogether blameless. It is said of a certain animal that he becomes furious at the sight of a red rag, levels his horns and rushes bellowing to toss it in the air or trample it in the dust. Something like this is the effect that a mineral discovery seems to produce on some of the members of our Geological Survey. Whether such discovery be in the copper-yielding formations of the Quebec group, in the silver-lined rocks of Lake Superior, or among the gold-containing schists of the Lake of the Woods, it receives but scant encouragement at the hands of the Survey. On the contrary, it is pretty sure to be decried. As an instance of this, I need but mention to the House a case which occurred not very long ago, at the Lake of the Woods. Dr. Bell had reported favorably on the prospects of gold mining in that section, and as a consequence there occurred a considerable investment of capital, in part by people from the United States and partly by the settlers of Rat Portage. Their method of mining was, no doubt, in some cases primitive in its character, because their circumstances admitted of nothing better. In 1883 their operations attracted the

attention of the Geological Survey, and a Mr. Coste was sent to examine and report. If the intention of the Survey had been to ruin and kill out the enterprise, no fitter person than Mr. Coste could have been selected for the duty. He visited all, or nearly all, the openings made, but could see nothing to approve of. He found the miners struggling with the difficulties incidental to a new country, and spoke of their efforts in the most contemptuous strain. He could not but admit the existence of gold, but it was in lodes so twisted, so narrow or contorted, that its working would not pay. With the leave of the House, I shall read a few extracts from his report, letter K, page 14, of the last volume issued by the Survey. Speaking of the Pine Portage mine, which he seems to have considered one of the best at the Lake of the Woods, he goes on to say:

"The great blunder had been made of erecting the stamp mill on the side of a small creek, full of water in the spring, but absolutely dry in summer. Clearly, the proper place for the mill was the shore of the Lake of the Woods; a self-inclined plane would have given an easy connection between the mine and the head of Pine Portage Bay. Besides, the fitting up of the crushing-house was entirely premature; the mine should have been first developed, and the crushing-mill erected only when the preliminary work was done and the mine in a regular working condition. But how could a lumber merchant and a gentleman farmer undertake to develop a mine without the assistance of a single competent person? Yet this is what has been attempted at Pine Portage mine, and the parties should not be surprised at their own failure. The shaft sunk in the vein was only 43 feet in depth, at the time of my first visit; and yet a crushing-house, with five stamps and two fine Frue vanners for concentration, had been erected two months before, on the bank of a creek without water, as though the proprietors had been seized by a mania for spending money on seeing a little gold in the quartz. At the time of my second visit, four weeks later, the shaft had reached a depth of 60 feet; four miners were carrying on the sinking, under a contract. They worked as they liked, and blindly, not being controlled by any competent person. Such was the method of working adopted on this vein, which is, nevertheless, the most promising of all those I saw on the Lake of the Woods."

I might quote a good deal of a character even more vicious than the paragraph I have read; but I shall not, on the present occasion, detain the House. In reference to the extract I have just read, it will be observed that he says: "They committed the great blunder of sinking a shaft in the wrong place;" and not content with this, he must indulge in a sneer at "a lumberman and a gentleman farmer attempting to develop a mine." Now, it appears that subsequent to his visit the lumberman and gentleman farmer were wonderfully successful in developing the mine; that, in 1884, they got good returns from it; and that the creek, which he said was dry in summer, had always abundance of water. Professor Bell, writing on the same matter in the *Canadian Mining Review*, remarks as follows:—

"Assays have been made by Mr. Hoffman, the painstaking chemist of the Geological Survey, of a considerable number of samples of ore from different localities on the lake, which show that the richest veins are those around Bigstone Bay, on the north-east side of its northern portion. The veins at the Pine Portage, Sultana, Winnipeg Consolidated and Keewatin mines proved to contain rich ore. Three of the assays of that of the Pine Portage mine yielded, respectively, 12.77 ounces gold, 20.41 silver, 9.68 gold, 8.92 silver and 9.91 gold, 15.37 silver, to the ton of 2,000 pounds. This mine was worked steadily by a small force of men during the whole summer of 1884, and the ore produced, together with what had been previously mined, was sufficient to give pretty steady employment to the five-stamp mill at the mine, and no scarcity of water for its supply was experienced. In the autumn, a second battery of five stamps was placed on the same cam-shaft as the first, the engine being originally intended to drive ten stamps. As a good deal of secrecy was observed last summer about all the discoveries and the mining operations at the Lake of the Woods, it was impossible to ascertain the amount of gold produced at the Pine Portage mine, but it is believed to have been between 150 and 200 ounces, or some \$3,500 worth. In addition to the free gold thus obtained, the sulphides were concentrated by two Frue vanners, and will be either exported or treated in time on the ground."

"The Keewatin mine was the only other which was worked during 1884. Operations were kept up all summer, with a few men, and the ore was taken in barges to the crushing-mill at the Argyle mine, on Clearwater Bay. The result was said to be satisfactory, but from the general observance of secrecy no particulars could be obtained."

"Although the quantity of gold which has actually been produced at the Lake of the Woods is small, still the progress which has been made towards its establishment as a mining district has been considerable and important. We have witnessed all the usual stages. First, the original discovery of the precious metal; next a good deal of promiscuous hunt-

ing and exploring, accompanied by many reported assays of very rich ore; then the commencement of mining and milling, partly judicious and partly injudicious. Finally, the district is surveyed geologically, and reliable assays and mill returns are obtained, and actual facts enough become known to justify the commencement of systematic mining and milling. The geological position and relations of the gold-bearing veins being pretty well established, the search for new mines may now be confined to narrow limits, that is, to the dark green diorites near the contact of the granite. The principal unexplored region would thus lie along this line of junction, which, as shown on Dr. Bell's map of 1881, trends south-eastward, from the head of Big Stone Bay towards the arm to which Dr. Bell has given the name of Long Bay, and new discoveries may, therefore, be looked for behind Yellow Girl point, and in that vicinity."

From this it will be seen that Professor Bell differs in opinion from Mr. Coste, and he (Professor Bell) has, in other reports, spoken very favorably of the Lake of the Woods as a mining region. But it appears that jealousies exist in the Geological Department, and it has been said that the director is somewhat given to disparaging what Dr. Bell approves. If he was led by any feeling of this kind to send Mr. Coste to the Lake of the Woods, it shows how the public interests may be made to suffer and, indeed, how important enterprises may be ruined, in a strife between contending scientists, placed in a position where their actions must have a widespread influence for good or evil. I may say, further, in regard to Mr. Coste, that the sneering manner in which he speaks of the miners and the scorn he bestows on their operations are quite out of place. He should bear in mind that his own report is not altogether a work of such classical elegance as to be beyond criticism, and it might be wise, on his part, to remember that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Were I disposed to be critical, I might say, and with justice, that his report, notwithstanding the director's (probable) finishing touch, was but an ill-considered muddle from first to last; that, of itself, it amounted to little more than a very silly and very unjust attack on a new and important industry; that it could have had no influence in crushing out that industry but for his connection with the Geological Survey, and that the frightful rush of scientific terms in which he has indulged is nothing more than a specimen of the dust usually raised by the charlatan in a vain endeavor to conceal his own incompetency and lack of knowledge. The director himself is not entirely blameless; for he, too, has, in some cases, decried the operations of miners, although in a way not quite so unbecoming as that which his subordinate has adopted; and I might point to a very promising enterprise in copper mining at Michipicoten Island and Mamainse, the stoppage of which, I am told, was in some measure due to his severe criticism of the manner in which they carried on their operations. It is, no doubt, within the sphere of the Geological Department to deal with the mineral character of the country, and I should say that it was within the range of its duties to discover and indicate the localities where mining could be advantageously carried on; but without a staff of practical miners, it is certainly a piece of impertinent assumption on the part of its officers to criticise and condemn systems of carrying on operations of a character of which they could have had no experience, and in regard to which they can only be, at best, the merest amateurs. Let them find, if they can, new mines and new mining regions; but as to actual working, they should leave that to those who make it their profession and understand it. The operations to which I have so far referred were confined to the district which I have the honor to represent, but the influence of the Survey extends far and wide. I could, I think, show where a system so costly might be improved upon; and I certainly believe that some new arrangement, by which we should, at least, have a harmonious staff, is necessary. The director, no doubt, means well; but whether, from having an unruly family of officials, or from some defect in his own temper, matters do not seem to work well. We saw last

Mr. DAWSON.

Session, when the committee was making its investigations, that we have scientists in the country of whom any nation might be proud. Dr. Hunt, a gentleman long attached to the Survey, enjoys a world-wide reputation as a geologist and mineralogist, and then we have Professor Chapman, of the Toronto University, a gentleman scarcely less distinguished than Dr. Hunt. There is really no lack of material out of which to form an admirable geological staff, seeing that we have already on it such efficient men as Dr. Dawson, Dr. Bell and Professor Macoun. The worst I have to say of the Survey is that it seems to have a hereditary and constitutional tendency to throw cold water on every mining enterprise. Recently, many important discoveries have been made a little inland from Lake Superior, and not very far from the United States boundary line. The mineral lodes on our side have their counterpart in Minnesota, and the people of that State have already expended six millions of dollars in building railroads and opening up their new mineral region. They may, perhaps, be going ahead a little too fast, for they have a geologist who says to them: Go ahead; open up and develop the mines; they contain boundless wealth; but mind you, there will be many blanks as well as prizes to those who invest their capital, but those who lose will still have the satisfaction to know that they have contributed to develop and people a new region, that they have been the means of placing happy settlers with their waving grain fields where the gloomy forest now overshadows the land; go ahead, by all means. Now, as a contrast to this, I may tell the House that our great geologist gives never a word of encouragement, and it has occurred to me that we might enter into negotiations with the State of Minnesota for an exchange of geologists. I should, of course, be exceedingly grieved to part with our distinguished director, but private feelings must yield to public expediency, and it is just possible that, after a time, we might get him back again. The people of Minnesota would soon find a salutary check imposed on their ardour, lots of cold water thrown on their mining enterprises and general stagnation prevailing, and when all this had occurred, we might, perhaps, without any very great opposition on the part of the Minnesotians, be allowed to take our unrivalled scientist to our hearts once more.

Department of Indian Affairs—Increases of salaries,  
arrears of salaries, etc..... \$752 05

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of these increases? *Primo facie* they seem to be objectionable, and a departure from the ordinary rules of promotion in the Civil Service.

Mr. BOWELL. It often occurs, in making appointments under the Civil Service Act, that it is necessary to pay more than the minimum salary of \$400; for two reasons. If the candidates pass optional subjects they are entitled, under law, to \$50 for each additional subject. Then, if they have special qualifications of a technical character, you can appoint them at any rate you please, between \$400 and a maximum sum of \$1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have these parties only \$400?

Mr. BOWELL. Some of them. Mr. Bray is assistant surveyor, and his duties are of a technical character. He is an excellent officer, and his present salary is only \$800. It is proposed to give him an additional \$150 on account of the technical knowledge which he possesses, and which particularly appertains to the work he is performing. Mr. Orr, a third-class clerk, is a barrister, receiving only \$450, which is considered quite inadequate to the services performed by him in the land branch, and consequently it is recommended that he be paid an additional \$150. Mr. Kemp is a third-class clerk, at \$450 per annum, a very careful, industrious man, and an increase of \$150 is recommended to him, on account of the responsible work he is

performing in the land branch. Miss Yielding is a third-class clerk, whose duties are of an onerous character, and are constantly increasing. She is in the Indian Department, and an increase of \$50 is recommended to be paid to her.

To provide for payment to certain clerks in Departments of Secretary of State, Finance, Marine, Post Office and Indian Department, of \$50 for each subject passed by them..... \$1,300

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are these subjects? Take, for instance, Mr. Labelle, of the Secretary of State's Department, who has passed four subjects.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there are, altogether, four or five optional subjects. For example, there is *precis* writing, shorthand, translation into the candidate's own language, type-writing, and I think there is another, but I forget it at the moment.

Administration of Justice..... \$20,150

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see one item here for miscellaneous justice, including North-West Territories, \$20,000. I suppose that is connected with trials of prisoners in the North-West?

Mr. BOWELL. I enquired of the Minister of Justice, just before dinner, what this vote was for, and he said it was to defray the expenses in connection with the trials that are the result out of the late difficulties. He thought it would require fully this amount, from the fact that very large expenditures would have to be incurred in connection with witnesses, and other matters incident to the trials.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any details on which this large sum of \$20,000 is based?

Mr. BOWELL. I have no details, nor do I think the Minister of Justice could give the details at present. I made the enquiry of him not two hours ago, and that is the answer he gave me.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman say what the distance is from the general locality at which these prisoners live and the place at which they are to be tried?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I cannot, nor can I tell the hon. gentleman the distance that many of the witnesses will have to be brought.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not now criticising the place of trial, for I have not sufficient information to do so; but it seems to me that it is a very considerable distance from the locality of the outbreak, the residence of the parties, and probably the residence of most of the witnesses. The general principle of our criminal law has been, and is in England, for very good and obvious reasons, that the trial should take place as nearly as possible in the locality where the offence occurs. I do not say that the place for this trial is not the proper place; I dare say it may be; but so very wide a departure from the ordinary rule will, of course, involve a great deal of extra expense to both the Crown and the prisoners, in the way of summoning witnesses, and therefore I should have supposed there would be some consideration extended by the Department of Justice to that circumstance, and that they would have furnished the hon. gentleman who is responsible for carrying the estimate through, with some more details than they seem to have supplied him with.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that the distance from Batoche to Regina is between 280 and 290 miles, and I am also informed that there are no gaols or places in which the prisoners could have been properly protected in the locality of the troubles, not even at Prince Albert. They were brought to Regina, which was considered the safest and best place, and where the least excitement prevailed, and it has

been thought that a better and fairer trial could be held there than in the locality of the troubles.

Removal of prisoners from Dorchester penitentiary to Kingston penitentiary..... \$750

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What class of prisoners are these?

Mr. BOWELL. It is proposed, I believe, to remove all the female prisoners from Dorchester to Kingston penitentiary.

To meet expenses in connection with sheep scab... \$8,000

Mr. SCRIVER. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if this amount is to be used in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. POPE. There is no sheep scab anywhere else, that I know of. I do not know how much we shall use.

Mr. SCRIVER. The information I have received is that the disease has been practically extirpated in those counties where it existed. Has the Minister received information of a contrary character recently?

Mr. POPE. I have information that there is still some work to be done in that line, but that the large bulk of the sheep that had the disease have been destroyed.

Mr. BLAKE. This is for a future work. If the great bulk of the work has been done, and the hon. gentleman wants \$8,000 for the small remainder, will he tell us what he has spent to do the great bulk of the work?

Mr. POPE. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. BLAKE. Then he thinks it is only a little more than half done.

Mr. POPE. I hope it is.

For one company of mounted infantry, 75 men, at Winnipeg..... \$80,000

Mr. CARON. There is a mistake in the number of men; it ought to be 100 instead of 75.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even so, I presume that the hon. gentleman has carefully ascertained the cost of each mounted man. Apparently, this vote is much larger in proportion than the vote asked for in the case of the Mounted Police. For 500 men only \$250,000 was asked; whereas, for 100 men, the hon. gentleman asks \$80,000, and there are items for salary, equipment and clothing, besides. I do not say the amount is too large. I am aware that the maintenance of a mounted man in the North-West is an expensive item; but it appears to me, if that be a fair proportion for 100 men, the estimate of \$250,000 for 500 men will be apt to fall decidedly short.

Mr. CARON. The estimate was based upon the best information we could get. The hon. gentleman will remember that out of the whole 100 men we intend having 50 mounted men. The saddlery and equipment for this mounted company extends over 100 men. Next year the estimate will be smaller than this year; but as far as we have been able to ascertain, I think the \$80,000 will cover the expense we will be called upon to incur for the purpose of organising and keeping up that company.

Mr. BLAKE. Give us some of the details.

Mr. CARON. One lieutenant colonel, at \$5.25 a day; two captains, one adjutant, six lieutenants; two captains, at \$3 a day would be \$2,190 per annum; one adjutant, at \$3, \$1,095; four lieutenants, at \$2, \$4,500; one surgeon, \$1,095; one veterinary surgeon, at \$2.50 a day, \$912.50; two sergeant instructors, \$730; six sergeants, \$72; eight corporals, \$2,044; 100 privates, \$17,345; rations, \$27,400; forage for horses, \$27,400; fuel and light, \$140; clothing,

\$5,000; contingencies, \$9,000. The hon. gentleman will remember that this, besides being one of the permanent corps, is also a school of instruction, and that we have to provide for the men and officers who come up to follow the course. Hon. gentlemen will understand that a mounted corps is very much more expensive than any branch that could be organised, and I thought that, for the purpose of the school, it was sufficient to mount half the corps, so that one half could go through mounted drill one day and the other half next. If the Government required it at any time, a certain number of horses could be purchased to equip the whole force. By providing horses for only one half the company, we will reduce the expenditure by a very large amount.

For barracks at London.....\$25,000.

Mr. CARON. I have not provided for any pay for the London school this year, because I consider that until the barracks were prepared to receive the school it was not necessary to provide for the equipment and pay of officers and men. The total estimated cost amounts to about \$50,000 or \$55,000; but I consider it would be sufficient to build a small portion of the barracks at present. When completed, the whole of the barracks will cost from \$55,000 to \$60,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Where is it to be?

Mr. CARON. There is a proposition now before the Department, from the municipal council of London, proposing an exchange of property. The Government have a property in London which was handed to them by the Imperial Government, and the council propose to exchange for it another property, which is far superior to it for the purpose of this vote, namely, the property now occupied as an exhibition ground. There we have more room for the barracks, and also have space enough for rifle ranges. However, that point is not yet settled.

Mr. VAIL. I believe the Government property occupies a central situation, and is very valuable. There is a very good building erected on it, a good drill room and armory; and I cannot see any property in London which could be given in exchange for it, without our making a loss. It is certainly a valuable property, and I hope the Minister of Militia will be very careful to see that he gets full value for that property.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that the property we now hold is 7 acres, and we are going to get 17 acres, besides which we get the rifle ranges, which are indispensable to a school of infantry, such as we wish to organise in London. The exchange is not completed, and everything in regard to it will be brought before the House. I am satisfied that, if the exchange does take place, it will be to the advantage of the Department; otherwise, we have no interest in exchanging the property we now hold for one which would not be as advantageous for us.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the proposition of the corporation of London for this exchange with the view of using the public property for a park, or for public purposes, or is it to have the property cut up into building lots?

Mr. CARON. No. The drill shed is to remain, and to be used for the purpose of drilling the local corps, and I understand that the property is to be utilised for a public park.

Mr. BLAKE. I have heard a rumor that the city intends to make a good speculation out of it, and to sell a part of it in city lots. If that is the case, I think it would be as well for the Government to sell the lots as for the city to do so. Of course, it is quite different if the property is to be used for public purposes, and is to be so retained in the deed. The hon. gentleman says it will be to the advantage of the

Mr. CARON.

Department. I am sorry he is going to drive so hard a bargain with the city of London, and I must appeal to his hon. colleague (Mr. Carling), to see that the city is not imposed upon by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. CARLING. I am quite sure, from what I know of the city, that the arrangement is a fair one on both sides.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the land to be disposed of in any way, or is it to be reserved for public purposes?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that this is a fair exchange, and that the city will do what is fair in the matter. I know pretty well the value of the property owned by the Government. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) appears to have an impression that this property is the ordnance lands which were there when he was Minister of Militia, but the chief part of those lands has been set apart for public schools. I am sure that the Government is getting full value in the exchange.

Mr. VAIL. What we gave for the public schools was only a small portion of the land on one corner. It must be a loss to the Militia Department to remove, on account of the value of the buildings there.

Mr. CARON. The leader of the Opposition, with his usual courtesy, has expressed his hope that my colleague will see that there is no imposition upon the city of London in this matter. I know perfectly well that the hope he has expressed will carry its weight, and that my hon. friend and colleague will see that I do not take advantage of the municipal council of London. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) knows that we keep the drill shed upon the property now belonging to the Department of Militia for the purposes of the militia force, outside of the new organisation which we are getting up, and that it is very important that we should have a drill shed for the local force. The question of exchange has been referred to and reported upon by the military advisers of the Department; and, taking into consideration the new organisation, I think the exchange, if it does take place, will be found satisfactory. We get a much larger ground than we now possess, which was too small for the purposes of our school; and it was a question whether we should exchange, or should buy land somewhere else. When the papers are brought down, I think hon. members will see that there is no attempt to impose upon the corporation of London, while, at the same time, it will serve the purposes of the Department of Militia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the Minister proposes to appoint some ten officers to this school. Can he state, now, whether it is the intention of the Government to select these officers from among officers who have been actively engaged at the front? It appears to me that that is a sort of recognition that should be given to men who have done such good service to the country in the recent emergency.

Mr. CARON. The commandant of the school has been already appointed by Order in Council. Col. Taylor has been appointed. He has great experience, and he is one of the very best officers we have on our staff. Outside of this appointment, my intention is to appoint every officer either from those who have been in the force now at the front or from the cadets.

Barrack huts, British Columbia ..... \$10,000

Mr. CARON. We intend organising, as we have provided for the last two Sessions, C Battery in British Columbia. It is expected, from the nature of the climate in that country, that the huts which will be required for the purpose of our school of gunnery, C Battery, will be covered by the \$10,000 which are now placed in the Estimates.

In aid of the Short Line Railway in Nova Scotia, for settling the unpaid claims of sub-contractors and others for labor and materials constructing said railway, between Oxford and New Glasgow, and for acquiring their rights in the railway and in the said claims, the expenditure to be under Order in Council, and to be a first charge on the subsidy for such railway, under chap. 14 of the Dominion Act of 1882..... \$125,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether this is sufficient to make everything pleasant for the member from Pictou—which, I take it to be, the primary and practical object of this vote.

Mr. POPE. I should think that this ought to do a good deal in this direction. A considerable amount of work has been done upon this road, and the people have been suffering very much for a long time because they could not get their pay. The object of this vote is to pay them, and to charge it against the subsidies. The work has been done to a larger extent than this sum would represent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What sort of work?

Mr. POPE. Grading, masonry, and that kind of thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it not almost all work which, from exposure to the weather, has pretty well crumbled away, and will be required to be done over again?

Mr. POPE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was informed by residents of that county that the work was of such a character that from exposure to the elements it had become of very small practical value.

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). The hon. member for Pictou is not quite so much interested in this matter as the hon. gentleman opposite has been led to believe, and a very small portion of the work has been done in the county of Pictou. In 1882 a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile was granted to this railway, from Oxford to New Glasgow, and a contract was made, in the summer of that year, for the construction of the work, which was to be finished the 1st July, 1884. The subsidy was to be paid for each 10-mile section; that part of the work which was done in 1883 was regularly paid for. I am informed that the work done by the contractors is of a very substantial nature. The bridges are built of stone, and the earth work is so substantial that very little deterioration has taken place. However, the work that was done after the year 1883 was prosecuted vigorously for about two months, but no payment has ever been made for that, up to this time. The value of the work done is more than double the amount of this appropriation, and I am satisfied, from the enquiries I have made, that it will approximate to \$300,000. Of course, the action of the company is entirely indefensible, and I think it is only right and just that this appropriation should pass at the present time. No loss can accrue from the payment of the money, as the road cannot be built without a subsidy, and this amount can be deducted from any sums that may be paid to parties undertaking the work.

Mr. VAIL. Have any recent arrangements been made to complete the road?

Mr. POPE. Not as yet.

Mr. BLAKE. It was stated in the papers, some time ago, that fresh proposals had been made by the company, in which Dr. Norman Green and Mr. Wiman are interested, which proposals had been made to the Government, for an arrangement by which a financial institution in France, I think, was to advance money to cash the Government bonds. Is any negotiation of that kind proceeding now?

Mr. POPE. Some French capitalist—I do not like to mention the name—has made a proposal. I think he made

a proposal in writing to me, that he could raise the money, and I think he is trying to raise it now. The last I heard from him, he thought he would be ready by the 1st of August.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the amount of subsidy granted to the company?

Mr. POPE. \$3,200 a mile, for 90 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. It is now proposed to pay on account of that \$125,000?

Mr. POPE. I forgot to say that after next year there is a further subsidy, which will make the whole about \$14,000 a year, and we divide it into two parts.

Mr. BLAKE. You mean as to the first half—not on the whole lot?

Mr. POPE. On the whole lot. It would be divided between this part of the line and the other part of the line.

Mr. BLAKE. It is proposed, then, to divide that subsidy into two sections, one for each part?

Mr. POPE. It was given for the whole portion. It is not proposed to divide it at all, but a portion of that would be applied. The proportion would be as 14 is to 60.

Mr. BLAKE. We know it is not the mileage that is important in this thing. Some miles cost more than others, and some miles are worth less than other miles after they are built. I see by the *Mail* newspaper of yesterday that:

“Advices were received to-day from Paris of the successful negotiations with the Banque Descompte, and another large financial institution, whereby all the capital necessary for the completion of the Short Line Railway in Nova Scotia has been secured. The line is said to be already partially constructed, from Oxford Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, to New Glasgow, where it joins the Eastern Extension, already completed to Canso, thence across Cape Breton to Louisburg. New construction is necessary, for the completion of which, and other uncompleted portions, fresh capital is immediately available. Negotiations have been carried forward by Comte D'Hauterive and Mons. Camper, on behalf of Marvin Green, Erastus Wiman and others.”

Has the hon. gentleman received any communication as to the issue of these negotiations?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. VAIL. While I am glad to see this vote in the Estimates, I am sorry that the Government are not in a position to state that they have made arrangements for the completion of that road. I think these people to whom money is owing have been hardly dealt with. It is another evidence that before we grant subsidies to railway companies we should be satisfied of their ability to complete the work; that railways shall not be commenced and allowed to go to destruction, and that the Government shall be called on afterwards to complete the work. Two years ago I intimated to the then Minister of Railways that I had doubts as to the ability of this company to carry out the contracts proposed to be made for the subsidies then asked for, and the Minister of Railways then stated that he had made every enquiry, and was satisfied of the ability of this company to complete the work. He spoke of Mr. Green as being a man of immense wealth, and he was quite satisfied that any contract in which that gentleman was interested would be completed without any doubt. The result of the contract was that the work remained in an unfinished state for nearly two years, and the poor men who worked on the road and provided supplies for building it were not paid; and at last the Government have come to their relief, without, however, there being any fair prospect of the road ever being completed, or completed within a reasonable time. I am sorry to hear that the arrangement is not more complete, as I had hoped, from statements I saw in the newspapers, that the Government would have been able to inform the House that they had made arrangements necessary to ensure the completion of the work.

Mr. WELDON. Does this include amounts due to engineers on the road, who, I think, have as strong a claim as sub-contractors?

Mr. POPE. I do not know.

Mr. BLAKE. I think there was some legislation passed by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, authorising this company to dispose of its interest in the work. Is it proposed to take any cession of the claim of the company?

Mr. POPE. I am not aware that it is intended to make any arrangement with that view. Our object was to come to the relief of the men who had done the work and never been paid. I should have thought that a man in the position of Dr. Green would have been able to raise the money. I have always held that payment to the men who have done the work should be made before anything else.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree that the people employed on the work should be paid, and that they have a sort of equitable claim on the Dominion Government, in view of the representations made on the floor of Parliament, in regard to the solvency of the company and their ability to go on with the work. I view of the statements made by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, and the certificate of character which the Minister of Railways gave those gentlemen in the face of the world, I am not surprised that the people of his own Province should take the company on the faith of the hon. gentleman's certificate, and that his successor should feel himself bound to honor the certificate given by a colleague then occupying the hon. gentleman's present position. The country has got to make good the ex-Minister's statement. The hon. gentleman feels bound to endeavor to make the losses good. There is, however, another source from which they might be made good. The company made a contract with a mysterious corporation, known as the North American Construction Company, which was not content with offering to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, but also carried on operations in the eastern part of the Dominion and made a contract for constructing the Short Line. It is primarily responsible for the failure—I think there was a Col. Snow connected with the enterprise, and the contracting company, the centre of whose operations is at Watertown, N. J., is authorised to carry on operations all over the United States and Canada. The Company did a good deal towards building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and succeeded in obtaining from that corporation the sum of \$600,000 in cash, which sum, according to a statement laid on the Table yesterday by the hon. gentleman, has been reduced by something under \$150,000, leaving about \$450,000. Has the hon. gentleman found anything out about that mysterious corporation, and has he made any enquiries as to its solvency and capacity to carry out its obligations and to go on with the work?

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will admit that at the time the Minister of Railways spoke of the company, its promoters were men of sufficient standing to induce the Minister to believe that the contract would be carried out in good faith. Circumstances beyond the control of any one changed the position of affairs. I believe some of the leading men in the company invested large sums from their private fortunes in the undertaking. I think Dr. Marvin Green invested \$100,000 or \$150,000 of his own money; I know it was over \$100,000 in cash. He had every reason to believe that he and those with him would be able to float the undertaking in the New York money market, and raise sufficient funds to carry it through. As to the local legislation which has taken place, the company assigned to trustees, for the benefit of the sub-contractors, all their rights in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. VAIL.

Mr. VAIL. When will the road fall into the hands of the Government, in the event of its not being completed?

Mr. McLELAN. I think they have two years yet.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). With respect to what has been said about the names of these two companies, I believe that although they are similar, they are entirely different parties. The company in the other case was the North American Contracting Company; in this case it is the North American Construction Company. I do not know who the shareholders are, but I believe Mr. Sidney Green is the president, and the shareholders are the same parties as the Short Line Company—four or five capitalists in New York. The contract of the company was to be completed on the 31st of December, 1883, but the charter does not expire for three years.

Mr. WELDON. Is this intended only to pay the laborers or are others included?

Mr. POPE. The object is to pay the laborers, the actual navvies who did the work.

Mr. BLAKE. On the face of the vote, it is to settle the unpaid claims of sub-contractors and others for labor and material, etc.; so it is far more than paying the laborers, for you pay the sub-contractors the sums which they may have paid for labor and materials.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The word "material" has been struck out, and "board" is inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think that such a change should be made, without a motion in the committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It was struck out at the Minister's request.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. member for Digby thinks it strange that this company is allowed to contract with the Government, and that it did not complete the contract. One would think the hon. gentleman had never heard of companies failing in their contracts with the Government. The hon. gentleman knows that when he was responsible for the legislation of the Nova Scotia Legislature, a company in Nova Scotia came to the western counties and got \$8,000 per mile, besides the ground, for 80 miles. They allowed the road-bed, the embankments, and so on, to go to destruction; they never completed the road, and they left it in the most deplorable state that ever a railway was left in in this country. Everybody knows that when the company now under consideration failed to pay the men, when railway stocks in the United States had depreciated, so that it was almost impossible to get a dollar, this gentleman applied his own private fortune to the work, which had also been reduced by dealing in railway stocks; else the road would never have gone on. So this must be feigned indignation on the part of the hon. member for Digby, or else his recollection has entirely deserted him.

Mr. VAIL. I think my memory is a little better than the hon. gentleman's is. In the first place, I did not pass the legislation, nor enter into the contract to give more than \$6,000 per mile to that company; in the next place, I left the Local Government and came here, before the company had been three months engaged at the work. I knew nothing of it afterwards, and had nothing to do with the subsequent arrangements, and therefore I was not responsible for them. If I had remained in the Government they would not have received a dollar beyond what they were entitled to receive under the law, and the road would have been completed.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is merely a case of the mantle of Elijah falling on Elisha.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we are concerned about is the payment of this large sum of money to

certain persons in Nova Scotia. The precedent looks to be an excessively bad one, and the whole thing looks like an arrangement to make things pleasant for some supporters of the Government

Mr. WOODWORTH. Why should they not be made pleasant?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at the expense of this large sum of money. I may say that the matter is in strict harmony with all the other proceedings connected with railways which have been conducted in this way for the last three or four years.

Mr. WOODWORTH. You have been here six months, and still you are not pleasant.

Mr. BLAKE. We would like to know what the language of the vote is to be.

Mr. POPE. I move that the word "materials" be struck out and "board" inserted, and the words, "in the construction," inserted instead of "constructing."

Mr. PAINT. It is a question whether the word "materials" should be struck out, because some of these materials were obtained from many of the men along the line.

Mr. VAIL. I agree with the hon. member for Richmond; I think the materials should be paid for as well as other supplies.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us why "materials" was first inserted, and "board" left out, and why "board" is now put in and "materials" struck out.

Mr. POPE. It was an oversight, and it stands now as I intended it to be. I intended to act in this case as we do in all such contracts, the object being to relieve the men who did the work.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not see why a difference should be made in that respect; certainly, that labor ought to be paid for. In building a railway you use stones, timber and ties; labor is required to prepare these things, and that labor ought to be paid for, just as well as the labor that is employed in other ways.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear. The chief value is the labor.

Mr. WELDON. I understand that the vote as it stands is not only to pay the men who do the labor on the railway, but the sub-contractors. They take their contracts merely as a speculation. I do not see why the class I have alluded to should be left out. Some of my hon. friends from the Lower Provinces have mentioned to me some six or seven young men who commenced their profession as engineers on this road, and who could much less afford to be deprived of their pay than some of the laborers. At all events, their claim ought to be considered before that of the sub-contractors.

Mr. VAIL. If you are going to pay the railway contractors, these sub-contractors owe a number of people in the county, who have furnished them with supplies, and I think the Government is bound to see that this money goes into the hands of the people who are entitled to it. They should ascertain who furnished the supplies, and everything else, and pay the parties.

To purchase the Carleton Branch Railway, with harbor frontage, wharf and town lots, and all other property of the company ..... \$85,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this?

Mr. POPE. This is a railway track about three miles long. It is a valuable property, which the Government think ought not to be allowed to fall into the hands of one company, but should be controlled by the Government, for the benefit of all the railways that may find their way

there. The wharf itself, I think, pays some \$1,500 a year, and we think that the Government ought to own this property, as we own properties in other cities. In the city of Montreal that has been found very important, and I think my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, will remember the difficulties that have taken place in the city of Toronto, and how much better it would have been if the Government had owned the Esplanade, and allowed all railways to have the right to pass over it.

Mr. VAIL. Will the hon. Minister tell us what line of railway this piece of road connects with?

Mr. POPE. It connects with the Intercolonial Railway across the bridge, and with other railways that run there, and we think this is the time we should purchase it.

Mr. VAIL. Is there any road between the end of the Intercolonial Railway and this road?

Mr. POPE. I believe there is a piece at St. John.

Mr. VAIL. Why should the Government undertake the purchase of a piece of road that does not begin at the Intercolonial Railway or any other railway, and ends at the water? I think it ought to be shown that this road is to connect with some Government work, that makes it necessary for the Government to own that particular branch.

Mr. POPE. We have found it of the utmost importance, in other places, where we did not own a single particle of road, that we should own the property on which the railroads had to run. I am certain there is not a man in this House who knows the property at Toronto but would say that if the Government owned that property, and allowed all railways to pass over it, it would have been of the utmost importance to Toronto. Now, we believe that this is going to be a large place, and that that is a valuable property; and although about half a mile of the road between Carleton and the bridge is another railway, we think it important that we should own this property, so as to be able to control the landing and the wharves.

Mr. VAIL. This line runs from the Maine and St. John Railway for four or five miles to the wharf at Carleton, independent altogether of any other road; and unless it is purchased for some special reason, I cannot see what the object is.

Mr. BLAKE. Is not the truth just this: That the Government subsidised the bridge across the St. John River, and thus enabled that bridge to be constructed? that the construction of that bridge took away the traffic from this branch? that upon that state of things arising a claim was made by those who built the branch? that as the Government destroyed their traffic they should buy their road? and that the Government a long time resisted that claim, and that they now believe this to be a proper time to meet it?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not quite all.

Mr. BLAKE. I was asking the Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. The road formerly entered at Fairville, and there was no passage between that and the Intercolonial Railway, across the St. John River, except by a carriage road. This extension was built from Fairville down to the wharf, on the Carleton side, and after that the traffic went across to St. John by the ferry. It may be that a double consideration enters into this claim, and the hon. gentleman will see the justice of it. The city of Carleton took a very large amount of stock in the building of that extension; it became the main line of traffic; after a time, in the progress of the country and the requirements of trade, it was found that it was too great an obstruction; that trade should be made to go to the city of St. John by a ferry and by a roundabout way,

so that a bridge has been built across the St. John River, and the Intercolonial Railway has been extended to that bridge. When you get across the St. John River by that bridge you are really at Carleton. The short line will be of very little use, as regards the outlet for traffic, unless it has good permanent facilities, and in no other way can these be got, except by means of that branch to the deep water terminus. If any single line controlled that it would be able to bluff the Short Line, or in some way interfere with the traffic. Besides, the property is a valuable one in itself, comprised not only of 4 miles of main line and bridges, but a valuable water frontage of over 1,600 feet, and a wharf which cost \$1,200, and is a paying property, one of the few wharves in St. John at which the largest vessels that go to the ocean float safely.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I do not know that these are the explanations on which the Government justifies the vote or not. I ask the Minister as to the circumstances under which the vote was brought forward, and would be obliged to have an answer from him. The hon. gentleman's statement is that of an independent member of the House, but not that of the Administration.

**Mr. POPE.** I have said to the hon. gentleman that I thought this was an important property for the Government to have, and that there is in it good value for the money. I think it is a real necessity, as we are going to have a pretty large traffic, that the Government should own it, so that there will be no danger of one company obtaining control over it to the detriment of others.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Is this railway the property of a private company?

**Mr. POPE.** I believe it is.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Has a bargain been made with the company?

**Mr. POPE.** No; there has not.

**Mr. BLAKE.** How does the hon. gentleman know he will get it for the sum mentioned? Was there any bargain?

**Mr. BOWELL.** The property originally cost \$150,000. The company offered to sell it to the Government for the sum mentioned.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Have negotiations been going on for some time for the sale and purchase of this property? No papers have been laid on the Table.

**Mr. POPE.** There have been no negotiations, but I understand that the property could be acquired for this amount.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Was the application made by the company to the Government, or by the Government to the company?

**Mr. POPE.** I do not know of any.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Unless I am greatly misinformed, the proprietors of the concern deem that the property has been depreciated in value by the bridge across the St. John, and claim that as the property was depreciated in value through the use of public money, their property should be purchased by the Government.

**Mr. POPE.** That has not come to my knowledge.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Did the advance with reference to the acquisition of the property begin with the Government or the concern?

**Mr. GILLMOR.** I cannot see how this branch can be utilised, unless the contemplated Short Line, instead of running to St. John, would run over the St. John and Maine Line, down to this point, within 3 miles of Carleton. That property might then be valuable. Another railway terminating in Carleton, the Grand Southern, at first ran over two or three miles of this Carleton branch, but the Carleton

**Mr. FOSTER.**

Branch Company were unreasonable, and compelled the Grand Southern to build a separate line. The two lines terminate at this wharf. How this branch of three miles can be of any service or income to the Government, at least by the Short Line, I cannot conceive. The wharf may be a source of income from vessels loading at deep water there, but as for this branch line being used by any line, the only line that could use it was the Grand Southern, and they, not being able to come to arrangements, built a separate branch to this terminus.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman has given two sufficient reasons to justify this vote. He stated the Grand Southern ran in there and wanted an outlet, but the company that controlled this road and the Grand Southern could not come to terms, so the latter built an independent line. He also stated, on a previous occasion, that the Short Line would be built. Taking these two things into consideration they furnish good reasons why this property should be in the hands of the Government.

**Mr. BLAKE.** If this is to be used simply by the Short Line Railway, it ought to be part of the Short Line Railway. We have given terminal facilities to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec and at Montreal, and at various other places, and if this is to be part of the Short Line, the Short Line Railway Company ought to buy it out of its subsidy. There is no reason why the public should buy it and present it to the Short Line Railway. The fact that the hon. gentleman will not state whether he was the first to approach the property owners, or the property owners were the first to approach the Government, leads me to the conclusion that it was the property owners who approached the Government.

**Mr. GILLMOR.** The result of this will be that the Grand Southern and the Carleton Branch will be useless, and that no other line can be utilised except the Short Line, because the Grand Southern is not going to stop at Carleton, but is ready, as well as the St. John and Maine, to utilise the bridge, and to terminate in the city of St. John, where the Short Line is also to terminate, I suppose.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The Short Line road is supposed to bring down a vast amount of traffic from the west, and to make St. John and Halifax shipping ports for grain to the old country. In order to have that done, it is necessary that the line should not end in the city, but should go down directly to deep water, where large vessels can lie and shipments can be made. Of course, the Grand Southern wants to get into the city, because it does not do an ocean business.

**Mr. GILLMOR.** Are we to suppose that elevators are to be built at Carleton and at the deep water wharf? I do not suppose the business is going to be so enormous as to require all that. There is no use disguising the fact that these branches are to be made useless, as they will be if this is adopted. Of course, if this great western traffic comes down, all these elevators and deep water wharves may be kept in employment.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Is it proposed to follow this up by a vote for the erection of elevators for the use of the railways at Carleton?

**Mr. POPE.** No, it is not.

**Mr. VAIL.** Would not the railway be left there, for the use of any company, the Short Line or any other company? I do not see that it changes the matter if the Government should purchase the road. It is there already, and the people of Carleton have the benefit of it.

**Mr. BLAKE.** My hon. friend does not see the point, that this very desirable property will be snapped up by others if we do not buy it now. Here is an opportunity which may never recur. Here is an advantage which is

seized by this far-seeing Government, who observe that this is the special opportunity to purchase at a low rate property of great value, for which capitalists all over the world are eagerly looking.

Mr. PAINT. I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) could throw a great deal of light upon this matter, but it appears that he is afraid to express his opinion fearing to implicate himself.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say that the hon. gentleman consulted me as to whether he should speak on this subject or not. He happens to be a shareholder of this railway, and I said that, if I were placed in the same circumstances as he was, I would not take any part in the discussion.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Are there any timber limits or colonisation companies there?

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there are any timber limits or colonisation companies there. No bargain was made with the Government. It was not by the Government that the Carleton Railway was acquired, and there was no blind shares in it, either.

Mr. White (Hastings). There are no blind shares in any matter that I am connected with. Anything I have done is just as pure and honest as anything you had to do with; but you like to cover up things which affect your own friends.

Pembina Branch, Canadian Pacific Railway— Award and expenses in connection with the claims of Messrs. Murphy, Kavanagh and Upper, and Joseph Upper & Co. ....	\$100,000
--	-----------

Mr. POPE. Most of this work was done when hon. gentlemen opposite were connected with the Government. We never could arrive at a settlement, and it was referred to arbitrators, and this is the finding of the arbitrators.

Mr. BLAKE. Who were the arbitrators?

Mr. SHANLY. Judge Clarke, of Cobourg, John Bell, of Belleville, and myself.

Mr. BLAKE. That is satisfactory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was this for work actually done, or was it for damages for the road being taken out of these gentlemen's hands?

Mr. SHANLY. It was for work done. There was an unsettled account. They were anxious to have the road finished a year sooner than the contract required. The arrangement was made under the Government of the hon. member for East York, and in that arrangement they set aside the contract and paid item by item. The matter never was settled until this year, when it was referred to arbitration.

Salaries and expenses of inspecting engineers and other officers.....	\$50,000
--	----------

Mr. POPE. This is for the whole of the staff of engineers employed on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all other railways. Hitherto, the larger share of this expenditure has been paid out of an appropriation. There is no appropriation now, and they must be provided for in this way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But under this heading it appears to be for the Canadian Pacific Railway engineers alone. Now, we surely do not propose to spend \$50,000 in 1886 on merely inspecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. POPE. There is a great deal of work to do besides inspecting the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have to keep a regular staff for some little time yet, both in the office and outside.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister stated to me the other day, in answer to a question, that the whole work would be done by October.

Mr. POPE. I said I thought the track would be laid, so that engines could go over in October.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been stated to us throughout that such progress would be made in this work that the Government would have paid off the loan and the subsidy by the month of September. I suppose that the Government sections in British Columbia will also have been completed by that time, or by October. Then, after the company has so far completed this work that the Government has paid its last dollar of loan and subsidy, and the Government has so far completed its work that it has delivered over this section, what are the inspecting engineers to do?

Mr. POPE. They will not have got all their money as soon as the contract is through, because certain other things will have to be done, and a certain oversight will have to be kept on this work.

Mr. BLAKE. How much is remaining unpaid of loans and subsidies?

Mr. POPE. I think about \$5,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe that according to a construction with which I rather quarrel, a view has been taken that this road is completed for the purposes of the contract as soon as a car can go over the rails, and you find a definition something like these words in Mr. Schreiber's statement of that serpentine exhibition that he gave us of the state of the contract, about two months ago; and you find complete payments made with reference to a good portion of the road north of Lake Superior, portions that are paid off altogether, although there remains a great deal to be done. Well, now, when does the hon. gentleman expect to have paid off the Government loan and subsidies?

Mr. POPE. We have to keep close watch of it, and that is what these engineers will do. North of Lake Superior, and on other sections of the road, there are some temporary trestles to be filled yet, which have not been paid for, so you will find there are other things to be done that are not paid for. Probably, during the last part of next year, we shall have as much work to do for our engineers as we have had during the last year. If we do not, I will be all the better pleased.

Intercolonial Railway—Sleeping Cars.....	\$150,000
--	-----------

Mr. POPE. We had an arrangement with the Pullman Car Company, by which they put on their cars and took care of them, and that contract expired, I think, last year. They had exactly the same contract, I believe, with the Grand Trunk Railway. We thought it advisable to extend it for a little time, until we saw what the Grand Trunk was going to do, but with the understanding that we should give them six months' notice. Under that contract we were pledged to take these cars off their hands at a valuation. I think the notice expires the first of next month, when we intend to run these sleeping cars ourselves, and to have as good cars as any other road. The Pullman Company have ten cars that we are to purchase, and the price of each will be from \$13,000 to \$15,000.

Mr. BLAKE. These are pretty old Pullmans, I understand.

Mr. POPE. Yes; they can be bought at a valuation. These cars are not in the condition that they ought to be. We have already got some of them made over, and the intention is to make them as good as new, and suitable for any road. A good deal of our business are excursionists travelling through the country, and they must have good accommodation. At this time of the year a great number of people are travelling, and we must provide for them. We must put these cars into such a condition as will be satisfactory to the travelling public.

Mr. VAIL. Was it part of the arrangement made by the Mackenzie Government that the cars were to be ultimately

purchased, or is this an arrangement made recently? I was not aware that the Government were bound, at the expiration of a certain time, to purchase those cars. I do not understand that this arrangement was made by the late Government.

Mr. POPE. No; it was not.

Mr. VAIL. It is a very little over a year since the contract terminated. This arrangement may turn out to be a good one, but it must be remembered that these are old-style cars, and that a large amount of money will be required to repair them, so as to be equal to the present standard.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the reason this arrangement was made?

Mr. POPE. We knew we must have cars, and we thought this was a proper thing to do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under the original contract there was no agreement by the Government to purchase the cars. That has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. It seems a very unbusiness-like transaction to arrange to purchase old stock, in view of the fact that new cars can be obtained at from \$13,000 to \$15,000.

Mr. BLAKE. It is more than merely purchasing old stock. It is purchasing old-fashioned stock. The new sleeping cars are very much better than the sleepers on the Intercolonial, which do not compare with the sleeping cars on the Ontario and Quebec division of the Canadian Pacific Railway by any manner of means. It is a great advantage, on the Ontario and Quebec road, to have an extra width in the sleeping car, and a sufficient height to sit up without knocking your head. I maintain that it is a mistake for a road like the Intercolonial, which is dependent on pleasure travel for its summer passenger business, to make an arrangement to purchase old-fashioned sleeping cars. I observe a letter in a newspaper from a correspondent who has just travelled over the road. He points out the most extraordinary irregularity in regard to stopping at stations. He said that the train ran at high speed from Quebec to Rivière du Loup. After that point it lost time at every one of the stations, and at last, at Campbellton, where the train was to stop 15 or 20 minutes, it remained 45 minutes; and then several of the passengers went up to the conductor and asked him if he was going to stay all night, as, if that was the case, they would take lodgings; whereupon the train moved off. That is not the way to create a good impression of the service on the Intercolonial.

Surveys for Cape Breton and other Railways..... \$12,000

Mr. BLAKE. What are the other railways?

Mr. POPE. Most of this money will be expended on surveys in Cape Breton. If there is anything over it will go to surveys for other railways.

Mr. BLAKE. But we would like to know some further particulars about the other railways. There are a great many anxious hearts beating to know what the other railways are. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what the other roads are?

Mr. POPE. I could not. It is intended for the Cape Breton Railway. There might be a little left over for other lines.

Land and damages, Grand River, and filling a pond near St. Catharines..... \$21,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this, on the Grand River, a special work?

Mr. POPE. This \$16,000 is for claims in the townships of Dunnville, North Cayuga, Dunn, and the town of Cayuga.

Mr. BLAKE. How old are these claims?

Mr. VAIL.

Mr. POPE. Since about 1874.

Mr. McCALLUM. In 1874 a dam was raised at Dunnville to supply water to the canal, and by that means there was a large overflow on the land, and some of the banks were washed away along the river. The matter was pressed for some time, and the late Government settled some of the cases where the land was overflowed, but they did not make allowance for those cases in which the wind drove the water upon the banks, washing away the land, in some cases houses, orchards, and even portions of cemeteries.

Mr. POPE. I may say that this matter has been before us for some time, and these claims have been in course of settlement, but we deferred them, to bring them all in together.

Mr. BLAKE. What is this other item—filling a pond near St. Catharines, \$5,000?

Mr. POPE. That is a piece of land which has been flooded from the canal near St. Catharines. It has caused a great deal of complaint in the city, and it is perfectly useless; so now we propose filling the pond, which will give us  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or 4 acres of land, and remove a nuisance.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says "towards filling the pond." Will any more be required?

Mr. POPE. The engineer says that an expenditure of \$5,000 properly applied would enable this quantity of land to be raised 1 foot above the water level.

Mr. McCALLUM. I think this is money well expended; and I am sure the land will rent for a sum sufficient to pay the interest. At present this pond is a great eye-sore to the city.

Grenville Canal—J. Simard, services..... \$75

Mr. POPE. This is a special case, in which this gentleman was a sole arbitrator in settling a matter, and for his services he charged \$15 a day.

Rideau Canal—To pay land damages in the township of Pittsburgh..... \$550

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How has this occurred?

Mr. POPE. There have been very great changes in the country; the timber has died out, and the wind has carried the water over a great deal of the land and destroyed it. These claims have been sent either to the arbitrators or the valuers, and this is to pay one of them.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it likely that we shall have a recurrence of these claims? The Rideau Canal is one of the oldest public works in the country, and it is rather alarming that we are now to be called upon to pay land damages in connection with it.

Mr. POPE. I believe there are a few claims that will arise from the very cause I speak of.

Repairs to Road Dyke along Lake St. Francis..... \$4,000

Mr. KIRK. When the main Estimates were before the House, in answer to an enquiry of mine, with reference to a vote I expected to be put in the Estimates for a small canal which the fishermen of Guysboro' county had petitioned for during the early part of the Session, the hon. Minister of Public Works advised me to wait until I would see what was in the Supplementary Estimates. They are down, and I do not see any vote for this work. Perhaps he intends to bring down Further Supplementary Estimates, and to provide for it there; if he does, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. POPE. What is the work?

Mr. KIRK. It is to enlarge a canal which runs through a small neck of land and connects the harbor of White Haven with Torbay. It was built by the Government of

Nova Scotia before Confederation, but it was not made quite deep or broad enough. Consequently, it can only be used by the fishermen when the tide is high. The Local Government, a few years ago, voted a small amount of money to put it in repair, but not enough. This Government, last summer, sent an engineer to examine the canal, and he reported that it is a very necessary work, and that it will require \$6,000 to put it in a position to serve all the requirements of the people. It is only about three-quarters of a mile long, and if put in proper shape it would be useful to fishermen, a large number of whom use it every year.

Mr. POPE. My impression is, that the engineer must have been sent from the Public Works Department, for I have no recollection of hearing of this canal before.

Mr. PAINT. Is it because I am more submissive than the hon member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), that I should be debarred from bringing the St. Peter's Canal claims before this House? The men who performed the hard labor of that canal and lost their pay, to the amount of \$20,000, when the Opposition were in power, would like very much to have those claims adjusted, and whatever is fair and proper in the matter done.

Mr. SCRIVER. Referring to the vote before the committee, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the fact that representations were made to his predecessor in office last year in favor of an extension of this dyke upon lake St. Francis. An officer of the Department was sent there to make examinations, and he made a report to the effect that by the extension of that dyke a certain distance, great relief would be afforded to the inhabitants, who are now suffering by the overflow of the lake. I would ask the hon. Minister if he has given his attention particularly to the matter, and if he can hold out any hope that action will be taken upon the report of that engineer.

Mr. POPE. There was something done there last year, was there not?

Mr. SCRIVER. There may have been some repairs, but I think there was nothing done in the way of extending the dyke.

Mr. POPE. I am informed by the chief engineer that there was a certain sum of money expended there last year, and that the further sum the hon. gentleman sees in the Estimates will be expended this year.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am afraid this sum is only for repairs on the dyke, and not for extending it.

Montreal Armories..... \$45,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We had another vote for this the other evening.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The other vote was for last year, for the foundations of the buildings, as I explained. This is for the superstructure. I am not sure that this will be enough, but it will be enough until Parliament assembles again.

Mr. BLAKE. About what is expected to be the whole cost of the armories?

Harbors and Rivers—Nova Scotia..... \$12,550

Mr. KIRK. I do not see any item for breakwaters in Guysboro', for which the hon. Minister of Public Works advised me to wait until these Estimates came down. The total amount to be expended on harbors and rivers in Nova Scotia this year is \$14,000. I can remember very well, when the Mackenzie Government was in power, how fond the Conservatives were of telling that Mr. Mackenzie gave such small grants to public works in Nova Scotia, and spent everything in Ontario, and how they predicted the Conservatives

would be more liberal. Yet this year only \$14,000 are granted the whole of Nova Scotia for rivers and harbors, while the lowest sum ever voted during Mr. Mackenzie's régime was \$56,500. The Government which was to be so much more favorable to Nova Scotia, can only afford to give \$14,000, while Mr. Mackenzie, year after year, granted over \$200,000.

Mr. PAINT. He never had to suppress a rebellion.

Mr. KIRK. That is quite true, but he might also say that he never raised a rebellion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says he does not see those works he spoke about provided for. I do not see them either. They are not there, because the Privy Council did not think we could afford to ask money this year. Works to the extent of millions of dollars are not put in the Estimates, because we do not want to increase the expenditure of the country to such an extent as to have to increase taxation. We expect our revenue generally will be better next year, so that we will be able to do more for public works. The hon. gentleman only looked for the column for 1885-86 for the harbor of Nova Scotia when he said there was only \$14,000 in the Estimates; if he had looked at the previous column he would have seen that last year we expended \$46,450 for that purpose.

Mr. KIRK. It is getting smaller every year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Then the hon. gentleman might have looked at public buildings for Nova Scotia, and he would have found that we put an amount of \$96,550 in the Estimates last year, and have put \$91,525 in the main Estimates this year. It may happen that, for harbors and rivers, we have not been able to do as much for all the Provinces as we would desire. For dredging, the hon gentleman sees that we have given to his Province \$30,000, while in the previous year we gave \$42,000; but the amount for Quebec is reduced from \$20,000 to \$15,000; for Ontario, from \$20,000 to \$15,000; for British Columbia, from \$17,000 to \$15,000, so that the reductions are not limited to Nova Scotia, but they are made in all the Provinces.

Mr. KIRK. I confined my remarks to those items which immediately interested the fishermen; because, when you talk about looking after the interests of the fishermen, we find hon. gentlemen opposite saying: We have given them a bonus of \$150,000 for fish, but that is voted for the fishermen of the whole Dominion, and while Nova Scotia may probably get half of that sum, the Government are robbing them, on the other hand, and depriving them of the moneys they formerly received from the Government. Their necessaries of life are taxed by duties on articles which they require in order to prosecute their callings, such as cordage and cans. These items alone amount to a good deal more than the money you give them as a bounty for their fish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We cannot have a tariff discussion.

Mr. KIRK. While the fishermen have received \$150,000 as a bounty, it is taken out of them by the duties they have to pay, and they are not receiving the advantage they formerly received, by grants of money for breakwaters to protect their boats and for dredging their harbors, and at the same time hon. gentlemen boast of being so liberal to the fishermen.

Improvement of the River Yamaska ..... \$10,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$6,000 of this sum is to pay the contractors the balance of their contract, and is required to complete the locks. All the work done amounted to about \$50,000, and the object is to remove obstacles and render the river navigable. It is a very important river, and this work has been going on since 1882. We expended, then, \$7,000; the next year, \$11,000; the next year, \$11,000;

and the next year, \$20,000; and this is for the balance of the contract. These obstructions in the river extend for a distance of 20 miles, near the villages the St. Hugues. This is in a very large and important district of the Province of Quebec. There is a line of steamboats on the river.

For the improvement of the North Saskatchewan River..... \$10,000

Mr. TROW. On what portion of the North Saskatchewan will this money be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say. A discussion took place in this House in respect to the Saskatchewan River, in which several members, including the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) took part, and it was represented that it was very important there should be an examination or survey of the river. That hon. gentleman spoke about \$20,000 or \$25,000 being granted for that purpose. We did not think we could ask Parliament for \$25,000, but we inserted \$10,000 in the Estimates. With that sum we expect to make a survey or examination, and to expend part of the money in making improvements on the river.

Mr. TROW. I have been under the impression that the river has been surveyed repeatedly—twice to my knowledge—and that we have reports describing the rapids and interruptions to navigation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were, no doubt, some partial surveys; but there has not been a thorough examination of the river. It will be of great advantage to know what points should be dredged or improved.

Mr. WATSON. I think the larger amount of money should be expended in making improvements rather than in conducting surveys. The captains of steamboats which navigate the river will be able to furnish information as to the points where money can be spent to the best advantage.

Roads and Bridges ..... \$16,100

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The sum of \$3,000 to aid the municipality of New Edinburgh to erect an iron bridge across Rideau River is, I suppose, owing to the fact that Government House is situated on the other side. The item looks like voting an amount for a purely local enterprise.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it is local; but the interest we have in it as a Government is such as should lead us to do it. The grounds of Rideau Hall are extensive, and form more than half the area of the municipality, which could not, therefore, afford to rebuild the bridge without some aid.

Telegraphs ..... \$28,650

Mr. MULOCK. Why is it necessary that the Government should build a telegraph line between Amherst Island and the mainland at Bath?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have considered a request made to them with respect to having telegraph communication there. The people of Amherst Island contribute to the revenue of the country, and cannot have the benefit of any improvement, except such as that which is proposed. The people have undertaken to build the land lines on the island. I believe the interests of shipping will also be served by having a telegraph line there.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has not answered my point. Why is it necessary for the Government to undertake the work? Will not private enterprise do it? Have enquiries been made, to see if the ordinary telegraph service will not make a connection with Amherst Island.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We understand from the inhabitants that they cannot obtain telegraph communication except by this means. The Government will not work the line, and of course they will work on the island without the interference of the Government. The Government will give the cable; that is all.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think this is a very proper thing to do, because those islands are so situated that in most cases they derive no advantage from the public works on the mainland, though they contribute as much to the revenue, in proportion to the population, as any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will not do to carry that point too far. There are many counties in Ontario which are among the largest revenue-contributing counties in the Dominion, but they get nothing at all from the Dominion Government, except, possibly, \$10,000 or \$15,000 for public buildings. A vote of this kind must be justified in the public interest, and not on that ground.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the Government making this grant simply to accommodate those people, or because they cannot be otherwise accommodated? The hon. gentleman says that the people there have made some representations, but that does not necessarily justify the grant.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). When the deputation came down here, I asked them the same question the hon. gentleman has asked, and they said they had tried each of the companies, but they could not get them to expend a dollar, because the lines would not be profitable, but that afterwards the company might probably operate them. They thought they should have some little benefit, especially as there were some seasons of the year when they do not get to the island.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many are there on the island?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There are about two townships.

Mr. BOWELL. There is another reason for the construction of this telegraph. The most dangerous portions of Lake Ontario, in regard to navigation, are about the head of that island, and near the Brothers' Islands below it. Wrecks often take place there, and it is important that there should be rapid means of communicating between the island and the mainland. Although the island is well settled, and although it is a good farming locality, there is not enough business on the island to make the telegraph a paying investment for the company. For these reasons, this amount, or even \$2,000 or \$3,000, would be money well spent for this purpose.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It should also be stated that the parties themselves are doing a great deal towards constructing the line on the island.

For the preparation of Dr. Rand's Micmac Indian dictionary..... \$1,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many Micmacs are there in the Dominion?

Mr. PAINT. There are about 2,500.

Mr. WELDON. Including New Brunswick?

Mr. PAINT. I think not. I may say that the Rev. Silas T. Rand has given 35 of the best years of his life as a missionary among these Indians, and he has collected some 30,000 words in this dictionary, and he asks for this assistance to publish the work.

Mr. BOWELL. I may say that this gentleman, as the hon. member for Richmond has stated, has devoted a great deal of attention to the compilation of this dictionary for the benefit of that tribe. The book will be used in their

schools, and by the educated Micmacs generally. We all know that the sale of a work of that kind will not compensate any author for publishing it; hence, the Government deemed it highly proper that he should be aided to this extent in the publication of his work.

Mr. GILLMOR. I should like to ask the hon. member for Richmond if Micmac is taught in the Indian schools. If so, they must have school books in Micmac, as well as the dictionary.

Mr. McLELAN. This dictionary is used for instruction in the Micmac language in every way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. According to such information as we have of these missionary tongues, the missionary, in most cases, has to construct a language out of his own head. I know that in some cases, when the work has been done, the Indians themselves have not recognised their own language.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The question arises as to the wisdom of the Dominion Parliament maintaining an Indian school in which the lessons are not taught in English.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They are.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know that the company who maintain several schools in my county, are making it imperative that the studies shall all be in English, and if the Government are attempting to bring the Indians into full citizenship, it seems to me the public money should be used to teach them English and to assimilate them to the rest of the people.

Mr. PAINT. The Rev. Silas T. Rand brought the highest credentials from the University of Dalhousie, in Nova Scotia, from the University of Acadia College, from the College of Sackville, N.B., and from Sir William Dawson, all recommending this work and soliciting the Dominion Government to aid its publication.

To pay for the compilation, printing and publishing of correspondence, petitions, reports and Orders in Council respecting provincial legislation..... \$500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has this reference to a justification of the numerous disallowances that have taken place?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any other information than is here, but I will try and obtain it for him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this is intended to produce a full report of all the correspondence that has taken place with respect to all the Acts of disallowance since Confederation, I doubt very much whether \$500 would do it, and if it is not, it is of very little value.

Expenses for translating and printing Chinese immigration report ..... \$4,500

Mr. BAKER. May I ask what this particular sum is for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the printing of the Chinese commissioners' report.

Mr. BAKER. I would move the word "commissioners" be substituted for the word "immigration."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This may be altered, but the report was about the Chinese immigration. There is only one report, and I do not think there is any ambiguity in the title.

Mr. BAKER. I know the impression it will convey to the people in British Columbia.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will make the alteration.

Mr. HOLTON. Where was this work done, and by whom?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was printed in Montreal, by the *Minerve* Publishing Company.

North-West Mounted Police—Equipment, pay and maintenance of additional men. .... \$250,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging by the expenditure for the remainder of the force, that amount will be inadequate. It does not compare with the vote already taken for the mounted infantry at Winnipeg. However, it can be repaired, as we meet again without great delay.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's opinion is borne out by the memorandum placed in my hand. The memorandum reads as follows: Equipment, pay and maintenance of an additional 500 men. This amount, I am afraid, will not be sufficient for the service mentioned, but that will depend largely on the number of men mounted, a subject which is at present receiving the consideration of the Government. If the whole are mounted, it certainly will not cover the expenditure; if, however, they determine not to mount the whole 500, the expenses connected with the equipment will not be so much. It may be all required before Parliament meets again.

Liquor License Act—To pay commissioners and inspectors appointed to administer the Liquor License Act, 1883, and generally to meet expenditure made under the Act for the license year ending 15th April, 1888 ..... \$50,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount was expended last year in enforcing this Act? and what was the amount contributed by the hotel keepers and by shop licensees?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I stated that the amount in round numbers was \$140,000 or \$150,000, including the amount provided by votes here to-day, and the fees paid in at additional places.

Mr. LANDERKIN. According to the Estimates in the year 1884-85, \$5,000 was contributed by the country for the Liquor License Act. In 1885-86, \$20,000 was voted; in the Supplementary Estimates for 1884-85 we find \$60,000; and we have now estimates of \$50,000. That makes the amount expended by the country in the enforcement of the Act \$135,000. There is a return brought down as to the amount that was contributed by the hotel keepers and the shop keepers throughout the country. I had not time to find out the exact amount, but I think the tax imposed on the hotels and shops of the Dominion amounted to at least \$100,000. I will give you an idea of what it cost in different places. In Brant \$670 was paid to the commissioners and the inspectors and sub-inspectors; in Bruce \$540 was paid to the commissioners, or, at least, I should say, was contributed by the hotel keepers and shop keepers there. In Elgin \$855 was levied on the hotel keepers and shop keepers, and in Essex \$385. In Grey, one of the most intelligent, largest and best counties in the Dominion, there was levied on these good men and true \$980. In the city of Hamilton I find that a tax was imposed on the hotel keepers of \$1,845; in the county of Hasting, so ably represented by the Minister of Customs and the member for East Hastings (Mr. White), and the other distinguished gentleman, they have had to contribute \$1,300 for the purposes of this Act; in Kingston, \$755; in Lambton, \$1,140; Lanark, \$535; Leeds and Grenville, \$895; Lennox and Addington, \$590; in the city of London, represented by the Postmaster General, \$920; in the county of Northumberland, \$410; Ontario, \$645; the city of Ottawa, \$1,210; Oxford, \$515; Peel, \$565; Perth, \$1,205; Peterboro', \$760; Renfrew, \$655; Simcoe, \$630; Wellington, \$1,030; York, \$1,445; Waterloo, \$1,135; Welland, \$855; and Toronto, \$4,480. I would like to know what was the use of levying this tax upon the hotel keepers and the shop keepers of this country to this alarming amount, when, during the last

Session of this House, an amendment of the Liquor License Act was passed, suspending its operation in regard to certain matters and compelling hotel keepers to take out Local Licenses. During this Session a Bill was introduced, and I believe passed, to suspend the Act, and yet we find that \$50,000 is asked when the Act is suspended. The people will no doubt be surprised to find we have spent \$135,000 on account of this Act, which does not protect them or protect any interest whatever.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I think the hon. gentleman is out of order in speaking of the money contributed by the hotel and saloon keepers of the country. What has this to do with this vote? I should like you to rule on that point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAINT). I am disposed to allow the hon. gentleman to make his remarks, very short.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was aware, from your well-known fairness, that you would allow me to proceed. After the Act has been suspended, what do we want the money for? Why should we throw \$50,000 away in paying officers who should have been dismissed as soon as the Act was suspended? I think the people have reason to complain of the introduction of the measure at all, of the enormous amount expended, and that the hotel keepers have reason to complain of the heavy tax levied upon them, which has given no protection to the people against the use of intoxicating liquor, or to the hotel keepers themselves. The law has been a dead letter from the beginning, and yet the Government ask for a vote of \$50,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has not put the case fairly; he has overlooked the very important fact that the Act has been suspended only in regard to those matters which are inconsistent with the decision of the Supreme Court, and that, only, until we get the decision of the Privy Council. There is no doubt as to our right to grant wholesale licenses and licenses to druggists, and, in Scott Act counties our inspectors are the officers who are bound to enforce the law, and the machinery must remain organised as it was. I know myself that from the Lower Provinces I have complete testimony from parties, independent of politics, who state that they regret there was any constitutional difficulty; that they never knew an Act better calculated to promote order and regulate and restrain the sale of liquor, and they would be only too glad if the constitutional question was settled in favor of that Act.

Mr. VAIL. Is it from your own inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was from the people of both sides of politics. We are not discussing the law itself, but the propriety of this vote of \$50,000, to make up any deficiency that will occur this year. As I have said, the board of commissioners must be retained until this question is finally settled, and the inspectors must be retained, even were there no licenses granted, except the druggists licenses, in every Scott Act county of the Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am desirous of knowing what salary is paid to the commissioners, to the inspectors, and the sub-inspectors. I asked this question before, and the Minister told me he did not know. I am very anxious to know, because it appears to me that this tax that is levied upon hotel keepers and shop keepers is for no other purpose than to pay these officers, when they do no good, do not administer the law and are of no benefit at all.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have already answered that it was proposed to allow the commissioners a *per diem* allowance of \$5 for every day they actually sit at the board, and a travelling fee of 10 cents per mile going to and returning from these meetings. With regard to the salaries of inspectors, there is no fixed rate, because we had to consider the questions of divisions, the population, the number of licenses

Mr. LANDERKIN.

issued, so as to form some idea of the work and to settle the salary on a regular scale.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will you tell me what is the salary paid to the sub-inspector in the county of Grey?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot remember, for the 200 counties.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would it amount to \$400 or \$500?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will amount to \$600 or \$700, from the receipts that he gave awhile ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand this year he issued two licenses, and consequently the people have had to pay him \$300 for each license.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I was speaking from the figures he read. If there were only two licenses issued in that county, I think the salary would be much smaller.

Mr. HESSON. If the hon. member for Grey had heard the discussion in the House this afternoon, he would not have spoken in this way. He seems to forget that the hotel keepers who applied for Dominion licenses did so on their own option. There was a doubt as to which Government had a right to issue licenses, and the hotel keepers had their option to apply to the Dominion Government and pay their \$10 and \$5, which was \$15 for the security which that option presented if they took advantage of it. The security would not be prosecuted by either Government, who might have a right to take action if they found they had authority. A great many came forward and made that deposit as a security that they would be protected by both Governments from prosecution, and I have not heard any fault found by the licensed victuallers of Ontario in that regard. At present the question has been decided that wholesale licenses, at all events, are under the jurisdiction of this Government, but there is still a doubt as to whether this Government have control over retail licenses, and that question has still to be settled by the Privy Council. Now, certain sums have been paid in—in the county of Perth, something over \$1,200—but I have not heard any complaints from the licensed victuallers in that county, and there is still something like \$600 lying to the credit of the Government in that fund.

Mr. KIRK. Does the chairman of the commissioners, who, in Nova Scotia, is the county judge, receive the same fee as the other commissioners?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think there is a little difference in favor of the chairman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it the intention of the Government to repay this \$15 to the hotel keepers of this country?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will take a little time to answer that question.

Mr. FISHER. Since the Minister seems to fix the salaries of inspectors according to the number of licenses which are issued in their respective counties, how is he going to arrange their salaries in Scott Act counties, where there are no licenses issued? I trust the Minister will fix the salaries in Scott Act counties sufficiently high to cause the men to do the work efficiently.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not state that their salaries were fixed exclusively according to the number of licenses issued. I said that in order to arrive at some settlement of the matter various points had to be taken into consideration, such as the extent of the district, the number of licenses issued, and so on. In Scott Act counties it will, of course, be different.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Does the Minister think that the amount of the present vote, \$50,000, will be likely to meet the requirements of the board? Last year the

expenses were \$150,000. Of that amount there was contributed from other sources \$73,000. I suppose the Minister proposes to reduce the salaries, as the amount of contributions will be considerably reduced. We must remember that much of the revenue which was contributed from other sources will not be available for the present year, as I do not understand that the Government intend to issue tavern licenses in future. Does the Minister hope to get through with \$50,000?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Does the hon. gentleman intend to reduce the amount paid to the license inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The work will be merely nominal. They are holding their positions, lest we should have to arrange a new staff. Their duties will not involve the same labor as their duties did last year, for which they were paid a larger amount.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I congratulate the license victuallers on having such an able and ardent advocate as the hon. gentleman opposite. I am sure the hotel keepers and saloon keepers will be only too happy to have an opportunity to pay that amount over again. I am speaking the sentiments of the licensed victuallers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is speaking the sentiments either of the licensed victuallers or the temperance people.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I believe he is.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Are all moneys collected under the Act paid in as part of the Consolidated Revenue of Canada, and, if that be so, are the commissioners justified in reserving for themselves so much on account?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They have power to retain money to pay their running expenses. Then the Dominion must make up the deficiency.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). If it should appear that we had no right to pass the Act, the people should be given their money back. I am satisfied that the hotel keepers throughout Ontario would be willing to pay \$15 each for the peace they have had during the past year. The inspectors and commissioners could not say to them: You must get a license. The Ontario Act is a machine to make men vote against their consciences.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the Minister of Inland Revenue lay on the Table the Orders in Council sanctioning the various payments?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think I could at once, although I have no desire to place obstructions in the way.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps it will be a more simple matter, if, instead of furnishing Orders in Council, the Minister would lay on the Table a schedule showing the salary that has been assigned to those various officers. That would simplify the matter, and it would not be necessary to copy out the former parts of the Orders in Council in that way. I think it is important that we should know how this sum is to be apportioned, for although the duties of the officers continue to some extent in those counties that have passed the Scott Act, that does not apply to the remaining counties, although they have some small duties remaining. On the whole, the duties of these officers, as they deal only with wholesale druggists and vessel licenses, are almost *nil*, and therefore it is important that we should know on what basis their salaries are now to be paid.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will not be able to give the Orders in Council the hon. gentleman refers to. This \$50,000 is to pay the salaries of the same officers for which \$60,000 was asked last year. I may say that it is to be understood these

officers must not expect the same salaries as before, as the work is very largely reduced.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Have the officers been notified to that effect?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They will be.  
Resolution to be reported.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. BOWELL presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Further Supplementary Estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1886.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

#### LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons additional Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1886; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 15th July, 1885.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the Message, and the Estimates transmitted therewith, be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:15 a.m. Thursday.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 16th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

#### PRAYERS.

#### TROUBLES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government received any, and if so, how many communications, and at what dates, from Bishop Grandin, relating to North-West affairs, and not brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no correspondence of record in the Department of the Interior from Bishop Grandin since that which he addressed to Mr. Laird, in 1876, already laid on the Table of the House, except a communication dated the 19th March, 1882, in which he asks for assistance in the construction of a hospital, a subsidy for the hospital, and help for the orphanages, and one (not dated) received on the 30th September, 1882, asking that Michael Deane be instructed to survey their settlement. These letters had no reference whatever to the half-breed question, nor were they called for by any Order of the House. The Order called for correspondence relating to land claims at Prince Albert and the neighboring districts. Albert is not in the neighborhood of Prince Albert, but in the neighborhood of Edmonton—over 400 miles west of Prince Albert. Michael Deane was instructed to survey the settlement at St. Albert in the spring of 1883. I may as well say that there are a great many letters, I dare say, addressed to individual members of the Government, which are not considered official, but they will be collated as fast as they can be, and laid on the Table of the House at the beginning of next Session.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government addressed any, and if so, how many communications, and at what date, to Bishop Grandin, relating to North-West affairs, and not brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government did not, since 1876, address any communication to Bishop Grandin on North-West affairs generally, but in reply to his letter of 1882 he was informed that instructions had been given for the survey of the lands in the settlement.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government received any, and if so, how many communications from inhabitants of St. Albert, Edmonton or Fort Saskatchewan, through Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney, in the winter of 1883, not brought down—whether the Government received any, and if so, how many communications from Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney, or either of them, on the same subjects, not brought down?

Mr. McLELAN. On the 7th April, 1883, a communication was received from Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney, representing the people of Edmonton and Fort Saskatchewan, asking for a river lot survey, patents, a land office, recognition of claims to lands by settlement in advance of survey, without reference to the question of whether the sections settled upon were even or odd, and making other representations in regard to local land questions. The only references of a general character in this communication was one on the subject of representation in Parliament, and a short paragraph asking consideration for the requests of the half-breeds. There were two short letters subsequently, having reference to the first. They were answered on the 12th April, 1883, promising them the survey asked for, the establishment of a land office, the issue of patents upon proof of title, and the recognition of the claims of actual settlers, in accordance with the provisions of the law in that behalf. There was no Order of the House calling for papers having reference to land claims in the Edmonton district.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government addressed any, and if so, how many communications to Father Leduc and Mr. Maloney on North-West affairs, not brought down?

Mr. McLELAN. There were two letters sent from the Department of the Interior to Messrs. Leduc and Maloney—one dated the 12th April, 1883, replying in full to their representations, and one dated the 3rd September, 1883, acknowledging and replying to the later letters received in the Department on the 27th August, 1883.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether, in the year 1882, instructions were sent to the surveyor engaged in the special river lot survey at St. Albert to desist; and whether this instruction was acted on for the time? Whether, in 1883, instructions were sent to have a river lot survey at St. Albert, Edmonton or Fort Saskatchewan, and whether such survey was made?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Michael Deane, without instructions from the Department, and while carrying instructions to do other work, commenced a river survey at St. Albert, in 1882. When the Surveyor-General discovered from Mr. Deane's progress returns what he was doing, he insisted, very properly, upon obedience, and ordered Mr. Deane to proceed with the work which he had instructions to do. In the spring of 1883 Mr. Deane got a new contract, including the river survey at St. Albert and Fort Saskatchewan, which he duly performed. The survey of the Edmonton settlement on the river-lot system was included in his contract for the previous year.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any answers were given, not brought down, to any, and if so, to which of the letters or memorials on the subject of North-West grievances, which have been brought down? and at what date were such answers given?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD

Mr. McLELAN. The answer to that question has not been prepared. Many of these questions involve a search in the whole Department for letters and papers, and they involve a great deal of time.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether it is true, as stated by Mr. Pearce, in his report of 12th March, 1884, that from correspondence on the departmental files it appears that it was the intention of the Government, as late as the spring of 1883, to re-survey into river lots the portion of land settled on by the half-breeds at St. Laurent? and what are the dates of such correspondence not brought down?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Pearce was mistaken. There is no such correspondence on record in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any answer was given to the letter of Father Vegreville, of the 19th January, 1881, to Mr. Deville? If so, when and by whom?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Deville replied, saying the letter had been submitted to the Minister, with a recommendation that Mr. Pearce be instructed to comply with the wishes of the settlers, as far as practicable. The letter of Mr. Deville is dated 15th February, 1881.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any answer was given to the petition of 19th November, 1883, from thirty-one persons of St. Louis de Langevin? and if so, when, and by whom?

Mr. McLELAN. The petition having been received at the Department through the local agent, there is nothing to show whether that official did or did not acknowledge it, but he doubtless did, and the communication was immediately referred to the Surveyor General and to Mr. Pearce, for action, which action was taken by granting the petitioners their river frontages in legal sub-divisions, as shown by the correspondence brought down.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any answer was given, after the return of the Deputy Minister, to the letter of Louis Schmidt, of 26th April, 1884? and, if so, when and by whom?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; an answer was sent by Mr. Burgess himself, on the 6th May, 1885, within a short time after his return to the Department.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any answer was given to Mr. Pearce's letter of 19th March, 1884, as to the settlement of the river lot claims? and, if so, when and by whom?

Mr. McLELAN. No reply was necessary. The correspondence brought down shows that the agent at Prince Albert was instructed to proceed with the settlement of the claims mentioned by Mr. Pearce, and that a large number of them have been settled.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any instructions were given after Mr. Pearce's letter of 19th of March, 1884, as to the mode of settlement of the river lot claims? And, if so, when, and by whom?

Mr. McLELAN. Not subsequent to Mr. Pearce's letter, but prior to it, as the correspondence brought down shows.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When were the plans and surveys of St. Laurent and the neighborhood sent to Mr. Duck?

Mr. McLELAN. The plan of St. Laurent settlement was sent to the agent at Prince Albert on the 15th February, 1884, and the plans of the neighborhood at various times, commencing with the spring of the year 1880.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Are there any orders, or instructions, or letters as to the mode of survey on rivers, particularly on the Saskatchewan, not brought down? If so, what are the dates?

Mr. McLELAN. There are separate instructions given to each surveyor, directing him as to the mode in which he

is to carry out the particular work entrusted to him. The Dominion Lands Act authorises the mode of surveys to be adopted, and particularly authorises the sub-division of lands fronting on rivers or lakes into lots with narrow frontages, if thought expedient.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did the Government receive communication of the resolution of the North-West Council of 1884 as to the half-breed claims, and when? Did they answer that communication? If so, when?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; on the 19th August, 1884; and since then, the subjects referred to in the memorial of the council have been dealt with at various times by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did the Government receive the report mentioned by Col. Houghton of his mission to the North-West in 1884; and if so, when?

Mr. CARON. All reports received from Col. Houghton, which are not of a specially confidential character, have been brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not answering the question. I ask whether the Government received the report mentioned by Col. Houghton, and if so, when.

Mr. CARON. All the reports which were received which could be brought down have been brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not ask whether any reports have been brought down. I ask whether the Government received any particular document.—No answer. Did the Government call on Governor Dewdney for any information as to the state of things, with reference to the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan region, in 1884, or in January, February or early March, 1885, and if so, when? Did the Government receive any communications from Governor Dewdney on the subject; and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that there have been any special calls on Governor Dewdney on behalf of the Government for information. It is Governor Dewdney's duty to give full information on everything affecting affairs in his jurisdiction, and he has been in continual communication with the Government or individual members of the Government on this subject.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did the Government call on any of the officials in the North-West and if so on which, and when, during 1884 or 1885, for information as to the state of things with reference to the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan region? Did the Government receive any communications from any of the officials in the North-West during 1884 or 1885 as to the state of things with reference to the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan region; and if so from whom and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government and several of the Departments have been in active correspondence with the various officials in the North-West, as to the state of affairs in reference to the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan region, and other matters affecting the North-West. Some of these communications are in the Department, and some are not. They will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did the Government receive any communication of Archbishop Taché's views on the subject of the half-breed question not brought down; and is so, when?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no record in the Department of the Interior of any communication on the half-breed question from Archbishop Taché, which has not been brought down.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was any answer sent to the letter of Father André's to Sir John Macdonald, of 16th January, 1883, and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not quite prepared to answer that question, neither as to the receipt of the letter nor as to the answer.

Mr. BLAKE. The letter has been brought down; I do not ask as to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is all right, then.

Mr. ROYAL (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have any information concerning certain facts said to have been committed after the taking of Batoche, on the 14th May last, by Canadian volunteers, namely: a rope was placed around the neck of one Damase Carrière, a half-breed, who was afterwards dragged for a distance; an old man named Donald Ross, while lying wounded, was stripped of his clothes and indignities were committed upon him; another half-breed, Vandal, was seized and was cut and wounded all over the body; also, whether they have any information concerning the wanton destruction of property in the settlement of Batoche, after the fight, by Canadian volunteers? And if so, whether they have ordered an investigation of said facts?

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) In answer to my hon. friend, I must say that the Government have received no information as to the facts mentioned in the question he has just put. I have communicated this question to General Middleton, in order to obtain the required information, but as the General is now *en route* to Selkirk, he is not likely to receive my letter before his arrival at Selkirk or at Winnipeg.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether Michel Dumas, one of the delegates to Riel, was offered an appointment as assistant farm instructor, or in some other capacity? If so, when? Did he accept the appointment? How long did he continue in office?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the answer here to-day, but Mr. Michel Dumas was offered an appointment and accepted it; the particular dates I will get for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether James Isbister, one of the delegates to Riel, was offered an appointment as assistant farm instructor, or in some other capacity? If so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. James Isbister was also offered an appointment? The dates I will obtain to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was a ferry license granted to Gabriel Dumont, one of the delegates to Riel, and if so, when?

Mr. COSTIGAN. All ferries under the control of the Federal Government are under the management of the Inland Revenue Department. Gabriel Dumont has received no ferry license from that Department?

Mr. BLAKE asked, What was the date of Superintendent Crozier's report (not brought down but mentioned in that of 27th July, 1884) in which he pointed out the sympathy of the Indians with the half-breeds, and suggested that precautionary measures should be taken?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the date, but I will obtain it.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has the Government received reports from officers of the Mounted Police with regard to the fight at Duck Lake, the evacuation of Carlton, the affair at Fort Pitt, the affair at Frog Lake, the affairs of Prince Albert, the affairs of Battleford, or any of them, and of what dates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reports of the affairs at these points have been received and will be brought down at once.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Had the Government received any communication from Sheriff Chapleau before the outbreak

in the North-West, relating to half-breed affairs? If so, when?

Mr. McLELAN. No communication from Sheriff Chapeau relating to the outbreak in the North-West or to half-breed affairs, has been received or is on record in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Had the Government received, before the outbreak, any communication as to half-breed matters containing the views of Mr. Forget, Mr. Hayter Reed, Judge Rouleau, Father André, Mr. L. Clarke, Mr. Macdowell, Bishop McLean, or any other prominent citizen of the North-West Territories?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very probably communications have been received from some, if not all, of those gentlemen. Those received will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did Sir Hector Langevin receive one or more communications, in 1884-85, from Mr. Jackson, M. C. North-West Territories, on the subject of the half-breed claims? If so, at what dates?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt I have received one or more. I do not know the dates.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did Sir Hector Langevin report to the Government his interview with certain half-breeds at Qu'Appelle in September, 1884; and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt I have so stated to my colleagues, but I do not know the date.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Are the telegram of 2nd January, 1885, and the report of 31st December, 1884, brought down, the only communications received by the Government on the subject of L. Riel's proposal to take money and go? If not, from whom and at what dates were other communications sent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From my general recollection, there have been several communications from persons present at meetings at which Riel made speeches and from officials and settlers, giving all kinds of contradictory reports about Riel's proposal to take money and go.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Were there any petitions, resolutions or letters on the subject of half-breed and settler's claims in the disturbed districts received by the Government and not brought down? If so, from whom, and when were they sent.

Mr. McLELAN. We have not, in the Department of the Interior, discovered any so far.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Is there any correspondence as to the settlement of the claims of the unenumerated half-breeds of Manitoba, not brought down?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did Mr. Walsh investigate into or report on the affair of the Qu'Appelle half-breeds referred to him on the 6th July, 1882? If so, at what date?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no report in the Department of the Interior of it.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Is there any correspondence on the subject of the affairs of the Qu'Appelle half-breeds, referred to Mr. Walsh, not brought down? If so, from whom, and at what dates?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a report in the House of Commons in respect of the settlers, not distinguishing whether half-breeds or not. I have not the date.

Mr. BLAKE. Are there reports from Mr. Russell and Mr. Aldous on the Prince Albert or the St. Laurent settlement, in the years 1877 and 1878?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; there is the report of Mr. Russell contained in the report of the Department for the year

Mr. BLAKE.

1877; and there is the report of Mr. Aldous contained in the report of the Department of the Interior for 1878.

Mr. BLAKE. Are the whole reports published?

Mr. McLELAN. The answer given me is, that the whole report is published.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that hardly accurate.—Does the report of the surveyor, or the report of the inspector give any particulars on the subject of the improvements made by settlers or squatters on the Prince Albert Colonisation Company's tract?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; the report of the surveyor gives the fullest details as to the settlers found upon the Prince Albert Colonisation Company's tract, as is the practice in the case of every squatter or settler found upon any surveyed lands. Section 36, 2nd Nov., 1883; Joseph Dufresne, house (log) partly built, about 4 acres broken. Section 2, John Toogood, house (log) partly finished, about 5 acres broken. Section 14, George Alexander McLeod, house (log) 15½ x 16, 32 acres broken and cropped, 120 acres fenced, logs out for stable 30 x 40. St. George claims land adjoining Joseph Dufresne, on which he has erected a log house and broken 4 acres; had been on the place 2 months, but was absent at the time of my visit, 12th August, 1884; had made no entry. Township 45 A, range 28, west of the second meridian, section 24, Maxime Lapine, Norbert Turcotte; these two lay claim to this section, but have neither made entry nor improvements; at present they reside in township 45, range 28, where they have made improvements. Norman Mackenzie, no residence; 20 acres cropped. André Letendre, no residence, house; 30 acres broken. Michel Dumas, no residence, 5 acres broken; logs out for house. Alexander McDougall, no residence, 5 acres broken; logs out for house. Chas. Boucher, lives with his father, 3 acres in crop. Solomon Boucher, lives with his father, 10 acres in crop. Baptiste Boucher, house, etc., 3 years residence, 35 acres in crop. I need not go through the whole list. These are the particulars, as given by the surveyor, which the inspector confirmed. These are not placed on record until confirmed by the inspector.

#### PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Does John Heney, of Ottawa, hold the property occupied by him, south of the Sappers' Bridge and West of the Rideau Canal in Ottawa, under lease from the Government? If so, what is the term of the lease and the amount of the annual rent? If not under lease, by what right does he occupy the property?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Heney was permitted, about 1867, on representations made by the Department of Public Works, to pile cordwood (which he had contracted to supply to the Government for the heating of the public buildings) on the portion of ordnance lands mentioned. The permission has been renewed under the successive contracts made by Mr. Heney with the Department of Public Works for the same purpose. He has no lease of the ground, and pays no rent.

#### STOCKHOLDERS OF GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Does the Government intend to take any steps to enforce the Order of the House of last Session, of the 28th March, 1884, calling for a statement showing the names of all stockholders in the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, with the amount of stock held by each of said stockholders at the close of the first year after the charter was granted or operations commenced; also the names of all stockholders in said company and the amounts of stock held by each on the first day of the current year?

Does the Government intend to take any steps to enforce the Order of the House of the 24th February last, for a list of the names in detail, with the residence or business address, of each of the several stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, on the first day of January last?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government intend to take steps in the matter.

#### MR. MATTHEW ROACH.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has the Pilotage Commission of the locality been remodelled with a view to remove Mr. Matthew Roach, of Lingan, Cape Breton, or is it intended to do so? On what ground is Mr. Roach deprived of office?

Mr. McLELAN. The Pilotage Commission has been remodelled, but not to remove Mr. Matthew Roach. He is a member of one of the boards.

Mr. BLAKE. Of which board is he a member?

Mr. McLELAN. There was a Board of Pilot Commissioners embracing the ports of North Sydney and the outports of Lingan and Cow Bay. Mr. Roach lived in one of the outer districts. I appointed two Boards of Pilot Commissioners, one board for North Sydney and an outer board, on which Mr. Roach is one of the commissioners.

#### DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—THANKS TO THE TROOPS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I give notice generally for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to this resolution. My intention is to move a specific resolution. If I am not strong enough to do justice to the subject, I will ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia to do so for me. I shall ask now that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will second the resolution.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. POPE. I have given notice of certain resolutions in the Committee of the Whole. I would ask if the House will allow me to move those resolutions after six o'clock.

Mr. BLAKE. I was about to enquire what the views of the Government were as to the business now before the House, or as to any further business which they propose to bring before the House, and as to what they think in regard to the date of prorogation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the present intention of the Government to bring down any further measures or to call the attention of the House to any subjects other than to those which are now on the Orders of the Day. I hope, if the state of public business will allow it, that we shall prorogue on Saturday, or at the latest on Monday. Of course, that depends altogether upon the length of the discussions upon the matters now before the House.

#### THE WRIT FOR ST. JOHN.

Mr. WELDON. I understand that the Speaker's warrant for the issue of a writ for the city and county of St. John was placed in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on Friday last, and, on enquiry, I find that no writ has been issued up to the present moment. I think that, under the statute, the writ must be issued immediately on the receipt of the Speaker's warrant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will enquire about it.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

On the Order for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Caron, that Bill (No. 141) respecting

the administration of justice and other matters in the North-West Territories, be now read a third time, and the motion of Mr. Mills in amendment thereto,

Mr. CARON. The consideration of the present Bill—

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has already spoken to the amendment.

Mr. CARON. I am under the impression that I spoke on another motion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. No; you spoke on this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I have spoken on this matter, and I would say at once that I am strongly opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am of the opinion that it is necessary for the peace and good government of that country, and for the restoration of confidence among the white people and settlers of that country, that this Bill should be carried out, and that the clauses should be adopted as they have already been adopted in Committee of the Whole. The object of the measure is simply to prevent arms of precision and of fixed ammunition from being in the hands of persons whom it is not deemed safe to entrust with such arms. In order to carry out the provisions of the Bill effectually, I think it is necessary that these clauses should be adopted, and the authorities in the North-West think it is of primary importance that these provisions should be carried out. The Bill provides that every person in the North-West Territories:

"Without the permission in writing (the proof of which shall be on him) of the Lieutenant-Governor, or of a commissioner appointed by him to give such permission, has in his possession or sells, exchanges, trades, barter or gives to, or with any person, any improved arm or ammunition shall be liable to a penalty."

Now I do not think, when it is known that it is for the purpose of preventing arms being in the hands of persons who ought not to have them, that a single loyal man in the North-West will object. I think if the whole of this House of Commons were now settlers in the North-West they would be quite ready to give an account of their rifles or revolvers, and to say that they had these arms. There can be no trouble whatever with respect to this matter. There will be commissioners appointed in every settlement, respectable gentlemen, who will simply enter in a register the name of every white settler who chooses to give his name and to say: I have a Winchester rifle, or I have such an arm. Now, Sir, the outbreak in the North-West did not originate with the Indians proper, but with the half-breeds, and with the white rebels, disloyal men. We can easily manage the Indians, but we cannot so easily manage the "white Indians," as an hon. gentleman calls them. It is of great importance that we should be able to trace the arms. This Bill is not to take any effect whatever, except in those portions of the North-West where the Government believe, from information, that danger might arise from the use or the possession of arms, and until that district is declared to be within the terms of the Act, there will be no objection on the part of loyal men; the disloyal men who wish to conceal their arms, may, perhaps, object. Then, Sir, if we confine this to the Indians and half-breeds, and leave out the white men, it will have a very bad effect. As I have said, the leaders in the outbreak have been half-breeds, who, through their superior education, have used their influence on the Indians, for the purpose of exciting them. Well, I cannot fancy a greater source of irritation to the loyal half-breeds than that they should be singled out, that their houses are searched, and that they are to give up their arms, or to give an account of their arms, while the whites are allowed to go free. There are loyal half-breeds, I am very glad to say, as well as disloyal half-breeds, and they will feel it as a great insult if they are proscribed

especially in the Act, while every white man, whether loyal or disloyal, should have the right to keep arms, while the half-breed, because he is a half-breed, should not have the same privilege. But we put in the Act that all persons, loyal or disloyal—if in a proclaimed district, mind you, in a district where there is information that there is danger in this direction, and after the proclamation is issued—that all persons, white, red, or between the two, should give an account of their arms. Unless this is done there is no means of tracing the arms. The moment that any person, white, red or half-breed, seeks to have an arm registered he can always be called on to give an account of what he does with it. If you had not such a check the Bill is comparatively useless. Now, in the temporary Act that was passed in consequence of the violence of certain parties in Canada in 1878, it is provided that:

“From and after the day named in, and during the continuance in force of such first named proclamation, it shall not be lawful for any person, not being a justice of the peace, or an officer, soldier, sailor or volunteer, in Her Majesty's service, while on duty, or a constable or other peace officer, or a person licensed under this Act, to carry or have within the proclaimed district, elsewhere than in his own dwelling-house, shop, warehouse or counting-house, any arm; and any person carrying or having any arm contrary to this provision, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.”

That Act was passed by the late Administration in consequence of riots in Quebec, and a very proper Act it was. It was for the purpose of preventing arms being used by any persons. True, that case and the present are different. In that case, unfortunately, there were riots, and people appeared on the streets, on the wharves, or wherever the fight was, with arms in their hands, and it was necessary to provide that no person should appear with arms, during the existence of this Act, in the street. They might keep the arms which belonged to them in their own house. Now the reason of that Act was very properly to prevent riots, whether trade riots, or riots between workmen, or whatever they were, and that Act, I dare say, had its good effect. The same principle is attempted to be carried out here, that in any district where there is reasonable suspicion of discontent, such as may lead to insurrection or outbreak, every person in the district shall be called upon by the enabling magistrate, or the commissioner appointed for the locality, to say: I have got such an arm, and no person will have any reason to object. We have just got through one outbreak, and I hope there will not be another. But both the Indian authorities and other authorities in the North-West are cautioning us to take care against giving any chance for a recurrence of the unhappy event of the last few months. I, therefore, ask the House to reject the motion of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very sorry the Government after consideration have not seen fit to accept the hon. member's amendment. I really think that had the hon. gentleman possessed personal and particular acquaintance with the state of affairs in the North-West he would have come to the same conclusion that many of his own followers who have that particular acquaintance with the country have arrived at, and that conclusion as stated by them on the floor of the House was this: That owing to the enormous distance over which the settlers are scattered, owing to the habits and feelings of the settlers, one of two results will follow: Either this measure will become practically a dead letter and utterly inoperative, which I suspect will be the result if it is placed on the Statute book; or else it will work a considerable amount of positive mischief. Any one who knows anything of the feelings of the inhabitants is aware that they regard the right to have arms, and arms of the best pattern, as an indefeasible right, as a thing which every settler going into that country, and particularly under existing circumstances, feels he has a moral as well as a legal right to possess. There

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

is no doubt whatever that if this act is attempted to be put into force, very considerable heartburning and dissatisfaction will be caused. That I think everybody who knows anything of the habits of our people and particularly of pioneer settlers, whether in this country or in the United States, will admit to be a matter of fact. It may be said this is a sentimental consideration. I say a sentimental consideration is a consideration of weight in these cases. Our people will not like to be subject to the reproach that they are not to be trusted with arms by the Government—that they are to be deprived of a right which has never been attempted to be taken away from settlers on the other side of the border. I do not believe there is much weight in the statement that has been made that any of the white settlers are at all likely to instigate an outbreak. It may be there were some of those men who were desirous of seeing their grievances attended to; but I do not think, and the response to arms made throughout the North-West proves it, those settlers are in the slightest degree disposed to countenance anything like armed revolt against the Government, no matter what their grievances might be. None were readier and none suffered more than the white settlers of Prince Albert, among whom, as I understand from the statements of some members of the Government, any dissatisfaction which existed among the whites had its centre. Then there are some other considerations we must bear in mind. The hon. gentleman lays the onus on the white settlers of obtaining a permit. If the hon. gentleman does not know, those who are acquainted with the North-West know, that the settlers are scattered on a very wide extent of country, and unless officials are sent to the various settlements for the purpose of conferring with the settlers there will be very great inconvenience, as the settlers living in some remote place will have to travel a great distance in order to see an official who could give this permit. It is the outlying settler who most wants and has most right to have the best arms of which he can possess himself. We must recollect, as the hon. gentleman said, that the Indian mind will be for a considerable period of time unsettled. There is no one thing which will give more confidence to the white population who are scattered among those Indian tribes than the possession of a good and superior quality of firearm, and the First Minister must know that now-a-days no man feels himself safe with a muzzle loader. Every man who is in the habit of using firearms has become habituated to the use of the improved weapons, and they will bitterly resent this proposition to deprive them of those arms. And we must also see that in attempting to enforce this Act, very great partiality may be used. It may be made the instrument of very serious oppression on the part of Government officials, who may exercise personal or party spite, who may refuse to loyal men arms, or may cause them to be fined under the provisions of this Act. As to the third point made by the hon. gentleman, that you could not discriminate between the whites and the half-breeds, I say that is not necessary. There is no reason whatever why we should not grant a liberal measure of power to carry arms to the loyal half-breeds, who, I am willing to believe, are by far the most numerous portion of the half-breeds, in spite of all that has occurred. They can be granted this permission. I do not think we have a right to say, after what has occurred, that the Government might not exercise some supervision over the issue of arms to the half-breeds. It must be remembered that some of that body have broken out into armed revolt, as well as the Indians, and it is judicious, perhaps, to give the Government the right to enforce severe provisions in regard to carrying arms by those people. I must protest, however, against applying the same regulations to the white population—and I would protest very much more strongly if I was not

pretty well convinced that when the hon. gentleman comes to put the measure into force it will become, as I have said, practically a dead letter, and it will resemble the hon. gentleman's famous proposition to exchange the Snider rifles of the police for the Winchester rifles of the Indians. He did not succeed in carrying out that project, and he will not succeed in giving effect to this legislation. Even the hon. gentleman's own supporters regard this measure with disgust. I do not think it is desirable to disarm the white population of the North-West. It is a totally distinct thing from applying an Act such as the hon. gentleman has quoted, where there is a dense population and where, as in the greater part of the old settled country, the use of arms is a luxury and arms are not required to be carried for the protection of personal property. But take the case of unfortunate isolated settlers. Perhaps such settlers are 20 or 30 miles from the nearest white family. To say that either they must not carry arms or be subject to a fine if they do, appears to be a most pedantic piece of legislation, and I regret exceedingly that the Government have not seen their way to accept the amendment of my hon. friend or some modification of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire, if I may be allowed, to read a portion of a letter written by a white man to a white man. For obvious reasons I do not give the names now, but they are well known in the North-West. The hon. gentleman says he thinks there is no danger from the action of the white people. Now, the writer of this letter is well known in the North-West and the person to whom it is written is well known in the North West. That gentleman says that he thinks there has not been since the commencement of the agitation, a better time to strike than at present; that everything seems ripe for it, he is certain that seven-eighths of the people of Winnipeg are in their favor, and he is certain 400 or 500 good men would accomplish their object without any difficulty whatever; that there is nothing to resist; that the military there would not prove a serious obstacle; that they would have easy access to the arms; they had a small meeting that night; that they determined to strike at once; that the parties there thought if they delayed they would be losing ground, and that the thing would never be accomplished. He says that he would like to know the probable number of men who could be got to assist in the scheme, and he expresses his perfect sympathy with it, and his readiness to take an active part in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was written in 1884, and that is from one white man well known in that country to another white man who is also well known.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The date is 1884.

Mr. BURPEE. I received a letter from a party in the North-West, and I can vouch that not only he is loyal, but he is not a Grit even, but a very staunch Conservative. I was very well acquainted with him in New Brunswick, where he did a good deal of business, and he now does a good deal of business in the North-West. He says:

"The classing of the white man on a par with the Indian in the use of the rifle I am more than astonished. I fear they—that is the Government—have lost their cunning. I do not belong to a cowardly stock, and never till to-day have I owned a gun; but since I read this morning the statement that it was only at the Government's sufferance that the whites would be allowed the use of a rifle, I bought one, and I do not intend to ask any man to be allowed to keep it or use it when I require to do so. If it is not too much trouble, you can tell Sir John 'them's my sentiments,' and the whole North-West will endorse them. I am a Conservative, but not a slave or serf."

The gentleman is well known to hon. gentlemen in this House.

Mr. ORTON. I still regret that the Government find it absolutely necessary to introduce this measure. I am certain it will create a good deal—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman has spoken on the amendment, and will have to wait until it is disposed of.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman spoke on the 2nd of July.

Mr. CASEY. This is the first time we have ever had to discuss in this House a question of this nature, and I hope it will be the last time, except on the occasion when this Bill comes to be repealed, and I do not think there will be much discussion on it then, for I think one or two years experience will convince this Government that they have lost their cunning, not to say their statesmanship, when they introduced this Bill, and that it will prove intensely unpopular, and will arouse such a feeling of deep indignation throughout the whole of Canada, that they will be only too glad to repeal it. It is a question which it is hard to discuss with ordinary coolness and calmness. The proposition is one to disarm full citizens of this Dominion; men who are living amongst excited savages, men who must have improved rifles for the safety of their lives and the lives of their families, men who in many cases must have improved rifles in order to obtain sustenance for themselves and their families by the chase. It is a proposal to disarm them, under what circumstances? Whenever the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories chooses to fancy that they are disloyal. The leader of the House said it would only apply to proclaimed districts, and to rebellious people. He read a telegram saying it was necessary to apply it in the case of the Indians and half-breeds. We are not discussing that question, but we are discussing an amendment by the hon. member for Bothwell, which asks that the provisions of the Bill should be relaxed so far only as concerns the white settlers, and the question now is: Are the white settlers to be subject to this disarmament? He said they would only be disarmed when they were rebellious whites, and he told us the Government considered it absolutely necessary to have the power to take these arms out of the hands of the people whom they consider to be rebellious in the North-West. They consider the frontier settler of the north-west to be rebellious and disloyal. Wait till the frontier settler hears about that, and until they hear the information upon which the Government have accused them in this wanton way of disloyalty! They have never shown a sign of disloyalty; they have given no excuse for the insult that is heaped upon them by telling them that they are disloyal. They have agitated for their rights in a constitutional way; they have stood up for their rights; and that is the gravamen of the charge against them. They have shown the badness of the hon. gentleman's policy, and while that policy had to be changed in many cases, in accordance with the desires of those settlers, in consequence of representations and claims made by those settlers, the hon. gentleman takes his revenge by calling them rebellious, and by asking from this House power to take away from them the arms on which their life and their means of livelihood may, and often do, depend.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. gentleman is working up a second rebellion by this talk.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for North Huron says: Work up a rebellion. Well, if there was anything better calculated to work up a rebellion than this Bill proposed by the right hon. gentleman, I have no doubt hon. gentlemen would have found it.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. gentleman has no right—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman can explain after the hon. member for Elgin is through.

Mr. FARKOW. I have a right to explain now, when he is putting words in my mouth.

Mr. CASEY. You have no right to interrupt.

Mr. FARROW. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi). The hon. member for Elgin says that the hon. member for Huron interrupted him by saying: Work up a rebellion. The hon. member for Huron rises to say that he said no such thing, but that he said: You are working up a second rebellion by such talk.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is not in order in interrupting a member when he is speaking, unless that member sits down and agrees to the interruption being made. The contradiction of the hon. gentleman can come at the end of the hon. member's speech.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Huron was distinctly out of order, on the showing of the hon. member for Missisquoi, for it is no point of order to contradict a statement. I do not object, however, to hearing what the hon. gentleman did say. He said I was working up a second rebellion—that this sort of talk was working up a rebellion. I say if there is anything calculated to arouse just that sort of feeling and hatred, which may be inflamed by designing parties into a rebellion, it is an insulting Bill of this kind, for the disarmament of men whom some local jack-in-office—some Dewdney—may choose to call disloyal. If anybody is to be accused of working up a second rebellion—I do not say anybody is to be so accused—it should be the contriver of this Bill. I have no doubt, judging from the past criminal blundering of this Government in dealing with the white settlers of the North-West, as well as the Indians and half-breeds, that if there had been anything more likely than this Bill to excite the minds of the settlers in that country, to prevent new settlers coming in, and to turn their feelings against Canada as against a stepmother, the genius of blundering which this Government display would have led them to propose it. What is the present proposal? To create a new Ireland in the North-West. The right hon. leader of the House said this is like the Act passed in 1878 to prevent people carrying arms in the streets with the view of avoiding a riot. Like that, indeed! There is not the ghost of a comparison between the prohibition to carry arms immediately after a riot in a town, and to prevent people carrying arms when they live in an unsettled country, to protect themselves against wild beasts and Indians. There is no comparison between those two cases; but there is a case exactly parallel to this which English rule has created in Ireland, whether rightly or wrongly I am not discussing. The right hon. leader of the Government proposes to treat the people of the whole North-West as if they were not loyal, and leave it to whomsoever happens to be his representative there under the influence of any petty jealousy or petty offence or petty spleen, to take away arms from the white people of the North-West. The hon. gentleman said he read a letter from one white man to another white man, prominent people of the city of Winnipeg, proposing rebellion.

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

Mr. CASEY. We do not know who his whites are, or whether they are possessed of the importance he fancies or not; we do not know what the real drift of the letter he read is. If we had the whole letter, and knew the circumstances under which it was written, we could judge; but supposing it did propose to rebel, it only amounts to this: that he has found one white man in the Province of Manitoba who proposed a rebellion; but from the fact that it did not take place and that nothing was heard about it, we must con-

Mr. CASEY.

clude that that man did not find any seconder for his proposal, and that the proposal in this Bill is one that gains no support from that letter. The letter is no evidence of any rebellion; according to the hon. gentleman's own construction of it, it only suggested that a rebellion or a riot or something of that kind would be a good move. Is the hon. gentleman going to propose to disarm all the people of Winnipeg or all the people of the neighborhood in which that man lives? Is he going to justify himself by doing that, or is he going to stultify himself by reading that letter and then taking no action in the neighborhood of the writer? But if that letter meant rebellion, if it meant what he wishes us to believe it meant—disaffection among the white settlers in the North-West—and if it was written in 1884, it is only another instance of the warnings the Government have received from time to time of rebellion in the North-West—warnings which they have disregarded, with the consequence that we have been subjected to a great expenditure of money and loss of life this year. We have here to note what the hon. gentleman and his friends have considered to be a loyal man in the North-West. Constantly before this rebellion broke out, and since we have had, in their newspapers, in this House, and from the hon. gentleman himself, the accusation that the white settlers who were guilty, as they call it, of agitating against the Government, guilty of organising to make their claims against the Government and to obtain their rights under the constitution were rebels. What shall we conclude? We shall conclude that every man who joins in an agitation against the Canadian Pacific Railway or against this Government and every man who considers himself aggrieved, is to be regarded as a rebel and is to be disarmed. The letter read by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) states what even Conservatives in the North-West think of this measure, and what Conservatives all over the Dominion think of it; and I warn the hon. gentleman that this is a matter which will rouse excitement not in the North-West alone. The people in the North-West are our brothers and our relatives in more than a mere sentimental sense. Everyone of them has relatives and friends throughout old Canada, and every indignity and insult which is put upon these loyal white settlers—and I believe you can call them to a man loyal to Canada—will be felt by tens of thousands of people throughout the rest of the Dominion; and the hon. gentleman will find that the indignation he has aroused will not be confined to the localities in which he has stripped the people of their weapons. This Act has taken us back to a period long past when attempts were made to prevent disaffection amongst the citizens of a country by depriving them of their arms. It is going back to Tory precedents, which I thought even the hon. gentleman would have hesitated to resort to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Taking us back to the Gladstone Government. He is not a Tory.

Mr. CASEY. Who is responsible for the policy the Gladstone Government carried out? Who is responsible for the policy of repression in Ireland, which has had to be carried out subsequently by the Gladstone Government? The hon. gentleman knows it was not Mr. Gladstone who introduced the prohibition to carry arms in Ireland; he knows that it was introduced long before Mr. Gladstone's time. But we are not discussing the misdeeds of Mr. Gladstone; we are discussing the misdeeds of the right hon. gentleman, and I say he is taking a very futile weapon out of the old Tory armory with which to coerce the people in the North-West. And we will find that the weapon will be ineffectual, and that its recoil will be more serious than its discharge. He will find that by trying to make these people, as my hon. friend says, serfs and slaves, and to deprive them of their constitutional rights as freemen, he is taking a course which will redound neither to his own honor nor profit, nor to the peacefulness

and quiet of the country. It is quite possible that its peacefulness and quiet may be disturbed without there being any riot or tumult. When these people feel that they are being insulted and put down, and placed in actual peril of their lives by this Government, the peace of that country is broken, although they may be kept perfectly quiet and may make no public uproar. But they will be in a ferment until the time will come when they get money enough to leave the country that has so treated them, to go to a country where men are free, where the pioneers and the settlers are free, where they have arms to defend themselves against beasts and savages, and to kill animals for their food. That is a sort of feeling which would arise in the minds of those men. It will certainly retard the settlement of the country like so many of the blundering acts of this Government for years.

Mr. CURRAN. I desire to say a few words on this subject, more particularly after the speech of the last gentleman, which will be known to future generations, no doubt, as "Casey's warning." We have had had introduced into this subject not only the hardships and the heart-burnings that are to be endured by the people of the North-West, but we have had also introduced here by the last speaker the real or supposed misdeeds of Tory rule in Ireland, and we were told that the right hon. the leader of the Government was endeavoring to revive the old time persecutions that were being inaugurated by that party. It appears to me that if we are to look for any good authority on this point as to who really were the culprits in that particular, I cannot call to my assistance a better witness than the late lamented Daniel O'Connell, who said that it was the "base, brutal and bloody Whigs" who had inflicted the most grievous wrongs on that country. But without going to ancient history or travelling much over the past, I think we have, in the present instance, before the eyes of the world, the fact that the Tory Government recently formed in England has undertaken to rule Ireland without any coercion, which Mr. Gladstone said he could not do. However let that rest. I imagine it will take something more than the remarks of the hon. gentleman to excite the sympathy he would like to create, to arouse the feelings he desires to awaken in the hearts of a certain section of the people of this country. What we have to consider is, what is the duty of the Government in the present instance. We have been told that the policy now about to be inaugurated by the Government is a policy that will be unpopular in a certain section of the country. That is not the question. The Government of the day may be obliged to do what is very unpopular in the interests of the country at large. It is not a question whether certain people's sentiments will be ruffled or not, but whether the interests of the country demand this legislation, and we are told, from information in the possession of the Government, this policy is absolutely necessary, and further that the very best means of making this legislation as far from being oppressive as possible is about being adopted. We have it in this Bill that no district is to be brought under the operation of the law without having been first proclaimed. Is it likely the Government, from mere wantonness, mere desire of oppression, with the most ample means of information at their disposal, would undertake to render themselves unpopular by proclaiming a district without being amply justified in doing so by the information in their possession. It is not at all likely. A district will have to be proclaimed just as the districts are proclaimed under what is commonly known as "the Blake Act." Reference has been made to that particular Act, which is a very good law. I have had a good deal to do, myself, in connection with the administration of that piece of legislation, and the reference made to it was merely to show that as, under the Act

against the carrying of firearms in certain districts, these districts have to be proclaimed, so, under the present Act, the district to be brought under its operation will also have to be proclaimed. We are told no comparison can be drawn; I do not think any comparison is sought to be drawn as between the two, but I will say that from my own knowledge it is difficult to conceive a law under which greater hardship may arise than the Blake Act. Under the rulings of the courts on the manner in which the Blake Act is drawn a man can, not only be tried and convicted for having firearms in his possession, but if he has only a bullet in his pocket, a cap, any particular piece of the fire arm, whether it be the handle, the trigger, or any other portion, he is liable to be convicted. This is not a case drawn from imagination; more than one case of this kind has come under my particular notice in the courts of law, and I contend that, just as certain people, under peculiar circumstances, may find fault with the legislation in that case, so in this instance we have to look, not to the popularity or unpopularity of the law, but to the question as to whether it is in the interests of the community at large that it should be carried out. Under all these circumstances, I feel that it is right to support the Government in the present instance, more particularly as no advantage will be taken and due warning will be given to a district in which this law is put into operation. It will be proclaimed before the law affects any particular district, and if it is in the interests of the law abiding population.

Mr. HICKEY. Everybody must be well satisfied that the loyal men in the Dominion will be willing to submit to the laws of Parliament, and for gentlemen to talk lightly of rebellion because of laws passed in this Parliament unsuitable to their minds, is casting a reflection on the country which is undeserved. Whatever observations hon. gentlemen might have to make on a Bill of this kind, it comes with bad grace at this time to talk of rebellion. What I rose to my feet for was to propose the adjournment of the debate, in order that a couple of gentlemen, who otherwise would be debarred from giving their views on this matter, and who are well acquainted with the North-West, may have an opportunity of doing so. I, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROYAL. I rise to state that I was under rather a misapprehension the other day when the debate took place on the motion in amendment. I was under the misapprehension that the provisions of the Bill would have immediate effect throughout all the North-West Territories. I should have thought at that time of the true latin maxim *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, and I should have thought there was something very wrong or captious in the motion of the hon. gentleman. However, I then expressed myself, as I thought just and fair, being under the misapprehension that the provisions of the Act would apply to the whole of the North-West Territories and the white population. On reading attentively the Bill, and having heard the explanations made by the right hon. the leader of the Government, and also the remarks made by hon. gentleman opposite, I believe this measure is a very wise one. No doubt if it had had existence before the outbreak, its wise and judicious application then would certainly have prevented the unfortunate occurrences which we all lament. The provisions of this Bill only apply to those portions of the North-West Territories which are proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor in respect to the provision as to the carrying of arms. I do not see that any evil can arise from such an application of the law. On the other hand, the law applies equally to all races, whether white or red or half-breed. It is well known that the law shall not discriminate against one race more than another. It is also very well known that the white settlers of Prince Albert and other places had a great deal to do—perhaps the utmost to do—with the late outbreak, and therefore I do not see

that anyone can say that the Government is discriminating in the application of the law under this Bill against one race or another. I would, however, call the attention of the Government to the fact that, very often, the application of wise laws has been made detrimental by the character of the officers who have been entrusted with the application of the Act. There is a great deal in the manner in which the officer applies the law, the manner in which an officer goes amongst the natives, the white population or the Indians, and impresses upon them the necessity of the law and the wisdom of its enactments. If this law is carried out by wise and judicious persons, I believe a great deal of good may result from it. If, on the other hand, it is carried out by officers who consider themselves, the moment they set foot in the North-West Territories, as Persian shahs, or monarch, or czars, many bad results will arise from it; and I cannot too much impress upon the Government the amount of wisdom which should be exercised in the appointment of the officers who will be entrusted with the application of this law.

Mr. ORTON. After the explanations I have heard from the Premier in regard to the mode in which this Bill is to be enforced, the chief objection which I felt against it is removed. It seemed to leave in the hands of the one man power of the North-West the privilege of stating who should carry arms and who should not, and I felt that such a power would be a very wrong one to entrust to one man, and that it would be resented by the people of the North-West Territories. It is already felt that there is too much power, in matters up there, devolving upon one individual, and that the discrimination may not be altogether very wise sometimes. I believe, if that were so in reference to this Bill, it would be very much resented by the people; but, after the explanations which have been given, it appears that parties are to be appointed only in the proclaimed districts in sufficient numbers to prevent it being a hardship to the white settlers to obtain a license to carry arms. Therefore, I can see no particular objection to the Bill, especially when, from the evidence the Premier has given, it appears that the people up there in an excited condition. It is known, at any rate, that the Indians are not in a quiet condition at the present time. It may be that even some half-breeds and some whites are in an unsatisfactory condition. Therefore, I shall have great pleasure in voting for the adoption of the Bill, but at the same time I wish to express the hope that the Government will not find it necessary to enforce such a measure for any length of time, and I think that every encouragement should be given to the loyal white settlers in the North-West Territory, to have firearms in their possession, so that they may be able to defend themselves against the Indians. The white settlers all have firearms in their houses, and I do not think the disloyalty of the white population is very extensive. It is true that a number of them, during the farmers' union outcry, spoke in a way anything but loyal to Confederation or to Canada, and that was calculated to do a great deal of harm; and I regret that members were found in this House who endorsed the action taken by the farmers' union at that time. I think that any hon. member who attended any of those meetings, and heard the wild and injudicious statements made by leading members of the farmers' union must have felt that they were calculated to excite trouble.

Mr. WATSON. Unlike the other two gentlemen who spoke against the Bill the other day, I do not rise to excuse myself for voting for the amendment. Those gentlemen apparently cannot vote against the leader of the Government, and they have attempted to give reasons why they should not. The reasons they have given are no just reasons at all. They simply amount to this, that they would not vote against the leader of the Government. I look

Mr. ROYAL.

upon this Bill as one of the most unjust measures which have ever been introduced against a loyal set of white settlers, men who have proved themselves loyal to their Queen and country during the late troubles. There are a great many settlers there who are not loyal to this Government, and they cannot be blamed for that. They have grievances, as has been shown, and they have sent deputations down here and have represented those grievances to this Government, but those grievances have not been redressed. Unfortunately, a few of the half-breeds rose in rebellion, but, to pass an Act to deprive the loyal white settlers of having a rifle or a shotgun without a license from an officer of this Government is a proposition which should not pass this House; and I feel satisfied that, if anything could be done by the Government or by this House to make the people of the North-West disloyal, it is to deprive them of the right of other citizens in the Dominion to keep arms. It is accusing every white settler in the North-West of being a rebel. I hope the House will see fit to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which I think is in the best interests of the people of the whole Dominion of Canada, and is only doing justice to the settlers in the North-West Territories. The member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) has stated that he believes the settlers in the North-West Territories should have the right to carry arms, but he states that, after the explanations of the First Minister, he thinks the Bill is all right. The member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) also stated that a few days ago he was not aware that the Bill provided that the affected districts only would be under the operation of the law. The Bill has not changed since he then spoke. He spoke what he honestly felt then, I believe, and what the majority of his constituents feel, and I do not think the majority of his constituents will endorse his action in depriving the settlers of having rifles and shot-guns in their possession. It is all very well for the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) to talk about farmers' unions and wander away from the question. It has been proved that the Government did a most unjust thing to the settlers in that section of the country when they disarmed them two or three years ago, because they virtually told them that they had no right to have arms in their possession, that they were not worthy to possess arms for the protection of the settlements in that section of the country. By virtue of that action on the part of the Government the rifle companies were disbanded, and I believe that if they had not been disbanded we would not have had this unfortunate rebellion in the North-West.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I fear that the law proposed by the Government, whose aim appears to be to prevent a recurrence of the rebellion in the North-West, by prohibiting the sale of arms by white men to half-breeds or others, might prove a preventive which would be worse than the evil itself. For, Mr. Speaker, when people will come into the house of a white settler, of a free man, and propose to take away his arms from him—as I do not see, in the proposed law, any clause authorising the Government officials to indemnify the settler for the arms which will be taken away from him—and without giving him any explanation on the bearing of that law, I believe that that man will be exceedingly dissatisfied with the policy of the Government, and will be rather inclined to side with those who, in the future, may take up arms against the constituted authority. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that to leave the application of such a law to officers appointed by the Government would be an act of imprudence on our part. We have experience as to the ability of a certain number of Government officials. We have had experience as to their conduct towards the half-breeds of the North-West. The last

rebellion is certainly due to vexations of which Government officials are the cause and the authors. Although not holding the Government themselves responsible for the conduct of their officials in the late rebellion, I say that the Government officials, by their conduct towards the population of the North-West, have certainly been connected with the late rebellion, and that they are responsible to a great extent for it, as are also a certain number of the mounted policemen. Now, for my part, I do not desire to assume the responsibility of voting a law which would authorise the appointment of new Government officials—because this law authorises the appointment of new officials—and which also authorises these officials to annoy the population, and especially the white men of the North-West.

Amendment of Mr. Hickey, to adjourn debate, negatived.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills :

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Allen,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Scrifer,
Burpee,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Landerkin,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Livingston,	Trow,
Casey,	Mackenzie,	Watson,
Casgrain,	McIntyre,	Wells,
Dupont,	McMullen,	White (Hastings).—35
Fleming,	Mills,	

NAYS :		
Messieurs		
Abbott,	Fortin,	Orton,
Allison,	Foster,	Paint,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Girouard,	Pinsonneault,
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	Pope,
Beaty,	Guilbault,	Pruyn,
Bell,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bergin,	Hall,	Royal,
Billy,	Hesson,	Shanly,
Blondeau,	Hickey,	Small,
Bowell,	Homer,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasse,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Duthbert,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dawson,	McDougal (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers (Mask'ingé),	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	McNeill,	Woodworth,
Dickinson,	Massue,	Wright.—89.
Dugas,	Montplaisir,	

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CHARGES AGAINST THE VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. CARON. I desire to read a telegram that I have just received, which answers the question that was put to me by my hon. friend the member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). It is signed by the General :

"In answer to yours of the 10th, I have to say that Donald Ross after shooting Captain French, as was supposed, was shot dead. A few minutes after I saw his daughter sitting beside it, and I heard since that the priests afterwards buried it. As regards Jamase Carriere and Vandal, I never heard their names. I was riding all over the field until late, backwards and forwards, and had any such disgraceful acts occurred I must have seen them. I found one wounded man myself and sent for a stretcher, which was brought on by some of the men. The man was taken to our own hospital. The whole statement is a foul calumny. I repeat again that the conduct of the men has been wonder-

fully good. We had five wounded men of the enemy brought into our hospital—all carried in by the soldiers themselves."

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

To provide for the salaries of two mining geologists as 2nd class clerks in the Geological Survey branch, at \$1,200 per annum, and one 2nd class clerk at \$1,100 \$3,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this resolution was concurred in the Minister in charge promised to give further information as regards one of the parties appointed to the office.

Mr. McLELAN. I have been furnished this statement :

"Mr. Eugene Ooste has been temporarily employed in the Geological Survey Branch, since the 1st July, 1883, as a mining geologist. He is a graduate of the School of Mines, Paris, France. He has been appointed a second class clerk in that branch, at \$1,100 per annum, to take effect from the 1st instant. Mr. Elfric D. Ingall has been temporarily employed also as a mining geologist, in the Geological Survey Branch, since 1st July, 1884. He is an Associate of the Royal School of Mines, London, England. He has been appointed a second class clerk in that branch at a salary of \$1,00 per annum, to take effect from the 1st July instant. The work of both gentlemen is purely technical and professional, their duties being to report upon the mining industries of the Dominion, to collect mineral statistics, and otherwise work out the economic geology of our mining districts."

Administration of Justice — North-West Territories ..... \$20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this vote some additional information was promised as to the mode in which it was to be expended, and the purpose for which it was required.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to give any more information than I gave to the committee last night. I enquired of the Minister of Justice to-day to ascertain the purposes for which this money was to be expended. He said the sum was only an approximate one, and that it was impossible to say what expenses would be incurred in the conduct of the trials which will take place at Regina; it is to pay the legal expenses, expenses of witnesses and other contingencies that will have to be met in the trial of, perhaps, 20 or 30 individuals who have been engaged in the late troubles in the North-West. He said it was utterly impossible for him to give a detailed statement for me to lay before the House. The only information he could give was that which I have just stated.

Welland Canal—Land and damages, &c..... \$21,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take this opportunity of enquiring from the Government whether the canal tolls on all articles have been reduced to 2 cents, or whether the reduction applies to only particular articles.

Mr. McLELAN. To cereals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the Government estimate the probable loss of revenue.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not more than \$20,000.

Harbors and Rivers—Ontario ..... \$54,750

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I called attention some time ago to the condition of Bayfield harbor, and I now desire to ask whether the Minister can give information with respect to the works undertaken to open the harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not present the other evening when I brought down a statement and made full explanation, which will be found in *Hansard*. And I did more than that, for I obtained two photographs of the work. The work was proceeded with; I will not give the exact figures now, but the hon. gentleman I am sure will be satisfied with this. A dredge was

sent there and we found that the bar at the mouth of the harbor had increased, and it was necessary to cut it to a certain extent, in order to allow fishing boats to go in and out. But the great work to be executed was to remedy the breach which had been made in one of the piers, and which gave another outlet to the water, so that we went to work and made pile work and brush work to fill up that breach. It was late in the fall of last year when that work was done, and the opening of the bar was left to be executed this spring. I understand that it is not done, or that the dredge is there at the mouth of the harbor doing that work. I may say that the other hon. gentleman, who stated that we had squandered the \$4,000 which had been given by Parliament to open the harbor, was misinformed, for we just expended \$200 to cut the bar, as I have just stated, and that money went for the legitimate and important work which has been performed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Minister know whether it is not open?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would enquire and let me know to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say further that we were waiting, in order that the material to be removed from the bar should be used in filling the cribs behind the pile work, so as to make the work more permanent.

Compilation, printing, and publishing correspondence, etc., respecting Provincial legislation... \$500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me, though I do not object to this vote, that it must be very inadequate, or that it will cover but a small portion of the matter here referred to. The Minister of Customs, I think it was, undertook to make some enquiry about the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I enquired with reference to this item from the Minister of Justice, and he said it was for the purpose of collating all correspondence with reference to the legislation of the different Provinces, affecting more particularly the question of disallowance, and that he thought it would be much better to have it published in one small book, as a work of reference on that particular question. But he said that he thought it was \$1,500 he had asked, instead of \$500.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this amount for printing or collating?

Mr. BOWELL. It is for both.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman know how much is for collating and how much for printing?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I cannot say. I supposed when the item was put in, that it was to cover the expenses, but when I was informed by the Minister of Justice that his recollection was that it should be \$1,500, I took it for granted that this sum will not cover it.

Mr. BLAKE. In proposing a vote of this kind, we should know what the work is going to cost, because that may have a good deal to do with whether we ought to vote it or not. At a moderate expense, I think such a volume would be a great convenience. I may say that a vast mass of this correspondence was brought together by myself when I was Minister of Justice in 1876. I found that the returns theretofore made had been imperfect, and I brought down as far as I could, from the researches made in the Department, a complete set of every thing which took place from the beginning up to that date. Since that time motions have been made, and latterly returns have been delayed very long. One which was brought down this Session I have not been able to look at. What made that return which I brought down almost useless was this: It was brought down in chronological form, so that you could know from

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN.

year to year what the course of opinion by Ministers of Justice and Governments had been upon this question; but the printing department printed it higgledy-piggledy, up and down, here and there, so that, as printed in the Sessional Papers, you do not know where to look for anything. I refer once more to another point on the vote which is before us, because it is due to this method of bringing down, or, when brought down rightly, to this method of public printing, that this vote is now on the Table. The system in the Department, in the accumulation of papers on a particular subject, is that a file is commenced. Of course this commences with the earliest documents in date. To that is added, from time to time, the accumulation of papers, so that everything is put on file in reverse order. Then, when a return is moved for in this House, instead of the officer in charge of the Department using his intelligence, or the officers in the Secretary of State's Department using their intelligence, and supplying the documents to Parliament in chronological order, they are brought down, if there is any order at all, in this reverse form, and you have to go back and search from the beginning. It is not merely that, but each document is of course at an unknown point in the series, and to get the document you want, you have to search back and forward. Now, I have had something to do with the handling of these documents in every Session, because a great many of them have come down from hon. gentlemen too late for any hope of being printed, and I fancy I read as many of these manuscripts as most hon. gentlemen. But this mode of bringing them down is evidently calculated to prevent the acquisition of the information they are supposed to embody. I hope that instructions will be given to have these returns brought down in a way which will give a little more convenience, and a little less trouble, in getting at their contents. If that were done, a great deal of this expense would be unnecessary, because of course the larger the bulk of these documents, the more difficult it is to use them. When it is in the chronological form, it is, as I have said, a work of an hour or perhaps more to find out the particular law as to which you want to find the action of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. I find that even in departmental work, when I send for papers on any given subject, they are in the reverse order as the hon. gentleman says, and sometimes they are in no order. I think we must amend our ways in this respect, which have been the same ever since we have had returns. The papers should be carefully arranged by the responsible officer in the Secretary of State's Department whose business it is to go over the returns no matter from what Department, and arrange them in some order, not only as to the dates, but also as to the subjects.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the remarks the hon. gentleman has made apply to the manner in which the returns have been printed in some instances after they have come to this House. If I understood aright the leader of the Opposition, he stated that some had come down arranged in chronological order, but when printed were all mixed up. That is a matter to which the attention of the Clerk of the Printing Committee should be called.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say for that officer, whose abilities I think are well known, that those returns, though brought down in chronological form, were not fastened together, and they may have been sent to the printing office in that condition and been upset by the printer.

#### DUTIES OF CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 157) to amend the several Acts relating to duties of Customs and Excise.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into committee on the Bill, and that it be an instruction of the committee that they have power to amend the Bill in conformity with the resolution which on the 13th day of this instant July, was reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, and then agreed to by the House. He said: I have adopted the exact wording of a similar motion made in the Imperial Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### INLAND REVENUE ACT, 1883.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that this House concur in the amendments made in the Senate to Bill (No. 146) to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act of 1883. The first amendment is on page 4913, in the proviso for distilleries, inserting the word "hereafter." The other amendments are verbal, not affecting the principle of the Bill at all.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I do not think it is in the public interest that one-third of the newly made whiskey should be put on the market, and that an advantage should be given to men who come fresh into the business against the distillers who have been engaged in it for years. I do not think that clause has received the consideration it should have from the Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That question was raised before by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I stated then that, while it is desirable that this whiskey should be purified by being aged, it was not because I did not believe in that principle, but it was to meet the objection against placing the control of the liquor trade in the hands of the present distillers, and that, while we could not expect to make the whole system perfect at once, they would be brought under the operation of the Act by slow degrees.

Mr. BLAKE. This is one of the great disadvantages when we have any legislation of this description at all. I think it is a great misfortune that the hon. gentleman should attempt to prevent the sale in this way. I think the inducements given for the sale of this maturing commodity are all that has been done in any country with a view to sanitary considerations, and he confirmed that when he was asked if that was embodied in any other legislation, and he said no. I think this a vicious description of legislation. We know that the whiskey trade is practically in the hands of a monopoly. There are only five or six distillers in Canada, the two principal ones being in Toronto and Walkerville. My hon friend (Mr. Patterson) is of course acquainted with the excellence of the one in the county of Essex, and I find that this proposal, if it did not come from, has not been very much condemned by, the larger distillers. As it stood, this measure practically confirms their monopoly, a monopoly which is created in a large measure by the operation of the law, because the difference which exists, and which we have exaggerated this Session, between the Customs and Excise duty, gives an enormous protection to the small number of persons engaged in the trade. With only five or six firms engaged in this trade in the whole Dominion of Canada, facilities are given for combination which are of course availed of to the uttermost, so that the price is kept up practically at the duty point. It was pointed out that this was practically continuing the monopoly, and after consideration, the hon. gentleman proposed to the House this which is a compromise measure, and which possesses all the inconveniences of a compromise measure. I think the result of the whole proposal will be to rather help than hinder the monopoly. I believe it is rather calculated as it stands, even though there is a power in the case of a new distillery to permit the sale of a certain proportion of new whiskey, to give an advantage to those engaged in the old

trade. There is a sense in which there is an advantage given to those who are now engaged in the trade, but they are reaping that now, and, in view of the enormous capital necessarily engaged in that trade, it would be practical prohibition if something of this kind did not come in. We are dealing in this case in this particular upon other considerations than those which we usually apply to the manufacture and consumption of liquor; this is not a prohibitory or restrictive measure, but is said by the Minister to be a sanitary measure, and is one of a very extreme kind. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he thinks that the manufacture of whiskey will become perfect under these provisions. I think he is in a sort of utopia with regard to that; but no doubt that is the effect he is attempting by this legislation to make. But one of the elements of improvement is competition, and, if you do not give some chance of competition, you will have something very different from improvement, unless the manufacture of this commodity, instead of being supposed to be the most useful to the world of all manufactures, is really one of such a character that people will not be influenced by the motives which ordinarily influence them in other matters. I would prefer to see these provisions stricken out which restrained the sale earlier, and consequently the provision of which the hon. member for Essex has spoken. I would prefer to see the inducement left of the drawback to sell the matured article, and to leave the freedom of trade otherwise unrestricted. But if it is to be restricted, I am afraid the result of the hon. gentleman's suggestion would be that it would be a practical monopoly in favor of the sellers of this commodity who may live by the grace and favor of the principal vendors who reside in the locality to which I refer.

Amendments concurred in.

#### ADDITIONAL COUNTY COURT JUDGE IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 3395) respecting the salary of an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Legislature of the Province of Manitoba has made provision for an additional County Judge, and the Department of Justice states that it can be clearly established that the judge is wanted. But this first resolution needs to be amended by inserting after the words "Province of Manitoba" the words:

"Being for the central sub-division of the eastern judicial district of the said Province."

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be more satisfactory if we had some statement from the right hon. gentleman of the circumstances under which we are asked to do our part in the creation of this additional officer. Of course, I am quite well aware that the condition of the Province of Manitoba is such that, if not now, at any rate very soon—and now, for aught I know—some additional judicial strength will be requisite. It is very important that we should know—and I may say that the experience of both Governments with reference to British Columbia will point to that importance—that a reasonable system of sub-division of the work of county court judges is being adopted. We had a great deal of trouble and a long controversy with British Columbia with reference to the function and sphere of the duties of the county court judges, and subsequently considerable difficulty with reference to the Superior Court judges. Now, I have no idea, myself, how many judicial districts there are in the Province of Manitoba. But if there is to be an eastern sub-division and a central sub-division of

the eastern judicial district, that would, I think, indicate that the eastern district must have three divisions, and therefore, I suppose, there will be three county court judges for that district. Does the hon. gentleman happen to remember how many there are altogether?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there are four county court judges.

Mr. BLAKE. The distribution of population has changed so much that it is necessary to see that proper accommodation is really afforded. At an early period, of course, we had to consider the question of distance as well as the question of population; but it might happen that there would be such a remodelling, having regard to the present centres of population, as would enable us to afford the proper accommodation. Now, I have always said that I attach considerable weight to the decision of the Province, although the hon. gentleman knows that I have declined to be bound by it; on the other hand, it seems to me that in our own judgment, acting as one of the two Houses of Parliament, if we are to exercise a judgment, it is hardly satisfactory to be told that the Department of Justice is satisfied, and to take that upon trust. My opinion is that the hon. gentleman ought to have obtained from the Department of Justice those reasons which satisfied that Department of the propriety of this change, and to have placed those reasons before us. The hon. gentleman takes the statement of his colleague upon trust, and communicates to us that statement and asks us to accept it on trust.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is something in that, but I think the hon. gentleman knows how very cautious the present Minister of Justice is in increasing the divisions. If I remember aright the Legislature of Manitoba passed a Bill for the appointment of two additional judges of the Superior Court, besides these county judges, and after full consideration the Minister of Justice thought that he would not be warranted in asking Parliament to provide a salary for more than one Superior Court judge, and after full discussion with the Provincial Government, one additional judge was added to the staff of the Superior Court.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 162) to provide a salary for an additional county court judge in the Province of Manitoba.

Bill read the first time.

#### JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 161) to amend the Act 46 Victoria, Chapter 9, intituled: "An Act to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts."

#### NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE NEAR QUEBEC.

On the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 159) for facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence in and near the harbor of Quebec,

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill has not been printed in French.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not marked as printed in French in the Order Paper. This Bill affects the private rights of parties in the city of Quebec, and it should not be proceeded with. It is to amend the charter of the city, which has been in existence 20 years. The city authorities have not been notified to attend and be heard upon it. Under

Mr. BLAKE

such circumstances I submit it would not be fair to proceed with the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. It has been considered by the Board of Trade of Quebec and by the Harbour Commissioners, and by the Board of Trade of Montreal, and they have all concurred in its provisions.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not dispute that. I know that on these occasions the board of trade takes one view and the corporation another view. The hon. Minister of Marine may not be aware of that fact, but the Minister of Public Works knows it. A similar Bill was attempted to be passed in the Session of 1884 but was not carried, and for a similar reason to that now offered. When it is proposed to amend the charter of the city—and this is attempted to be done in the Bill the very last hours of the Session—the city has a right to be heard before her charter is amended. For these reasons I take the objection I have mentioned.

Mr. CURRAN. With respect to this Bill it will be acknowledged that the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec are better judges of what is necessary for the navigation of the river than are the city authorities. The hon. gentleman mentions that this is an amendment to the city charter. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the statute, which enacted this legislation we are now about to amend, he will find this special clause slipped in at the bottom of an Act in regard to the Quebec water works. I am satisfied that the mercantile community of Quebec, with the Harbor commissioners of both cities, as well as the Board of Trade of Montreal, all approve of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BLAKE. It is only proper that the head of the Department should bring down such a Bill as this at a reasonable period of the Session.

Order allowed to stand.

#### SUPPLY—DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS, ONTARIO BOUNDARY, THE NORTH-WEST TRIALS, etc.

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

Mr. MILLS. There are one or two matters which I wish to bring specially to the attention of the House before going into Committee of Supply. The first is with reference to the Department of Railways and Canals. The House is aware that in 1879 the Government declared it was necessary, in order to the efficient administration of public affairs, that the office of public works should be divided, and that there should be two chiefs of Departments instead of one. The Act provides for the distribution of the offices of the Department under two respective officers. One the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the other retaining the old appellation of Minister of Public Works. Now, as I understand, under our law at the present time, whatever may be the prerogative or the rights of the Crown, where there is no legislation, the administration of public affairs in this country is provided for by certain statutory provisions, and there is no prerogative right of the Government to administer the affairs of State in any other way than that which is provided for in these various Acts of Parliament. Now, under the provisions of the law it is enacted that the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be appointed by commission from the Crown, under the Great Seal of Canada; and I think it is important to know whether such a Minister has been appointed, and whether the Minister has been regularly appointed under the law. It is pretty clear, I think, that there can be no Acting Minister of Railways, unless there is a Minister of Railways appointed in the regular way. In fact, I think whether there can be an Acting Minister of Railways or not legally appointed, is open to question. Of course, in so far as the Deputy Heads of Departments are concerned, there is provision made in various statutes, that they shall, in their absence, have power to appoint others to act on their behalf. I do not find

in our law any such power for a Minister to appoint his colleague to discharge the duties of his office in his absence. But that is the practice. The law in that particular may be defective, and I do not raise that question, but I do call the attention of the House to the fact that, as I understand, our law at the present time does not empower any Minister of the Crown to undertake the administration of a Department except under the authority of a patent from the Crown for that special purpose. It is true, in England a Minister has held more than one administrative office, but in those cases the Crown has issued its patent to the Minister, for the purpose of discharging the duties of those various offices, as in the case of the Duke of Wellington, when he undertook to discharge the duties of the head of several Departments. But there is no provision made which authorises the Prime Minister, or any other Minister, to employ or appoint one of his colleagues to discharge the duties of an office to which the Crown has made no appointment, which is practically vacant, and has continued vacant for a number of years. I think it is a matter of very serious consequence that the Government should come down to Parliament in 1879 and ask Parliament to legislate with a view of dividing the Department for the more efficient administration of the affairs of the country, and that that Department has been for more than two years without the proper head. We know, Sir, that the Crown cannot act except through some responsible Minister, and then only by the authority of the Sign Manual of the Sovereign. It is also necessary that the Seal of State shall be attached to the document by which the party is appointed, and it shall bear the signature of at least one responsible Minister. Now, so far as the House has been informed, I do not understand that the so-called Minister of Railways has been regularly appointed to the discharge of those duties in the manner contemplated in the statute. If he is, it is impossible to see why he should be called "Acting Minister of Railways," a position which the law does not formally recognise. Having said this much in regard to this particular matter, I wish to refer to another, because I suppose this will be the last opportunity of doing so, and I do so by way of complaint of the action of the Government. As early as February last I asked the Government:

"Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any legislation, or to invite Parliament to ask for Imperial legislation to define the boundary of the Province of Ontario upon the north and west?"

The Prime Minister answered:

"It is not the intention of the Government to propose any legislation. The question as to whether it is necessary to ask for Imperial legislation is now receiving earnest consideration."

At a later period in the Session, the Prime Minister informed the House, in reply to a further inquiry, that it was the intention of the Government to proceed with this matter during the Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To deal with the subject.

Mr. MILLS. At all events, to deal with the subject. Now relying on the accuracy of that statement, I took no action upon this question. It was my intention to submit a proposition for the consideration of the House, and I was prevented from doing so by the answers of the Prime Minister on this question, from time to time, during the Session, until a day or two ago, when it became too late to invite the action of Parliament upon the question. Now, the hon. gentleman made, a day or two ago, a statement which I suppose it would be irregular on my part to refer to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it would not.

Mr. MILLS. I think the answer the hon. gentleman gave me on that occasion is a just ground of complaint. The Minister said it was proposed next Session to deal with the subject of the western boundary of Ontario, in accordance

with the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that the question as to the northern boundary of Ontario would be dealt with along with the question of the northern boundary of Quebec, a question upon which there was no division of opinion, I believe—no contest between the Province of Quebec and the Dominion of Canada, as there has been in the case of the Province of Ontario; but I wish for a moment to call the attention of the House to the report of the Judicial Committee on this question, and also to the conclusions to which that report points. The hon. gentleman expressed an opinion which seems to indicate that he is disposed to accept the conclusions of the Judicial Committee, so far as the western boundary is concerned; but so far as the northern boundary is concerned, he repudiates the action altogether. Now, I wish briefly to call the attention of the House to what the Judicial Committee did, and what they have reported. There was the question as to where the western boundary of Ontario was, and whether the territory extending from a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, westerly to a line drawn due north from the north-west angle of Lake of the Woods, was part of the Province of Ontario or part of the Province of Manitoba. Whether this belonged to the one or the other depended on the decision of the Committee, upon the facts which were submitted to them. Now, the Dominion Government were represented there by counsel. They agreed to refer the whole question of the northern boundary to the Judicial Committee, and it was only after the Committee was invited to take action in the matter that the Dominion Government failed to carry out its agreement with the Province of Ontario. But it was contended by the Dominion counsel, and this agreed with the contention of Manitoba, that the Province of Manitoba extended eastward to the meridian drawn due north from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi. Now, in order that the observations of the Committee may be perfectly clear, let me state that if the contention of the Province of Manitoba were correct it would embrace not only all the territory eastward to that line south of the Albany River, but also a considerable extent of the territory north of the river. In the argument and the evidence submitted to the Committee, the claim of the Dominion to the territory north of the Albany River, as against the Province of Manitoba, was never put forward for one moment. The contention was, that Manitoba extended eastward to that meridian line. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council said it did not go south of the Albany River. They said that the Province of Ontario extended westward to a line drawn due north from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, and that it extended northward as far as the Albany River and the English River, which runs westward into the Winnipeg River. To whom the territories north of that line belong was a question which might have been at issue between the Dominion and Manitoba; but it was not raised. The Dominion put in no claim to the territory to the north of the Albany River as against the Province of Manitoba, and it was not possible, therefore, it seems to me, for the Committee to come to any other conclusion than they did on the evidence before them—that while they conceded the contention of the Province of Manitoba to extend eastward to this meridian line north of the Albany River, they held that it could not extend eastward of the meridian of the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, to any territory south of the English or Albany River, because they held that that territory was the property of the Province of Ontario. I suppose the Minister has read the argument and the observations made by the members of the Committee from time to time during the argument. With regard to another question in this case, which is a question of immense consequence, the Committee said that

the northern boundary of Ontario, and, in this respect, also the boundary of the old Province of Quebec, under the Act of 1774, was not the 49th parallel; they also said it was not the height of land. They have expressed a clear opinion incidentally—in dealing with the question of the northern boundary—of what was the boundary of the Province of Quebec under the Act of 1774. It was neither of those two boundaries—either one or the other was contended to be the boundary of Quebec by the counsel of the Dominion or by the counsel of Manitoba. The evidence went to show that there was a line proposed by the English and one by the French at the negotiation of the Treaty of Utrecht; wherever that line was, it was the boundary of the Hudson Bay Territory on the south. I think the evidence went to show that it was somewhere near the 51st parallel, and that the Province of Quebec extended northward to that boundary. I wish to call the attention of the Government and the House to this fact, which made a very great impression upon the members of the Committee; because, although they were inclined to hold, at first, that the northern boundary of what had been the Province of Quebec was also the northern boundary of the Province of Ontario, they expressly maintained a different opinion before the conclusion of the argument, basing that opinion upon two papers which were submitted to the House of Commons in 1791, when the King intimated his intention to exercise his prerogative to divide the old Province of Quebec into the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. I submit the papers, to show where the dividing line was to be drawn. One paper defined the separating line between the two Provinces, and the other defined the eastern boundary of the Province of Upper Canada. The Lord Chancellor directed the attention of the other members of the Committee to the fact that if the intention of the Crown had been simply to divide the Province of Quebec into two Provinces, there was no necessity of providing one paper to define the eastern boundary of Upper Canada and another paper to define the separating line; the one paper would have served both purposes. But in order that the House may see the exact effect of these two papers, I will read them. One paper is entitled, "Description of the intended boundary between Upper and Lower Canada." It reads as follows:—

"To commence at a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the cove west of the Pointe au Beaudet, in the limit between the township of Lancaster and the seigneurie of New Longueuil, running along the said limit in the direction of north 34 degrees west to the westernmost angle of the said seigneurie of New Longueuil, thence along the north-western boundary of the seigneurie of Vaudreuil, running north 25 degrees east, until it strikes the Ottawa River, to ascend the said river into the Lake Temiscaming, and from the head of the said lake thence through the middle of the said lake to the most northerly extremity thereof; and thence running due north to the boundary of the territory granted to the Merchant Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay."

That is the definition of the separating line; it was to extend as far as the old Province of Quebec extended, and then to the southern boundary of the Hudson Bay territory. The paper to define the eastern boundary of Upper Canada, which was sent by Sir Henry Dundas to the Lords of the Council, after a recital similar to a portion of the other paper, goes on to say:

"By a line drawn due north until it strikes the boundary line of Hudson's Bay"—

A different phrase altogether, and as the Judicial Committee observed, if it had not been intended to define a different line, it would not have been necessary to submit this paper—

"including all the territory to the westward and southward of the said line, to the utmost extent of the country commonly called or known by the name of Canada."

Now, it is perfectly clear, from the observations made by the members of the Judicial Committee, that they held that

Mr. MILLS.

the Provinces of Upper Canada extended beyond the old limit of what was the northern boundary of the Province of Quebec to the shores of Hudson Bay, and to the Albany River. The hon. gentleman has all along expressed his anxiety to have a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That decision was given formally upon the question referred to them, and incidentally upon the whole question. It seems to me, that being the case, the hon. gentleman ought to have acted in accordance with the despatch forwarded him by the Secretary of the Colonies. The northern boundary of Quebec has nothing to do with the matter. Undoubtedly, it lies near the shore of Hudson Bay, where the old southern boundary of the territories of the Hudson Bay Company was situated, and if the hon. gentleman proposes to extend that further north, and give to Quebec a more convenient and natural boundary, nobody will object. But I call attention to the fact that the two are wholly distinct; that they were held to be distinct by the Judicial Committee, and that the two papers submitted to Parliament, at the time the Act was carried for the purpose of dividing the old Province of Quebec into the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, show that they are wholly distinct. The Judicial Committee recommended their award to be carried into effect by Imperial legislation. The Colonial Secretary addressed a letter to the Government on that subject; but that letter was never answered. A motion was made here for all the papers; the hon. gentleman brought down certain papers, in obedience to that motion, but the papers he brought down do not contain even an acknowledgement from the Government of the letter received from the Colonial Secretary. I find a communication from the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, urging the hon. gentleman to give effect to the recommendation of the Judicial Committee, asking for co-operation, and proposing the draft of a Bill for this purpose, and that has never been answered. I have what I consider good authority for saying that since that several communications passed, which have not been brought down. This is the manner—and I have this to complain of—in which the Orders of the House are observed by the Government. We are furnished papers which give but imperfect answers, conveying the impression that the Orders of the House are obeyed, and we are still left in ignorance as to what correspondence has taken place. I believe I am correct in saying that even that communication of the Lieutenant Governor has never been acknowledged by the Government, nor has any other been acknowledged which has been submitted to the Government by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario on this subject. Further, I am informed, on very good authority, that Parliament is, at this time, prepared to legislate on this question; that it is not too late; that there is no room for dispute; that we know the views of the Privy Council; that they are precisely the same as those of the arbitrators who made the award in 1878, as to the boundaries of Ontario, and I say the House is misled. The hon. gentleman has pretended to do what he has not done, and has prevented other members bringing forward a question which ought to have been disposed of long ago. It was fairly dealt with long ago, and it has been dealt with a second time by the Privy Council, yet the hon. gentleman proposes to defer final settlement of this question until another year. It ought to be dealt with at once, as there is no longer any room for controversy.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), just before recess, suggested it was highly desirable that legislation should be had in order to confirm and establish the boundaries between Ontario and Manitoba and between the Dominion and Ontario. Now, I think legisla-

tion in this matter, in the shape in which it stands at present, would be attended with no small difficulty. The decision of the Privy Council is somewhat contradictory in itself, and the boundaries between Ontario and the Dominion have not been at all touched upon in that decision, further than that by inference it seems to confirm the boundary of the award which was made by the arbitrators on a former occasion. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggested that the boundary of Ontario extended further to the north than the boundary of Quebec. That is a mistake. The same documents which extend the boundary of Ontario to the north extend the boundary of Quebec also to the north. They stand equally far north. Wherever the northern boundary of Ontario is the boundary of Quebec is in the same latitude. The 10th article of the Treaty of Utrecht says :

"But it is agreed on both sides, to determine within a year, by commissaries to be forthwith named by each party, the limits which are to be fixed between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French, which limits both the British and the French subjects shall be wholly forbid to pass over, or thereby to go to each other by sea or by land."

That clearly indicates that there was some point inland from Hudson's Bay which formed the boundary line between the English and the French. That is very clearly stated in the Treaty of Utrecht; but a little later than that, in the commissions issued to Governors, a long series of commissions, there is a line spoken of as the boundary line of Hudson's Bay to which the hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, referred, as the shore of Hudson's Bay. The boundary line of Hudson's Bay and the shore of Hudson's Bay were two very different things. Here is a description which held for very a long time, from 1791 to 1838 :

"Running along the said limit, in the direction of north 34 degrees west, to the westernmost angle of the said seigneurie of New Longueuil; thence along the north-western boundary of the seigneurie of Vaudreuil, running north 25 degrees east, until it strikes the Ottawa River, to ascend the said river into the Lake Temiscaming; and which said Province of Lower Canada is also bounded by a line drawn due north from the head of the said lake, until it strikes the shore of Hudson's Bay."

It is clear, by the Treaty of Utrecht, that the boundary line of Hudson's Bay, as there referred to, was not the shore of Hudson's Bay. It is equally clear that the subsequent commission of the 1st March, 1838, to the Earl of Durham, carried the boundary line to the shore of Hudson's Bay. But it carried the boundary line of Quebec to the shore of Hudson's Bay as well as the boundary line of the then Province of Upper Canada. With regard to the recent decision of the Privy Council, I think it can be construed in more ways than one. I will read a portion of it. It goes on to describe the boundary line as running :

"Along the middle line of the river, by which the waters of Lake St. Joseph discharge themselves, until it reaches a line drawn due north from the confluence of the Rivers Ohio and Mississippi, which forms the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba."

Now, this decision says that the western boundary of the Province of Ontario is the boundary line between Canada and the United States up to the Lake of the Woods, and from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, a line drawn due north until it strikes the Winnipeg River or the English River, as the case may be, then following up the English River and making it the boundary between Ontario on the south and Manitoba on the north. Now there are two Acts of this House, the one describing the boundaries of Keewatin and the other describing the boundaries, of the enlarged Province of Manitoba. Both are essentially the same. The one describes the eastern boundary of Keewatin as the western boundary of Ontario, and the other describes the eastern boundary of the enlarged Province of Manitoba as the western boundary of Ontario. Consequently, it is quite evident that in case of two Provinces separated by a line running due north, the one Province cannot lie north or south of the other. This

decision of the Privy Council describes the Province of Manitoba as lying north of the Province of Ontario. In this it simply overrides two Acts of this Parliament, which have remained for a long time on the Statute Book. As I have said, it gives the disputed territory in the first place to Ontario, and winds up by giving it in just so many words back to Manitoba. It says :

"A line drawn due north from the confluence of the Rivers Mississippi and Ohio, which forms the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba."

The Government of Ontario ignores the decision of the Privy Council, and calls on us to pass an Act which shall set aside a part of it. That is certainly not following the decision of the Privy Council. Now, Sir, I think that under all the circumstances, if I may express an opinion on the subject, it is highly desirable that these boundaries should be settled forever, and settled in such a way as that they cannot be cavilled at. The question is now in a worse muddle than it has ever been in before, and considering that it has got into such a mess, I think the whole question should be taken up at our next Session, and referred back to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. When it was before the Privy Council only one side of the question was practically heard. The Government of Ontario was represented ably and well; it had most elaborate maps, elaborate reports, and counsel who represented their case very ably, and pointed out every circumstance which could bear out their view of the case. The Dominion Government had for counsel those who were but very slightly acquainted with the subject, and had but a short time to become acquainted with it. No doubt they did their best, but they were over-matched. The Government of Ontario had volumes written, explaining their view of the matter, while the Government of the Dominion had literally nothing. The decision of the Privy Council has evidently been made in haste. It gives the disputed territory, in so many words, to both parties, and overrides two Acts of this Parliament. Under these circumstances, I think this House would be justified in referring the whole question back to the Imperial Government, with a request that it should be re-opened and gone into fully from first to last, so that a decision may be obtained which cannot be attacked. Then there is the Indian title to the lands, which appertains to the boundary question. Did time permit, I could show that as long ago as 200 years the title of the Indians was acknowledged by the Imperial Government—not a sort of *quasi* title, that only gave them a sort of right, but a title that gave them an actual right in the soil; that deeds were taken from them covering large areas of country, and worded in the same way as a deed would be now which conveyed land from one person to another in fee simple. There is a deed, in 1684, in which the rights of the Indians were acknowledged by the then Sovereign, and it was confirmed in 1726; and there is a regular sequence of confirmation of Indian titles up to 1763, when an Imperial Act was passed, and when the proclamation of 1763 was issued, fully confirming the rights of the Indians to the soil. It would be interesting to show how that proclamation is still in force; it would be a matter of great interest to show how it was looked upon by the Imperial Government, and how the Imperial Government construed the Act which it had passed. That could all be made out. As late as 1792 there were treaties made with the Indians on the Canadian side, where deeds were taken from them of large tracts of territory, which they conveyed in fee simple to the Imperial Government. I am quite aware a decision has recently been given; I do not know what it is; we have not yet seen it; but I suspect it may very likely be like some other decisions—given without full information on the subject. I think it can be clearly proved that the right of the soil was in the Indians, and that it has been acknowledged

to be so both by the Imperial Government, by the Government of the United States and by Canada.

Mr. TROW. I am somewhat familiar with that speech. It is an old stand-by that we have heard repeatedly. I think it is quite out of place for the hon. gentleman to advocate the propriety of appointing a commission on a matter that has been set at rest by the Privy Council. After arrangements have been agreed to by the contending parties, I do not see why it should be revived just now.

Mr. DAWSON. It was the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) himself who revived it.

Mr. LAURIER. There is one other matter to which I think it my duty to call the attention of the Government. It is a matter affecting the uprising in the North-West Territories. There are to-day, as we know, in confinement at Regina, a very large number of prisoners. I understand there are between 40 and 60 half-breed prisoners, and of Indians I do not know how many. Now, I cannot conceive how it can be the intention of the Government to put everyone of these prisoners on trial, nor can I conceive that it would be in the public interest that such a course should be followed. Of course, I apprehend that the Government are anxious to vindicate the law, but what I want to submit to the judgment of the Government and of this House is, whether the law would not be sufficiently vindicated if the leaders only of the rebellion were put on trial. Let the leaders, of whatever race they may be—either white, red or mixed—be placed on trial and allowed to make their defence, and let the country decide on the issue raised between the Crown and them. Let those also, of whatever rank and station, who have been guilty of offences against the common law, be put on trial. But this should not apply to those who have not been leaders, but have been led, if they have committed no offences against the common law. I am not going again to discuss the cause of the rebellion. I do not think it opportune or necessary, nor is it necessary, even for the purposes of the question I now raise, but whatever may be the causes of the rebellion, I submit that those who have not been leaders, but have been led, those who have simply taken up arms on the impulse of the moment, soldiers who have fought in battle and have been taken prisoners in battle, should not be put on their defence; and, if the cause be what has been stated by the Government in the discussion of a few days ago, if it is not any grievances from which the half-breeds have been suffering, but if they have been led astray by Louis Riel or other designing men, this statement would carry with it the argument, and not only the argument, but the conclusion, that those who have been led astray should not be put on their trial. The United States have given us, on this matter, an example which is worthy of imitation. They have been assailed by the most formidable rebellion the world has ever seen, and it was only after four years of war, after innumerable disasters, after hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended, after hundreds of thousands of lives had been lost, that the national cause triumphed. The rebellion opened in April, 1861, and it was not until April, 1865, that the armies of the South had to surrender. The surrender of General Lee's army took place on the 9th April, and less than two months afterwards, on the 29th May, the President of the United States issued a proclamation, which was almost universal in its effect. I may quote it with some appositeness in the present instance, but I will only quote a few words of it. After having recited the causes of the war, the President speaks as follows:—

"To the end, therefore, that the authority of the Government of the United States may be restored, and that peace, order and freedom may be established, I, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, do proclaim and declare that I hereby grant to all persons who have, directly or indirectly, participated in the existing rebellion, except as hereinafter excepted, amnesty and pardon, with restoration of all rights

Mr. DAWSON.

of property, except as to slaves, and except in cases where legal proceedings, under the laws of the United States providing for the confiscation of property of persons engaged in rebellion, have been instituted; but upon the condition, nevertheless, that every such person shall take and subscribe the following oath (or affirmation), and thenceforward keep and maintain such oath inviolate; and which oath shall be registered for permanent preservation, and shall be of the tenor and effect following, to wit:—"

Then follows the oath. The exceptions follow. There are fourteen of these. It is useless to recite them, but they all apply to persons who took a leading part in the rebellion, as military and civil officers, and so on, but full amnesty and pardon was given to the mass of those who took part in the rebellion, only excepting the leaders. We must admit that this was a most humane and wise act. It was a humane act in itself. It was a wise act, because it restored to citizenship the whole population of the South; it enabled them at once to apply themselves to restore their position as citizens of the United States, and no doubt it contributed also largely to restore in the hearts of these men a love of the national Government, which four years of war had alienated. This is an example which I think might be followed under the present circumstances. Moreover, if, for reasons of their own, which I will not discuss at present, the Government do not think it expedient to at once grant an amnesty to these people who are now in confinement, who have not taken a leading part in the rebellion, I submit that at all events they should be released from custody and sent back to their homes—not discharged, not pardoned, still amenable to law, but discharged from custody, remaining subject to law, and their future conduct answering for any future amnesty. This conduct, I believe, would be politic and wise. We know that, apart from any other consideration, it is folly to believe that so many men can be put upon their trial for life and death. It would be appalling that there should be, in this country, any such bloody assizes, and we know that the district is in great destitution, and that the families are sadly in want of the help of their bread-winners. I do not wish to discuss this matter, but I make the statement, which I hope will be taken into the favorable consideration of the Government. It would be a policy both humane and wise if these men were sent back to their homes and families, and I believe this would restore, in the hearts of these men, the love of our country, and faithfulness to the institutions of our country.

Mr. BERGERON. I share, to a great extent, in the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), and I would go a little further, and would ask the Government, as a matter of justice, whether they could answer, in this House, a question which has been put in the other House by the Hon. Mr. Trudel, which I find in the Order Paper:

"Whether the Government has taken into consideration the question, whether it would not be better, in the interests of justice, to modify the law in such a manner as to afford to persons implicated in the rebellion in the North-West a trial before a jury of twelve of their fellow-subjects, such as the common law of the British Empire affords to every subject of Her Majesty?"

I am told that Riel and all his fellow companions in the rebellion are going to be tried before six jurymen, and I see by the newspapers that they will be English-speaking jurymen. I do not want to say whether Riel is guilty or not; that is a matter which will be discussed in court; but it will be a great act of justice, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, and it will be a great satisfaction to every one, whether Riel is guilty or not, to know that he was tried before a mixed jury of twelve men, as was the practice in Quebec, men who knew him and were qualified to give judgment on the case brought before the court. I do not know what answer was given to Mr. Trudel in the Senate; but I would be very glad if the Government could see their way to change the law in the manner I have suggested. I find in a newspaper published in Montreal, *La Presse*, a statement with respect to the trial of Riel, that the Govern-

ment have issued a proclamation by which, in the Act of 1880, concerning the North-West Territory, the Government is given the right to apply to the Territories laws which have been previously adopted by the Parliament of Canada; and a simple proclamation is sufficient to obtain this result and give a retroactive effect to the cases. I do not know whether this is correct or not, and I will be very glad if the Government will give an answer to these two questions. As regards the sentiment of the people, they are very indifferent as to what the verdict may be. It is a question of law, and as a matter of justice it would be a great satisfaction if these men were tried according to the laws of Ontario and Quebec, and it would be a great consolation to people interested in these men.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Quebec East says that we should interfere with the trial of those men, Riel and the others, in the North-West Territory.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not say Riel.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman spoke of the leaders, and I think Riel is one of the leaders.

Mr. LAURIER. I said those who were not leaders should not be put upon trial.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understood the hon. gentleman's remarks. The hon. gentleman wishes the Government to interfere in these trials. He makes a distinction between the leaders and those who have committed acts against the common law, as he calls it, and soldiers, who, in the heat of the moment, took up arms and were led astray by Riel—he thinks they should not be put upon trial. The question is, how to distinguish those men—who is a leader, who is not a leader, who has committed an act against the peace of the country, who has committed murder, or any other offence, and who are those who have not committed such offences. Of the men who were battling against the troops of Her Majesty in the North-West, they are not all under arrest at Regina ready to stand their trial. A large number of them were placed at liberty at once, and are at their homes. Others, of course, fell on the field; others were wounded; and a number of these who were wounded were found on the battle fields, were picked up by our own troops and placed in the hospitals, and they are being cared for the same as our own soldiers. That is a positive fact. I am glad it is so, because it shows that after the battle is over humanity has its course, as before. But the question of deciding who is the leader in these troubles, who has committed a grievous offence, the offence of murder, for example, and the question whether a man is guilty or not—these are questions which it is not for us to try. It is for the tribunals of the country to decide the question. That is the reason why you did not see the men tried by martial law. The men are to be tried by the civil authorities, and under the laws of the country. I do not think it is in the interest of those men who are to be placed on their trial, or in the interest of the peace of the country, or in the interest of any one, that we should interfere in a matter of this kind. The only interference we should make is this: to see that the men have a fair and impartial trial. That is their right, and it is what the Government intend to secure for them, and what they have intended from the beginning—to see that these men, beginning with Riel, down to the last man in custody, have a fair and impartial trial. Now, as to the question whether the men should be sent home and pardoned, that question comes afterwards. The pardoning power is there, and can be exercised at any time, until the sentence has been carried out; and, therefore, the question of pardoning will come afterwards. The court will first decide whether the men are guilty or not. If they are found guilty of a heinous crime the sentence of the law will be passed upon them.

The pardoning power will always be there, and it is to be exercised with that humanity which has always guided the Government of this country, no matter whether they belong to one side of the House or the other. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is for the interests of the poor people that such a course should be pursued as is suggested. I say poor people, for those people, whether guilty or not, are always pitied when they are called upon to stand their trial. I need not consult my colleagues to say that this Government, neither more nor less than any Government, have not shown they were disposed to be cruel towards any part of the population of this country. We feel our position. We felt it the other day, when we were obliged to call upon the volunteers of the different Provinces to rally round the flag of this country and go and defend the North-West against the depredations of those men who had taken up arms and assumed the authority of the Queen. We were sorry we were put in a position to be called upon to vindicate the law; but it was our position, and it was one of the obligations which our position cast upon us, and we were supported by this House by a large majority, and by both sides of the House, because both sides felt that the first thing to be done was to establish peace. With respect to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), it would be hardly the thing just now to change the law of the country for the purpose of trying those men, or any other men. The law of the country is on the Statute Book. If there was a change, it might be for better or for worse. Why should there be a change made in the law? The law will be exercised with justice, and although there are only six jurors, those jurors are to be selected in the same way as we select them in other parts of the country. There is to be the right of challenge on the part of the prisoner as well as on the part of the Crown. Therefore, we need not be uneasy or afraid that there will be a packed jury. There will be nothing of the kind; there will be justice and a fair trial, and I hope, when the affair is over, hon. gentlemen will be able to say that though we have to see that the law is executed, whenever we have been in a position to recommend mercy, mercy has been granted.

Mr. BLAKE. I should be sorry to say a word which would add to the embarrassments and responsibilities of the Government on the present occasion, but I cannot avoid this observation with reference to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, that he has not met the position of my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Laurier). In point of fact, he has acknowledged the accuracy of my hon. friend, in the statement which he has just made. My hon. friend pointed out the large number of persons who were, so far as is evident from the proceedings before us, to be submitted to trial, and he stated his views on that subject. The hon. Minister of Public Works answers him by saying that he must not suppose that all who were in arms have been taken up and submitted to trial. Therefore, there has been a discretion exercised as to the persons who shall be submitted to trial. Who has exercised that discretion? The hon. gentleman says the Government can exercise no discretion, but the Executive, or whoever is charged with the responsibility of administering justice, must have exercised some discretion as to those who should be taken up and those who have been taken up. Now, I thought it my duty, I thought it a public duty—though I was aware that political considerations of a minor kind might have prevented me from doing so—I thought it to be my duty to say, with reference to the course which General Middleton pursued, as to the number of prisoners he took, as to the rank and file, that I thought he had acted wisely in releasing those prisoners. It is utterly impossible for me, at any rate, with such information as I have been able to collect, to form any idea as to the case of any particular individual of those who are in

gaol at Regina—I mean, of the common number. There may be good reasons—I do not say there are not—for the arrest and trial of each one of those individuals. The only difficulty which occurs to me as rendering that improbable, is the largeness of the number; because it is difficult to conceive—I hope it is not the case—that so many men have been responsible in that major degree to which my hon. friend from Quebec referred—the degree of being leaders in crime, but the committers of acts of gross violence against the law. But what I desire to point out is, that the Minister of Public Works has said in effect that a discretion has been exercised, in that large numbers of those who were engaged in the field have not been arrested, and therefore he has acknowledged that a discretion must be exercised. Then the question which my hon. friend from Quebec submitted is, on what principle should that discretion be exercised, upon which he expressed views in the general spirit of which I think we must all coincide, namely, that what we have to deal with are those who are consciously guilty and practical culprits and leaders, whether Indians, half-breed or white—whoever they may be—to deal with them rather than with their unhappy and misguided followers. That is all I desire to say upon this subject, which is, of course, a delicate and difficult subject, and upon which I feel the Government has a grave responsibility resting upon them, upon which there are very mixed feelings in different sections of the country; but I did not think it would be a manly thing to leave this House without having said a word in the general sense, in which I have spoken. I now wish to say a word or two upon some other topics, as I will not have the opportunity of speaking again on this particular occasion. I wish, in the first place, to say that I think the proposal that you should leave the Chair this evening, upon these fresh Estimates, of the magnitude of which they are, is one which shows, in a very marked manner, a neglect of duty on the part of the Administration of the day. I maintain that we are running into a system of conducting the finances of this country, so far as there is parliamentary supervision over them, in a manner which renders it utterly impossible, even for Parliament itself, and still less for the country, to apprehend what the nature and character of our annual engagements are. To that end it is essential that at one time and upon one occasion you should have, in the large and general sense, to deal with our accounts—our engagements on the one hand, and our receipts on the other. No less a master of finance than Mr. Gladstone has not unfrequently stated that proposition, that it is utterly impossible for a House of Parliament, and still less for the community at large, to have a reasonable apprehension of what their duty is as to financial propositions which affect the whole country, or to tell what the state of the country is, unless in the large sense of the term we have one Budget instead of three or four. Well, we have fallen into the habit of having Supplementary Estimates, and, circumstanced as we are, some Supplementary Estimates may probably be necessary. But our Supplementary Estimates are growing in amount, and they are coming down later and later, and now you have had already, I think, three Supplementary Estimates this year. We have had a second Supplementary Estimate, which came down only a little while ago, and shortly afterwards it was considered in committee. Then at one o'clock this morning, Further Supplementary Estimates for more than \$3,000,000 were brought down, and at half past 5 the same evening we were asked to go into committee on them, and are asked to dispose of them on what is practically the day after the last working day of the House. Now, as to this Estimate, there was no reason why it should not have been before us a long time ago; and when you observe that these various Estimates contain appropriations, sometimes, for matters which have a bearing one upon the other, and should be

Mr. BLAKE.

considered together, but instead of that you are asked to vote upon one, and when you have disposed of it, another Estimate comes, and you are asked to deal with the other branch of a topic which should have been considered at one and the same time. When you consider, at the same time, the magnitude of those Estimates, the sum amounting last night to about \$4,500,000—that is the Estimate brought down by the Minister of Railways, as well as that which we are about to deal with at this moment—I say financial proposals of that description, brought down just as we are about to prorogue, when there is no opportunity of considering them, are objectionable on that ground. I maintain that we should mend our ways in this regard; that there should be a very strenuous effort to deal with more of the financial proposals in the Main Estimates, and to reduce to a minimum those Supplementary Estimates which are unforeseen, at the time the Main Estimates are made up, instead of being simply put away to the end of the Session, until a time when it is easy to run through things, and when the opportunity for scrutiny and investigation are not so great as at an earlier period of the Session. I maintain that those two propositions are of the last importance, that you should have as few Supplementary Estimates as possible, instead of the number being large, and that you should have your Estimates at an earlier period of the Session. As to this particular Estimate, I stated, and the statement was not contradicted from the other side, that I understood that this Estimate was in a state of preparation, in fact, in print, for a considerable number of days, while hon. gentlemen did not choose to lay it on the Table. That is an addition to the offence. I believe it ought to have been so, if it was not so; I believe it was so; but if it was not prepared and in print before now, why was it not? I maintain that that proper parliamentary control which ought to exist over public expenditure is rendered almost nugatory by the course which has been latterly, and notably this Session, adopted. Then, the hon. Minister of Railways proposes that we should go to-night into the railway resolutions. I am not, of course, about to discuss the railway resolutions in any detail, or to refer to any particular line of railway; but I take the opportunity of adverting to them as a portion of the very large financial engagements which we are called upon to endorse at this period of the Session. At a very early period of the Session, as early, I think, as the 6th of February, I obtained an Order of this House for copies of all the papers connected with the applications of aid for railways. I was satisfied that they were numerous, and that they ought to receive the attentive consideration of this Parliament. That return was brought down the day before yesterday, in the evening, five months after I had obtained the order, and it is succeeded the following day by proposals with respect to a large number of railways—I forget the number—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Seventeen.

Mr. BLAKE. Some seventeen railways in the proposals of the Minister of Railways, and a railway or two in the Supplementary Estimates, which are now before us—some eighteen or nineteen railway grants. Now, the mass of the papers which were brought down the day before yesterday, by far the larger proportion of which bear date in the year 1884, and the bulk of the remainder bear date in January, February and March, 1885—comprise 850 foolscap pages. I presume no one in this House has looked at them except myself, and I confess that I have not been able to analyse them in such a way as would enable me intelligently to state the conclusions which should be drawn from an examination of them. Under these circumstances, I need not say that it is absolutely impossible to intelligently discuss these financial proposals, just because the Administration have determined to postpone the period at which they would

give the information to the House, until a day or two before the close of the Session, and within a few hours of the vote which the hon. gentleman proposes to take. These proposals, therefore, will not receive any intelligent discussion on this occasion, because intelligent discussion is impossible. There may be, of course, a member who is pretty familiar with the railway in which he is interested, or which passes through his locality; but the mass of us are not familiar with these railways, and it is impossible, without study of the papers, and time to ascertain, after that study, what facts are omitted from them, that we can exercise an intelligent judgment as to the propriety of these different grants. I have to say, once again, with reference to these proposals, as I have said with reference to the Supplementary Estimates, that parliamentary control over the public expenditure becomes almost nugatory when this practice is resorted to. I observe that many of these railways are political railways. A proposal, in many cases, is made to increase grants which were announced to us as ample and adequate when Parliament was asked to make them. I observe that they are largely promoted by members of Parliament, who may be interested in them. A return was moved for, some time ago, but has not been brought down, of the names of the members of Parliament who are interested as directors and shareholders in the different railways; it would be an interesting document, but that information is not vouchsafed to us. Under these circumstances, it is a matter of very great indifference when the hon. gentleman proposes to take, I cannot say the discussion, but the decision of this House on these proposals. I do not intend to interfere in the slightest degree with his taking it at an early or a late hour, because, be the hour early or late, at this stage of the Session, under the circumstances to which I have referred, it would be equally impossible to have an intelligent discussion. But I have thought it right to use this last opportunity I would have of dealing with this subject, to point out how far wrong we have gone this Session, with the expression of the hope that things have come to the worst, and having come to the worst, will mend next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to the trials in the North-West, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works stated correctly what is the proper duty of the Government under the circumstances, and the Government are resolved to carry that duty out in the spirit of justice, and British justice, which is always tempered with mercy. With regard to the criminality of the people who were concerned in the late outbreak, there is a difference in responsibility between the men of education, the leaders—men who ought to know better—men who use their influence, from their superior intelligence and education, to overcome the mass of the people—a great difference between them and their deluded followers; and this House may depend upon it, and it goes without saying, that a marked line of difference will be drawn between the leaders of the outbreak and those who were drawn into it. Then, there are great differences in the criminality of different men, whether they are leaders or belong to the rank and file. The leaders are responsible as leaders, and there are some, I fear, who cannot be reckoned in that category, who are specially responsible for some atrocious murders of men and women. Those cases have to stand on their merits or their demerits. The hon. gentleman says, truly, that discretion has already been exercised somewhere. We can understand what the discretion is. The General who has successfully commanded the force which was employed to put down this outbreak, from the information he could get on the spot—and he had very good means, I take it, of ascertaining the different degrees of criminality—discharged at once, on his own responsi-

lity, the great mass of those who were taken, whose offence was rising in arms, and who were not leaders, or supposed to seduce others into the rising, or to have been guilty of special acts of atrocity. We have exercised that discretion very largely. Of course, the Government very readily entrusted that discretion to a man who is equally remarkable for his personal courage, great caution and great humanity. Those men who were selected for reasons which have not all reached us—which have not as much as reached us, except, perhaps, the Department of Justice—will be tried there, subject, however, to the discretion of the legal representatives of the Crown. I think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will admit that the Minister of Justice, in selecting as his representatives such men as Mr. Christopher Robinson, Mr. B. B. Osler and Mr. Scott, has selected gentlemen who may well be entrusted with the exercise of the functions of the Attorney General. Only those persons in whom there is found decided criminality, on the *prima facie* evidence laid before the Crown prosecutors, will be put on trial. The Attorney General has given his representative the full power of issuing a *nolle prosequi* in particular cases. Then, afterwards, will come the pardon power, which, I believe, has always been exercised in Canada, as in England, in late days, with every discretion, on the principle that justice should be tempered with mercy. With respect to quite a different subject, that of railways, it is quite true the grants have come down late, and there are a good many reasons for it. In the first place, the Government has to consider all the applications as they come in. Unfortunately, our friends, those who promote railways in all parts of the country, cannot get it out of their minds that the proper time to make application is when Parliament is sitting. They defer their applications, and the production of their plans and locations, and the merits of their several schemes, until the last moment. We cannot help that; that is done continually, though we would prefer those matters were laid before the Government at an earlier day. Another consideration the Government have to consider is the probable demands that will be made on the public revenue from the previous votes; they have got to consider what is the liability to these railways which have got subsidies voted to them on certain conditions, and whether they will perform those conditions. Then we have to consider what may be the state of the revenue, and the ability of the Government to come forward and assist in the development of the railways. For all these reasons, whether it is this or any other Government, these matters will be brought up rather late, unless there is a distinct change in our system; and I cannot hope for that. The hon. gentleman complained there is no real check. While there is not so effective a check as if the Estimates had been laid on the Table the first day of the Session, and had been a matter of discussion until the end of the Session, it has not been the practice to bring them down at the beginning of the Session. Bad examples are catching, and if my memory serves me right, in the Province of Ontario, when the hon. gentleman was in the Government, railway grants were brought down at the very last moment, a few days before prorogation, and when there was no second Chamber to supervise the acts of the Government and of Parliament. So the hon. gentleman must take a little of the blame—not too much; we will assume our share—of bringing down votes at the very last moment. As regards these railway grants, the hon. gentleman says they are political votes. Well, they are political votes in the sense that the Opposition of the day chose to say the Government of the day are actuated by political motives in their schemes. Every Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, must put up with that, and leave it to the judgment of the country whether the statement be right or wrong. We submit these different applications; if wrong, the House will say so; if right, the mere statement that we

are actuated by political motives is really of no consequence. I am strongly in favor of the Dominion Parliament assisting railway enterprises in the Dominion of Canada, so far as it is prudent to do so. Railway development is really one of the material necessities of this country, with its immense stretches depending altogether for development, or depending chiefly, except in those portions favored by water communications, on railways. Our experience is, that the revenues of the different Provinces are not sufficient to manage provincial affairs properly, and at the same time assist largely in railway development; so that the Government of the Dominion has to do one thing of two, railway development being an absolute necessity. They have to submit to each Province giving large grants to local railways and then coming here for better terms, saying: We have ruined ourselves; we have become insolvent, and you must pay our debts. That is one of the dilemmas, one of the positions. We must either do that, from time to time, according as the Provincial Legislatures, for political or other reasons, having a legitimate desire to develop their railway systems, run largely into debt. What will be the consequence? It will be *ex necessitate* that the different Provinces will run into debt, and then join together and bring pressure on the Dominion to assist them, greatly to the injury of the credit of the central Dominion Government. The other alternative is that the Dominion Parliament, which has representatives from every Province, shall know what they have to expend, to what extent they can charge the public revenue; and, on their own responsibility, assist the different sections of the country, assist the different Provinces, assume the responsibility of raising taxes upon the people, which will be required for the purpose of assisting this railway system. It is quite clear to me, at all events, and it has been the policy of the Government of which I am a member, that of the two alternatives it was infinitely better to assume the responsibility of raising the money and putting on taxes, if taxes are required, and that the responsibility of the distribution of this money for railway purposes should rest here. The two things must go together. If we are to raise the money, if we are to take the responsibility, the unpopularity of putting additional taxes on the people for railway enterprises, that expenditure must be accompanied with the power of pointing out where and how and when it shall be made. I am speaking not now particularly as advocating the policy of the Government, but am pointing out to this House what I think ought and must of necessity be held to be the policy of the Central Parliament; that, as we really have the control of the great revenues of the country, as we have the only means of raising a large revenue for the development of the country, we have to assume that responsibility in the future, and that we should assume the co-ordinate disposal of this money wisely and well among the Provinces, opening up all the avenues of accommodation, improving the development of the different Provinces. And we avoid the great point on which I believe Confederation is in danger: that is to say, that Provinces may become largely in debt by running beyond their resources, and throw themselves, by conjoint action, on the Dominion Parliament, upon the Treasury of the Central Parliament, and that Parliament, in order to save the credit of the various Provinces and to save their good names, may come forward. This has been the policy of our Government, and I think that, so far, it has not worked ill. Those railways that have real merit get assistance, and with the very moderate assistance given them the lines are built, and they assist in developing the country. Some of them have not succeeded. Perhaps, in a little while, when railway credit is better than it is now, when the railway depression has disappeared—and it is rapidly disappearing, I am happy to say—those grants not yet called for may be utilised by-and-bye. The railway should be commenced in two years and finished in four, if they

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

obtain these grants; and if the company cannot raise the necessary money to proceed with the work, Parliament can close the door, and transfer the votes to some other railway and make improvements in other parts of the country. That is the policy of the Government, and I say it is a substantial policy, and one which will meet the approbation, not only of this House, but of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has very much misconceived the purport of my remarks if he imagined that I either attacked or denounced the policy of the Government. I did not say a word upon that subject. What I did say was this: We are called upon to take the responsibility, as the hon. gentleman has admitted, to pass this railway aid grant, and in order that we, as members of Parliament, may efficiently discharge that responsibility, hon. gentlemen opposite should adopt a different policy, and afford us the necessary information at an earlier period of the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to follow the First Minister in the discussion as to the course to be adopted with regard to Riel and his associates. Nor do I think the present is the best time to discuss the very large question as to the future policy of this Dominion with respect to railways, which he has *more suo* dragged as a herring across the trail. There is another way of dealing with the important question which has been raised. All I will say at present is this: I have no doubt whatever that the consequences involved in the measures introduced are very much more far-reaching and more important than he has intimated to-day, and I think within the space of a very few years we will find ourselves confronted with results which hon. gentlemen pressing forward those grants may not anticipate. But what I want to call attention to is this: It is in the last degree to be regretted that we had not these Estimates, coupled with the proposals of the Government as to railways, at an earlier day. I have looked carefully over them, and there is positively nothing in them of the least importance which could not have been laid on the Table probably four or five weeks earlier. The most important facts which they disclose were, in effect, stated by the Acting Minister of Finance, in reply to some remarks made by me. As to the course pursued with respect to railway subsidies, whatever the policy of the Government may be, whether well-considered or likely to be mischievous I am not going to discuss now, but the delay is utterly and entirely indefensible. Here we are asked, in eight and forty hours, or, at the outside, three or four days from the close of the Session to pass subsidies to twenty different railways in different portions of the country. There is no single member who, in the time at his disposal can form anything like an intelligent idea as to the great majority of these matters on which we are called upon to vote. The sum required is large. It makes a very considerable addition to our public debt, and the time for asking these additional grants is most inopportune. In addition to the large sum that has been borrowed, another large sum must be borrowed, in order to place our finances in at all a tolerable condition. I say nothing at the present time about the reasons which have induced the Government to bring these proposals down at this time. Until we have obtained the information that my hon. friend has asked for, until we know clearly and distinctly who are interested in those various 20 railways and who are not, I do not think we are in a position to form any accurate idea as to why the Government have brought these different proposals down. They do savor suspiciously of an attempt to implicate or interest many of the Government supporters in carrying the measures of the Government through, as to prevent their forming any clear or correct estimate of the other measures which the Government have, in some fashion or other, induced this House to sanction. But it is specially unreasonable that we should be

asked to consider these propositions now, in the face of the fact that we are obliged to add, according to the Estimates of the Minister, about \$2,000,000 to the taxation of the country; and even with that added, if I may judge from the Estimates which are now proposed to be discussed, there is no reasonable ground for hoping that we will avoid a very considerable deficit on the transactions of the year for which we have now entered. For all these reasons, I think no more inopportune time was ever taken to make such a proposal than that submitted by the Minister of Railways, and I repeat that it is absurd to suppose that we can discuss twenty-one different railways in twenty-one different districts—for that is what the Government proposes to do—in the space of something like twenty-four hours.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). It is too late in the day for the hon. gentleman to complain of Orders in Council and proposals to aid railways being brought down at a late stage of the Session. It is within the memory, no doubt, of a great many hon. members, that when the present leader of the Opposition was leader of the Ontario Government, in 1872, he, within twenty-four hours of prorogation, brought down resolutions and Orders in Council granting aid to railways, which might be described as political railways. On 28th February the hon. gentleman brought down an Order in Council relating to the railway aid fund. On 28th February, on the motion of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Blake, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, it was resolved that the House should ratify the Orders in Council granting aid to the different railways to which aid was granted or proposed. Among the railways to which grants were given were the Toronto and Nipissing, Wellington, Grey and Bruce, Kingston and Pembroke, and I think some others. These Orders in Council were ratified by the House, which was controlled by the hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Opposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When were they brought down?

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). They were brought down on the 28th, and were forced through the House on the 29th February. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I think I am right, unless the journals of the House are wrong; because I am now reading from the journals of the Ontario Legislature. On the 29th they were forced through the House, and on the 1st day of March the Lieutenant Governor gave his consent to the Bill. I therefore think it is hardly within the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say now that this proposition is altogether too late.

Mr. TROW. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad my hon. friend moved the adjournment of the debate, because I do not think, after the statements made by the First Minister and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), that it would be right for myself, for you or for the House, that I should permit these statements to go without a few words of reply. It is not necessary to those who bear a candid recollection of the facts, as they have been stated to this House more than once, that I should reply, but a good many members may not have heard them before. I shall be as brief as I can in giving a statement of the facts to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. The late Sandfield Macdonald, during his tenure of office in the Legislature of Ontario, had obtained power to distribute amongst the railways of Ontario the sum of a million and a-half of dollars, without any further action of the Legislature whatever, without any further control by the Legislature whatever, without any description or denomination of the particular railways to which it was to be given. To that policy the Liberal party, of which I had the honor to be leader at the time, was opposed, believing that the Legislature ought to have a voice in the decision as to which railways should receive the public

money. A general election took place, in which that question was one of the questions at issue, but in the meantime, and pending that election, many negotiations had taken place, many proposals had been made, and some progress had been made towards the ascertainment, in a sense, of the railways which were to be aided. Many expectations had been excited, many companies had been incorporated, and the whole question of railway enterprise in the Province was waiting a solution of the particular railways which were to be aided. The result of the general election, as evidenced by the vote of the House on the debate on the Address, was that the Government of the day had lost the confidence of the people. They resigned office, and I acceded to office in the course of that Session. Immediately upon my obtaining office, in fact, before I came back from the re-election to which I then submitted myself, I took occasion to commence obtaining the information necessary to a decision by the Government of the day, of the railways which we proposed to the House to aid. You will observe, Sir, that I was in this position: that I was in the middle of a Session, and had to obtain information which had not been, up to that time, obtained in any proper form. During the course of the Session, as rapidly as the papers could be obtained from the different companies, all of whom were communicated with, as rapidly, I say, as these papers could be obtained, they were laid upon the Table of the Legislative Assembly, in order that the Assembly might become acquainted, at the earliest possible moment, with the materials which had been submitted to the Government, and so familiarise itself with those materials, in order to exercise its judgment upon the proposal of the Government. So soon as the materials which we had thus been enabled to collect, and which it had taken a considerable time to collect—though all diligence was used in its collection—so soon as this material had been obtained, we were called upon to decide whether the proposal which had been ratified by the Legislative Assembly, of a million and a-half, would be adequate to the demands of the public and to the fulfilment of the promises, more or less expressed, of the late Ministry. We reached the conclusion that the fund then proposed would not be adequate, and that it would be necessary, if we were to make a grant of such an amount per mile as had been formulated as the policy, that a larger sum should be devoted by the Legislature to this particular object. With that view we introduced a measure into the Legislature for the creation of a railway aid subsidy fund, and an additional million was to be granted, by annual instalments of \$100,000 a year for twenty years. Unless and until the Legislature should determine whether that fund was to be granted or not, it was impossible for us to announce a decision to the House as to what our judgment should be upon the amounts to be granted to particular railways; because the coat must be cut according to the cloth, and we were obliged, therefore, to ascertain whether the Legislature would grant this further sum, before we could decide upon the proper policy—not that we expected to be in a position to ask for votes for the whole amount during that Session, but we perceived from the papers before us that although all the applications might not be ripe for action that Session, yet a sum of that magnitude would be necessary to answer the exigency, according to our judgment. The moment that measure, which was pressed with all diligence through the Legislature, received the final assent of the Legislative Assembly, we laid upon the Table the Order in Council which had been prepared, even in advance of that measure upon the hypothesis that it would pass, in order that there might be no delay in laying them upon the Table after our chief financial policy had been approved of. We could not lay them on the Table earlier, because, unless the larger sum were decided by the Legislature to be devoted to this purpose, it would have been impossible for us to propose

grants of that magnitude to these particular railways. We could not otherwise have met the demands, the fair demands, of the various portions of the Province which had been stipulated by the said policy. I mark, therefore, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman cannot prove but that the utmost diligence was used by the new Government, which came in in the middle of the Session, to obtain the information which was essential to the formation of a judgment, and that the moment the information had been obtained as to any particular railway, it was laid upon the Table, so that the House might know what we knew. I mark, secondly, that so soon as my Administration had decided that the larger sum would be essential, it presented the necessary legislation, and prosecuted that legislation with all diligence. I mark, thirdly, that the moment the Legislature had agreed to that legislation we laid it upon the Table, and, therefore, at the earliest possible moment that it could have been done, we laid upon the Table our railway proposals. I mark, in addition to that, that there was no announcement as to the period of prorogation; on the contrary the leader of the Opposition, the present Chief Justice Cameron, having invited me to say when I proposed to prorogue, I declined giving any intimation whatever, saying that full time must be given for the discussion of this question. I mark, beyond that, that no request was made to adjourn the consideration of this question at all, and that after one division upon the first of them, no more divisions were attempted. I say that, under the exceptional circumstances in which the Liberal Administration was placed, we did all that men could do, all that it was possible to do, to inform the Assembly and the public, in the first place, of every fact we had obtained, at the earliest possible moment necessary for the formation of a judgment, and, in the second place, to lay these proposals on the Table of the House at the earliest moment we could have laid them on the Table. And then there was no pressure whatever to reaching a decision; on the contrary, any application for delay would have been cheerfully granted. And I mark, lastly, Sir—and at this stage of the Session this is the only observation I shall make—that notwithstanding that state of the facts which I have given to you, notwithstanding the fact that the men whom I was opposing, the Conservative party, were the men who declared that that Legislature did not have any voice whatever in deciding what railway should be aided and what aid they should receive, and that it was a subversion of the principle of responsible government, they denounced me most vehemently for not having given sufficient time to decide this question, and my denouncers, on that occasion, are the denouncers, on the present occasion, of the very opposite policy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that the present denouncers are those who were his denouncers in Toronto. I think they denounced him very properly, because the hon. gentleman opposed, and his whole party opposed the propositions made by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, that a sum of money should be appropriated to aid railways. He objected to it, and therefore, when the hon. gentleman was untrue, in a political sense, to his original proposition, it is right that he should be censured for it.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Sandfield Macdonald proposed that \$1,500,000 be given. That was not enough. The hon. gentleman opposite must go a little further; and having the policy of the Legislature, that a certain sum should be appropriated, before him, he considered himself clear and free. That is quite true. But that is our policy, and the hon. gentleman opposes it now. That, I say, is our policy, it has been enunciated by us for three years—that we would come to Parliament and ask every year for a certain sum of

Mr. BLAKE.

money to assist railway development. One would think the hon. gentleman would not have opposed it. Suppose, for instance, immediately after the annual speech was delivered, it was declared that \$3,000,000 would be voted during the Session for railway purposes, would not the hon. gentleman now have come down and have objected, because there was no statement as to what particular railways were going to be advantaged?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly I would.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows the policy of the Government—he knew from the beginning of the Session that that was our policy. He has asked again and again that we should announce the grant, just as it was the hon. gentleman's policy when he was head of the Government. But it does not prevent him now making complaint. What did the hon. gentleman do? He brought down the aid grants at the end of the Session. There are petitions setting forth the advantages and claims of all these railways that are now asking for subsidies. The hon. gentleman did no more. The applications and petitions were sent to the Government and were laid on the Table, and at the very last moment, the 28th February, they were brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman said applications.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The applications were laid on the Table. Petitions and statements setting out the merits of the different roads and the claims have been received. The hon. gentleman, I say, did no more, but on the 28th he brought down his Bill, and it is said that some of the railways were rather political railways than otherwise.

Mr. BLAKE. They are all built.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not object to their being political railways, if the railways run in proper directions and are in proper places. But it does not rest with the hon. gentleman to come here and deliver a jeremiad over our delinquencies and charge us with bringing down these grants too late, when, on the 28th, the hon. gentleman made proposals before the Local Legislature, on the 28th he forced them through, and the next day the guns were fired and the Lieutenant Governor came down and prorogued the House.

Mr. McCALLUM. As I had the honor of a seat in the Local Legislature at that time, I desire to say a few words. When the hon. member for West Durham was leader of the Opposition in the Local Legislature of Ontario, he opposed the railway aid proposed by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald. That Government proposed to grant \$1,500,000 to aid railways. That was spoken of at the elections of that time; but it was not the principal question at the election—that question was the murder of Scott. I do not intend, however, to refer to the murder of Scott to-night, but I want to show how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) went back on his pledges so soon as he got into power. The hon. gentleman has said that he supplemented that \$1,500,000 by \$1,000,000; that is not correct. By his Bill he added \$400,000, which made the amount to aid railways \$1,900,000, and he mortgaged the resources of the Province of Ontario for twenty years, to the extent of \$100,000 a year, making \$2,000,000 additional. The Government of Ontario to-day have annuities to pay railway subsidies granted. Why did the hon. gentleman do this? Any one can see the reason. Because he endeavored to turn out the Sandfield Macdonald Government, and succeeded in doing so by a majority of one, and he turned that majority into a majority of twenty-five in less than two weeks. How? I do not wish to be unparliamentary, or I would say the hon. gentleman bought them.

Mr. BLAKE. Were they all Tories ?

Mr. McCALLUM. There was one Tory you could not buy. The hon. gentleman bought a Minister of the Crown by "speak now." But I come to the point of the discussion. When the hon. gentleman finds fault with this Government for not bringing down these railway resolutions at an earlier period of the Session, he is going back on his record. In Opposition he has one policy; when in Government he has another policy. Any one who looks at the journals of the day will see that the resolutions which we were called upon by the hon. gentleman to consider would make a book larger than the Bible. The hon. gentleman gave us about twelve hours to consider them. Yet he had them all in his desk. The poor Tories were not to be trusted. Reference to the journals will show that the leader of the then Opposition, now Judge Cameron, moved a resolution, setting forth that any resolutions giving aid to railways should be allowed to lie on the Table at least five days before they were taken into consideration. Does the hon. gentleman deny that that resolution was moved ?

Mr. BLAKE. It was after these resolutions were disposed of.

Mr. McCALLUM. That is not any excuse. The hon. gentleman did not even promise to do better in future. I do not desire to do the hon. gentleman an injustice, and I would rather understate the case than overstate it, but I say that the hon. gentleman boasted in the House that he had bought members, but they were Tories.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not make such a boast.

Mr. McCALLUM. He said they were Tories that were bought. I hurl that statement back in the hon. gentleman's teeth. But I must say that there is no doubt that by the expenditure of a large sum of money in the Province of Ontario he mortgaged the resources of that Province for twenty years, and demoralised the people of Ontario, and was the means of enabling the Grits to govern that Province.

Mr. McMULLEN. And by your policy you are going to demoralise the people of the Dominion in the same way.

Mr. McCALLUM. I have accused the hon. gentleman of striking a blow at responsible government by his system of railway subsidies in Ontario; and whether I am right or wrong, I will stake my reputation on what I am going to say, and it is this: that if we have responsible government, the Government of the day are the trustees of the people and of Parliament. They must see that the money is expended and that they get full value for it, and if there is not a proper expenditure, if the Government do not carry out their wishes, they can withdraw their confidence at the very next Session. They can put the matter right immediately; but what the hon. gentleman did on that occasion was to take the expenditure of the money by a vote of Parliament, without giving the House time to consider whether the railways were entitled to be considered or not; and when they came back the next Session, when the money was squandered, do you mean to tell me that it could be expected that Parliament would vote non-confidence in itself ?

Mr. BLAKE. What are you doing now ?

Mr. McCALLUM. We are doing what we all profess to do. The hon. gentleman professed, in the first place, to be opposed to the granting of aid to railways.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. McCALLUM. Then you gave aid to everybody. And now the hon. gentleman tells us that he bought them. I have accused the hon. gentleman before, but this is the first

time that he has admitted it. If it were parliamentary, I would say the hon. gentleman paid for them, but to-night the hon. gentleman says that he bought the Tories with that money.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is wholly mistaken. I never said that I bought the Tories, and it would be untrue for me to say that I had done so. What I said to the hon. gentleman was, that when he charged me with having bought members of the House, I said these are Tories whom you are charging me with having bought. I never spoke to any man on this subject, and I desire to say that the more particularly, because it is my political opponents that the hon. gentleman says I bought.

Mr. McCALLUM. It cannot be that it was the hon. gentleman's opponents, because he first boasted that he turned out the Sandfield Macdonald Government, but by a majority of one.

Mr. BLAKE. Nineteen.

Mr. McCALLUM. A majority of one, after you promised them to aid the railway.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for Monck has just been pointing out events which took place in the Legislature of Ontario, and he alludes to the member for West Durham, who was then leading that House, as having demoralised a whole Province by the legislation he introduced at that time; that he brought down certain propositions to aid certain railways, at a late day of the Session, and that the effect of these grants was, that he bought members of that House; that he made a majority of 25 in favor of himself from a majority of one, and he says that the effect was to demoralise the whole Province. He has condemned that course in the strongest language, and hon. gentlemen have cheered him to the echo as he spoke, the First Minister himself joining in the applause. We have heard the defence or the explanation of the hon. member for Durham, that he gave all the information possible, that he brought down the measures and put them through at the earliest practical moment. But leaving that question aside, and taking it from the standpoint of the hon. member for Monck, and the hon. gentlemen who cheered him, if that was the result in that case, if it had the effect of demoralising a Province, and that Province has not yet recovered from that demoralisation, how will hon. gentlemen opposite justify the Government coming down within the last days of the Session and asking Parliament to sanction the grants of millions of money to roads of which many hon. gentlemen could not give the geography, the destination or the financial standing? Out of their own mouths they have been condemned. If those be the views of the hon. member for Monck and those who cheered him, as to what took place in the Provincial Legislature, it must eventually compel hon. gentlemen opposite to say to the Government that the results of the course they are proposing to follow, have been demonstrated by one of their own staunchest supporters to be demoralising, as tending to subvert the independence, not of one Province, but of the whole community comprised within the Dominion of Canada. That is the position that hon. gentlemen have come to, and I say it plainly and boldly. I say that if the evil results followed, as the hon. member for Monck has said, from what took place in the Local Legislature, and after what my hon. friend from Durham has said as to the reasons he was not able to do it sooner, I ask, has the First Minister given any reason why, at the end of a six months' Session, almost, we should have these propositions brought down, to spend millions of money in various parts of the country of which many hon. gentlemen do not know the

locality or their requirements. The hon. member for Hamilton seems to sanction these proposals, and I ask him if he knows the particulars of the road from Stellarton to Pictou; in what county it is; whether there are railways there at the present time, and whether this road is required? The Minister says the information is on the Table, but where is it? We have not seen it, and I venture to say that when the explanations are given as to these roads, they will be given in rather a halting manner, as many such explanations have been given this Session, and, but halting as they are, I suppose those propositions will go through, notwithstanding what a staunch supporter of the Government has said as to the demoralising effect of the legislation which took place in the Province of Ontario.

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

(In the Committee.)

Public Works Department—To pay A. Gobeil the difference between the amount paid him from 23rd January to 30th June, 1885, and the salary of a chief clerk, at \$1,800. .... \$206 54

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was this gentleman made chief clerk?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the 23rd of January, 1885, at the death of the late secretary of the Department, Mr. Ennis. He continued to fill the office of Secretary of the Department until the 1st of July, and this is the difference between his salary as first-class clerk and as chief clerk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He has received no promotion, then?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, he had \$1,400 a year, and we give him the difference.

To pay the salary of a fourth stipendiary magistrate in the North-West Territories. .... \$3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is it proposed to quarter this officer? Is he to have a particular district assigned to him, or is he to act in conjunction with the others?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The stipendiary magistrates have their ordinary districts assigned to them, but they all have jurisdiction over the North-West; they work together, and not infrequently they do work for each other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the other two?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Col. McLeod, — Rouleau and Hugh Richardson.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to state whom he is going to appoint?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot state, because I do not know.

To meet certain expenses of the Senate. .... \$4,459 25.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this extra expense for the 16 or 17 days?

Mr. BOWELL. This is extra expense incident to the length of the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would properly belong to 1885, I suppose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It culminates after the 1st of July. There is no use of dividing it into two sums.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Such an amount as \$3,000 for the *Debates* and short-hand writers seems pretty large. They may have talked more than usual, but they

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

would hardly talk that amount in the 16 days, especially as 14 of them were holidays.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any proposal for the Commons analogous to this? It is extremely inconvenient that the expenditure of the Session, which applies to the year 1884-85, should be, in part, attributed, as it will be in the Public Accounts, to the year 1885-86, and if that is not proposed to be done, and I think wisely, with reference to the Commons, it is apparently proposed to be done with reference to the Senate. If, on the other hand, this is for 1885-86, the only question to be asked is, why was it not in the Main Estimates for 1885-86?

Mr. BOWELL. The reason is, that no one anticipated that Parliament was going to sit into the year 1885-86, that is, for six months instead of the ordinary time of three months and a-half. This vote, I understand, was given to the Finance Department as the sum required to cover the extra expenses of the Senate on account of the length of the Session. Whether the \$3,000 is to cover the extra reporting for that time exclusively, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BLAKE. If this proposal is due to the extra length of the Session, it is quite clear that it is not due to that portion which has elapsed since the 30th of June. Part of it is for that only, but the bulk is for the earlier part of the year; and yet you are proposing to vote it for the service of the year 1885-86. It is really almost altogether for the service of the year 1884-85.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How are the short-hand writers in the Senate paid? Are the officers of the House paid by the Session?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that in the past they have been paid by the Session, but owing to the length of the Session the Senate have granted them an additional sum, to compensate them for the extra work, which was not contemplated when they were given the job, if I may so express it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it not a fact that the extra length of the Session has made no extra work in the Senate? They have adjourned from day to day, without doing anything. If you are to give an additional amount to the reporters in the Senate, whose work has not been increased one particle, if you give \$3,000 to them, on no principle of justice or fair play can you refuse to increase the pay to the reporters of this House, who, everyone will admit, have had a very severe Session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). To give it to one and not to the other will have a very strange appearance.

Mr. BLAKE. I have here the records of the Session carried to a late period. I see the contract is about \$8,000, including printing. Of course, we cannot tell how much these reports can be compressed in binding, but I do not think they will exhibit a large volume. If \$8,000 covers the printing and the reporting, to add \$3,000 under the pretence that the extra length of the Session has greatly increased the work, seems an extravagant addition. The hon. gentleman said it is included in the job. This seems to be very much of a job.

Mr. BOWELL. I will be careful how I use the word "job" in the future. I qualified it when I did use it. Any one who will look at the reports will see there is a great deal more work in them, and the volume will be much larger than that which was printed in the past. Supposing it to be the case, that there was no more work caused by the length of the Session than the reporting, suppose that there was not more debating, still you cannot overlook this fact, that these reporters, who made the agreement to do a cer-

tain amount of work, based upon a certain portion of time, have been continuously in attendance two or three months longer than was anticipated. I think there is a good deal of force in the remarks made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in reference to the reporters of this House, who have attended so zealously to their duties this Session. There has never been, in any Session, so much labor performed by the reporters as has been done this Session by those who sit at our Table. They have been here night after night, and day after day, and the only marvel is, that one-half of them are not sick and unable to do work at all. It is a question the House may fairly consider, as to whether they should not receive some extra remuneration.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. In order to meet the views of the Opposition, I would suggest to add after the words, "to meet the expenses of the Senate," the words, "in the Session 1884-85."

House of Commons—Sums required to meet increased expenditure, under reports of Internal Economy Commissioners.....	\$1,020
--	---------

Mr. BERGERON. Before this item is passed, I wish to point to what I consider was an oversight on the part of the Internal Economy Commissioners. I did not hear anything mentioned about the first assistant clerk; and I think that every hon. gentleman in this House has recognised the services of that gentleman. When Mr. Rouleau was appointed, I think the salary it was intended to give him was \$2,800 a year, and he only received \$2,400. When I came to Parliament, in 1879, we had two clerks, one first assistant, and the other second assistant, and they received the salary each of \$2,200 a year, which made \$4,400, and the first clerk received \$3,200. To-day we have only one clerk, who does the work of the two, and for that work he only receives \$2,400. In the Senate, the first assistant clerk receives \$2,800 a year, and the second, \$2,200, and every hon. gentleman knows we have ten times more work to do here than they have to do in the Senate. By the ruling of the Internal Economy Commission, it is provided that certain employes of this House will receive a maximum of \$2,800 a year, that is gentlemen in the rank of employes next to the first assistant clerk. Well, they will have \$400 a year more than Mr. Rouleau when they reach the maximum, and I think, therefore, it is an oversight on the part of the Commission not to have given Mr. Rouleau, the only assistant clerk we have, a fixed salary of \$2,800. This will still be an economy on previous years of \$1,600 a year. I am sure the mere fact of reminding the Government of such an oversight will be sufficient to induce them to fix Mr. Rouleau's salary at \$2,800 a year. The question is not a political one, but only a question of justice, and I have no doubt every hon. gentleman will be ready to admit the justice of this claim.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with my hon. friend in the compliments he has paid to the assistant clerk of this House. No doubt, a more efficient, a more zealous, a more painstaking officer, we could not have. The question of comparing the salaries paid to the officers of this House with the salaries paid to officers of the other House is hardly the thing to do. We have no control over the salaries of the Senate. They control their own salaries. They determine what salaries they shall give, and of course they are the best judges as to what the services of their officers are worth. We may have our own opinion, but we have no control over them. In so far as our officers are concerned, I must say that the Commission examined the different salaries, and though they might have been disposed to recommend the increase of some salaries, they did not think that, under the circumstances, they could go further

than they have done. However, this matter is always in the hands of Parliament, and if Parliament, another Session, thinks that a salary or two may be increased, we know how this matter may be brought before the House.

Mr. GIROUARD. I believe, considering our assistant performs the duties of two officials, his salary ought to be increased to that of the assistant in the Senate.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the committee to two other questions which arise on this report, with reference to two other officers, Mr. McGillivray and Mr. Ross. Neither of these gentlemen has directly or indirectly made any application to me, but I have learned from other sources what I am about to say. The scheme of the Commission appears to have been to give the annual increment for a certain time; but, with reference to the existing officers, no matter how long they may have served, they do not get up to the maximum, which is in some cases a very modest maximum, at once. Both of these officers have, I believe, been about thirty years in the service, and they most certainly have attained the maximum of their efficiency, and have probably come very nearly to the end of their period of service, when you consider how much of the ordinary period of life thirty years are. I am informed that, as long as twenty years ago, there were two persons who discharged the duties which Mr. McGillivray now discharges alone. I think, with regard to public servants who have discharged the duties which they discharge to-day for twenty-five or thirty years, whatever may be the sum we fix as the maximum proper sum for the office they might very fairly have it conferred upon them at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is worthy of future consideration.

Mr. SCRIVER. In reference to what the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said, in regard to the assistant clerk, I did not observe that the Minister of Public Works made any reply as to the limit in his case being less than the limit of other officers of this House, who, I suppose, are not, at all events, of superior rank or station. The limit for the accountant is placed at \$2,800.

Mr. SPEAKER. The limit for the accountant is placed at \$1,800, and none of the other officials go above \$2,400, except the clerk. As to the two officials referred to by the leader of the Opposition, they are both most efficient officers; they are very valuable, and deserve every consideration. The Internal Economy Commissioners, however, wanted to cut their coat according to their cloth, and to deal with this question from an economical standpoint. I have no doubt, however, that the commissioners will take the views expressed by the hon. gentleman into consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, my suggestion is based upon the principles of the report itself. I am not suggesting an increase of salary, but if the House solemnly decide that a certain sum is the proper maximum sum for a particular officer performing a certain service, I say that, if you have an efficient officer in your service for thirty years, he ought at once to have the maximum salary.

Mr. BERGERON. I see, in the proceedings of the 12th June, the following:—

"Resolved, That the Miscellaneous Branch shall comprise the office of the Accountant, the Stationery Office, the Engrossing Office, and the Post Office, and shall consist of: 1 first-class clerk, 3 second-class clerks, 6 third-class clerks; that in consideration of long service, the present accountant do continue to receive the same salary as heretofore."

That is, \$2,800. My hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) has just struck the nail. If we have an assistant clerk, who is the second rank of all the officers of the House of Commons, how is it that the accountant is to receive more salary. I have no objection to the accountant receiving \$2,800 or \$3,000, if he deserves it, but it seems to me

unreasonable that the man ranking after the first assistant clerk should receive more salary than he does.

Mr. TASSE. (Translation.) As we are discussing the report of the Internal Commission, I would like to call the attention of the House to the salary received by the first assistant to the chief of the French translators. The salary of that officer is, at present, of \$1,450. The position, which is very important and responsible, is held by Mr. Genand, who is an officer of this hon. House since many years. I believe the commission, instead of fixing his salary at \$1,450, amount he received since many years, should have given to him the salary of his predecessor, that is, \$1,700 or \$1,800; for, in the translator's office the first assistant is practically the chief translator; the chief translator who is, at the same time, assistant law clerk, being, consequently, obliged to devote the most of his time to the legal branch; so that the assistant is practically the chief translator. Considering the importance of his position, considering his services and his responsibility, I think the Internal Commission must put his salary at \$1,700 or \$1,800, amount paid to his predecessor.

Gratuity to the father of the late W. Haché ..... \$200

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the young man who was drowned, and this is practically paying his salary to the end of the Session.

Increased sessional allowance of members of the Senate and House of Commons, subject to the present position of the law affecting the absence and attendance of members.... \$144,699 60

Mr. BOWELL. I propose to insert after the words "attendance of members," the following:—

"The members on service in the North-West not to be subject to any deduction."

Mr. McMULLEN. I have only to say, in reference to this matter, that I stated to my constituents, in my address, that I should oppose any increase of the indemnity to members of the House of Commons or of the Senate. On these grounds, I oppose this increase, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. BLAKE. This proposal is intended to apply as well to those members who have been in the North-West and have returned, as to those who have not returned?

Mr. BOWELL. It is intended to apply to those who have been away in the North-West, in order that when they make their declaration they may not be called upon to state the length of time they have been absent.

Mr. BLAKE. By a resolution which we passed awhile ago, I think they were to get their sessional indemnity in advance before they left.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, the thousand dollars.

Mr. BLAKE. And those who have not since returned?

Mr. BOWELL. Those who have not since returned will be entitled to the balance voted to members here.

Mr. MILLS. That is rather an extraordinary regulation. I cannot understand why, entering into service in the North-West, they should be allowed the ordinary sessional indemnity; but when members sit here for six months instead of the three of an ordinary Session, I do not see, myself, why an exception should be made in favor of others.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be rather an invidious distinction. We came to the conclusion when they got their indemnity in advance that the service in the field was equivalent to service in the House, and that they

Mr. BERGERON.

should get for service in the field as much as we get for service in the House. They are now in the field. If they had returned, as the hon. member for Wellington says, then there might be a different calculation, but as they are all up there, except only two, who have been able to get away in advance, I think it would look very small in us to make any objection to give them the \$1,500, which they have earned, I think, as well as we have here. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) objects to the increase. He can remedy it, to a certain extent, by not taking the money himself. That will be so much saved. But I fancy that the hon. gentleman, in making his speech, wanted to say that he would do the work cheaper than other hon. members.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall not cheat my constituents out of the money. If I take the money I shall give it to them for the benefit of agricultural work. I say I am opposed to the idea. I am opposed to it on all grounds. I believe the sessional allowance granted to us is quite sufficient, and I think any man who takes it should do as I intend to do with mine.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are two members of the House, who, I think, should be exempted this Session from the members' declaration, which is required by the accountant. I refer to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thomson). Both those gentlemen became sick in the service of the country, and have been obliged to be away a great portion of the Session. No representations have been made to me by them, nor do I know their wishes, but I think, as a matter of justice, they should be exempted from making the declaration of the time they have been absent during the present Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If that is the general opinion of the House—and I gather it to be so—although we cannot at this period of the Session alter the Estimates, I dare say means will be found to recoup these gentlemen.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the motion of the Minister of Customs cover the case, for instance, of Col. Williams? I see, also, there is a special item for paying the balance to the representatives of the late Mr. Benson.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the case of Col. Williams, who has fallen, you may say, on the field of battle, and as the leader says he has really done—will stand on a higher ground, and will be dealt with fully by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Have we a right to conjecture that the hon. gentleman promised this vote at a particular stage of the debate on the Franchise Bill in order to obtain the necessary support to carry that measure, and had to give certain assurances that such arrangements would be made? Now, I do not myself think that it would be at all unreasonable, perhaps, if the hon. gentleman had proposed a special provision for that gallant minority which has been fighting against this oppressive legislation which has been the cause of the enormous length of this Session—because I maintain that within a week, at any rate, of the expiration of the three months of our normal Sessions, five-sixths of the fighting on the disputable work which has occupied our time this Session, was yet to be done. But that the hon. gentleman should propose that the majority that he has misled into this mode of conducting public business should be compensated for the consequences of that misleading, seems to me an extraordinary proposition. If he had proposed a vote for those who are not responsible, it would have been another thing, but to propose it for those who are responsible seems extraordinary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that I would like that subject to be left to the vote of the House,

as to who are responsible for the delay. The hon. gentleman is not responsible for the delay in any sense. He was not present, and he did not make, 6, 8 or 10 hours speeches on the Franchise Bill, and I think if he had been in his place he would have kept hon. gentlemen behind him from wasting the time of the House and spending the money of the country. But we will leave it with the House. Shall we say that we shall have a vote, and that only those who, in the opinion of the majority of this House, have a right to the addition of \$500, shall have the money? If the hon. gentleman will accept that proposition, we will carry it at once.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that he has it in his power to make a proposition that the majority only shall have it, or that the minority shall have it, or that nobody shall have it. He will make his own proposition, no doubt, and his followers will support him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The minority agrees that we are right in this matter, with one exception.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not propose to offer any opposition to this vote at the present stage, but I desire to say that I hope it will not be taken as a precedent in future Sessions, and that if the indemnity is to be increased at all it should be increased by a Bill submitted to Parliament. If it is to be taken as a precedent in future Sessions, we might have the same prolongation of the Session, not by members on this side, but by members on the other side of the House. Although I am opposed to an increase of the sessional indemnity, I shall not oppose this vote at the present stage, but simply say that I hope it will not be taken as a precedent for future Sessions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope this Session will not be taken as a precedent for future Sessions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To that end, I think the hon. gentleman might give a pledge now that Government business will be brought down at a decent time, in order that we may have full opportunity of discussing it. If he will pledge himself to do that, I, for one, will pledge myself that the Opposition will not factiously oppose his measures. And I may add this, had the Franchise Bill been brought down at a proper time, this Session would have been terminated three months ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; I have no doubt about that. If it had been brought down on the second day of the Session we would not have had a single speech against the Indians having a vote, not a single speech against the revising barristers, not a single speech about the alleged encroachment on provincial rights. The hon. gentleman says that if the Government had brought down their measures in good time there would have been no such delay. This is a House of Commons where there are representatives of the people, and we find that the Government gave a decent opportunity for members of the House, who are not members of the Government, to bring in their measures. All those notices of motion cover important subjects, and hon. gentlemen had an opportunity to bring them up during six weeks. They played themselves, and did not do it, and if they had gone on with those measures, every hour of the time would have been profitably occupied.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister seems to forget that he has taken absolute control of every day of the Session, for a period of nearly four months.

Mr. BLAKE. I have only this to say. I regret the tone which the First Minister last assumed, because I warn him that if the course he seems to indicate is to be repeated next Session, he will not find it possible to get through the business in the time at which we are all anxious to dispose of it; and unless he reforms his ways and the action of the

Government, by bringing in the Government business at an early period, he will not succeed in pressing the business through the House at the end of next Session, any more than he succeeded in doing so at the latter part of this Session. In order to get through the public business in three months, and I am as anxious to do so as is any hon. member, it is necessary that a different course should be taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman carries out his threat and continues obstruction, we shall have to take the same steps in Canada as Mr. Gladstone took in England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let the hon. gentleman do it. He will not gain much by it. The hon. gentleman has had some experience, and not from magnanimity, but from simply knowing that no cloture he could introduce would help him, none was proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the proceedings of the English House of Commons, he will find that the method in which they deal with Supply and bring under the consideration of Parliament the discussion of important measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, he will find that it is a very unfortunate precedent to which he has alluded.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are 17 measures of Mr. Gladstone's Administration hanging over now.

Mr. MILLS. That may be quite true; but it is equally true that they were introduced at an early period of the Session. I called attention to this fact early in the present Session. I took every important measure introduced into the English House of Commons for half a century, and I showed each was introduced during the first few weeks of each Session. During the last seventeen years the hon. gentleman has sought to take legislation out of the hands of Parliament and control legislation by the Administration of the day. The hon. gentleman, in fact, has made the House of Commons a mere farce, and a mere register of the acts of the Administration. And the hon. gentleman is pursuing that course in the measure now under consideration. What opportunity has this House to look into the merits of any one of the railway enterprises which the hon. gentleman proposes to aid. We have had no opportunity of seeing whether they are meritorious or not meritorious. He has denied the House that opportunity, and there is not the least doubt that a majority will acquiesce in the position which the hon. gentleman has taken; but I am satisfied a majority of the country will take a different view, and that the people are prepared for a new departure, and that the hon. gentleman will find that he must adopt a different course, or not succeed.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There were more documents read in this House this Session than were read in the House of Commons of England for the last five years.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have one remark to make in regard to the Franchise Bill, which occupied some time during the present Session. The Franchise Bill was introduced into the English House of Commons on 26th February, and the third reading was taken on the 28th June. The principles of the Bill were discussed within the first month after the House met.

Mr. BOWELL. There were over 600 members to discuss it, while there are only 200 here.

Election Expenses..... \$1,200

Mr. BLAKE. What is this item?

Mr. BOWELL. This is a sum which the Auditor General and the Government refused to pay, considering that the charges made were too large. It was carried into court,

and the Government were defeated. This is to pay the judgment.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the second vote.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The amount voted has never been paid, because the explanation given of the vote did not cover exactly the claim. So it was a dead letter, and it is to meet the exigencies of the case that this new vote is proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. Am I to understand that this is not really a second vote, but the same vote?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There seems to be some difficulty about the payment of returning officers. A returning officer in whom I have every confidence, and who would not make an unfair charge, has stated that it is a difficult matter to get a settlement of just claims. There must be something complicated in the arrangements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are frequent complaints made. The accounts for the different constituencies vary. In the case of a hotly contested election in an urban constituency there may be occasion to have an additional constabulary force. It is impossible to make general regulations, and the whole matter is pretty much left in the hands of the Auditor General. He is worthy of confidence and will not allow undue expenses. Sometimes he is too economical—at least, in the opinion of the returning officers.

Indian and Colonial Exhibition..... \$20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this money for? We have already passed a considerable sum under this head.

Mr. POPE. We have already asked \$40,000, but we anticipate that a considerable additional sum will be required.

Balance of pay, etc., to militia called out in aid of the civil power at Lingan mines, C.B., pending recovery of the same from the municipality, under Act 46 Vic., cap. 11, sec. 27..... \$1,472

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There were some riots there some years ago, and the troops were called out in aid of the civil power, as the law provides. The municipality resisted payment of the accounts, and the matter is now in the hands of the Department of Justice, for the purpose of enforcing the claim on the part of the militiamen, who have been complaining for some time that they have not been paid. We think it better to pay them their due, and to collect it from the municipality.

Mr. BLAKE. This Session the hon. gentleman representing that constituency made enquiry about this matter, and one of the Ministers told him clearly that the Government had nothing to do with it, and could not pay it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They could not pay it without a vote.

Mr. BLAKE. What right has the Government to sue for it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand, under the law, instead of the militiamen suing individually, the Government sues for them.

Mr. BLAKE. When did the riot take place?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I forget exactly, but it was some years ago.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any proceedings been taken for the recovery of the money?

Mr. BOWELL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so, but I am not sure.

North-West Territories—Prince Albert Court House and Gaol..... \$20,000

Mr. BLAKE. Will this finish the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Plans have been prepared, and we were about beginning the work when the troubles broke out in the North-West, and we had to postpone it. The intention is to erect a substantial building, which will likely cost more than this, but this we think will be sufficient until Parliament meets again.

Mr. BLAKE. About how much will it cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$10,000 or \$15,000 more.

To pay Messrs. Purcell & Ryan for expenses incurred by them in July, 1881, for transportation of and supplies furnished to His Excellency the Marquis of Lorne and party ..... \$1,612

Mr. BLAKE. What is this?

Mr. BOWELL. These are expenses incurred by this firm at the time when the Marquis of Lorne visited the North-West by way of Port Arthur. After leaving the portion of the railway which is called Section 15, I think, they were conducted through at the expense of these gentlemen from Rat Portage to Winnipeg. They have been constantly applying for this, I am informed, and until they could show that the expenditures actually took place, the Government have not deemed it proper to ask the House to indemnify them. I have a memorandum which shows that a large portion of this account is for supplies furnished to the Indians when His Excellency met a number of the bands, when he was passing through, for labor of the portages, for the use of cars, and for the employment of fifteen Indians during the trip.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the total expense of that progress of Lord Lorne?

Mr. BOWELL. I am unable to say. The expense of the whole trip through the North-West Territories is given in the Public Accounts.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the expense of that trip, generally, paid by the public?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says there have been constant applications for this amount, and the Government refused to pay it until Messrs. Purcell & Ryan showed that they were entitled to it. What was the difficulty in their showing that?

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Railways says they were constantly applying for it, and the principal reason why it was not paid was, the final settlement of their contract had not taken place.

Mr. POPE. Since then they have pressed it very strongly.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that Messrs. Purcell & Ryan had a claim before the country in 1881, and did not press it until a comparatively late period. Of course, the longer they were in furnishing the items of their account the more difficulty there would be in ascertaining whether it was a substantial one or not. It is when they are fresh that an efficient investigation of these matters can take place, and I must say I cannot see why there has been so much delay.

Mr. POPE. One reason for it was, that they pressed the account upon the Railway Department, and I always maintained that the Railway Department had nothing to do with it. The reason they did so was that Col. DeWinton came to Mr. Schreiber and asked him to arrange with those people

to assist in the trip, and Mr. Schreiber did so. Finally, I said this belonged to the Finance Department, and that is the reason their account went there.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that it having gone to the hon. gentleman's Department is a reasonable excuse for the delay.

Mr. TROW. Can the hon. Minister tell me what portion of the road His Excellency went over, and how much was by rail and how much by water? At that time there were 100 miles constructed from Selkirk east, and probably 60 miles westward from Port Arthur. If he went by the railway track, he would probably go part of the way by teams furnished by the contractors; but he would have seen no Indians. He must have diverged from the railway to Rainy River and Fort Frances locks to meet the Indians.

Mr. BOWELL. His Excellency met some Indians between Port Arthur and Eagle River, and he met all the tribes around Rat Portage. He went nearly to Eagle River, I believe, by rail; then he diverged to the south, I believe, and went to Vermillion Lake, thence to Eagle Lake, and so on, making two or three portages. When I went over the road shortly before that time, I went further north, and I had no less than 19 portages. His Excellency also met Indian tribes at the Lake of the Woods, and the hon. gentleman knows that when a Governor or other high personage meets with the Indians he has to dispense a large amount of supplies to them.

For the establishment of a Model Farm..... \$20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a new departure entirely, and may involve a very considerable future expenditure. I am not prepared to say that the money may not be well and properly spent; but if I recollect anything of the extent of the grants which have been found necessary in other countries for these model farms, and the number of places that will probably apply for them, the hon. gentleman may find that this departure may involve a much larger annual grant ultimately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman may remember that on the motion of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), a committee was struck, and it recommended the establishment of a Dominion model farm, not a series of model farms. That report was laid before the House. I am not a good judge myself, but I have seen mention of that report made in one of the English agricultural papers as being a most valuable report. I do not think there was a formal concurrence by the House in the report, but the question was put by the hon. gentleman, as chairman of the committee, whether the Government would take any action upon it; and with the general consent of the House the Government said they would carry out the general recommendation of that report, which was that a model farm should be established somewhere in the Dominion of Canada, as a model farm in every way. A portion of this sum will be used to acquire the property wherever the farm may be established.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to have some idea of what is proposed to be done. If a model farm is bought, I suppose something more or less akin to an agricultural college will be ultimately established on it, and I doubt whether one model farm will be found to suit the various wants of the various Provinces. I am not prepared to say that the money will not be well expended in an agricultural country like ours. No doubt, we waste a vast deal of money, in my opinion, on objects not one-tenth as valuable, but still it is a new departure, and will involve pretty considerable ultimate expense; and I think we ought to have, from the Minister of Agriculture, some general statement of what his plan is. You will require a very considerable quantity of land for this. This \$20,000, I suppose, will only be a mere preparatory vote to the sum we will ultimately have to vote in this direction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So far as any plan has been formed by the Government, it is this: We think there should be a site obtained, situated somewhere in Canada, where the climate will represent our average climate of the settled portions of Canada. It will not do to have it down in Gaspé or in Niagara. We do not want to get the best farm in the world, or the richest, or an arid farm, but a farm where the pupil students can really be employed profitably, where they will have some difficulties to overcome, and which will require some skill on their part to bring into proper cultivation. I think the money cannot be better spent than having a first rate model farm, and in order to carry the project out, I must agree the proportions will have to be liberal. There must be a careful choice of superintendent and those who manage the farm, men able to teach and to understand the whole subject.

Mr. TROW. In establishing a model farm, if it must be established, a great deal of jealousy will be created as to where it shall be situated. If too far to the east, the climate will be very severe, and if too far to the west, it will be too mild. If the Government are to undertake to purchase Berkshire Pigs and Shropshires and Downs, it seems to me it will be travelling out of the record.

Mr. BLAKE. We ought to know what the scheme of the Government really is. It is important we should know, both with reference to the financial and utilitarian aspects of the whole business. We must get a farm in which the climate is not too severe and also not too mild, in which the soil is not too good and not too bad; it must not be a desert, nor must it be very fertile; it must be a farm which has capability, but it must be one which will also contain difficulties to be contended against, in order that the scholars may have something to learn. Besides being a model farm and an exemplar to the farmers, provided by a paternal Government, it is also to be a college of a more or less ample character, a school in which to teach the young the art of farming. If that is part of the work of the model farm, and it is not necessarily a part of a model farm at all, we are going into a scheme of an agricultural college. We ought to know what we are going into; we ought to know the system under which young men are to be taught the art of farming by Government instructors. What is the extent of the farm proposed? What is the number of instructors to be appointed? How many young men are to be admitted? We are asked to vote \$20,000, and are not informed, in the slightest degree, as to how it is to be spent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We intend to have a model farm; we will obtain teachers, and the farm is intended to be worked by the pupils. Those pupils will be self-sustaining. The hon. gentleman knows there are a great number of young men who are anxious to be educated as farmers, and who pay considerable fees to private teachers at this moment, in various portions of the country. There are gentlemen agriculturists who give handsome fees to be taught farming. No doubt, a Government farm, conducted on scientific principles, with competent teachers and a sufficient area to employ students, will be well attended, and the pupils will pay a reasonable amount for their education. There is a very successful model farm conducted by Major Strickland, in Peterboro' district; he has a large number of pupils, and receives very handsome fees.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I would draw attention to a fact which has come under the notice of the Government already. I think an application has been made for help to establish a botanical school or garden in Montreal, on the slope of the mountain. The corporation has given 75 acres of fine land, and the Province of Quebec has voted \$1,000 to the object. It is expected that the Central Government will do something to aid it, as it is for the benefit of the whole Dominion.

Towards defraying expenses and losses arising out of the troubles in the North-West Territories..... \$2,300,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This, in addition to the \$1,700,000, makes the sum of \$4,000,000, which the hon. the Minister of Customs estimated was the minimum that these unhappy disturbances were likely to cost the country. Now, at this stage, I suppose the hon. gentleman has some fuller information on the subject, and that he can tell us approximately what will be the cost of the military service, and what the other items covered by this vote will likely cost, and also give us some idea of the claims which have been preferred by various parties, the Hudson's Bay Company and others.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand it, no claims for loss have reached here as yet. No doubt there will be claims; no doubt claims will be made to the local agents, but they have not arrived here yet. The staff who have been up there—storekeepers, and so on—will be down here in a very few days, and the accounts will be soon made up and adjusted. I do not think we have made any great progress, if any, as to what the actual expense will be. That cannot be adjusted without a little delay.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this vote ought to be altered and made similar in its character to the vote of \$1,700,000, so as to be a vote of credit, for which detailed accounts should be given within fifteen days of the commencement of the next Session. Precisely the same principles should be applied to this as to the \$1,700,000, unless the hon. gentleman is now prepared to explain it more in detail. You will remember the language used in the vote of credit, and subsequently inserted in the Bill. I may ask one thing more, however, because I think it is natural that, at this stage, we should expect a little more definite information from the Minister than he could give us at the earlier period, when \$4,000,000 was the rough estimate of the Government. I see there is a vote of \$25,000 asked for the relief of distress in the North-West, so I suppose that this vote of \$4,000,000 is not to be applied to that purpose, but I presume it is still intended to apply a certain amount to the indemnification for losses in the Territories, as the hon. gentleman stated earlier. I should have supposed that, at this time of day, the Minister of Militia could give us some further information as to the military expenditure. It is now a very considerable time since we have received any statement on that subject, that is to say, when the Bill for the \$1,700,000 passed its second reading. At that time the hon. gentleman had received a large number of accounts, and he must have received a number since. I do not say that he should produce the accounts or should give us detailed information, but he promised to give some information after a short interval. Now the opportunity has arisen, and I have no doubt that we shall hear something as to the division of this approximate sum of \$4,000,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will try to do that.

Mr. BOWELL. The \$25,000 does not form any part of the \$4,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that.

Mr. BOWELL. It is to cover expenses which the Government were compelled to incur in supplying food to the Indian tribes, as well as to the white people, to protect them from starvation.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware of that, but I should like to ask when we are to receive the information as to the approximate division of the four millions.

Mr. BOWELL. I am under the impression that it will be impossible to give the information during the present Session, for this reason, that while the Minister of Militia is constantly receiving the accounts and having them investi-

Mr. DESJARDINS.

gated, the distance from the scene of operations to the seat of government here is so considerable and the length of time occupied in travelling over that country until you reach the railway is so great, that he is necessarily prevented from coming to anything like a correct conclusion as to the expenditure incurred or the amounts to be paid. I know, from conversations I have had with the Minister, that large accounts have been presented, which will require investigation before he will consent to their payment. He has been obliged to make large advances in order to secure the comforts and even the necessities of the troops in the field; and, as the hon. gentleman well knows, it costs, in some cases, two or three times the value of the article itself in transport alone. For these reasons, I do not think I can hold out any hope that the information will be given during this present Session, unless we sit much longer than we expect. I will call the attention of the Minister to the subject to-morrow, and all the information possible will be given on concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, I recognise that the questions of transport and subsistence are uncertain elements, but the pay of the forces and the cost of their transport to the North-West, and of their transport back, is all either known, or is easily capable of being known, because they are on their way back now. If we have that information, we can learn what is the extent of the uncertain amounts. I entirely admit that, with reference to the large portion of the subsistence and the item of transport, we cannot hope for information just now, after what the Minister has said; but there is included, in this estimate of \$1,000,000, a sum for indemnity for losses. I do not ask, because I do not think it would be right for me to ask, at this moment, how much is to be paid in this way, but the Minister must make his own general calculations, and while I do not think it would be fair to ask him to make any statement, it would be quite fair to ask him to state what is the general principle upon which the Government is going to act on the claims for losses which are made by reason of the absolute destruction of houses and personal property, or the raiding of property. There are claims made, I believe, by reason of the loss of the crop, people being driven from their homes and unable to seed the ground during the season, and so forth. I think we ought to know the general principle of action which the Government propose to adopt, and the machinery by which they propose to ascertain what should be paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there will be any prospective damages. In the first place, actual loss by destruction of property will be considered, the actual cost of replacing the property; but then, I take it, the party must contribute, to a certain extent. That has always been the rule in settling war losses. It was so in regard to the war of 1812, and of 1837-38. There were no prospective damages. There were no damages, except for the loss of property, and business and time, and so on. The Government think that, perhaps, it would not be well to state, at this moment, the exact mode by which they will ascertain the loss and damage which may have been sustained. The investigation will, perhaps, be made by a commission, as there was one which sat in 1871, when Judge Johnson went up and settled the claims for loss, and acted with great acceptance to the people up there. The accounts were not considered excessive, and that was found to be a very good mode to settle the claims. We have not heard of any complaints since.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, there is a great deal of loss which will inevitably fall on the people, and they must bear this. There is also the danger of exaggerating claims, and I recognise that the task is a difficult one; but I must say a word as to the position the hon. gentleman has

assumed in reference to the settlers, who, at the critical time in the North-West, found that seeding was prevented by the outbreak. That is not a speculative question. There are farmers there who have only a few days within which they can seed, and if it were clearly established that they were absolutely prevented, in the disturbed portion of the country, from seeding, it means starvation for the year, I am afraid, because they cannot earn their bread otherwise. There must be a great many individuals who are really deprived of the opportunity of seeding their ground, and, in consequence, of reaping a crop. Some sort of allowance in respect to them would appear to be reasonable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman lays down a good principle. I am glad to know that the area is very small, and therefore, perhaps, we can afford to be more generous.

For relief of distress in the North-West Territories. \$25,000

Mr. GASGRAIN. I predicted, some time ago, that those people would be in want, and I think these particular supplies ought to be there at the present moment. This amount ought to be employed immediately, because two or three months hence it might be useless.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman can rest assured that this sum will not be kept for three or four months. Government have already acted upon telegrams they have received, and in order to meet the cases of want in that country, so far as they could, they have utilised the supplies of the mounted police; and, also through General Middleton, some of the supplies which were there for the use of the volunteers have been devoted to the purpose of preventing these people from suffering. The resources of the mounted police have been drawn upon to their fullest extent. The Government have lost no time in taking every step in order to prevent the suffering that has occurred by these unfortunate people.

Mr. BLAKE. I observed in a paper the other day that some twenty families of those people who were in prison had come to Regina. I suppose they will be attended to, as well as those who are on the spot?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes. I called particularly the attention of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West to these poor people. I telegraphed him to take care of the people at Batoche, where the buildings were destroyed, and whatever may be the criminality of the owners of property, their families are not allowed to starve. I got a telegram to-day from Mr. Dewdney, who says that we need have no anxiety about Batoche at present, and that the pressing needs of destitute families are supplied.

To make good to those persons of Prince Edward Island who were British subjects the amount of duties paid by them to the United States Customs on fish and fish oil, in the years 1871 and 1872 (Re-vote, \$5,965.47).....\$20,820 49

Mr. BOWELL. There was \$30,000 taken to cover the amounts paid for 1871, but when an investigation took place it was found that large sums were paid in 1872 also. The amount paid to British subjects by the commissioner, Mr. Fitzgerald, was about \$24,000. This is to cover the amounts which were paid principally by the fishermen in 1872. It was deemed advisable and equitable in meeting the claims of those who have paid the duty in 1871, that the same principle should be extended to those who paid the duty in 1872. I am inclined to think, however, that this sum is a little larger than is absolutely required. I think it might have been made a few thousands less. However, if it is not required it will not be used.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no use asking for more than you want.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not positive as to the amount that will be required. However, I think we might take off a couple of thousand.

Mr. BLAKE. A long while ago there was a motion made for the report of this commissioner, and it was ordered; but so far as I can remember, it has not been brought down. It is very important to be seen, so that one might observe the principles upon which the enquiry had gone on. Now, we had a rather animated discussion as to the mode in which this vote should be applied, and I think these words are not the words of the vote of last Session. It was corrected, with the view to taking care that the fishermen themselves received the benefit of it, because it was alleged that occasions had arisen in which the fishermen had given their fish to the wholesale merchants, upon the understanding that they should get back the duties if they were returned, and that they received, therefore, a smaller price for the fish.

Mr. BOWELL. The resolution passed last year, as near as I can recollect, was to pay back to those who had lost by the duties, both to the fishermen and the merchants. Sometimes the merchant purchased from the fishermen and deducted the amount of duty which he would have to pay in sending it to the United States. In that case it belonged to the fishermen. In other cases, where the merchants gave the full duty, then the principle laid down has been to pay the merchant. I am informed that a large portion of the duties for 1872 belongs to the fishermen, and that in almost every case in which they sold to the merchants, whether upon the island or to the American merchants, the amount of duty was deducted from the barrel.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman give us a statement of the application of the last vote—the large sums that were paid to the merchants? We have had the names of the claimants and the amounts, and we should like to have the names of those whose claims have been allowed.

Mr. BOWELL. There can be no objection to have the papers brought down. The Minister of Marine and myself went through them, in order to ascertain the claimants who should be paid; and we adopted the principle of recommending to Council payment of all sums recommended by the commissioner to persons who were British subjects at the time, in 1871, and who made the claim, excluding American merchants and fishermen who resided on the island at the time. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the names of the parties who received money. I have no objection to bring down the papers.

Mr. BLAKE. The motion was made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). The truth is, we have less information this year than we had last year, before the commissioner reported.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume, as this precedent is established, we shall have claims made by our own fishermen for duties paid between now and the end of the year. I hope the Minister will take steps to procure money to provide for the claims.

Towards aiding in the publication of "Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises"..... \$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the author?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Abbé Tanguay. That gentleman has been working for probably 15 or 20 years on this work, which is considered a most valuable one. It gives the genealogy of all the French families of the country, since its settlement. It is really a most valuable work, but the author has not the means to publish a book of this kind, and therefore he has asked the Government to give some aid. The book will be published in three volumes. It is a work which a great many people cannot purchase, but it is one which will do honor to the country, and it is proposed to give \$1,000 to assist in its publication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a Canadian "Burke's Peerage," in short.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; unless you consider all French families in Quebec to belong to the Peerage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose we must take the hon. gentleman's word that this work is going to be of some historical value to the country. We have not many of these works in Canada. I must say, however, we are introducing a good many very curious precedents.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is reference made in this work to old Acadian families?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. GIROUARD. This is a very important work, upon which Abbé Tanguay has labored about 30 years. One volume was published eight or ten years ago, and the Abbé got an indemnity or subsidy from the late Government, in order to assist in its publication. The printing expenses of the volume reached about \$4,000. There is now material prepared for about three volumes more. This is not a provincial but a Dominion work, and Abbé Tanguay has been collecting for from 25 to 30 years, not only in Quebec, but in Acadia, Ontario, and even France. The author is 65 years of age, and his death would prove a misfortune to the whole country. Very recently, in an important case at Quebec, where the genealogy of a family was required to be proved, the only proof was in the possession of Abbé Tanguay, and it enabled the rights of the parties to be adjusted.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a serious matter, for we do not know how many volumes there are to publish, and we are asked to grant \$1,000 to publish one volume. Every other nationality might make a similar claim.

Mr. GIROUARD. There would be no objection whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. We have not got any ancestors.

To purchase copies of Lynch's treatise on butter-making..... \$2,000

Mr. TROW. I would like to enquire of the Minister the number of copies which it is intended to purchase from Mr. Lynch, and whether the work is to be brought into some portable shape, different from the volume which was prepared for the Government of Ontario. That volume was composed of extracts from lectures, etc., by Professor Arnold, and others.

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Agriculture is not present at the moment, but I understand that this item is placed in the Estimates on the strong recommendation of the Committee on Immigration and Agriculture, and by a large number of members of this House. I should judge that, by the calculation made by the Minister, the book would be only a pamphlet, and he expected to get about 30,000 copies, 10,000 of which would be in the French language, which would bring the price to about 7 cents per copy.

Mr. TROW. It was not the wish of the committee, at all events, whatever may be the wish of the House, to have any copies of the old treatise.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite right. I believe that was the understanding.

Mr. TROW. It was to be a new work, containing all the improvements since the issue of the first edition.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think it would be desirable, in the issuance of this work, and its publication under the authority of the Department of Agriculture, that the Minister should be thoroughly satisfied that the system of butter-making advocated in this treatise should be the one which

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

is considered to be the best. Improvements in the manufacture of butter are matters of great interest, and whilst I think it would be desirable to furnish and disseminate information about improved methods of butter-making, it is also desirable that the Minister should see that the treatise is one which could convey the latest and best information with reference to that question. I express no opinion, with reference to Mr. Lynch's treatise, on this subject, because I have not sufficient technical knowledge to enable me to state whether the publication that is to be issued is one which would convey the best information on the subject or not.

Mr. TROW. I think it should be better understood how many copies we are to receive for this sum of money. I understand that it is 30,000 copies, which would bring them about 7 cents each. For myself, I question much the propriety of giving 7 cents a copy, because I know that the printing of the book, in its present shape, would not cost 3 cents a copy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is not only the printing of the work, but there is the preparation.

Mr. TROW. It is all prepared already for the Province of Ontario, where he issued the same work.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that this work is different from the one Mr. Lynch got out for the Province of Ontario. He has revised it to the present time, and embodied all the latest instructions and improvements in butter-making, and besides that, he would require to pay for the change in the edition, the translation into French, and so on.

Mr. TROW. There are too many slipshod pamphlets circulated in this country, but we want something containing valuable information, bringing in all the recent improvements with reference to butter-making.

Mr. BLAKE. Is Mr. Lynch to get a specific sum for revising the book, and is it to be printed by the public; or is he to print it himself, and present it at a fixed price? Does he cause it to be printed, 20,000 English and 10,000 copies French, for \$2,000, or is the printing to be undertaken by the public printers, or those other independent printers who are sometimes employed to do such work?

Mr. POPE. I do not know whether 7 cents a copy is a proper price or not. All such books with which I have anything to do are sent to the Queen's Printer, who fixes the price. I suppose this book will be delivered to the Department, and then that it will be distributed in every county.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the Queen's Printer fixes the price for the printing, if the price is for printing, but when the price involves the author's compensation for his work, the Queen's Printer cannot fix that.

Mr. POPE. I do not know whether 7 cents per copy covers the whole or not, but that is all the money will be expended upon it. I suppose that Mr. Lynch believes that by circulating 30,000 copies this book will be patronised, and his book will find a larger sale afterwards.

Towards paying the expenses incident to the visit of the American Institute of Mining Engineers to Nova Scotia..... \$2,000

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). This American Institute of Mining Engineers is an influential body, which holds its meetings in different parts of the United States. Their proceedings are always reported and widely distributed all over the country. This year, I think through the influence of some of the Canadian members of the Institute, they have been induced to hold the annual meeting at Halifax, Nova Scotia, and it is thought that their visit to this country will attract the attention of capitalists to our large mineral resources. Last year there was a large sum appropriated towards the visit of the British Association, and I think

that the visit of a body of this kind should be met by such an appropriation.

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate my hon. friend on his election to an important office, and I hope that, in his case, coming events cast their shadow before. It strikes me, however, that as it is expected that the visit of this body will attract the attention of capitalists to the mining interests of Nova Scotia, perhaps Nova Scotia might arrange for the visit. It is true we did pass a small vote last year for an object which was deemed to be a Dominion object—the visit of the British Association, which was arranged to go to various points in Canada. But, of course, if that is to be taken as a precedent for the Dominion contributing towards the expenses of the visits of scientific bodies, first in one Province and then in another, I do not know whereunto this may lead. I do not object much to this; after the votes of this Session, it is but a drop in the bucket; on the contrary, I rather rejoice in the vote, since it has given an opportunity to my hon. friend of explaining it so fluently, and filling so admirably, in advance, the position which I hope he is to fill next Session. That is really worth the money voted. Still, we should guard against these votes, because I fancy we shall have a repetition of the demand from different localities which would like the visit of a distinguished scientific body of that character.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I intended to make a long explanatory speech on this matter, but since my hon. friend behind me has convinced the hon. gentleman, I will not say a word.

To provide for the transport of Indian families (90) still remaining at Oka to the Indian reserve in the township of Gibson, and their settlement thereon, the seminary of St. Sulpice paying a like sum.....\$5,000

Mr. SCRIVER. I would like to ask whether the consent of these Indians has been obtained to this removal, and whether they are to be removed to the reserve already occupied by a portion of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope this vote will be the last that will be required with respect to the Oka Indians, who, as the hon. gentleman knows, have given a great deal of trouble and caused some excitement for some years. The seminary has behaved with great liberality to them; a tract of land has been bought in the township of Gibson, in Parry Sound, which has proved to be good land; a number of Indian families have gone up there; and those who have gone are happy and contented. They are close to the lake; they have good fishing; and they are altogether quite satisfied with their situation. The remaining families, who, at first, would not leave, have consented to go. As a final settlement, when the superior was here the other day, we came to an agreement, subject to the consent of Parliament, that we would pay half and the seminary the other half of the cost of removing the other ninety families, who are quite willing to go, and that will close the whole dispute, which has lasted so long.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am glad to learn that the Indians who have settled in the township of Gibson are doing well and are in comfortable circumstances, because the accounts as to that have been somewhat contradictory. I have not seen anything recently, but last year I saw a statement of a correspondent, in a Montreal paper, to the contrary effect. I hope the information of the hon. Minister is reliable, and that these poor creatures are doing well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The best proof of that is that the Indians now at Oka sent some of their friends to Parry Sound, to see for themselves, and the result of their report of the way they saw their brothers getting on was, that the rest have agreed to go.

483

To provide for an additional subsidy of \$500 a voyage, for five voyages, of steamers from a port in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to Great Britain and continental ports..... \$2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is Miramichi, in New Brunswick, a port referred to?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. This line calls at Charlottetown, and the round trip is between Canada and Germany—at Antwerp and Hamburg.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I was in hopes, when I saw this vote, that in it might be included a sum of \$500, in response to an application which was made to the Government in the early part of the Session, for a subsidy for steam communication between Prince Edward Island and Richibucto. I think it was represented, from observation, for the last twenty-five or thirty years, that a steamer could ply there the whole year round. A steamer could be found for \$500 to make the experiment next winter, and I was in hopes this vote would cover that amount. If it does not, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the matter again, in the hope that it may be thought of during the recess, and that next Session a grant may be made for this object.

Mr. BOWELL. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the matter will be considered by the Government. Everything is being done that can be done to secure constant communication between that island and the mainland.

To increase the salary of Daniel Kinnee, assistant inspector of Weights and Measures..... \$100

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This officer is one of the very few officers first appointed to that service who has remained without an increase. I find, by the inspector's report, that he is one of the most efficient officers in the service, and I think I would not be doing him justice if I did not recommend an increase.

Resolutions to be reported.

#### VOTE TO GENERAL MIDDLETON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would mention to the House that it is the intention of the Government to ask a vote to Major General Middleton of \$20,000.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. POPE moved, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following Resolutions:—

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to and for the parties, railways and railway companies hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company, for a line of railway from Ottawa to Waddington, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$166,440.

To the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company, for a line of railway from Sackville to the Straits of Northumberland, at or near Cape Tormentine, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$118,400.

To the Montreal and Sorel Railway Company, for a line of railway from St. Lambert to Sorel, a subsidy not exceeding \$1,600 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$72,000.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for a line of railway from Brockville to Westport, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$128,000.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for a line of railway from its junction on the North Shore Railway to St. Raymond, upon condition of the company extending their road to a point 50 miles north of St. Raymond, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$96,000.

To the Northern and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from the northern end of the 49 miles subsidised between Fredericton and the Miramichi River by 47 Vic., chap. 8, to Boystown, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$19,200.

To the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company, for a line of railway from Brossaens to Dundee, a subsidy not exceeding \$500 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$30,000.

To the Thunder Bay Colonisation Railway Company, for a line of railway from the Murillo station of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the east end of Whitefish Lake, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$92,000.

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for a line of railway from Ose Hill or Rathburn, to Bancroft, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$64,000.

To the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, for a line of railway from the Village of Madoc to the junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$10,500.

For a line of railway from Long Sault to the foot of Lake Temiscamingue, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$25,600.

For a line of railway from a point on the Canada Southern Railway, near Essex Centre, to Kingsville Harbor, on Lake Erie, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$44,800.

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for a line of railway from Tamworth towards Bogart and Bridgewater, 16 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 47 Vic., chap. 8, a subsidy of \$70,000.

To the Gatineau Railway Company, for a line of railway from Hull station towards Le Desert, a distance of 62 mile, in lieu of the subsidies granted by 46 Vic., chap. 25, and 47 Vic., chap. 8, a subsidy of \$320,000.

For a line of railway from the Grand Piles, on River St. Maurice, to its junction with the Lake St. John Railway, a distance of about 50 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 47 Vic., chap. 8, for a line of railway from the Grand Piles, on the River St. Maurice, to Lake Edward, a subsidy of \$217,600.

To the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, for a line of railway from Valleyfield to a point one and a-half miles west of Johnson's, a subsidy not exceeding \$1,600 per mile, and from one and a-half miles west of Johnson's to Lacolle; also from the present terminus at Ottawa to the Chaudière Falls, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$96,000.

For a line of railway from Indiantown *via* the Miramichi Valley to its junction with the Northern and Western Railway, at or near Boystown, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$140,800.

The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies, respectively. The other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways, respectively. All the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted shall be commenced within two years from the 1st day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government shall be empowered to make; the location, also, of every such line of railway, shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies, respectively, shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the said report of the said Minister.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:20 a. m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 165) to continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

Mr. POPE.

## THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved that the fourth report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the debates of this House during the present Session be adopted. He said: The report contains three recommendations. One is in relation to Mr. Boyce, who was mentioned in the House the other day very favorably on both sides, who revises the *Debates*, reads the English proofs and prepares an index. He has been receiving \$800 a year. The proposal is, in view of the length of the Session, that he should get an addition of 50 per cent., which I believe has been the standard rule of the Session with regard to increases. Another proposal is that the translators, whose translations last year amounted to about 1,600 pages, against about 3,600 pages this year, and who receive at present a salary of \$1,000, shall receive an addition of \$500. The other proposal is that Mr. Quéry, who reads the French proofs, and who receives \$400, should receive \$200 extra. He is also on the staff of regular officials, and it is on that ground that he does not get so much as Mr. Boyce, who receives no other pay in the service except what he receives for his work in connection with the *Debates*.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for this Session only?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is distinctly for this Session only.

Mr. TROW. While this matter is under discussion I think the hon. member for Cardwell should have extended the motion to embrace the *Hansard* staff. I think if any gentlemen are entitled to remuneration for extra services, the reporters, who have been kept here reporting all hours of the night, and many times the whole night, and who are not receiving sufficient remuneration for their services, should receive it. I think it would be doing a liberal act to extend that motion to the *Hansard* staff. While I am on my feet, I may say that there is another class of officials belonging to the Commons who have onerous duties to perform. The Session has extended to about double the usual length of our Session. There are gentlemen on our staff of permanent officials, such as translators, the gentlemen who prepare the indexes, and make up the Sessional Papers and Journals during the recess, who, to my knowledge, have been employed, during the Session, an average of 18 hours per day. They certainly are entitled to the consideration of this House. The permanent officers in the other departments have certain stated hours of labor, probably six hours a day, and in many cases less. To my knowledge they do not work more than 6 or 7 hours per day in the Departments while the permanent officers of this House have been laboring 18 hours per day, and I think their cases should be brought under the consideration of the Government, who I hope will give such some recognition of the services by allowing them a month's pay, which I think would be ample.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) I see, with pleasure, that my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) understands that he and his friends—not him particularly, because I think he occupies but very little place in the *Debates* in proportion to his friends—have protracted the Session to such an extent that it would be desirable to give a bonus to the reporters of the *Debates*. I fully agree with him, and I shall second a motion to grant a bonus, not only to the translators, but also to the reporters of the *Debates*.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). With regard to what has been said by the hon. member for South Perth, I would say that this is a matter that we would not have been troubled with but for the long sittings, the reading of books and extracts, and speeches which were printed in *Hansard* and circulated by the thousand, and I think it is very proper that the member for Perth, who did something in the way of read-

ing from books, should bring up this matter, and say the reporters should get something, and I think they deserve it. I believe that *Hansard* is to blame for the length of this Session, which will cost the country a quarter of a million of dollars, and it comes very well from the hon. gentleman, who read books for hours, as I said, and had his extracts published all over the country by the thousands, to make this request. Now, I believe that is a matter that hon. members of this House should put a stop to. If the Government do not put a stop to it, or the leader of the Opposition does not, the members will. Life is too short for that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker. I may say that when I was in Winnipeg your predecessor, Judge Walbridge, told me that he had contracted a disease by his long sittings in the Chair of this House, from which he was not cured until he was cured by the pure breezes of the North-West. What will be the state of your health, Mr. Speaker, if this goes on, and I say the responsibility for it rests on the shoulders of those who read these books and extracts, because they have not brains enough to make speeches of their own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman should not have passed such a reflection on the Ministry, for it was a Minister of the Crown that read the longest speech in the House. It must be consolatory, Sir, to you to reflect that 22 years have elapsed since your predecessor, Mr. Walbridge contracted the disease as the hon. member by sitting in the House for such a lengthened period, and that gentleman is still alive and well. I may add that there was no *Hansard* in the time of Mr. Speaker Walbridge, so that *Hansard* can hardly be held responsible for the long sittings at that time.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What I said, was, that it was the pure breezes of the North-West which had kept him alive so long. If the Minister to whom the hon. gentleman referred, read his speech, it was his own speech prepared by himself.

Mr. TROW. One word of explanation with reference to the reading of extracts and speeches of which the hon. member for Hastings says I was guilty. It is true that for one evening I did for a short time read a few extracts, but there was not a single sentence of those extracts in *Hansard*. We were in committee, and these extracts were not in *Hansard* no matter who read them, I am sure that no one but the hon. member for Hastings will complain of the time which I occupied.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). With reference to the observations of the hon. member for Perth, I may say that the committee would have been glad indeed to have made a recommendation with regard to the stenographers if they had felt that it would be reasonable for them to do so, but they had made a report last year for increasing the salaries of the stenographers to \$2,000, on the ground that they were to be officers of the House, and employed the whole year round. The suggestion was then made that sometimes there might be two Sessions, and that it would cost no more in that way for the two Sessions than for one, in so far as the salaries of the shorthand writers were concerned. Therefore, they confined themselves entirely to those whose work was of a sessional character, based on the particular amount of work as illustrated by the experience of the past year. Personally I should rejoice very much, if it is the sense of the House, that the stenographers should get an increase this year, and also that the amanuenses should get an increase this Session. I may say that the reason why no recommendation was made in their case was that they are receiving \$12 a week during the Session, and therefore the length of the Session does not affect that indemnity. In one sense, the longer the Session the better for the amanuenses—that is to say, they receive a larger amount in the aggregate, according to the time they are employed. I may say, at the same time, that the amount

they receive, \$12 a week, is certainly not a very high rate of remuneration, as compared with the sessional clerks, who do not perform anything like the work they do. I think, in that view, the rate of remuneration is very low indeed, but it was fixed by Parliament, and the committee did not feel that they could go any further in that direction. As to the other point raised by the hon. member for Perth, that, of course, does not come within the purview of the *Debates* Committee, but I am sure the House will agree that the permanent officers—and there are not a great many of them—would be entitled to some consideration for the length of this Session and the long hours they have had to work; but, of course, we could make no recommendation on that subject.

Motion agreed to.

#### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until half-past one o'clock p.m., on Saturday, and that Government business have precedence on that day after Routine Proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that for the remainder of the Session there shall be on each day including this day, two distinct sittings, the first from half-past one o'clock p.m., until 6 o'clock p.m., and the other from half-past seven o'clock p.m., until the time of adjournment; and that Government business shall have the precedence at each such sitting.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I think on the 5th of July, I received a telegram from the Major General. In that telegram he stated that Big Bear had been captured, that his band was surrendering, and he wound up the telegram in the following words:

"I may safely say that the whole object of the campaign has been achieved, that the troubles in the North-West are ended and I am ordering the troops home."

The announcement of the end of the troubles in the North-West calls, I think, for an expression of opinion on the part of the Parliament of Canada here assembled, as to the manner in which these troubles were ended, through the gallantry, through the energy of our volunteers. It must be remembered that our volunteers undertook to put an end to these troubles, the first we have had for so many years in Canada, at the most inclement season of the year. Leaving the question of fighting alone, the hardships incident to such an expedition must have been very much more considerable than at any other time. I think that I can safely say that we have been adding one more page to the history of Canada. We have been, as a nation, for years and years past, increasing our prosperity, but, as a nation, we had to go through the ordeal which other nations have passed through; we had to have disturbances and troubles within our own country. I regret exceedingly that the right hon. the leader of the Government, from the great strain consequent upon the heavy work of this long and protracted Session, has felt that, instead of his following English precedents on this occasion and moving this vote, seconded by the leader of the Opposition, he should hand over to me a duty which he could have performed so much better than I can attempt to do it. I regret it for more than one reason. I regret it because I know how much more agreeable it would have been to the whole force of Canada that this vote should have been proposed by the leader of the Government, who, I must say, during the whole of these troubles has given me the

invaluable advantage of his advice and his great experience in the matters connected with the administration of my Department. Before reading the resolutions which have been placed in my hands, I mean, as briefly as it is possible, to refer to the Department over which I preside, to give a few details, first, on the breaking out of the rebellion; second, on the movement of the troops; third, on the forces we sent out; fourth, on the engagements fought; fifth, on the ambulances established, and on our commissariat. I mean also to call your attention to those outside of the service and inside of the service who have helped us so successfully and so energetically in carrying out the campaign and making it a success. Lastly, and certainly not least, I mean to speak of the Major General in command of the forces, who has played his part so successfully and has carried out the plan which he himself had framed so well, in quelling and putting an end to the disturbances in the North-West. The first intimation we had of troubles in the North-West was from a telegram which was received by the right hon. the leader of the Government on the 22nd March, 1885. After studying the various details of that campaign, after taking into consideration the difficulties which we had to contend against, I think I am safe in saying that the most important features of the plan of campaign to be adopted was to quell as rapidly as possible the disturbance which took place in the Saskatchewan Valley, and which was announced to us by that telegram of the 22nd March. It was of the utmost importance, from a military standpoint, as far as we can judge, that this disturbance should be quelled as rapidly as possible, and, if it had not been for the wonderful energy displayed by the volunteers in marching as rapidly as they have done, it certainly might have resulted in very much more serious consequences than those we have had to meet in the North-West troubles. If the Major General, when he engaged the insurgents at Batoche, through marches so rapid, forced marches in fact, which have shown the endurance of our militia force, had met, united with the insurgents, the bands of Poundmaker, Big Bear and the other bands of Indians, there is no question at all in my mind that the engagement would have been ever so much more serious, and the loss of valuable lives to Canada ever so much greater and the campaign must have lasted very much longer than it has. This I consider as one of the great reasons of the success which accompanied the efforts of our volunteers in the campaign they have so successfully terminated just now. It was on the 23rd March that the Major General left Ottawa, on the 27th he reached Winnipeg. Hon. gentlemen will easily understand that it became necessary for the Major General, as soon as he reached Winnipeg, to remain a few days, so as to be able to establish his base of supplies and to take the necessary measures to allow a column such as the one under his command to traverse the great distances they had to traverse and to be ready for the field. He was delayed a very few days. After the measures I have just spoken of had been taken, he left Fort Qu'Appelle on the 6th April with his first flying column; on the 11th, he was at Salt Plains; on the 14th, at Humboldt; on the 17th, at Clark's Crossing, on the 24th, at Fish Creek; on the 8th May, at Gabriel's Crossing; on the 9th, at Batoche; on the 19th, at Guardepuy; on the 21st, at Carlton; on the 26th, at Battleford, and on the 2nd June, at Fort Pitt. Now, when one considers that almost all—I can say everyone—of the troops so engaged were engaged for the first time, when we come to consider that everyone of the volunteers who formed that first flying column, except a few officers who formerly belonged to the Imperial service, had never seen active service, it is certainly wonderful that they could have, without any previous training, so to speak, covered a distance of nearly 500 miles in 60 days, after having three engagements, the first at Fish Creek, and the two others at

Mr. CARON.

Batoche, where the rebels sustained a loss which culminated in the breaking down of the rebellion. Sir, during the whole of this time—and as Canadians, I think we cannot be too proud of it—every officer, from the Major General down to the men who had seen active service in the imperial army, have written to the press, to their friends, to the Department, to England, that no troops could have behaved better than the Canadian troops. I feel proud of it, as I know every Canadian must feel proud, to know that the honor of the country was sustained in the North-West, that law and order were vindicated by men who showed all the qualities which constitute a good citizen and a good soldier. The average number of days taken by the troops in going from their headquarters to Winnipeg was about eight days. I have caused the following table to be prepared showing the time taken by the different corps:—

A and B Batteries.....	8 days.
Infantry School Corps.....	8 do
2nd Battalion Queen's Own.....	8 do
10th Battalion.....	8 do
Midland Battalion.....	8 do
York and Simcoe Battalion.....	8 do
Sharpshooters.....	8 do
7th Battalion.....	8 do
65th Battalion.....	8 do
Governor General's Body Guards.....	9 do
Cavalry Corps (Quebec).....	9 do
9th Battalion.....	10 do
Montreal Garrison Artillery.....	10 do
Halifax Battalion.....	11 do

It is of interest to the country to know that over this new line of railway which binds the Provinces of the Dominion together, while it was yet unfinished, the troops were sent all the way over Canadian territory and succeeded in reaching Winnipeg in eight days, from their headquarters. Sir, this brings me to say a few words in reference to the line of railway which was selected for the purpose of conveying troops to the North-West. Many thought that we were, perhaps, running a risk, but we felt that we should make the experiment, we felt that having a road of our own we ought to put forward every effort to show that we could carry our own troops through our own territory without having to appeal to a foreign though friendly nation for liberty to pass through their territory. And, Sir, I think it my duty to state here that the thanks of the Department are due to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the manner in which they assisted us in every possible way, from the President down to the officials; everything they could do they did, in order to expedite the transport of our troops. Sir, I can say that, had it not been for the energy displayed by that company, the sufferings and hardships which are inevitable in military service, and which were incurred by the troops, might have been very much greater than they were. We had provided four days rations in case of accident, and we asked the company and the contractors under that company in order to save time and prevent delays, to provide all the subsistence necessary for the troops which were conveyed over that line; and I can say that in no instance were the troops called upon to fall back upon the four days rations which had been provided in case of an unexpected delay. Sir, I feel that in speaking to the resolutions which have been placed in my hands, I would not do my duty were I to fail, publicly and from my seat in Parliament, to express my thanks to those who, under the control of the company, helped us so successfully in carrying our troops north of Lake Superior. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is worthy of note, it is worthy of some remark, that the very first troops sent to the North West, A and B Batteries, reached Nepigon on the 4th of April, after having crossed about 90 miles of gaps in the railway, and that the Montreal Garrison Artillery, under Lieutenant Colonel Oswald, reached Nepigon by rail without transfer, on the 19th May. Between the 4th April and the 19th May the bridges had

all been completed, the gaps had been closed, and we had an all rail route which would allow us, if the necessity occurred, to pour in any number of troops that might be required to suppress the insurrection. Sir, we had also the great advantage, as a means of transport, of having, as soon as the rivers were opened, the use of the boats belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Coal Navigation and Transportation Company. These means of conveyance reduced enormously the expense which we had to incur for transport facilities, and in fact the troops themselves felt the benefit of not having to go through these long, heavy marches, and in being able to take a boat through the waterways to their place of destination. Sir, we had to send to the North-West to quell the disturbance, 4,760 men, 473 horses, and 8 guns. These troops, Mr. Speaker, were distributed by the Major General into three flying columns, composed as follows: the first, from Qu'Appelle to Prince Albert; the second, from Swift Current to Battleford; and the third, from Calgary to Edmonton. The remainder of the force were distributed all along the line of railway, and were stationed at Winnipeg, Troy, Qu'Appelle, Medicine Hat, Gleichen, Calgary, Fort Macleod, Old Wife's Lake, Cypress Hills, and Swift Current. Subsequently detachments were left at Touchwood, Humboldt, Clark's Crossing, Yorktown, Birtle and Prince Albert. The first column took 44 days to go from Qu'Appelle to Prince Albert; the second column took 15 days from Swift Current to Battleford, and the third column took exactly 14 days from Calgary to Edmonton. I now wish to say a few words in reference to the engagements which resulted from this disposition of the troops sent up to the North-West. As we all sadly remember, the first blow struck at peace and order in that territory, the first engagement that took place, was at Duck Lake. I need not, Mr. Speaker, go over the details of that engagement, as they have been set forth fully in the press of the country. This engagement took place between the Mounted Police and the Prince Albert volunteers on the one side, and the half-breeds and a few Indians on the other. The battle of Fish Creek took place on the 25th April. This was the first engagement between the first flying column under the command of Major General Middleton and the rebels. The scouts belonging to his column were fired upon by the Indians and the half-breeds for several hours, and the result was that we had 10 volunteers killed and 48 wounded. Proceeding chronologically we now come to the engagement known as the Cut Knife Hills engagement, which took place, as the House will remember, on 3rd May. It was between a column, composed of about 300 men, commanded by Colonel Otter and a large body of Indians. Our troops marched out from Battleford to a distance of 35 miles, fought Poundmaker and returned. Colonel Otter, with his column, certainly achieved a march which is almost unparalleled. His force during 30 hours marched 75 miles, and fought several hours with the Indians. The next and most important engagement is that of 9th May at Batoche, and the one which followed on the 11th. The engagement has already been so thoroughly described—and I had the pleasure yesterday of laying upon the Table of the House a plan of the whole engagement drawn by an officer belonging to the engineers of the Imperial army—that I will not occupy the time of the House by entering at length into its details. Suffice it for me to say that this was an engagement between the first flying column under the Major General and the half-breeds and Indians led by Gabriel Dumont—the most serious engagement since the beginning of the outbreak and the one which really terminated the troubles, proving to the rebels that it was impossible for them to stand against the troops which had been sent against them. On the 9th we had 1 killed and 7 wounded; on the 11th, 9 killed and 30 wounded. We have altogether to deplore the loss of 37 killed and 107 wounded. I have endeavored to refer very

briefly to the engagements that have taken place; but now that those engagements are over and it is necessary to count our losses, it seems right and proper for me to express what I believe to be the feeling of the whole of Canada. Every one of us deeply felt the loss sustained by the families of those brave heroes who fell on the field of battle. We deeply felt the great loss of those men who showed that they possessed great qualities; we deeply felt the loss which the death of such men would cause in the family circle and among their friends. We could not help feeling, as we were rejoicing over the success of our arms, that our loss was great, that many lives precious to Canada and giving rich promise for the future had been lost—men who left their homes for the purpose of vindicating law and good order, and who were left staining the field of battle with their blood, but giving to their companions in arms and to every Canadian a noble example of devotion to their country and to their flag. In mourning the loss of those to whom I have referred, I am led to say a word about the ambulance corps and hospital organisation, which was established in order to prevent needless suffering. Here, again, and it is with great pleasure I say so, I had the invaluable advice of a gentleman, an hon. member who has occupied a seat in this House for many years—I refer to Surgeon General Bergin. I had, I was going to say, daily intercourse with him, but during the first few days of the outbreak every ten minutes almost he had to refer to me. When you consider, Mr. Speaker, with your experience of military life, of camping and marching as we see it in our camps of exercise—when I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we had nothing in our stores, except a few medical panniers, nothing with which to arrange for a hospital service, and when I tell you that the whole of the service was organised in four days, it might seem somewhat improper on my part to express an opinion on a matter which hon. gentlemen may fairly say I know very little about. But I do not rely on my judgment in a matter of this kind, and I desire to give the House and the country the highest testimony that can be given on the subject by a high authority sent out to Canada by that gracious lady whom Canada will never forget, Her Royal Highness Princess Louise. I refer to Dr. Boyd. I must be permitted to say a few words in regard to that distinguished gentleman. Dr. Boyd who was sent out by Her Royal Highness, was specially selected by Sir Wm. McCormack, on account of his ability and special qualifications, and from the fact that he had already rendered eminent services in three or four campaigns. During the Turco-Russian war Dr. Boyd was in a hospital at Plevna, where there was 2,000 or 3,000 wounded; he has also been in Africa and served in several other campaigns. Perhaps the House will permit me to read a letter addressed by Dr. Boyd to the Surgeon General, as follows:—

“FIELD HOSPITAL,  
“SASKATOON, 22nd June, 1885.

“DEAR DR. BERGIN.—Since I left Ottawa I have done a great deal of travelling and seen some splendid scenery almost equal to any I have ever seen before, the wildness of it being very noticeable. When I arrived at Winnipeg Dr. Roddick met me there and accompanied me over the town and through the hospital where there were a few sick and wounded soldiers. The hospital appeared to be excellently managed and comfortable and the building very appropriately situated and great care has been taken with regard to the ventilation as shown to me by Dr. Kerr; the patients appeared all to be doing well and very happy. We journeyed next day to Moose Jaw, where I gave your letter of introduction to Hon. Dr. Sullivan; I visited the field hospital there with Dr. Roddick and was immensely pleased with it, in fact, for a field hospital it equals any I have ever seen for cleanliness and management in my experience of campaigns, the introduction of nurses into field hospitals is a great boon and one I always advocated as the attention, nursing and care bestowed on the wounded by the female sex cannot be nearly as well carried out by men. I gave a small donation both to the Winnipeg and Moose Jaw hospitals to get any trifles that might be of any service to the wounded. We journeyed next back to Qu'Appelle where I met Dr. Edwards, an old St. Thomas Hospital man and colleague of mine, and I stayed with him in his hospital for a couple of days during which time I visited the Bell Farm of 54,000 acres, which was very interesting on account not only of its extent but the way in

which it is worked. Dr. Roddick and myself then began our ride across the prairie which we accomplished in 48 hours from Fort Qu'Appelle here. The scenery in parts was very lovely and the extent of uninhabited country astonished me and shows what a field there is for immigrants into this land, the distance I believe is about 275 miles. Here I again found a field hospital that would do credit to any nation as a model when it is taken into consideration the distance to be travelled by road from the railway. The patients appear to have everything conceivable that they may want and are cared for better than they would be in their own homes. A good many of the wounded are of a serious nature, and there are other very interesting cases amongst them and some that ought to be in my opinion recorded. All the cases seem to be on a good road to recovery, which speaks highly for the medical staff and nurses up here. The hospital is situated in a very healthy situation.

"The mosquitoes have had a 'great time' of it with me, but they have not been so troublesome for the last two days.

"I cannot conclude without saying that the greatest credit ought to be due to Dr. Roddick for the way he has managed the whole affair under such trying circumstances, and his kindness and attention to me has been much greater than I could expect, he has made my trip most pleasant and he has mapped out a route so that I may see everything. I am doing all in my power to carry out Her Royal Highness's wishes and expending the fund in the way I think she would most approve of. For instance, to-day, I find that many of these poor fellows in the hospital here have lost all their clothes, and I have telegraphed to Col. Whitehead to send twenty suits together with warm shirts and drawers to Moose Jaw, and there to be distributed to the men who may want them.

"I must now thank you for all your kindness in having me so well looked after, and I shall make it my duty to inform the Princess on the first possible occasion how kindly I have been treated on her behalf.

"With kindest regards,

"I remain yours faithfully,

"(Signed) ROBERT J. BOYD.

"Dr. BERGIN."

He has already recommended several times the introduction of female nurses in the hospitals. He says that the care given to the wounded soldiers, as we all know, can never be as well given by men as by the female nurses who are sent out. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other branch of the service, and one of such enormous importance that I cannot express to you the great anxiety which the Department felt, in so far as that branch of our work was concerned. I speak now of the commissariat. Of course, to those who have read the history of campaigns in Europe, the very great difficulties which the most perfect military nations have had to contend against when it became necessary to organise a commissariat are well known. Here in Canada we had no commissariat organised; every moment was of importance; every delay if not fatal might have resulted in increasing considerably the dangers and the length of time during which those troubles would last. But, Sir, we had to provide for a force of close on 5,000 men; we had to provide them with horses, with heavy ordnance, to send into that country. We believed, Sir, that this was a feat which could not be accomplished unless we took advantage of the only complete organisation which existed in that country, an organisation which had been in existence almost for a century, and we found that through that organisation of the Hudson Bay Company, it became almost an easy work to get our supplies into that country. But, Sir, it was really as I said for a time, a source of considerable anxiety to the Department whether we could provide a commissariat such as we required for our force. And let me here again give my testimony to the energy and the activity and the zeal displayed by Mr. Wrigley the commissioner of the Hudson Bay Company at Winnipeg. From what I have been able to ascertain every hour of his time and his office were given over to the Department of Militia. His office, his organisation, his stores—everything which could be of any possible use to the Department were placed at our disposal and willingly. He was always ready to undertake anything that we asked him to do, to forward the troops, and to help in reducing as much as possible the troubles which had to be encountered by the men going forward. When I tell you that we had 1,400,000 rounds of ammunition, 6,000 Snider rifles, 1,500 sets of new accoutrements, 2,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, and a reserve

Mr. CARON

supply of clothing, boots, socks, undershirts, drawers, flannels, grey flannels, blankets, towels sufficient for 4,000 men, besides the supplies furnished to some corps at headquarters before leaving, you will form some idea of the importance of this branch of the service. Every man was given two blankets before he left, and one of those India rubber sheets which are used in camping. Now, Sir, we never could have succeeded in accomplishing what we have accomplished, had it not been for the energy displayed by Mr. Wrigley, and the help we received from the Hudson Bay Company; and I trust, although I do not wish to refer to the matter at present—I trust when the House is made acquainted with the conditions upon which they rendered us these invaluable services, it will be found that those conditions were very fair and reasonable when we consider that had it not been for the organisation possessed by this company, which they placed at our disposal, it would have become necessary for the Government at an enormous cost to them to get up an organisation similar in almost every respect to the one which had been the result of many years of organisation. Well, Sir, I feel now that having given those few details as to the principal events of these troubles, it is now my duty, as indicated by the resolution which I know will be received unanimously by the House, to call your attention to those which have helped us in carrying out the campaign. I consider, Sir, it is my duty here to thank the Deputy of my Department Col. Planet. I think it my duty also to call your attention to, and to return my thanks to the Adjutant General Col. Powell. During the first days of the outbreak, when telegrams were pouring in—and one day we received 162—when it became necessary to give orders almost as soon as the telegrams reached us, so as to prevent any possible delay, when work had to be carried out without a moment's delay, I can say that the Deputy Minister of Militia and Adjutant General both proved that they were the right men in the right place. They did their duty by their country and by their Department. Mr. Speaker, I must also call your attention to the Director of Stores, Lieutenant Colonel Macpherson. He had to supervise the despatch of all the stores which were necessary for our troops. It was he, Sir, that had to provide in the city here, the rations which were necessary for every battalion passing through Ottawa to follow up on the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior, and I can tell you that his work was incessant, that he did it willingly, and that he strove constantly to make the task of the men under him as light as possible. We have another officer in the North-West who has rendered valuable services; I refer to the Purveyor General, the Hon. Dr. Sullivan, who was the means of communication with Dr. Bergin, whose services I have already referred to, and I can say that Dr. Sullivan in the important position he occupied, in looking after the comfort and the safety of the troops, has rendered services which entitle him to the appreciation and thanks of the Department of Militia. In speaking of the men who have rendered services to the Department, I could not possibly ignore my two secretaries. I can say that Mr. Benoit and Mr. Aldrich, during two months, had only a very few hours sleep every night. They were kept busy deciphering telegrams, which arrived every half hour; they were kept writing despatches, long and important, and many of them in cipher, which had to be absolutely accurate, and which if not absolutely accurate might have led to mistakes the results of which would have been disastrous; and during the whole of that time these two gentlemen, Sunday and Monday, night and day, were working away performing their part of the business in such a satisfactory manner that I for one cannot forget the services which they have rendered. I must also say that in Mr. Dwight, the superintendent or manager of the telegraph company, I found a man always ready to facilitate in every possible way the despatch of the telegrams which were going over his line. He was always

ready to give precedence to any of my telegrams, and he acceded to almost anything I asked him to do in the way of sending repairers and others over the line to maintain uninterrupted the communication between the various columns of the force and headquarters. Sir, I could not, and I know that the volunteer force of Canada would certainly blame me very much, were I in returning thanks as I have done, to forget the ladies of Canada. The volunteer force of Canada would not forgive me were I not to bring under your notice the kindness of the ladies of Canada in sending them clothing and other supplies. I do not wish to name any particular city for fear that I should forget one; but I may say that the devotion of the ladies of Canada was almost universal during that crisis; and Sir, in the despatches we have received from our own officers, it was stated to me officially that the supplies which had been furnished by the ladies of Canada, had contributed more than anything else to the comfort of our wounded in the hospitals. And, Sir, in mentioning the ladies of Canada, I cannot help mentioning a lady to whom I have already referred, a lady whom Canada will never forget, and who never forgets Canada. Whenever anything occurs in Canada, we know that we have in London a friend of Canada in the person of Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise. At the very beginning of the outbreak, Mr. Speaker, as you know from the despatches published, she took the deepest interest in what was going on in our North-West. She cabled out to know the condition of the wounded; she cabled out to provide them with pipes and tobacco during their hours of suffering, while they were lying in the hospitals; she telegraphed, also, to send out medical supplies, because England could not believe—and I am not surprised at it—that we could in such a short period of time have organised a system which Dr. Boyd himself says can compare favorably with the most perfect system in Europe; and it is a proud boast for Canada that, in the troubles we had to meet, we found all the means which were necessary to make our wounded comfortable, to secure for them all the appliances which science could provide, and to give them the benefit of the most skilled surgeons that Canada could provide; and I say that Canada can provide as good as any other country in the world. It is a proud boast for us that our system of ambulances and hospitals was considered by so high an authority as Dr. Boyd to be so perfect. Now, Sir, before I sit down I wish to return my thanks not only to the ladies of Canada, but to the nurses—the Grey Nuns and the other ladies—who went to the front to nurse our wounded in the field hospitals and elsewhere. The history of Canada is filled with examples of the devotion of Canadian women in great times of trouble and disturbance like the present, and it would be wrong for us to forget them on this occasion. To them again I return my sincere thanks, and I know that I am merely echoing the feelings of the poor wounded whom they tenderly nursed and watched during their hours of pain and suffering. Now, Mr. Speaker, my programme is about covered. I have only one word to add, and that is to carry out the intention of these resolutions by speaking of the Major General to whose military knowledge and skill we are indebted for the success which we have achieved. We know that he had good material in his soldiers; but, Sir, the soldiers of Canada were untaught and untrained; they had not, fortunately for Canada, had cause to acquire that experience of warfare that European soldiers possess; still, they had all the bravery of old troops; they had all the devotion to their colors and to their general that any other army in the world could boast of; they were as brave as any others; but they required a good general, and in the person of General Middleton they had the right man in the right place. He has proved himself to be, Sir, an able general; no one can dispute that; but he has proved himself, what I appreciate more, to be a kind

general; he has been anxious by every possible means within his power, to take care of his troops and to save as many lives as possible under the circumstances. Sir, I am told that his humanity, his attention to the wants of the troops under him, has made him dear to every Canadian volunteer. Every Canadian volunteer, from letters which I have received, written by some who fought under him, says that Major General Middleton could get the volunteer force of Canada to follow him almost anywhere; and let me say that, during that battle of Batoche to which I have referred, he has shown that to save the lives of his soldiers he did not hesitate to risk his own. Under the circumstances, I believe that I can safely appeal to the House and the country to pass the resolutions which have been placed in my hands. I beg to move:

1. *Resolved*,—That the thanks of this House be given to Major General Frederick D. Middleton, C. B., for the distinguished skill and ability, with which he conducted the military operations in the North-West Territories, which resulted in the suppression of the rebellion against the authority of Her Majesty.

2. *Resolved*,—That this House doth acknowledge and highly approve the gallantry, discipline, and good conduct displayed by the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the militia force of Canada, and of the North-West Mounted Police, in the suppression of the said rebellion.

3. *Resolved*,—That this House doth acknowledge with admiration the distinguished valor and conduct of those who perished during the operations in the North-West, in the service of their country, and desires to express its deep sympathy with their relations and friends.

4. *Resolved*,—That Mr. Speaker do communicate said resolutions to Major General Frederick Middleton, and that he be requested by Mr. Speaker to signify the same to the several officers and men surviving.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The duty which devolves upon me to-day is one of a very much more pleasant kind than that which is wont to fall to hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches. I very much regret that the physical prostration of my hon. friend, the member for West Durham, (Mr. Blake), has compelled him to be absent from the House and the city on the present occasion. Everybody who knows how severe the labors of this Session have been, will feel that, with him and with, indeed, the leader of the Government, it is no wonder, however much it may be a source of regret, that their physical strength should have proved unequal to the strain put upon them. It may be too soon for us to dwell on the history of the past few months; and it is possible that, when we come to review those events, there may be matters on which we may be compelled to differ, as to the causes of the outbreak or even as to some of the measures taken to suppress it; but there is one point on which every man in this House, and I believe every man in Canada, will feel, as we do, that the thanks of the whole Dominion are due to the gallant officers and men whose bravery and good conduct have contributed to restore peace and order throughout this Dominion. The hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke, and spoke truly, not merely in high praise of the bravery which our fellow countrymen have displayed, and which we all knew that they would display, but he spoke of other qualities, equally valuable and equally important, and he spoke, I believe with perfect truth, in terms of the highest praise of the endurance, of the discipline, of the good conduct, and of the humanity, in the largest sense, which these men have displayed from the commencement of the operations until now. Sir, it must be remembered that these persons who, without any previous experience, without any previous training, came forward at the call of duty to uphold the laws of their country, have made almost to a man sacrifices more or less serious. We expect from trained soldiers that they shall hold their lives in their hands, and be ready at an hour's notice to go where ever their commanding officer directs; but it is asking a great deal; it is asking more than could have been expected from our citizen soldiers, to ask these men, literally at an hour's notice, to throw up valuable employments, many of them to leave their families to the charity of their neighbors,

many of them to quit businesses which would probably sustain loss that could hardly be repaired for some considerable time, to risk permanent and valuable employments—all at a moment's notice; and I believe I am correct in stating that almost universally, when the order came from headquarters to the various corps to hold themselves in readiness, these men, neglecting their business, forsaking even the care of their families, were found, one and all, ready to respond to the call that was made upon them. This is highly creditable to them, and it is highly creditable to the Dominion, and it gives good hope that the national spirit upon which we must rely for the future prosperity of this country, has already attained greater growth than some of us would have anticipated in the short time during which our Confederation has been a nation. I trust, now that these volunteers are returning, that all of them who have sacrificed for the time their employments, will find that the various companies or persons from whose employment they went have appreciated the sacrifices they have made and the risks they have run, and taken care that none of these men shall suffer for the gallantry they have displayed in responding, as they have responded, to the call of duty. It is only right that that should be done, and I hope public opinion which can, if it pleases, will enforce that duty on all who have anything to do with our volunteers, because I say this: I say that a great danger has been averted from this country; I say that the promptitude which has been displayed in putting down this revolt, has averted what would have been a very serious cause of peril. Had there been delay in responding to the invitation of the Government, had there been delay in prosecuting that campaign, all who know anything of the conditions of life in that country, know that we might, as our neighbors on the other side of the border have been again and again, have found ourselves confronted with an Indian war which might have lasted for years, which might have cost thousands of lives and tens of millions of treasure, and it is to the volunteers of Canada, to their prompt response to the call of duty on this occasion, that Canada owes it that our losses are measured by units when they might be measured by tens or by hundreds. Moreover, Sir, I agree, and I am glad to be able to agree on this occasion, with the Minister of Militia, that the position of Canada has been decidedly raised in the eyes of the world by the conduct of our gallant friends. Sir, people respect those whom they find to be able to fight for their own land, and to defend their own country. Our conduct has been watched and scrutinised on both sides of the Atlantic, and there is no doubt whatever in my own mind—I say it frankly—that we stand before the nations of the world in a better position to-day than we did three or four months ago, on that single score. Not only have our citizen soldiers shown their value, their prowess and their endurance, but the people of Canada, I think, have learned the consciousness of their own power; the self-respect of the nation has been raised, and it was no slight thing, after all, for a country like this, which had no previous training and no organisation, as I may say, other than that which could be acquired in the very few days usually at the disposal of our volunteers, to place a fairly well equipped force of 5,000 or 6,000 men in the field at a distance of 2,000 miles from the base of our operations within the space of three weeks, or to crush out a revolt of formidable proportions in very little more than six weeks; because, if you remember that the first notice of this disturbance was received on the 22nd March, and that the revolt was, to all intents and purposes, practically crushed at Batoche on the 12th May, you will see that within six weeks we have sent our troops 2,000 miles from their base, have marched them over 300 or 400 miles of rather difficult country, have fought several engagements, and have completely pacified the whole of that extensive country in that short period. Sir, in all this,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

I see but one thing to regret, and that is that these gallant men were compelled to contend with our own countrymen. That is the only thing to be regretted, and I am sorry that their prowess could not be shown, if it must be shown, on a foreign foe, instead of being shown on the brave though misguided men whom they were obliged, in the common interest, to reduce to peace. And let me say that, among all the things to be regretted in these occurrences, there is at least one thing on which I can congratulate the people of Canada, that it would appear that the patience and the justice which, on the whole, Canada has shown for a great number of years in dealing with her Indian subjects or allies, has not been entirely thrown away. There has unfortunately been bloodshed, there have been murders committed, but those atrocities which, in other countries, have marked Indian outbreaks have been creditably absent. There has been murder and bloodshed, but I believe that there is no reasonably well authenticated instance of the Indians having tortured or outraged their prisoners; and, in that respect, I say there is good hope for the future of the North-West, there is good hope that the course we have pursued has borne some reasonable fruit. Sir, it is true that the cost both in blood and in treasure has been serious. I am not disposed to underestimate it, although, as I said, I believe that prompt action has prevented it from swelling to very greatly increased proportions; but I believe also that that cost and that loss are likely, to a great extent, to be compensated to the people of this country. I say that there has been gain in national spirit, and I say more too. I say that, in all countries which have made any mark in history, it has been found that considerable sacrifices are a necessary ingredient in true patriotism. The more men sacrifice for a good and honest cause, the more, as a general rule, are they likely to sacrifice in the future, and therefore it is that, although I regret the loss of life, although I regret the loss of money, still I feel that that is not a regret entirely without compensation; and when I compare the losses we have sustained in other respects with the losses which have been borne time and again by other nations no larger and no older than our own, I am compelled to admit that these sacrifices, taken collectively, have been comparatively light. Sir, I am very far, indeed, from underestimating the sacrifices which have been made by the men who went to the front. They endured much; and it may interest hon. gentlemen to know that, of the troops actually engaged, as large a proportion appear to have been killed and wounded, in proportion to their numbers, as are usually found to have been injured in conflicts between much larger bodies. Moreover, when it is remembered that these men were almost entirely without organisation, that not one of them, or scarcely one of them, had ever seen a shot fired in anger in his life, we can hardly speak in too high terms of the general discipline and the bravery which they have displayed. It was not a case in which a general well known to his troops was conducting tried soldiers to battle. It was a case where a general who had had no time to make the acquaintance of his forces, and whose men were necessarily without any knowledge of him, was compelled to contend, under circumstances of no ordinary character, with a foe of no contemptible sort, because his opponents, besides being brave men, were very well versed in all the wiles of the Indians, and of the Indian mode of fighting; they were men who were accustomed to defend themselves, against savage foes within a comparatively short number of years. When we recollect, as we very well may, how trained regular troops have failed under similar circumstances in other parts of the Empire and in conflict with similar enemies in other parts of the

Empire, we may well be proud of the record, on the whole, of our Canadian volunteers. I do not, on the present occasion, after the very full manner in which these affairs have been dealt with by my hon. friend opposite, and at this stage of the Session, propose to detain the House much further. I may say that I believe that these young lives, so freely spent for Canada, will not be spent in vain, and although it may well be that we can do very little to compensate those who have lost husband or son or father, we will still remember, as was said by an English poet in days of old,

" Though their country weeps the slain,  
Yet the burthen of our pain  
Is nothing to the blaze of their renown."

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I fully approve of the noble sentiments which have just been expressed. General Middleton has well deserved the gratitude of the country. As an old and devoted commander, he has reconciled the rough duties of war with sentiments of benevolence towards mankind. Sparing of the blood of his soldiers, he also managed to spare the blood of the half-breeds, for he knew that that blood, which, but yesterday, was the blood of the rebellion, might, to-morrow, become the blood of national defence. Our soldiers, Mr. Speaker, have also well deserved the gratitude of the country. As the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) truly said, most of them were impromptu soldiers, citizen soldiers, as the First Minister most properly termed them. These men, who had never seen battle, except from behind their desks, behind their counters, or behind their ploughs; these soldiers have faced everything—cold, hunger; they have endured innumerable fatigues—sleeping out in the open air when required; they have marched hundreds of miles, and I am sure their manly endurance must have surprised everybody; they have achieved marches which have never been excelled, if they have ever been equalled. And for several hours they have stood the fire of the enemy in positions in which they were much exposed, and which put them at a disadvantage. And that enemy, Mr. Speaker, was commanded by a brave man, whatever may be his faults—I refer to Gabriel Dumont. That enemy who had no Gatling, no guns, and a great number of whom were only armed with old flint muskets; that enemy, whose ammunition gave out, have proved, by their astonishing organisation, under the circumstances, that they were no mean enemy; that they were not to be despised, and that they did not deserve the obnoxious epithet which was thrown into their face, some years ago, by a General, who was then more successful than he is to-day; and I regret to say that this epithet was repeated by a man who was, for several years, one of the leaders of the Liberal party, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, at the head of these soldiers, of whom we are so justly proud, we, members of the House of Commons, have the honor to claim some of our own colleagues. Some of them have already come back to resume their seats in the House. I refer to the hon. members for Middlesex (Mr. MacMillan), and for Wellington (Mr. Orton). Others are still at the post of duty, which, fortunately, is no more the post of danger. But there is one who is not here to answer to his name, and that one was at least one of the bravest and the most respected among the braves, who took part in that campaign of the North-West, one whom history will call the Hero of Batoche—I refer to the late lamented Col. Williams. Death, which he had vainly dared, which he had vainly defied on the battlefield, has suddenly overtaken him, away out in the far distant Saskatchewan, on board the steamer which was conveying him back with his troops. The unanimous declamations of his fellow-citizens awaited him in his country; but, alas, to-day, all we can do is to shed

tears on his grave and to give funeral honors to his memory. Well we may say with the poet, that we are only shadows who are following shadows. For some time we have feared, Mr. Speaker, that the honor of our arms would be tarnished by atrocities committed by our soldiers in the intoxication of victory; but I heard yesterday, with great pleasure—and I am sure this sentiment will be adhered to by the whole House—the telegram from General Middleton, which is calculated to dispel these fears, and I hope that nothing will hereafter contradict this good piece of news. Indeed, we would all be happy to repeat what Sir Robert Napier said of his soldiers after the glorious campaign of Abyssinia:

" A single complaint has been made against a soldier of having injured or wilfully molested either person or property."

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Huron has just said very truly, that for us French Canadians the circumstances were exceedingly painful. We had to fight against brothers, men who have French blood in their veins, if that blood is not as pure as our own; men who are bearing the names of some of the best families of France; men who were among the first to extend the limits of civilisation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the voice of blood, strong and mighty as it is, has not prevented us from doing our duty. The voice of blood, I say, has not prevented us from going to fight for our flag—for the maintenance of our political and national existence. Hence, the indignation with which we have seen certain newspapers questioning our loyalty, our devotion to our country. With what indignation have we not seen them attempting to tarnish the reputation of a whole French Canadian regiment—the 65th, from Montreal—which I am glad to proclaim it in this House, has been one of the last, if not the last, in the field, driving back the enemy in inaccessible retreats, from which they came out only to surrender their arms. With what indignation have we not seen these newspapers proclaiming that the time had come when the French Canadians must go; that they must be swept away from the country. With what increasing indignation have we not seen these same papers, have we not heard certain hustings resounding with the charge that our bishops and priests were at the bottom of the North-West rebellion, when everybody knows, or ought to know, that without the intervention of Monseigneur Grandin, the venerated pastor of the Saskatchewan; without the intervention of Father Lacombe, the apostle of the Blackfeet, a man who, all alone, is worth a whole regiment, as the celebrated Abbé Piquet, formerly said; without the intervention of Father Cochin, the apostle of the Crees, who brought about the speedy submission of Poundmaker; without the intervention of Father André, and all these apostles of Christian civilisation in the North-West, the prairies throughout the whole of that great country would only be to-day a vast ocean of flames, and I fear also, a vast ocean of blood. Mr. Speaker, the terrible death, the frightful death of these glorious and sublime martyrs, Fathers Fafard and Marchand, who gave up their lives to protect unfortunate captives against the barbarous atrocities of the savages, has not even been found sufficient to disarm slander. And it was the next day, after that double martyrdom, that Bishop Grandin said, in a letter, that his eyes were tired with weeping, and that while on one side it was stated that the bishops and clergy were sold to the Government, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, they were accused of taking part in the rebellion; and the language used by Monseigneur Grandin has been used by every bishop in Canada. The House will allow me to repeat the manly and noble words which His Lordship the Archbishop of St. Boniface, addressed to the 9th Battalion from Quebec, another battalion composed of French Canadians, and commanded by the gallant Col. Amyot, in St. Mary's Church, at Winnipeg, when the battalion passed through that city.

Here is what was said by that great prelate, that great patriot, who is also a master in eloquence. I have named the Bishop of St. Boniface :

"I hope and pray that you may not have to wage a bloody contest, but if that duty, the most painful of all, is devolved upon you, I know that you will not fail to discharge it well. The flag which you are defending is carried by braves, you will be as brave as they are, and I have a guarantee of that by the very blood which runs in your veins ; you belong to the noble race of the Franks.

"Our forefathers," he adds, "were heroes. Well, soldiers, you must prove that you are the grandsons of heroes, and this country expects no less, and cannot expect any less from you.

"In this campaign, gentlemen, you will find regions where French Canadian heroism has preceded you ; this heroism, inaugurated on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and of its rich tributaries, has also asserted itself on the banks of the Saskatchewan, of the Athabaska, and of the Mackenzie. You will only add to this glorious chain of devotedness and abnegation with which our ancestors and their descendants have encircled this vast continent."

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I pointed out abuse and insults which have been addressed to the 65th Battalion of Montreal. Well, I am happy to state to-day that the truth has dawned upon us. The English press, a small portion of which had insulted these men, takes pleasure to-day in offering homage to them. I am glad to be able to state that the General commanding the troops in that part of the North-West where that battalion was on duty, has been obliged to commend the bravery, the heroism, and the efficiency which these men displayed, and I may be allowed to quote General Strange's own words with regard to them :

"How splendidly they have behaved all through the march. They never flinched at anything, or complained, and they fully bore out the opinion always had of such soldiers. Their songs and cheerful good humor surmounted all the discomforts of the long tedious six hundred miles march, and I never saw better or steadier troops."

The *Montreal Star* published a few days ago, a correspondence from Fort Pitt, which bears a no less conclusive testimony to the bravery of the 65th. Allow me to record it :

"The 65th Battalion came in on the steamer *North-West* from the Midland Landing near Frog Lake. The officers and men of this gallant regiment looked exceedingly well after their arduous and tiresome tramp over an unbroken muskeg country, teeming with marshes and swamps. As the steamer bore in sight at Fort Pitt, their English compatriots lined the banks, and gave their comrades cheer after cheer. The officers are all loud in their praise of the gallant conduct of the 65th, both while on the march and while under the enemy's fire."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed to add as a last testimony, an extract from the correspondence of the *Ottawa Free Press*, which correspondence is dated Fort Pitt, 1st July, and relates to a grand review held by General Middleton himself, and which reads as follows :—

"The many reports circulated as to the looseness of discipline, &c., of the 65th Mount Royal Rifles, is indignantly denied by the officers and men of other corps stationed here. It is a shame that these reports of misconduct should have appeared at all, as the 65th have proved themselves to be as good as any other corps in the field. The pluck and endurance on the march and field of battle is admired by their English-speaking compatriots."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the Government have not deemed it sufficient to compliment our volunteers, but that at the same time they have thought fit to give them a more tangible proof of public gratitude, by granting to each of them a piece of land in that vast territory, which a great many of them have sprinkled with their blood ; but I do not hesitate to say that all our volunteers would have been disappointed had not the Government carried out the noble idea which inspired the hon. the First Minister last night, when he declared that it was the intention of the Government to give General Middleton a more tangible testimonial, by voting him a sum of \$20,000. To honor General Middleton is to honor a General whose modesty equals his valor. To honor General Middleton is to honor the 5,000 militiamen, or rather the 5,000 braves who fought for their country. England has always liberally rewarded her generals, whether they were called Wellington, Napier or Wolseley ; she has never been

Mr. TASSÉ.

sparing of her gold and of her titles to those who distinguished themselves at her service on the battlefield ; what will not she do for those who have carried her flag to the remotest parts of the North-West ? These titles General Middleton will carry nobly, as he carries his sword, as a true soldier, as a true officer. Glory then to General Middleton, glory also to his officers and soldiers. But I take this opportunity to ask the Government, to ask the authorities in this country to have mercy on the vanquished. For, if justice has rights to vindicate, if examples must be made, if rigor must be exercised, have pity on the least guilty ; mercy on those who have been led through false representations to revolt against their country ; mercy on those who have not learned that liberty has cost too dear to us French Canadians, to leave any doubts in our minds on the fact that we should desire it for all, and that the Government of Canada will never permit that one inch of land should be suddenly taken away from its owner, whether he is white, redskin, or *bois bruté*. I shall also add : mercy on the families of the half-breeds who are to-day in tears, in distress, and a great number of whom have lost their chief support. That mercy, I am happy to find, the Government have been the first to exercise it, by aiding the families in Batoche and the surrounding parishes. I am sure that the unanimous voice of the country will acknowledge the great act of charity which has animated the Government under that circumstance. Let us tear asunder the death pall which hangs over the plains of the Saskatchewan, and let us rather cause a gleam of hope to dawn over that country. I do not hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, that fair, that noble dealings only, can reconcile these people to us, by showing them how unfairly they had judged us. If faults have been committed, and those faults were inevitable in the administration of so large a territory, I do not hesitate to state here that it is our duty to acknowledge them, and to atone for them. We have already had enough, and even too much, with one civil war. Let us render its recurrence impossible in the future. While causing authority to be respected, while applying the strong hand of justice, let us show at the same time that we are just, merciful, and I will even say, magnanimous, as far as possible. Everybody will admit that peace is indispensable to the development of that vast North-West region, which is the hope of the country ; peace is indispensable to the good working of our free institutions ; peace is indispensable to the prosperity of the Dominion at large, and that peace is only possible if it is based on justice, on generosity, for the present time and for the future.

Mr. WRIGHT. After the eloquent speeches that we have just heard, it appears a work of supererogation to say anything, but I cannot refrain from expressing my opinion on this occasion. In all this unhappy business there is one thing of which we have special reason to be proud, and that is the conduct of the militia force in this emergency. At a moment's notice, without any premonition of so perilous a service, the conduct of the active militia force has been eminently gallant and patriotic ; and I venture to say that if the Minister of Militia was at liberty to make a statement he could assure the House that the services of the entire active militia force of the Dominion of Canada had been placed at his disposal. When the startling news came that rebellion was rife in the land, that the laws had been violated, and the institutions of the country threatened, the conduct of the Minister of Militia was marked by singular ability, and his appeal to the active militia force, from Vancouver to Halifax, was received with the stern response of "Ready, aye ready." To me there was much in this generous answer which had a deeper meaning and a broader significance than appeared on the surface. It proved to me that at last we had a country, and that the

men and the sons of the men who had made for themselves fair homes in the wilderness, could always hold the land as bravely as they had won it. It was very pleasant to turn from the pettinesses and puerilities of Canadian political life, from the fierce struggles between the men who have and the men who want, to the splendid spectacle of the genuine patriotism and enthusiasm of our brave young Canadian soldiers, to see the sons of those who are fighting their political battles so fiercely on the floors of this House, engaging in a more patriotic and a more generous warfare, only emulous as to who would best maintain the honor of the country and carry the glorious old banner the furthest into the ranks of the foe. It makes us feel proud of our country, when we remember that in the hour of danger, and difficulty, and trial, all distinctions of class, of caste, of creed, of nationality, were forgotten, and that our militia force only remembered that they had a common country to defend and common institutions to protect, and that above and beyond all they were Canadians. It is very pleasant to notice that the gallant boys of Toronto, of Quebec, of Montreal, of Winnipeg, of Ottawa, of Halifax, of Kingston, and of the Dominion generally, offered their services so freely to their country, and went as cheerfully to face danger and death as ever a bridegroom went to meet his bride. That country has a future before it whose young men are animated by such generous and patriotic sentiments. And the members of our own House were not behind hand in this patriotic service. We gave many of our bravest and best to the service of our country. The names of the lamented Williams, whose death has cast a gloom over the whole country, of Orton, of O'Brien, of Tyrwhitt, of Amyot, of Ouimet, of Bergin, of Macmillan, and of Scott, will always be held in reverence and honor. Those gallant gentlemen and trusty comrades of ours, illustrated the great body to which they belonged. In the hour of trial and danger and difficulty they were weighed in the balance and were not found wanting. Sir, in speaking of Col. Williams I am reminded of a discussion which took place in this House last Session with regard to militia matters. That discussion never interfered with our pleasant personal relations, and there were no members of this House who wished the gallant Col. Williams "God speed" more heartily, and who rejoiced more sincerely at his gallant conduct and success, or who mourned his death more sincerely, than did the members who took part in that discussion. In that discussion I said that the hon. member was the Bayard of the Canadian militia force, and I made that statement honestly and sincerely. His conduct in the North-West proves that that statement was correct. The leader of the storm at Batoche, the man who, after victory, was so kind to the wounded and to the women and children, proved that he was well named after the great French soldier; and to-day, regretted by the entire House and country, we feel that this trusty comrade, this true gentleman and gallant soldier will go to his rest in the robes of glory, under the sod and the dew waiting the judgment day. I must not forget, also, that some of the officers of our House behaved in the most creditable manner, notably, our Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, Major Smith, and Captain Todd, of the Library; many gentlemen of the Civil Service also behaved in a very creditable manner; and it must be remembered that our people are not fond of playing at soldiering. The struggle for existence is too fierce to allow us to engage in the pomp and pride and circumstances of glorious war. It was thought by many that the militia service, as at present constituted, was more ornamental than useful, that in the time of danger the defence of the country must devolve upon the men of the forest and the farm, on the toilers of the sea and the toilers on the land. But we must admit that we were all wrong, and that the Minister of Militia, his General, his staff, his Department, his soldiers, have behaved in a most creditable

and honorable manner, and that, to borrow a time-honored formula, they deserve well of their country. In all of this unhappy business there is much of compensation. The marvellous mobilisation of our troops, their transport over our own railway and through our own country, the readiness with which our young soldiers adapted themselves to military service, the military skill, the courage, the coolness and bravery, the humanity and moderation of the General, and, above all, the dauntless bravery of our soldiers—all these are matters on which we may congratulate ourselves. And they had no ignoble foe to contend with. The wild hunters of the plains, in a nobler cause and fighting for instead of against their country, would have ranked as heroes. The splendid courage which would throw down the gauntlet to the British Empire, was only exceeded by that of the Canadian soldiers who took it up. I venture to say that if the victors could be consulted, while they would insist upon the savage leaders being punished, yet they would give the verdict in favor of tempering justice with mercy. So far as the deluded rebels were concerned, I think that this whole matter is most creditable to the militia service. It must be remembered that in this country we have no privileged class to fall upon, no military caste. It is literally the survival of the fittest. In the older civilisations there was a privileged class who took possession of all the emoluments and honors of war; in this country it is only valor and capacity who attain to the foremost place. That matter was decided at the French revolution when it was conceded that every French soldier carried the baton of a marshal of France in his knapsack. In that terrible charge which swept away the Russian cavalry at Eylau, it was Murat, the inn keeper's son, who "rode three lengths ahead of the best blood in France." The first grenadier was not more splendidly reckless. It was stated of the battle of Inkerman that it was a people's battle, and this campaign may be said to be the campaign of the people of Canada, a battle fought in defence of their institutions and their rights. We must all say that everybody concerned in it deserves well of his country. But while we welcome back with acclamations our brave citizen soldiery who have fought so gallantly and well, we cannot but think of those who will not be in the ranks when the troops come marching back again with glad and gallant tread. It is the price which we pay for victory. It is an awful price, but it is a price which freemen will always be willing to pay, and those who have fallen will always be remembered with reverence and honor by the inhabitants of the land they have died to save.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wish to detain the House with only a few remarks. This is the first time I have had an opportunity of saying a word on this subject, and I cannot allow the resolution to pass without giving my humble meed of praise to the volunteers who have defended this country against their savage foes. And, Sir, particularly am I proud of the Province from which I come, a Province which, though it entered this Union with some trepidation, afraid of we knew not what, when it found the Confederation was threatened on its western point, our citizen soldiery rushed with celerity to the front, and in 17 days, on our own soil, and over our own railways, they travelled 4,000 miles. Now, Sir, I do not believe that the history of the world presents another instance of a distance so great being travelled in the same time, and with the same speed and despatch. In 1861, when the great civil war in the United States broke out, to which the hon. member from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) alluded last night, General Butler, of Massachusetts, was ordered to send his troops at once to guard Washington, and the Massachusetts troops, although within 600 miles of that city, took 9 days to reach that point. But our own volunteers travelled over 4,000 miles, upon our own soil, in

17 days, and I do not think the history of the world furnishes an example like that. It is true that the volunteers from my Province had not their baptism of fire; but, Sir, I know many of them personally, and I know that British blood flows in their veins, and had they met the foe side by side with the gallant Midland Battalion, and side by side with the Winnipeg boys, and the boys from Ontario and Quebec, they would have done their duty just as nobly, and if they had fallen it would have been with their face to the foe. While I rejoice that the most of them will come home with their ranks undecimated, yet I myself feel proud to know that if any of them had been left behind they could not have fallen in a nobler cause; for, as Macaulay says:

"How can a man die better than in facing fearful odds,  
For the ashes of his fathers, and the temples of his gods?"

This baptism of fire we have had, this civil war through which we have passed, this rebellion which has been put down, has been referred to by the hon. member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) in an eloquent and patriotic speech, which was cheered by hon. members on both sides of this House and will be cheered again and again outside of this House, a speech which will do a great deal of good. I say those lives which have been lost are hostages to fortune. I say that the lives lost, although we have mourned for them, could not have been lost in a better cause. Their sacrifice will elevate Canada and show the world that we possess a national spirit, that we are self-reliant, and that this Confederation is not, as some writers have said, a rope of sand, but a great Dominion, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, bound together by one unanimous sentiment and that is, that we will maintain Canada for liberty-loving people at all hazards. It is true we have lost our comrade who sat over there. I thought the other morning, as I looked at that chair and remembered his death, that it should be known forever as Williams' seat. No coward would sit there; no man who has not a brave heart would sit there. Let it for all time be known as Williams' seat. As in France, in 1800, the name of La Tour d'Auvergne, the first grenadier of France, was called every morning on the parade ground, and an officer and standard bearer stepped to the front and said: "La Tour d'Auvergne, *mort champs d'honneur*,"—so let that be called Williams' seat and known as such, for he died, to all intents and purposes, on the field of honor. In the words of another poet I may say:

"On fame's eternal camping ground  
Their silent tents are spread,  
And glory guards with solemn round  
The bivouac of the dead."

In our hearts we will keep their memories green and will tell our children's children of the brave heroic deeds of our volunteers who defended our Canada against the savage foe.

Mr. MACMILLAN. Forty-eight hours prior to the engagement at Duck Lake, I believe there was not a resident of this country who had the least idea that a drop of blood would be shed in consequence of the events happening at that time. I say that, for the simple reason that I believe the disaffected people of the North-West thought the Government of Canada would make concessions that would render armed resistance unnecessary. And I think, further, that the mounted police and volunteers upon that occasion believed that all they had to do was to go and demand a surrender, to ask those persons who were acting disloyally upon that occasion to surrender, and they would immediately do so. We all made a mistake in coming to that conclusion, and it was an unfortunate one for us. There fell on that occasion some of the noblest young fellows of this country. I may particularly mention Elliott, Napier and others. I may also say that young men took part in that engagement whose names have

Mr. WOODWORTH.

not been spoken of here. Among them is a young gentleman, the son of a Minister of the Crown, who stood side by side with a poor fellow who was shot. He, among others, fought valiantly, boldly and bravely. I refer to a son of the Minister of the Interior, Sir David Macpherson. That engagement having taken place, the Minister of Militia found it necessary to call for troops and he called for volunteers, and as I believe, received replies from all parts of the country, showing that it was only necessary to state the number of men required to obtain them. He naturally called the regulars out first; immediately afterwards the Queen's Own, Grenadiers, and one regiment and another, until he had obtained a sufficient number of men. Those troops which went from the east travelled over a very difficult road. Although they had a very hard time in passing over it, the C.P.R. proved most useful, and I think the thanks of this country are largely due to the management of that road for the active exertions they made in order to carry through the troops as rapidly as possible. Those troops arrived at Winnipeg through that instrumentality, and their own exertions. Upon their arrival at that point they found that General Middleton had gone ahead; that he had taken with him a regiment from Winnipeg, the 90th, and proceeded to Troy. There the troops had to leave the railway, and from that point to the scene of the first engagement the regiments marched every bit of the way, a distance of about 260 miles. They were the first to take part in the engagement, and they took a most active part in suppressing the rebellion. And here let me say that the regiment to which the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) is attached as surgeon suffered most in the campaign. It went out about 300 strong, and when I saw it last it had lost 21 by death and was about 100 men short, a large number being shot and others wounded and suffering on account of the hardships they had undergone. I will pause here while I speak of the gallant officer who led the troops—General Middleton. During the engagements he thought it necessary to be in front of the fighting, in order that he should show an example to his men, and prove to them that he was determined to carry the attack to a successful result. When I speak of the General I can say that he was brave, and, not only so, but that his bravery almost amounted to recklessness, because he placed himself in positions where he and those associated with him were fired upon, two of his officers, Wise and Doucet, being dangerously wounded, and he himself having had a narrow escape. He showed the volunteers he was equal to the occasion, and was prepared to lead them wherever it might be necessary for them to follow. These troops were supported by others, and shortly afterwards the engagement at Batoche took place. It was evident to me that two great calamities may befall any army: One, that the General has not confidence in the men, and the other, that the men have not confidence in the General; and I look upon one as being equally dangerous with the other. On that occasion General Middleton did not know his men. He wished to be as careful of them as possible; he was generous and kind in that particular, probably to a fault; and I am inclined to think that he himself has come to the conclusion that if he had not been so generous to them on that occasion we might have been successful at least two days before we won. At all events, on that occasion our men were opposed by a strong contending force. They went out to their rifle pits from day to day, and it was more particularly upon coming in at night that disasters befall them, as they thus became more conspicuous marks for the enemy. They were becoming impatient and anxious that a charge should be made, but General Middleton, in his kindness, and in his fear that disasters might result, delayed the charge from day to day. At last it was understood that upon the fourth day a charge should be made, if there was any chance for it. On that particular afternoon Col. Williams saw it was a fitting

time, and sent word to Colonel Straubenzie that now was the time, that he was going to charge, and he wanted support. It was upon the occasion of that charge which was led by Colonel Williams—one of the most splendid of officers, one of the kindest of men, and one of the best friends that any member of this House ever had—it was then that he shouted "Come on, boys," and almost simultaneously with it the command was given to the Grenadiers, the 90th, and then to the scouts. The engagement took place, and in a short time the field was ours, and I am inclined to think that if the charge had taken place some time previously we would not have lost so many men. On that occasion we have to regret the loss of many noble fellows, and none more to be regretted than Capt. French, who was one of the last shot in the engagement, but not the last, because he had hardly been killed when his murderer, Donald Ross, fell in his tracks, killed by a ball from one of our own men. That charge practically ended the battle, and General Middleton, with a considerable number of troops, went on towards Prince Albert. I may say that I went over the whole ground on more than one occasion after they left, and I do not think that this House is properly informed with reference to the looting or destruction which is said to have taken place there. I saw no evidences of anything of the kind. I saw many of the women after the engagement was over; the men had taken to the woods, and remained away for a period of five, or ten, or twelve days, and many of them had not returned; in speaking to these women we heard nothing of the ransacking and destruction which has been referred to. It is true that, so far as Batoche's house is concerned, that was riddled, and no wonder, for it was the council chamber of the rebels, and the house in which our poor friend French was shot. The stores in the place were also considerably riddled, Batoche's store among others, it being kept as a prison by the rebels. The troops went on from that to Prince Albert, Battleford, and Fort Pitt. Of the engagement at Cut Knife Hill I will say very little, as I fancy some further enquiry will be made with reference to the course pursued by the officers and men, and how far they were justified in that engagement. Nor will I comment further on the conduct of Col. Irvine, than to say that there is no doubt that, situated as he was, it would have been a most dangerous thing to have left Prince Albert unprotected, where there were a large number of women and children, and, more especially, Sir, when there were a number of the rebels residing in that locality, although it was difficult to discover who they actually were. I will say this, that whatever the fate of Riel may be, there are some few white men who deserve quite as bad a fate, if not a worse one. I could name them, but it is unnecessary on this occasion; and I am sorry to say that even now, after the troubles are over, they come out boldly and express their regret that Riel was not more successful. I sincerely hope that at the coming trial these men will be brought to justice, because they are well known, and that the punishment will be meted out to them which they deserve. The Indian has a reputation for cunning, but there are some white men who, I think, equally deserve it, and deserve it even a great deal more than the others, because they incited the half-breeds and Indians to rebellion, while they did not themselves come out boldly with arms in their hands, in which case the evidence would be positive against them. One of these men was the chairman of Riel's meetings, whenever he was required, and I regret to say that he is a man who emigrated from Ontario to that place. I proceeded to Fort Pitt, and I may say that when I came in view of the 90th, the Grenadiers, and the Midland Battalion, it was a matter of difficulty for me to decide whether or not the troops had just escaped from some prison, because they were clad in a most peculiar and motly style, the ground work of their clothing being the original black or

red, while their clothes were patched in every conceivable way with pieces of white bags and other material of that kind. I am blaming nobody for this state of things, because, under the circumstances, it was an impossibility that matters should be otherwise. A more dilapidated looking lot of men, so far as clothing is concerned, I never saw; but they wore cheerful countenances, countenances which showed they were prepared to obey any orders which might be given, so long as it came from an authoritative source, and I have no doubt that those men who followed Big Bear underwent as great hardships as any body of men ever did. I know that some of those who went down the river on barges were men who had been on the Nile expedition, and they stated that it was much easier labor going up the Nile than it was going down the Saskatchewan. I have just stated these things for this reason, that having gone over this ground pretty well, I had a chance of becoming acquainted with the history of the troubles and with the localities, and I must join my meed of thanks to those which this House offers to the volunteers. I can do it all the more cheerfully from the simple fact that I am one of the recipients, although I am not one who can boast of having done any great or arduous duty. My position, I may almost say, was that of a featherbed soldier; but the men of my regiment, the 7th Fusiliers, were hewers of wood and drawers of water during the whole campaign. I will venture to say that no body of navvies in Canada ever worked so laboriously as they, and not only they, but other regiments as well. But we were in the same position as all the other volunteers; we did what we were instructed to do, what the General, who knew what was best, asked us to do; and in doing that we did our duty, and did it well. There is one matter to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister. He returns thanks, on behalf of this House, to the Hudson Bay Company and deservedly so, because I suppose no other company in Canada would have performed what was done as well as that company. But allow me to say that that affair is surrounded with some things which should be looked into very closely. Like all armies, the expedition was followed by a lot of speculating suckers, who were determined to make all they could out of the affair; in fact, they have been exceedingly anxious that the rebellion should continue, not only during this summer, but during the whole year, in order that they might realise something out of it. I am sorry to say, and I think the evidence will show, that when some of the officers of the Hudson Bay Company were applied to by teamsters for employment they positively refused to accept them, and they were told that they must make application to other persons; and I regret to say that "the other persons" were persons who formed this ring, who were prominent in swindling the Government of this country. I would not have regretted it one whit if this money had been spent among the settlers of the country, who required it; but I think it very unfortunate that one farthing went into the hands of this ring, which, on enquiry, may be found to be composed of harpies, whose names I have very little care of mentioning at present; and I sincerely hope that before the Government pay these amounts—

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not the question of paying; it is simply a vote of thanks.

Mr. MACMILLAN. It is true, I have probably taken the wrong occasion on which to express my views on that subject; but I was doing it now to save me the trouble of doing it on another occasion. At all events, I am just about done. I am very thankful, amongst the other volunteers, for the vote proposed on this occasion, and also for the gratuity which has been granted to the forces, and I am sure it will be most thankfully received by very many of the men who went out on that occasion. I may say, with reference to

my own regiment, that although it was under 300 strong, I believe about 50 of them volunteered to remain on service, and I have no doubt a great many will take advantage of the gratuity offered by this Government, and go out to that country, to make it their permanent home. I am also thankful to see that this gratuity is not hampered by any conditions which might prevent any of the men accepting it.

Motion agreed to.

#### GRANT TO GENERAL MIDDLETON.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

#### LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General submits to the House of Commons the expediency of recognising the eminent services rendered by Major General Middleton, C.B., in the suppression of the recent rebellion in the North-West Territories, and to present Major General Middleton, in consideration of his eminent services in the suppression of the rebellion in the North-West Territories, with \$20,000.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 15th July, 1885.

Resolution to grant \$20,000 to General Middleton considered in Committee of Supply, reported and concurred in.

#### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House considered and concurred in the remaining resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply.

House of Commons—Sums required to meet increased expenditure under reports of Internal Economy Commissioners..... \$1,020

Mr. TROW. In the matter of permanent officers of the House, something should be added to this. They have been working 18 hours a day, on an average, during the whole Session, and I hope the Government will do something for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot bring it down, except by Message. Of course, that can be done later.

To make good to those persons of Prince Edward Island, who were British subjects, the amount of duties paid by them to the United States Customs on fish and fish oil in the years 1871 and 1872..... \$20,820 49

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to move that that amount be reduced, as I find, on enquiry, that the proper sum is not that inserted in the Estimates, to \$16,542.49.

Amendment agreed to.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL moved:

1. Resolved,—That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1885, the sum of \$3,546,465.99 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.
2. Resolved,—That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1885, the sum of \$26,694,313.40 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Resolutions read a second time and concurred in.

#### SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 163) for granting to Her Majesty certain moneys required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending, respectively, the 30th June, 1885,

Mr. MACMILLAN.

and the 30th June, 1886, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many stages do you want to take now?

Mr. BOWELL. Only three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not to be taken as a precedent.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no.

Bill read the second and third times, and passed.

#### ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 159) for facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the harbor of Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This Bill affects the charter of the harbor commissioners at Quebec, and I move:

That the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

#### THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 160) respecting a grant of land to the Militia on service in Manitoba and the North-West.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 162) to provide a salary for an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. POPE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions to authorise the granting the subsidies therein mentioned to and for the parties, railways and railway companies mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be perfectly idle to oppose the intention of the Government to put these resolutions through; but at the same time, although I am not going to oppose them, I wish to say, as a matter of course, not only must they be passed wholly and entirely on the responsibility of the Government, but I desire to renew a protest I made last night against the introduction of measures of this kind at the present stage of the Session. These various grants which are proposed may be good or may be bad. They may open up very valuable districts; they may give important commercial facilities to important classes of the community; or they may be of precisely an opposite character. They may be roads which are of no real value to any one but a few interested parties; they may be roads which run through districts, which will not repay the expenditure; they may involve this country in heavily-increased expenditure. We cannot tell; we do not know; we possess no information. I do not profess to know anything about the great majority of these proposals which the Government makes. I am sure the House, in the aggregate, does not know, and I have the strongest suspicion that members of the Government do not know, with the exception of one

or two members, who may be specially concerned with those localities, more about it than I do or the House does. Moreover, I have observed that in a great many of these proposals which have been brought down from time to time, no proper precautions seem to have been taken to ascertain whether they would go on or not. The Government do not seem to have assured themselves that these grants, when made, will be taken advantage of by solvent companies, or by individuals of sufficient means to construct these roads. We have had no information; we are not likely to get any information of any consequence, as to the chances of trade being developed by them. There are not more than one-third of the members of the House present, and yet we have propositions brought down, involving grants of aid to nineteen railways, seventeen in the list before us and two provided for by the Supplementary Estimates. These roads are scattered over a very wide extent of country. They do not seem to have been proposed on any particular system or scheme, that I can see. As I have said, it is quite impossible to judge, unless we devote many days to the task, of the merits of each of these particular schemes. I venture to say that if I were permitted to put the First Minister in the box, whatever the Minister of Railways may know, it would appear that the First Minister is not one whit better informed than I am myself, as to the bearings or aspects of most of these propositions. As to what their political value may be, I dare say he could pass a good examination on that point, but as to the nature of the country through which they will pass, the extent of trade they will develop, the hon. gentleman is entirely ignorant, and I think, entirely indifferent. Moreover, there is another fact to be borne in mind. I will not undertake to say, from my own knowledge, but it has been stated again and again, and the surrounding circumstances have lent color to it, that in a good many cases the charters of these roads, to which the Government have given grants, have got into the hands of private individuals or corporations, which have trafficked in them and made a profit out of them, the original parties having no honest intention of building the railways; but these parties got the Government grants and charters as a means of making profit out of them for their personal advantage. I say that for all this the Government must be held responsible. The only mitigating circumstance I can think of is, that in a great many of these cases, in a very considerable number of them, the roads will not be prosecuted at all, and if any profit is made it will be made merely in the way I have said. I repeat again that I think it very unfortunate and mischievous that the discussion of questions involving directly a couple of millions of dollars, and involving indirectly many millions more, should be put off until a few moments before the close of the Session.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not rise to oppose the resolutions, because, from my knowledge of certain of the roads, I believe they are deserving of the aid that the Government is giving them; and having more confidence in the Administration than the hon. gentleman who has just spoken I believe the other roads, of which I have no personal knowledge, are also deserving of the consideration extended to them by these resolutions. I regret to say there are certain other roads that have made application to the Government for aid which have not received that support which I believe they should have received. I speak now with respect to the application made by the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for the extension of their line from Renfrew to Eganville. That application was supported by petitions from the several municipalities in South Renfrew, and also from one municipality in the riding which I represent. The country which that road would open out is one possessing mineral and agricultural resources of a valuable character, and it seems to me, if this road were

pushed through the section in question, a valuable tract of country would be opened up, and especially mineral resources developed. It is therefore a matter of regret to me that while the Government have dealt liberally with the grants to other enterprises, they have not seen fit to grant the application made by the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, supported by the municipalities to which I have referred. I venture to express the hope that the Minister of Railways will, at the next Session of Parliament, propose to grant aid to this enterprise.

Mr. POPE. It is quite true what the hon. gentleman has said, that that road would open up a valuable section of country. It is quite true, also, that the policy of the Government is to aid railways, and local railways, to a certain extent. But it must be remembered that this is not the only road to which we have had to refuse a grant; and I hope that at some future time we may be able to carry out the hon. gentleman's desire. The policy of the Government has been well explained by the First Minister. From the time the First Minister took office until now, the Government have pushed with vigor and energy all the railway enterprises of the country. We have done that as strictly as we could, but in 1882 we felt there was something remaining to be done, and we took into consideration local roads of importance; and, as was stated yesterday, when the Provinces were unable to do that work, although they were interested in local roads, we felt that it was the duty of the House to aid them. We felt that while it was the duty of the Provinces to open up ordinary roads, for the purpose of developing the newer sections of the country, it was better for this Government to take in hand, as far as possible, the general railway interests of this country—those great interests which must contribute largely to the Dominion Government. In 1882 we granted \$1,508,000 for the opening of local roads throughout the country. In 1883 we granted \$2,138,400, which has done a great deal of good. In 1884 there was granted \$2,891,600 for these purposes. The hon. gentleman has included roads in his estimate for which \$1 has not been granted over and above the amount granted to them last year. The total number of roads to which there are new grants this year is fourteen, and the total amount of money is less than it was in 1882, and less than it was in 1883 and 1884. I am sorry that I have been obliged to curtail so much in regard to these grants, because I believe that it would be in the interests of the country to do much more than we are doing. The hon. gentleman says that he fears this money will not do that good we anticipated; that a good deal of it will be wasted. The hon. gentleman need have no fear on that point. This money is, after all, but a small proportion of the cost of these railways; it is really about enough to furnish the rails, and if we were able to give even a little more aid to these roads, we would be doing a good thing for the business of this country. I say we can never come to the position we should occupy until this country is opened up by railways, and that cannot be done simply by private enterprise.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Renfrew). I may say that a deputation came down here the other day, and saw the hon. Minister of Railways, with reference to the continuation of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway to Eganville. He told the deputation then, that probably something would be done, but when I saw him later, he told me that nothing could be done this year, but that he would try to have something done next year. The road is a level road, easy of construction; it will not cost a great deal, and the municipalities are prepared to grant a small bonus towards it, and if we can get a subsidy from the Government, along with what money the company will put in, I think we would be able to give the road a start.

Mr. ORTON. I am not inclined to criticise unfavorably the course which has been taken by the Government in reference to these railways. I believe that some of the roads which have applied for and have not received grants, such as the Ontario Western Pacific road, deserve some assistance from the Government. But it is not so much with reference to that that I rise, but I wish to draw the attention of the House to the importance of giving such aid to railways in Manitoba and the North-West as will secure their construction. Now, although grants of land have been made to the South-Western Railway, the North-Western and other roads, it is a well known fact that there is great difficulty in obtaining money by selling bonds or otherwise for the construction of those roads. I regret that the Government have not also taken power, in the case of the failure of these roads in obtaining money, that they should get aid in some other shape, either by guaranteeing the bonds or otherwise. The importance of those roads to this country cannot be over-estimated. In southern Manitoba, and in that part of the North-West south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there is one of the most magnificent portions of the whole Dominion of Canada for agricultural purposes, and a large number of enterprising and well-to-do settlers. So far, however, those investments have been profitless, and the settlers there are, as it were, driven almost to desperation. This very year, I know, a large area of ground has been sown in that district, in the hope that they would secure railway accommodation to carry out the grain of this season. Sir, if the grant of land is not sufficient to fill that object, the Government of Canada will be censured, and perhaps with some reason, for not having insured railway accommodation to the people of that country during the present season.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have heard from the Minister of Railways that it has been the settled policy of the Government, since 1882, to aid in the development of the country, as far as possible, by aiding local roads in the public interest, and the hon. gentleman says he is sorry that he cannot do more this year. Why has the Minister found it necessary to curtail in this direction? The Government have given no indication that they are impoverished or unable to aid in public enterprises of this kind. I would also ask what amount of good has been accomplished by the grants which have been given since 1882? How many miles of railway have been built, as the result of these grants, and in what Provinces and counties have these roads been constructed?

Mr. POPE. We felt it necessary to curtail, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, there has been an extraordinary expenditure this year. He also knows that the condition of all those grants was that the roads should be begun within two years. Hardly more than two years have elapsed since the grants were made, and a good many of those roads have got fairly under way; but I am sorry to say I cannot give the exact number of miles.

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

(In the Committee.)

To the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company, for a line of railway from Ottawa to Waddington, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$166,400

Mr. POPE. This road is a very important road, running from Ottawa to the St. Lawrence River, with an extension for several miles up the Gatineau River, and when built it will be the shortest road to New York. It runs through a splendid country, which is well settled, and it will accommodate a great many people.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Renfrew).

To the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company, for a line of railway from Sackville to the Straits of Northumberland, at or near Cape Tormentine, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$118,400

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this a new project altogether?

Mr. POPE. This road has been subsidised by the Government of Nova Scotia, and is an absolute necessity to provide the people of Prince Edward Island with connection with the Intercolonial Railway. It is a new project, so far as we are concerned.

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for a line of railway from Brockville to Westport, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole....\$128,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was any of this road built?

Mr. POPE. No; it is a new project. The line runs into a mining country, where there are many settlers, and also through a fine lumber region. At the terminus there is a village of about 1,200 inhabitants, and several villages along the line, which have no outlet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not parallel, of course, with the Canada Central. In what direction from Brockville does it run? How wide apart are the two roads, say from Westport?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may say that the road is not parallel with the Canadian Pacific at all. The Canada Central runs almost north from Brockville, and this road will run in a north-westerly direction. At Westport, I suppose, they would be 30 or 40 miles apart.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for a line of railway from its junction on the North Shore Railway to St. Raymond, upon condition of the company extending their road to a point 50 miles north of St. Raymond, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per miles, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$96,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This road is partly built, is it not?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is not this an addition to another subsidy already granted?

Mr. POPE. This is for a portion of the line that was not subsidised.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there a probability of its being completed the whole distance, to Lake St. John?

Mr. POPE. There is a probability that this subsidy will enable the company to complete it. This is through the hardest part of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much more will have to be built after the point mentioned here is reached?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think about 70 miles more.

To the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company, for a line of railway from Brosseau's to Dundee, a subsidy not exceeding \$500 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$30,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not this look like a local enterprise—\$500 a mile?

Mr. POPE. This road is very well advanced, and the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) can tell all about it.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is in operation, and has been for some time.

Mr. POPE. Well, we will strike it out.

Mr. SCRIVER. It would not hurt me very much if it were struck out. I was not a party to asking for the grant. I do not know the principle on which \$500 is granted to the Champlain Junction Railway and three times that amount to the Canada Atlantic. They both traverse the same country, one running north and south, and the other east and west. I find no fault, but I do not understand the principle on which the discrimination was made.

To the Thunder Bay Colonisation Railway Company, for a line of railway from the Murillo station of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the east end of Whitefish Lake, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole. \$92,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What length of road will this be?

Mr. POPE. Twenty-nine miles.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Anything done?

Mr. POPE. No. It runs through a mining country.

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for a line of railway from Coe Hill or Rathburn, to Bancroft, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole .....\$64,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is a road which has received no aid hitherto.

Mr. POPE. Not at all. It is to extend it.

To the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, for a line of railway from the village of Madoc to the junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, a subsidy not exceeding \$1,500 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....\$10,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will bring Belleville in connection with the Central Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to the subsidy to a railway from Long Sault to the foot of Lake Temiscamingue, is that a continuation of the road?

Mr. POPE. No; this is to overcome a rapid of the river.

Mr. SCRIVER. What proportion does this increased subsidy to the Napanee and Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company bear to the former one?

Mr. POPE. There is no increase of subsidy, but the distance is a little shorter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose changing the subsidies will give the companies two years from now to build the roads, instead of their forfeiting their charters, as they would have done under previous grants.

Mr. POPE. So far as these increases are concerned, all the roads will be completed within the two years, except one, and the time of that will be extended. That is the Gatineau Railway.

Resolutions reported, and read the second time and concurred on.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. (164) to authorise the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned in aid of the construction of certain railways.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THE LATE COLONEL WILLIAMS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure the House will be pleased to know that you, Mr. Speaker, as representing

our feelings, have ordered a floral wreath to be sent to lie on the coffin of our dear friend Colonel Williams, and I have no doubt that your action will meet with the universal consent and approval of the House.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PROROGATION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman is now in a position to state when we may expect prorogation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we shall meet again until to-morrow afternoon, and we shall meet to-morrow simply to receive Messages from the Senate. No proceedings will be taken up in this House of any kind, except the transmission of Messages from one House to the other, and it is proposed, if the state of public business will allow it, that the House should be prorogued on Monday, at 2 o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it not possible to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have consulted the leader of the Senate, and he tells me it will not be possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any rate, our work is now closed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received the following letter:—

“OTTAWA, 17th July, 1885.

“SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament on Monday, the 20th instant, at 2 o'clock p.m.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“CHARLES J. JONES,

“for the Governor General's Secretary.

“The Honorable

“The Speaker of The House of Commons.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns, it stand adjourned until to-morrow, at half-past one o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, 18th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

#### PRAYERS.

#### MEMBERS' INDEMNITY.

Mr. TROW. I desire to ask the First Minister if anything has been done towards the payment of certain members who have been unavoidably absent for some time this Session on account of sickness, I mean the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson). Both these gentlemen have been unwell for some time, though they endeavored to remain, and did remain, in attendance, when they were quite unfit, for some weeks, attending to their parliamentary duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is, perhaps, a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says. The subject was

alluded to yesterday, I think, in regard to these members. The hon. gentleman has only mentioned two, but there was also Mr. Gaudet, who broke his leg. Under present circumstances, it is impossible that there should be a vote of Parliament on the subject, but I have no doubt that Parliament will vote the money next Session, and possibly there may be a means found, between now and the next Session, for the Government to anticipate the certain vote of Parliament in its favor, and to act accordingly.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the state of public business is such that there will be really no necessity for our meeting again to-day. For fear of accidents, as the House will be prorogued at two o'clock on Monday, we had better meet here on that day at twelve, because I have the recollection that on one occasion, by our thinking the business was all disposed of, the Governor General of the day had to wait three hours in the room of the Speaker of the Senate, while the two Houses were settling a matter. I, therefore, move, that when the House adjourns to-day, it stand adjourned until Monday at twelve o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

#### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

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

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There is one matter which I think has not been fairly dealt with. That is, the typewriters. The typewriters get \$2 a day. The *Hansard* reporters get large salaries. I bring the matter before the attention of the Government. I think it is a shame that these men should get the small sum of \$2 a day. I think they are equally hard worked with the reporters. I bring the matter before the notice of the Government and the House.

Motion of Sir John A. Macdonald agreed to, and House adjourned at 2:15. p.m.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 12 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### OMISSION FROM THE DEBATES.

Mr. PAINT. I wish to make a reference to an omission in the *Hansard*. Am I in order in doing so now?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. PAINT. In the *Hansard* of the 16th inst. some remarks that were made in the debate on the vote of \$300,000 for the railway from Metapediae towards Paspébiac are omitted. There were some remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side and also from this side; these are omitted. Also, in connection with the \$250,000 for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Pictou harbor from Stellarton, some remarks were made that are also omitted, and, I judge, a good deal more.

Mr. TROW. I may say that if there was anything omitted from the *Hansard* it must have been because the remarks were inaudible, because, as a rule, the reporters have done their work admirably. I do not suppose that in  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the whole Dominion, or even on the continent of America, there are men who can do better work than the staff of the *Hansard*.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. PAINT. I am not making any charge against the *Hansard* reporters. None are so deaf as those who will not hear.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint), about some omission in the *Hansard*, I may state that I have just been enquiring in the *Hansard* room, and it appears that some members of the *Hansard* staff have left, but it has been arranged that their note books will be sent for at once, and the omission supplied, if possible, in the bound volume.

#### REMARKS.

Mr. TROW. I do not desire to intrude upon the House, but if there is a quiet member of this House, I think it is myself. I have no doubt that you, Mr. Speaker, feel quite relieved at our approaching departure. Your duties have been very arduous, and so have been those of your assistant. I must say that our Speaker, after being in close communication with the members of the Opposition, probably in closer communication with them than even the leader of the Opposition himself, knowing the wishes and wills of every member of the Opposition almost daily, can depend upon a universal feeling of good will amongst the members of the Opposition. I know that they say that he is the right man in the right place, no matter what party is in power. I was pleased on Saturday to see the healthy complexion and elasticity and activity possessed by the First Minister, at the close of the Session, the long and tedious Session that we have had. The First Minister seemed to be better in health than he was at the commencement of the Session, and I hope he will continue to be possessed of that vigor and determination which he now has. I have seen it stated somewhere in the press that there is an anxiety on the part of the Opposition that he should leave—not this world of tears; we never anticipate anything of that kind; we hope it will be a long time before he will be called away from us; but we hope most sincerely that, before long, he will change positions with the leader of the Opposition. That is all the evil we wish him. I was very much pleased at the conduct of Sir Richard Cartwright this Session, for the reason that, notwithstanding the ability of the hon. gentleman in his own Department—and I think our friends will give him credit for understanding his business in that Department and performing it satisfactorily—I know there were several occasions on which Sir Richard Cartwright could have brought him to task on financial matters; but he refrained from doing so, and I think he is entitled to some credit for the toleration he gave to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. Our next friend, the Minister of Public Works, rather pleases me, at all events, in the way he has everything prepared. Every question that he is asked, he is at all times ready to answer; or, if he has not the answer in his head or on the point of his tongue, he has his little volume beside him, and that is opened instantaneously, and very little time is taken in answering any question by the Minister of Public Works. In that he shows a good example to other hon. gentlemen, and I might mention, without being invidious, the Minister of Agriculture. He is a good natured gentleman, but I think he might learn a lesson from the Minister of Public Works on that subject, and I am sure the result would be more satisfactory to the House.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Though he is a Pope, he is not infallible.

Mr. TROW. The Minister of Militia rather astonished me, and, I have no doubt, astonished the country, by the

manner in which he has dealt with this bloody war, the manner in which he brought his troops into the field and provided for them. Considering the distance they had to travel, the route not being thoroughly prepared for them, and the expedition with which he forwarded them to the North-West and made provision for them, we must all agree that his duties must have taxed his energies to the utmost; and he has shown a great deal of executive ability in performing the services he has performed. I do not think it is necessary to go all round the Ministers. The Postmaster General is an old friend of mine. We live near each other, and I think he is improving. At all events, I do not think he has an enemy in the House. As for our friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, if he would express himself with a little more vim and determination it would be better for the House, but we have all come to the conclusion that he is sincere and honest in his intentions. The Session has been unusually long, and some allege that it is owing to the unnecessary amount of discussion on the part of the Opposition on the Franchise Bill. I do not know that it is altogether due to that. The measure was one that was very objectionable, one that the First Minister has had on his mind for sixteen or eighteen years, and some features of the Bill were extremely objectionable. The measure has been, to a great extent, remodelled, and is better now than it was at the outset. Of course, now, the revising officers are to be judges, and they have their reputation to sustain, and it will be a different thing from appointing an outsider, even if he is a barrister of five years' standing. The Indian clauses were also very objectionable. The plea of the members of the Ministry and their supporters was that the franchise was to be uniform, but that has been abolished, and it is not a uniform franchise, because the Government have yielded to their friends from British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. I think the Session, on the whole, has been rather satisfactory. No doubt, like all previous Sessions, we have added to the indebtedness of the country, but probably that is unavoidable. Our indebtedness now amounts to nearly \$300,000,000, and I think we have some very doubtful assets, and a great number of these should be struck off the list as uncollectable or unremunerative. I have no doubt the hon. gentlemen are glad to see the Session brought to a close, but if the measures of the last week had been brought down earlier in the Session, and some time had been given for their thorough investigation, it would have been more satisfactory. The Government have seen now that it is the determination of the Opposition, no matter at what stage of the Session important measures are brought down, to discuss them thoroughly; and no doubt that will prolong the Session if those measures are not brought down at an early date. For many weeks this Session we were doing very little. I think the Government will acknowledge, I think the First Minister has already acknowledged, the assistance received, in all measures brought down, from the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman is indefatigable in his determination, no matter how crude a measure is, to get that measure perfected, though he is not always responsible for its perfection or imperfection. If he can do any good he is always ready to do it. His labors this Session have been very severe, and, at its close, he felt very ill, or possibly he would have been here to-day.

#### PAUPER TURKISH IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. TROW. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question in regard to a vessel which is said to have arrived with pauper immigrants—I think they are Turks. They landed at Rivière du Loup, I think, on Friday. It is reported in one of the Montreal papers that there were some fifty immigrants, and that they are in destitute circumstances,

and a subscription is being raised to support them immediately on their arrival. Has the Minister any knowledge of their arrival?

Mr. POPE. No; I have not seen anything of the kind. I have asked every one of my friends about the matter to which the hon. gentleman alluded, and if there had been fifty destitute Turks I think I should have heard of it. Did the hon. gentleman say they landed at Rivière du Loup?

Mr. TROW. Yes.

Mr. POPE. He must be mistaken, because no immigrants are landed at Rivière du Loup.

Mr. TROW. I showed the hon. gentleman the paper.

#### PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General, by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER.—His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your hon. House in the Chamber of the hon. the Senate.

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

#### IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to incorporate the Alberta and Athabaska Railway Company.  
An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Acts incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

An Act to amend the sections of Acts therein mentioned, relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board.

An Act for granting certain powers to the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association.

An Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act for the relief of George Bradford Cox.

An Act to amend the Act intitled: "An Act to provide for the employment without the walls of the Common Gaols of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein."

An Act to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.

An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.  
An Act respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.

An Act to incorporate the Fort MacLeod Range Telegraph Company.  
An Act to amend an Act respecting "The Central Prison for the Province of Ontario"

An Act to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884.

An Act respecting proof of entries in Books of Account kept by officers of the Crown.

An Act to authorise the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.

An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.  
An Act to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, to be held in London in the year 1886.

An Act respecting "The Bank of British Columbia."  
An Act further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882."

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilisers.  
An Act further to amend "An Act for the better Preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works," and the Acts in amendment thereof.

An Act further to amend an Act intitled, "An Act respecting offences against the person."

An Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.  
An Act respecting Canned Goods.

An Act further to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874," and the Acts amending the same.

An Act to authorise the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.

An Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilisers.

An Act to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.

An Act to authorise the grant of certain Subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.

An Act respecting "The Liquor License Act, 1883."

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.

An Act to amend "The Consolidated Militia Act of 1883."

An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise.

An Act for the final settlement of the Claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

An Act to modify the application of "The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."

An Act to authorise the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers.

An Act further to amend the Act relating to the Culling and Measuring of Timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec

An Act to amend "The Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883."

An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada.

An Act respecting the administration of Justice, and other matters, in the North-West Territories.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.

An Act to authorise the granting of further Subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the Railways therein described.

An Act to amend the several Acts relating to Duties of Customs and Excise.

An Act to amend the Act forty sixth Victoria, chapter nine, intitled: "An Act to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts."

An Act to continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned.

An Act for facilitating navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the Harbor of Quebec.

An Act to provide a salary for an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.

An Act to authorise the granting of the Subsidies therein mentioned in aid of the construction of certain Railways.

An Act to authorise grants of land to members of the Militia Force lately on active service in the North-West.

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

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

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

An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,700,000, required for defraying certain expenses now being incurred in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories.

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1885, and the 30th June, 1886, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service, to which Bills I humbly request Your Excellency's assent

To these Bills the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the third Session of the fifth Parliament of the Dominion with the following speech:—

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

I desire to convey to you my best thanks for the diligence with which you have performed your duties during this long protracted Session.

It has been in many respects an eventful Session—in none more so than because since its commencement the peaceful progress of the Dominion, unbroken for so many years, has been interrupted by a serious insurrectionary outbreak in the North-West Territories.

I congratulate you upon the prompt and complete suppression of these disorders and on the restoration of public confidence throughout the regions in which they occurred.

The insurrection has been encountered by the military force of the Dominion under Major General Middleton in a manner deserving of the highest commendation.

The courage which our citizen soldiers have shown in the face of a formidable and determined enemy, their cheerful endurance of privation

and fatigue, and the readiness with which they have submitted to sacrifices, inevitable whenever a force composed of citizens of all classes is called upon to relinquish the employments of civil life, reflects the highest credit upon them.

I am gratified that both Houses of Parliament have considered the conduct of Major General Middleton and the officers and men under his command deserving of their formal thanks. It has been my agreeable duty to bring under the notice of Her Majesty's Government the value of the services which have been thus rendered to the Empire.

I cannot leave this subject without expressing my sorrow that the success of our arms should have been purchased at the cost of many lives which Canada could ill afford to spare. The memory of those who have fallen, either on the field or from sickness contracted during their service, will be gratefully cherished throughout the Dominion.

It affords me much pleasure to acknowledge the prompt action of the Government of the United States in taking the precautions necessary in order to prevent any co-operation with the insurgents from their frontiers.

The measure for the adjustment of the representation of the people in Parliament will extend the franchise to numbers who have not hitherto enjoyed the right of voting for the election of members of the House of Commons, and render such representation free from frequent changes by the unconcerted action of the Provincial Legislatures.

The settlement of all matters in discussion between the Federal Government and that of Manitoba will, I trust, satisfy the expectations of the people of that Province.

The Bill regulating the influx of the Chinese people into Canada will, I doubt not, allay the feeling of discontent in relation to that subject which has for some time prevailed in British Columbia.

The aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will secure the advantages which are justly expected from the completion of that great enterprise, whilst the grants in land and money to other railways in various portions of Canada may be expected to accelerate the progress of settlement, and augment the commerce of the Dominion.

The ready conversion of our five per cent. bonds, which have recently matured, into four per cent. securities, and the success of the loan for four millions of pounds sterling, lately offered in the London market, shew the satisfactory state of the credit of Canada.

I congratulate you on the other useful measures, both of a public and private nature, which you have passed.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

In Her Majesty's name, I thank you for the Supplies you have granted for the public service.

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

The readjustment of the tariff will tend to increase the revenue and enable the Government to meet the various engagements of the country.

I now, with reiterated thanks, relieve you, for the present, from your important duties.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate and Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Saturday, the twenty-ninth day of August next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Saturday, the twenty-ninth day of August next.

# INDEX.

## THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1885.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup>, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., Moved; Neg., Negatived; N. B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys, Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

### **Abbott, Hon. J. J. C.,** *Argenteuil.*

- Can. Congregational Missionary Society and the Congregational Union of N.S. and N.B., confirmation of Union (B. 54, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 170 (vol. i).  
C.P.R. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. on Res., 2734, 2735, 2739 (vol. iv).  
Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2436 (vol. iii).  
Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1416 (vol. ii); "revision of voters' lists," 2345, 2350; "general provisions," 1448, 2352, 2355; "appeal," 2363 (vol. iii).  
Private Bills, reception of Reps. from Com. (Ms. to extend time) 505 (vol. i); 782 (vol. ii).

### **Allen, Mr. B.,** *North Grey.*

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1058 (vol. ii).  
Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1493 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1853; "who shall not vote," 2166 (vol. iii).  
Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (personal explanation) 2209 (vol. iii).

### **Allen, Mr. B.—Continued.**

- Maritime Court of Ont. extension of jurisdiction B. 11 (2<sup>o</sup> m.) 127; on Order for Com, 215; in Com., 495 (vol. i).  
Rys. in the County of Grey, refund of bonuses to County Council, &c., on M. for memorials, 59 (vol. i).  
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 590 (vol. i).  
SUPPLY:  
*Public Works—Consolid. Fund:* Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 3386 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 794 (vol. ii).

### **Allison, Mr. W. H.,** *Hants.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1398 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff, on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 676 (vol. i).

### **Amyot, Mr. G.,** *Bellechasse.*

- Antwerp International Exhibition, on M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com. (Amt.) 306 (vol. i).  
Can. Agricultural Insurance Co., receipts and expenditures of liquidators, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 303 (vol. i).  
C.P.R. Extension to Can. ports on Atlantic, Vernon Smith's Rep., on M. for copies, 294 (vol. i).

**Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.**

- Cholera, precautions against (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).  
 Dom. Subsidies to the Provinces (M. for copies of Cor.) 303 (vol. i).  
 France and Canada, Commercial relations between (M. for copies of Cor.) 825 (vol. ii).  
 Gosselin, Eugène, record in the matter of (M. for copy) 703, 704 (vol. i).  
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 504; (Amt.) to recom., neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504 (vol. i).  
 Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).  
 Plant, J. B., of St. Charles, Claim of (M. for copies\*) 147 (vol. i).  
 Postage Privileges, Extension of, to Local Govt. (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).  
 School of Navigation at Quebec (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).  
 Steam Communication with France (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) to M. for 2°, 166 (vol. i).

**Armstrong, Mr. J., South Middlesex.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1272-1274; on M. that Com. rise, 1434; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1469; "tenant," (Amt.) 1481; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1506, 1542; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1643 (vol. ii); 1880-1882; "manhood suffrage," 1970; (Amt.) 2001; "registration of voters," 2247, 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2433 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064 (vol. iv).

- Infectious and Contagious diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070, 1086; (Amt.) 1090; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1331 (vol. ii).

- Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 588 (vol. i).

- Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen rags) 793 (vol. ii).

**Auger, Mr. M., Shefford.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to M. for 3°, 1061 (vol. ii).

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1238-1241; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452, 1456, 1458; "tenant" (Amt.) 1482; "person" (Indian) 1543; "actual value," 1597, 1606 (vol. iii); "qualifications in towns and cities," 1987, 1995; "in counties," 2068; "registration of voters," 2296 (vol. iii).

- Holland, Messrs. Geo. and Andrew, services as Reporters, &c. (M. for Stmt.\*) 147 (vol. i).

- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1068, 1070, 1079, 1091; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1323 (vol. ii).

- Liquor License Act, regulations directing License Fund under (Ques.) 76 (vol. i).

- Official Reporters of *Debates*, employment of, during recess (Ques.) 76 (vol. i)

**Bain, Mr. T., North Wentworth.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2469, (vol. iii).

- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2478; in Com., 2479-2483 (vol. iii).

- Cherrier, George E., Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, dismissal of (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

- Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road, Sale of, by Govt. (M. for copies of papers, &c.\*) 147 (vol. i).

- Dundas Public Buildings, erection of (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1535; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1709-1712 (vol. ii); 1776-1779; "manhood suffrage," 1952-1954; (Amt.) 1993; "in counties," 2052, 2062 (vol. iii); 2758 (vol. iv); "registration of voters," 2252, 2280, 2289; "officers and duties," 2356 (vol. iii).

- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310, 1313 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2554 (vol. iii).

- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1333 (vol. ii).

- Muskoka Lakes and River Severn Canal System (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1035 (vol. i).

- Immigration*, 2832-2838, 2839, 2843 (vol. iv).

- Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen rags) 791 (vol. ii).

- Wood Supply to Public Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).

**Baker, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B.C.**

- Buoys in Victoria and Nanaimo Harbors (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt., (B. 67, 1°) 246 (vol. i).

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 963 (vol. ii).

- Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3013-3022; in Com., 3023, 3050 (vol. iv).

- Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).

- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1119, 1121, 1124-1129; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1282 (vol. ii).

- Civil Service Employés in B. C., names, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).

- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).

- Debates*, Official Rep., on conc., 3371 (vol. iv).

- Deep-water Fisheries off coast of B.C. (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).

- Discovery Island, B.C., Lighthouse on (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

- Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (vol. ii).

- Esquimalt Graving Dock, Length of (Ques.) 743; substitution of Granite for Sandstone (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).

**Baker, Mr. E. C.—Continued.**

- Fisheries Inspector, B.C., name and date of appointment (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1587 (vol. ii); (Ques. of Order) 2015 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Great American and European Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret. (correction) 79 (vol. i).  
 Immigrants settled in B.C. (Ques.) 189 (vol. i).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2834 (vol. iv).  
 Indian Affairs in B.C., Cor. between Govt. of Can. and B.C., on M. for copies, 870 (vol. ii).  
 Indian Reserve Lands in B.C., purchase of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Indian Schools in B.C., establishment of (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3423 (vol. iv).  
 Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
 Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (vol. iv).  
 Penitentiary in B.C., suspension of Rules, on M. for copies of Cor., 824 (vol. ii).  
 Postal Revenue at Vic., (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Public Reserves and "fore shore" rights in B.C. (M. for Ret.) 703 (vol. i).  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2916, 2920, 3386 (vol. iv).  
 Satuma Island, B.C., Lighthouse (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).  
*Sir James Douglas*, steamer, Repairs to, &c. (M. for copies of Cor.) 831 (vol. ii).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res. and in Com., 1280 (vol. ii).  
 Superior Court Judges, Quebec, B. 161 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 3375 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dominion Exhibition) 1027 (vol. ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Chinese Immigration Rep.) 3241 (vol. iv).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs, 3237; Public Works (agent and contingencies, B.C.) 3308 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2834 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing of) conc., 3371.  
*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3423 (vol. iv).  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamships Subventions* (U.S. and Vic., B.C.) 2936; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2915 (vol. iv).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Exam. of Masters and Mates) 2946; (Govt. Steamers) 2946 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Capital*: B.C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 2916.  
*Consolid. Fund*: B.C., 3386. *Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2920 (vol. iv).  
 Telegraph Cable across Juan de Fuca Straits, cost of (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Telegraph and Signal Service in B.C. (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (steel) 811 (vol. ii); (transportation charges) 3224 (vol. iv).

**Beaty, Mr. J., Jun., West Toronto.**

- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2433; (Amt.) 2438 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1874-1880 (vol. iii).  
 Insolvents, discharge of past (B. 34, 1°\*) 113 (vol. i).  
 Insolvents Estates, distribution of (B. 39, 1°\*) 113 (vol. i).  
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 185, (vol. i).  
 Private Bills, petitions for (M. to extend time for receiving) 40 (vol. i).  
 Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors (B. 125) prop. Res., 1040-1045; 1°\* of B., 1063 (vol. ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government* (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).  
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 272 (vol. i).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 157 (vol. i).

**Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.**

- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1069 (vol. ii).  
 Richelieu River Floods, memorials from riparian owners (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff, on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 739-741 (vol. i).

**Belleau, Mr. J. N., Levis.**

- Immigrant Buildings at Levis, construction of (Ques.) 89 (vol. i).  
 Official Arbitrators, legislation respecting (Ques.) 88 (vol. i).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 168 (vol. i).

**Benson, Mr. T., South Grenville.**

- Privilege, Ques. of, personal paragraph in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 48 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (glucose syrup) 852 (vol. ii).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.**

- Antwerp International Exhibition (M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com.) 305 (vol. i).  
 Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, &c. (M. for papers) 928; (reply) 935 (vol. ii).  
 Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 35, 1°\*) 113 (vol. i).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., prisoners held for trial (remarks) 3440 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. License Act, working of (M. for Cor.) 307 (vol. i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, article in *Toronto News*, French Aggression, &c. (remarks) 1678 (vol. ii).

## SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: H. of C. (increased expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Com.) 3449 (vol. iv).  
 Wheat and Flour Duties, alteration of (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).

**Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.**

- British Medical Act and Amts. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.\*) 33 (vol. i); Rets. respecting (remarks) 939 (vol. ii).
- Can. Southern Ry. Co. and the Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. (B. 9, 2°\*) 57 (vol. i).
- Factories, employment in, regulation (B. 2, 1°\*) 29; Order for 2° dschgd., 362; (B. 85, 1°\*) 362; printing of B. in French (remarks) 605; 2° m., 873-881; Order for rsmng. adjd. deb. on M. for 2°, 940; (remarks) 943; (Ques. of Order) 944 (vol. ii).
- Factory Rep., printing and distribution of (Ans.) 211 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., (Ques. of Order) 1432; (explanation) 1432 (vol. ii); in Com. (remarks) 2203; "qualifications in counties," 2085 (vol. iii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2819 (vol. iv).
- Inspection of Factories, Res. respecting, on Order for Com. (remarks) 606 (vol. i).
- Militia clothing and great coats, in Com. of Sup., 2907 (vol. iv).
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 72, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i).
- Rifle Associations, headquarters, annual grant, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 46 (vol. i).
- River St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co. (B. 8, 2°\*) 57 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

- Immigration* 2819 (vol. iv).
- Militia* (Clothing and great coats) 2907 (vol. iv).

**Billy, Mr. L. A., Rimouski.**

- Insolvency (B. 32, 1°) 101 (vol. i).

**Blake, Hon. E., West Durham.**

- Address, on the, 8.
- Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Res. (Amt. neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3001 (vol. iv).
- Administration of the N.W.T. B. 144 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res., 2929, 2932-2934; in Com. on B., 2962, 2966; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 2967 (vol. iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467-2469; on M. for 2°, 2466; in Com., 2541 (vol. iii); 2751; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751 (vol. iv).
- Advances to Local Govts. (M. for Cor., &c.) 45 (vol. i).
- Advances to Provinces B. 7 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. to introd. B., 32; on M. for 2°, 102 (vol. i); in Com., 1064 (vol. ii).
- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 905, 922 (vol. ii).
- Allan Line, payments to, for assisted passages (Ques.) 567 (vol. i); (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- American Mining Engineers' visit to N. S., in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Amherst and P.E.I. Ry. Incomp. B. on M. to introd., 349 (vol. i).
- Analysts, Public, Remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2541-2543 (vol. iii).
- André, Father, letter from, in Jan., 1883 (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Antwerp International Exhibition, on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com., 306 (vol. i).
- Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (vol. ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1026, 1029, 1033 (vol. ii).
- Assistant Rec. Gen. of Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
- Auditor and Assist. Rec. Gen. of Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
- Auditor and Rec. Gen. of St. John, in Com. of Sup., 858 (vol. ii).
- Bank Advances to the Govt. (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
- Bank of B.C. B. 105 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2396 (vol. iii).
- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 47; on M. to ref. His Ex.'s Mess. to Sp. Com., 102 (vol. i).
- Benson, Mr., M.P., Death of (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).
- Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825 (vol. iv).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Auditor Gen., &c., 137 (vol. i).
- Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature (personal explanation) on M. for Com. of Supply, 3445 (vol. iv).
- Boots for the Toronto Militia (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Bounty on Manufactures of Iron (M. for copies of O. C., &c.\*) 100 (vol. i).
- Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 893 (vol. ii).
- British Medical Acts, Rets. respecting (remarks) 939 (vol. ii).
- Brokerage and Commission, in Com. of Sup., 896 (vol. ii).
- Buckram, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- Can. and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2943 (vol. iv).
- Can. and Germany, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Can. Southern Ry. Co. and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. B. 9 (*Mr. Bergin*) in Com., 245 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on 1°, 449; on ques. to fix day for 2°, 713; on M. (*Mr. Jamieson*) to place B. 2nd Order on Pub. Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. for 2° (Ques. of Order) 952; in Com., 955-957, 960, 961; in Com., 1056; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2645, 2648, 2651, 2654, 2657 (vol. iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 65 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1°, 235 (vol. i).

# INDEX.

## Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Can. Contingent for the Soudan (Ques.) 563 (vol. i).
- C. P. R., ability of Co. to fulfil engagements under prop. Res., 2238 (vol. iii).
- Agreement by Co. to Terms of Resolution (Ques.) 1915 (vol. iii).
- Allowances to Canadian manufacturers (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 44 (vol. i).
- Amended Plans and Profiles, B.C. (Ques.) 362 (vol. i).
- Avalanches in the Selkirk Range (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).
- Branch Lines (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).
- B. C. Sections, work on (M. for Rep., &c.) 204 (vol. i).
- Calgary and summit of Rocky Mountains, cost of (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Callander and Port Arthur, cost of and equipment (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Change in arrangement between Co. and Govt. (Ques.) 695 (vol. i); 1744, 1913 (vol. iii).
- Correspondence between Co. and Govt. *re* change in arrangements (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Construction near Lytton, B.C. (M. for Ret.) 225 (vol. i).
- Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res. (reply to annual Stmtnt.) 2586-2619; in Com., 2724-2750; on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2858; on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2859; on Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 2861; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) 2862; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 2863; in Com., 3031, 3033; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3293 (vol. iv).
- Cost of construction from Winnipeg to 615 miles west (M. for Stmtnt.) 226 (vol. i).
- Curves, Grades and Tangents (Ques.) 694, 744 (vol. i); 2239 (vol. iii).
- Earnings, main line and leased lines, &c. (M. for Stmtnt.) 61 (vol. i).
- Earnings and Working Expenses, Eastern and Western Division (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Expenditure on account of (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Expenditure on main line between Callander and Port Arthur, and Selkirk and Kamloops (M. for Stmtnt.) 100 (vol. i).
- Expenditure upon branch lines, &c., cost of equipment, &c. (M. for Stmtnts.\*) 147 (vol. i).
- Extension to Quebec, papers, &c., 1677 (vol. ii); 2239 (vol. iii).
- Forty Mile Belt in B.C. (remarks) 1983 (vol. iii).
- Grades and Curves on line from foot of Rocky Mts., &c., &c. (M. for Stmtnt. and Plan\*) 67 (vol. i).
- Grades and curves on line as far as constructed, exclusive of line from foot of Rocky Mts. to Kamloops (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 145 (vol. i).
- Grades and Curves, number of (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).

## Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- C. P. R., Grades and Curves, maximum and minimum (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).
- Govt. mortgage, changes in relation to (Ques.) 36 (vol. i).
- Govt. Sections in B.C., working of, by contractors (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).
- Homesteads within Ry. Belt (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
- Interest paid to Govt. by Co. on loans (Ques.) 350 (vol. i); 1677 (vol. ii); 1955 (vol. iii).
- Land area in the 48-mile belt accepted by Co., on Stmtnt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 782 (vol. ii).
- Land Grant accepted by Co., number of acres (Ques.) 568, 744 (vol. i).
- Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds, present position of (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 100 (vol. i).
- Lands rejected by Co. outside Ry. Belt. (Ques.) 927 (vol. ii).
- Legislation respecting (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
- Levels, Grades, Tangents, &c., from summit of Rockies to Moody (Ques.) 888 (vol. ii).
- Location, &c., land set apart, granted, &c. (M. for map\*) 46 (vol. i).
- Location of line in B.C., change of (Ques.) 223 (vol. iii).
- North American Contracting Co., position of debt of \$600,000 (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Passenger, Freight and Mixed Trains, running of (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 67 (vol. i).
- Port Moody Wharf and Freight Shed (M. for copies of Repts., Plans, &c.) 295 (vol. i).
- Progress Estimates (Ques.) on adjmt. of House, 188; for Feb., 429, (vol. i).
- Proposals made by Co. (attention of Govt. called to) 746 (vol. i).
- Postal and Transport Service (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Rails for Govt. Section, B.C. (Ques.) 1914 (vol. iii).
- Relief of Co. by Govt. (Ques.) 350 (vol. i).
- Rep. of Mr. Van Horne, &c. (M. for copies) 208 (vol. i).
- Res., publication of, in *Mail* newspaper (remarks) 1712 (vol. ii).
- Returns ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmtnt., 482 (vol. i).
- Returns, enquiries for (remarks) 782, 1565 (vol. ii).
- Returns, presentation of (remarks) 3371 (vol. iv).
- Rolling Stock, Eastern Section, Western Division, on M. for Ret., 303 (vol. i).
- Rolling Stock, payment of Duties on, by Co. (Ques.) 888 (vol. ii).
- Roundhouse and buildings in Man. on private property (Ques.) 2030 (vol. iii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- C.P.R., Route, construction, rolling stock, extensions, cash subsidy, land grant bonds, &c., &c. (M. for Stmt.) 44 (vol. i).
- Section B., Engineers' Reps. on re-measurement, re-classification, &c., on M. for copies, 123 (vol. i).
- Section B., Judge Clark's Rep. on award to contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
- Shareholders in Co., names and addresses, &c. (M. for Stmt.)\* 533 (vol. i).
- Stock of \$10,000,000, pledged for a loan of \$4,950,000 (M. for Stmt.) 45 (vol. i).
- Tangents and Curves, number and aggregate length (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).
- Town Sites, sales of, transactions on joint account (M. for Stmt.)\* 67 (vol. i).
- Western Terminus, route or routes from Port Moody to English Bay (M. for plan, &c.) 145 (vol. i).
- Canals, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2° 2439; in Com., 2534-2540 (vol. iii).
- Cape Breton Ry., construction of (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii); survey, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3118 (vol. iv).
- Carleton Branch Ry., purchase of, in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).
- Carlton, Evacuation of, Rep. (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Carpet Mats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 102 (vol. i).
- Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
- Census of Man. and N. W. T., &c., B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res., 74; on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 125; in Com. on B., 171; on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 214 (vol. i).
- Chains, iron or steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from *re* outbreak, in the N. W. T., 3426 (vol. iv).
- Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 895-897 (vol. ii).
- Charlinch Post Office, appointment or removal of Postmaster, &c. (M. for papers) 708 (vol. i).
- Chief Justice Meredith, resignation of, on M. for copy, 44 (vol. i).
- Chinese Commissioners' Rep., presentation of (remarks) 235 (vol. i).
- Chinese Commission, rooms rented and payment of Secretary (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
- Chinese Immigration, legislation respecting (Ques.) 505, 632 (vol. i).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 898-900, 902, 905, 907, 914, 917, 922, 924, 972 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 274-282 (vol. i); in Com. on B., 1097-1100

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- 1113-1117, 1125-1130, 1282; on M. for 3° 1293; (Amt.) 1294; neg. (Y. 53, N. 104) 1296; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823, 2397 (vol. iii).
- Clark, G. M. K., sums paid to, on M. for Ret., 698 (vol. i).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3397 (vol. iv).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibition, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Pope*) 461 (vol. i).
- Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1033 (vol. ii).
- Colonization Companies, modification of agreements (M. for copies of Pets., &c.) 92 (vol. i); (Ques.) 1678 (vol. ii); 2241 (vol. iii).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilly*) (remarks) 1671 (vol. ii); in Com., 2396, (vol. iii).
- Communication with Imp. Govt. *re* Troubles in N. W. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act, 1883, Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2936; (vol. iv); in Com., 2968-2970; on M. for Com. on Res., 2527 (vol. iii); in Com., 2529; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3435 (vol. iv).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 126 (vol. i); on Order for 3°, 2532 (vol. iii).
- Consolidation of the Statutes, on presentation of Rep. of Commissioners, 32 (vol. i).
- Cotton Yarns, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- County Court Judges (Man.) B. 162 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3435 (vol. iv).
- Court of Claims for Can. B. 93 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1°, 450 (vol. i).
- Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (vol. 1).
- Criminal, Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).
- Crozier, Supt., Rep. of *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds, 3425 (vol. iv).
- Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii); in Com. on B., 3044. (vol. iv).
- Customs Collections in Algoma, on M. for Ret., 40 (vol. i).
- Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 924 (vol. ii).
- Customs Seizures, Fines exacted and disposition of same &c. (M. for Stmt.) 56 (vol. i).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means 844 (vol. ii).
- Damask of Cotton, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
- Dams at Lakefield and Young's Point (Ques.) 1130 (vol. ii).
- Death of Col. Williams (remarks) 3074 (vol. iv).
- Debates, Official Rep., on presentation of First Rep., 32, 34 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2168 (vol. iii); in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii); conc., 3371 (vol. iv).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Deptl. Clerks, delay in Payment of (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Deptl. Contingences, in Com. of Sup., 917, 922, 924
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Res., 68; (Amt.) to appoint Sel. Com. to consider and report to House, 70; Amt. neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72; (Ques. of Order) 73; in Com. on B., 175 (vol. i).
- Despatches, Official, respecting engagements in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Disturbance in the N. W. (Ques.) 693, 714 (vol. i); 782 (vol. ii).
- Amt. to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 761; neg. (Y. 57, N. 122) 771 (vol. i).
- André, Father, letter from, in Jan., 1883. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from, *re* Outbreak. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Claims, &c., of Half-breeds in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).
- Communication with Imp. Gov. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Crozier, Supt., Rep. of, *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Dewdney, Gov., communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Disposition of Insurgents by Gen. Middleton (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Dumas, Michel, appointment of, as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Dumont, Gabriel, ferry license granted to (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Duck Lake, Engagement at, on reading of telegrams, 790 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2855; in Com., 2855-2857 (vol. iv).
- Free transport of bodies of volunteers killed (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Govt. officials in the N.W., communications with (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Grandin, Bishop, communication from (Ques.) 3321, 3423 (vol. iv).
- Half-breed grievances, 2030-2040; (reply) 2051 (vol. iii).
- Houghton, Col., mission to N.W. in 1884, 3425 (vol. iv).
- Indemnity to members on active service, on prop. M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 812 (vol. ii).
- Information, further (Ques.) 745 (vol. i); 811, 813, 838, 889 (vol. ii).
- Isbester, appointment of, as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Land and Surveys of St. Laurent (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Langevin, Sir Hector, communications from Mr. Jackson, *re* Half-breed Claims (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Disturbance in the N. W. Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Man. Half-breeds, unenumerated, \*claims of (Ques.) 3423 (vol. iv).
- Memorials, &c., respecting grievances, answer to (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Mission of Hon. Mr. Royal, attention called to newspaper paragraphs, 889 (vol. ii).
- Montreal Garrison Artillery (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Mounted Police Officers, Reps. from, *re* Engagements (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Mounted Police Recruits (remarks) 1566 (vol. ii).
- North-West Council, Res. *re* Half-breed claims (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- On personal explanation of Mr. Ives (remarks) 1064 (vol. ii).
- Official despatches respecting Engagements (remarks) 2999 (vol. iv); (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Payne and Applegarth, murder of (remarks) 859 (vol. ii).
- Pets., Res., &c., on Half-breeds and settlers' claims (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert Colonization Co.'s land, settlers' or squatters' improvements (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert and St. Laurent settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prisoners held for trial (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3441 (vol. iv).
- Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Question of Order, 3161 (vol. iv).
- *Resumé* of Events since 1878 (speech) 3075-3110; (Res.) in amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213 (vol. iv).
- Riel's proposal to accept money (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- River Lot Claims, settlement of, Mr. Pearce's letter respecting (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Schmidt, Louis, answer to letter of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Laurent, River lots, re-survey (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Stoney Indian rising, further information asked, 863 (vol. ii).
- St. Louis de Langevin, Pet. from settlers (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Surveys of river lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ques.) 3424; mode of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Taché, Archbishop, communication from, *re* Half-breeds (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Telegraphic communication west of Winnipeg (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
- Troops, movements of (remarks) 838, 872, 887 (vol. ii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Disturbance in the N. W. Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 ———— Volunteers, recognition of services of (Ques.) 2029, 2170 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3370 (vol. iv).  
 ———— War Supplies, carriage of, by American Rys. (Ques.) 838 (vol. ii).  
 Dewdney, Gov., communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Disallowance of Provincial Acts (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 52 (vol. i).  
 Dom. and Provincial Franchises, despatch from Mr. Fielding (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).  
 Dom. Day, sitting of the House on (Ques.) 2773 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. Drainage Co's. B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1008 (vol. ii).  
 Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).  
 Dom. Lands, alleged frauds and irregularities in the Dept. (Ques.) 1915, 2170 (vol. iii).  
 Dom. Lands, Gabriel Dumont's lot on the Saskatchewan (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).  
 Dom. Lands in B.C., timber dues (Ques.) 2240 (vol. iii).  
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 307 (vol. i).  
 Dom. Notes, issue and redemption of, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).  
 Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 939 (vol. ii).  
 Dredges, Tugs and Scows, building of, on M. for Ret., 53 (vol. i).  
 Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).  
 Duck Lake, engagement at (remarks) 790 (vol. ii).  
 Dumas, Michel, appointment of as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Dumont, Gabriel, ferry license, granted to (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Dundas and Waterloo Road, on prop. Res. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 451 (vol. i).  
 Duties, collection of unauthorized (remarks) 427 (vol. i).  
 Eastern Extension Ry., repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).  
 Earthenware and Stoneware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).  
 Easter, adjmt. for (Ques.) 713 (vol. i).  
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Co.'s Agent (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii); Township Surveys, 2171 (vol. iii).  
 Elections since General Election, 1878, date of certificates, date of receipt, issue of Speaker's Warrants, receipt, &c., &c. (M. for Stmt.) 210 (vol. i).  
 Establishment of a Model Farm, in Com. of Supply, 3453 (vol. iv).  
 Exchange Bank, Govt. advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 373 (vol. i).  
 Excise Duties, conc. 3295 (vol. iv).  
 Explosive Substances B. 95 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 893; in Com., 1167 (vol. ii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Extract of Fluid Beef, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).  
 Extradition Arrangement, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and Ambassador at Washington (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 147 (vol. i).  
 Extradition, demands for, and proceedings taken (M. Stmt.\*) 67 (vol. i).  
 Factory B. (Ques.) 29; B. 2, on M. to dischg. Order for 2°, 362 (vol. i).  
 Factory Commission, Rep. of, distribution of (remarks) 455, 478 (vol. i).  
 Finances of the Country (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (vol. iv).  
 Financial Commissioner in Eng., in Com. of Sup., 896 (vol. ii).  
 Financial Inspector, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).  
 Fish, in Com. on Ways and Means, 859 (vol. ii).  
 Fish taken in the Miramichi, on M. for Ret., 295 (vol. i).  
 Five per ct. Consolid. Loan, retirement of, on M. for copies of O.C., 488 (vol. i).  
 Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 221 (vol. i).  
 France and Quebec, fortnightly line, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2937, 2939 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 629 (vol. i); on Order for 2° being called (remarks) 1095; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1177-1192; in Com., "usufructuary" 1448, 1450, 1452, 1456, 1457; "person" (Indian) 1487, 1565; "farm," 1591 (vol. ii); on disqualifying revising barrister, 2086; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104-2111, 2161, 2163; "registration of voters," 2173, 2177, 2180, 2231, 2312; "revision of voters' lists," 2346; "qualifications in counties," 2395; "appeal," 2395 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2759; on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059 (vol. iv); on personal explanation of Mr. Mills, 2140 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1510, 1512 (vol. ii); 2144 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures, 2026, 2028 (vol. iii).  
 French Half-breeds at St. Laurent, Claims of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Fort William, Ont., Indian Reserve, Road on (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Free transport of bodies of Volunteers killed in the N. W. (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).  
 Fuel for settlers in the N. W. (M. for copies of Cor. &c.) 61 (vol. i).  
 Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Act Amt. B. 119, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 837 (vol. ii); on M. for 2°, 2419 (vol. iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1311 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2549 (vol. iii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Glamis, Post-office, enquiry respecting (Ques.) 1131 (vol. ii).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 851 (vol. ii).
- Gold Reserve, Govt. withdrawls, on M. for copies of Cor., 354 (vol. i).
- Gosselin, Eugène, record in the matter of, on M. for copy, 704 (vol. i).
- Govt. Agents in the N. W. T., Fees from Settlers (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Bonds, disappearance of, from vaults of Dept. (Ques.) 3371 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 451 (vol. i); (Ques.) 895; on M. to take in Wednesdays, 965; on M. to take in Mondays, 1336 (vol. ii); (remarks) 3293, 3371; on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) on prop. Res., 2462; in Com., 2464; on M. to conc. in Res., 2525 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Officials in the N. W., communications with, (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Gov. Genl.'s Sec's. Office, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Grandin, Bishop, communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3423 (vol. iv).
- G. T. R., Imperfect Ret. presented by Mr. Hickson (remarks) 861 (vol. ii).
- Guns used in fight with Poundmaker (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Half-breed Claims in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Commission, Claims recognized and rejected (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii); sittings of (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed grievances, 2030 - 2040; (reply) 2051 (vol. iii).
- Half-breeds and Indian Reserves and Homesteads (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breeds and Settlers' claims, Pets. and Res. (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Half-breed (Man.) Minors, claims preferred and rejected (Ques.) 2169; temporarily absent (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii); unenumerated (Ques.) 1743, 3426 (vol. iv).
- Half-breed Plots on the Saskatchewan (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Scrip (Ques.) 1914 (vol. iii).
- Half-breed, Settlement of Claims (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Settlement, undisturbed occupation (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Halifax Steam Navigation Co., moneys paid by Govt. to (M. for copies of Repts., &c.) 210 (vol. i).
- Hamilton Provident and Loan Society B. 114 (*Mr. Kilvert*) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).
- Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148, on M. to conc. in Res., 2534 (vol. iii).
- Heating Public Buildings, cost of (M. for Stmtnt.) 90 (vol. i).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- High Commissioner, office of (M. for copies of Cor.) 44; Rep. and Despatches to Govt. (M. for copies) 56; position or salary of (M. for Rep.\*) 210 (vol. i).
- Hoop Iron, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- Homesteads within the Ry. Belt (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
- Houghton, Col., Mission of, in 1884, to N. W., 3425 (vol. iv).
- House Furnishing Hardware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Hughes, D. J., Charges against, on M. for Ret., 99 (vol. i).
- Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s B. 69 (*Mr. Tyrohitt*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1387 (vol. ii).
- Imitation precious Stones, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Supply, 2831-2834, 2836-2838 (vol. iv).
- Immigrants to the N. W. (M. for Stmtnt.) 45 (vol. i).
- Imperial Govt. and N.W. Troubles, Communication with (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Indemnity to Members, increase of, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
- Indemnity to Members on active service in the N.W., on prop. M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 821 (vol. ii).
- Indians of Fort William Reserve, Cor. between and Indian Dept. (M. for copies\*) 1442 (vol. ii).
- Indian Reserve, Victoria Arm, B.C. (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).
- Indian Troubles at Metlakalla, on M. for copies of Cor., 305 (vol. i).
- Industries of Canada, Commission respecting (M. for copy of Com., O.C., Cor., &c., also Rep., &c.) 56 (vol. i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts, 2397 (vol. iii).
- Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 917 (vol. ii).
- Insolvent Debtors, distribution of Assets provision B. 4, (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1280 (vol. ii).
- Inspecting Engineers' Salaries, C.P.R., in Com. of Supply, 3417 (vol. iv).
- Inspection of Factories, Res. respecting, on Order for Com. (remarks) 606 (vol. i).
- Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 84 (vol. i).
- Insurgents in the N.W., disposition of by Genl. Middleton (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- I. C. R. and Beaver Steamship Line, through rates of freight (M. for Cor.) 144 (vol. i).
- Cost of equipment (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Costs of working, &c., from 1879 to 1884 (M. for Stmtnt.) 202 (vol. i).
- Earnings and Working Expenses, monthly (Ques.) 76, 114; for Jan., 1885, 428 (vol. i); for March and April, 2029 (vol. iii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- I.C.R., Earnings and Working Expenses (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Equipment, valuation of (Ques.) 888 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3300 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Sale of Tickets on Chatham Branch (Ques.) 2238 (vol. iii).  
 Internal Economy Commission, increased expenditure, in Com. of Sup., 3449 (vol. iv).  
 International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 264 (vol. i).  
 Interior, Dept. of, receipts (M. for Stmt.) 54; Dept. Rep. (remarks) 49 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 972 (vol. ii).  
 Interior, Minister of, absence (remarks) 1131 (vol. ii).  
 Iron, Bounties on manufactures of (M. for copies of O.C., &c.\*) 100 (vol. i).  
 Isbester J., appointment of, as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Judicial Reform in the N.W.T., Petitions, &c. (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii).  
 Justice, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).  
 Justices of the Peace, summary proceedings before (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).  
 Jute cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).  
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 986 (vol. ii).  
 Kits served out to the Militia (Ques.) 1568 (vol. ii).  
 Land Claims in N. W. T., duties of Mr. Russell (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Land Grants and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W.—(M. for copies of Cor.), 92-97 (vol. i).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 782 (vol. ii); 2440-2443; in Com. on Res., 2483-2491, 2494, 2497-2503, 2514-2517; on M. to conc. in Res., 2533 (vol. iii); on M. for 2°, 2770; in Com. on B., 2855; on M. for 3°, 2890; (Amt.) 2891; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; (Amts.) 2894 (vol. iv).  
 Langevin, Sir Hector, communications from Mr. Jackson, *re* Half-breed Claims, 3426 (vol. iv).  
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 503 (vol. i).  
 Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Government (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 991, 2801, 3443-3450 (vol. iv).  
 Librarian of Parliament, office of (Ques.) 41 (vol. i).  
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John*) on prop. Res., 1659; in Com., 1667-1670, (vol. ii), 2760 (vol. iv).  
 License Act, 1883, decision of Supreme Court (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Licenses or Permits to cut Timber, &c., applications for and not granted (M. for Rets.\*) 209 (vol. i).  
 Lieut.-Govt. of N.B. (Ques.) 362 (vol. i).  
 Lingan Mines, C.B., aiding civil power at, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*) on M. for 1°, 170 (vol. i).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, constitutionality of (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2402 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768 (vol. iv).  
 Liquor License Act, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).  
 Loan, recent, on M. for copy of prospectus, &c., 37 (vol. i).  
 Local Govts., advances to (M. for Cor.) 45 (vol. i).  
 Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).  
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).  
 Mail Robberies in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for copies of Cor.) 91 (vol. i).  
 Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 2937, 2939, 2943, 2945 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2778-2780, 2783; on M. to conc. in Res., 2824; in Com. on B., 3047-3049 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Legislature, Session of 1884, Man. Central Ry. Co. (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).  
 Man. South-Western Colonization Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2497-2503, 2514-2517 (vol. iii).  
 Man. Indian Agency, Management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).  
 Manufacturing Industries of Canada, Rep. on (remarks) on absence of information respecting B.C., 595 (vol. i).  
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 907 (vol. ii).  
 Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 129; in Com., 215.  
 Meeting of the House, irregular time (remarks) 2996 (vol. iv).  
 Memorials, &c., respecting grievances in the N. W. T., Answers to (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Meredith, Chief Justice, resignation of, on M. for copy, 44 (vol. i).  
 Metlakatla, Indian Troubles at, on M. for copies of Cor., 305 (vol. i).  
 Middleton, Genl., instructions (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii); respecting insurgents (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).  
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 3045; in Com., 3046 (vol. iv).  
 Militia Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).  
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 899 (vol. ii).  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 3412, 3452 (vol. iv).  
 Minister of the Int., absence of (Ques.) 964 (vol. ii).  
 Minister of Rys., office of (Ques.) 41 (vol. i).  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1304 (vol. ii) 2234 (vol. iii); 3396, 3434; 3452-3457 (vol. iv).  
 Mission of Hon. Mr. Royal, attention called to newspaper paragraphs, 889 (vol. ii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Model Farm, Establishment of, in Com. of Sup., 8453 (vol. iv).
- Montreal Garrison Artillery, (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (vol. ii).
- Musk, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
- Navigation in Can. Waters B. 132 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1278 (vol. ii); on M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 2399 (vol. iii).
- North Shore Ry., Use of by C.P.R. (Ques.) 1915 (vol. iii).
- North-West Council, Res. *re* Half-Breed Claims (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- North-West Council, Salaries, conc., 3396 (vol. iv).
- North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2483-2491, 2494 (vol. iii).
- North-West Mounted Police B. 140 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3°, 2822 (vol. iv).
- North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res. (Stmnt. of Events) 2403-2412, 2415-2418 (vol. iii); on M. to conc. in Res., 2423-2425; on M. for 2° and in Com., 2770; on M. for 3°, 2820 (vol. iv).
- North-West Mounted Police, Commissioner's Rep. (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).
- North-West Mounted Police, increase of force (Ques.) 2169 (vol. ii).
- North-West Mounted Police, Officers Reps. of Engagements, 3425 (vol. iv).
- Mounted Police Recruits, North-West (remarks) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Ocean Mail Service, Annual Cost, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 204 (vol. i).
- Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2752; on M. to conc. in Res., 2754; on 1°, 2757; on M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 3375 (vol. iv).
- Ontario Boundary, proposals to Parl. (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s bonds (M. for copy of prospectus, &c.) 145 (vol. i); Stockholders (M. for Stmnt.\*) 1443.
- Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1225 (vol. ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., N.S., projected line (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 145 (vol. i).
- Papers in respect of the N.W. (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Patent Act Amt., 1882, B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1°, 234; on M. for 2°, 268 (vol. i).
- Patents issued to Settlers in Prince Albert (Ques.) 964 (vol. ii).
- Payne and Applegarth, murder of, by Indians in N.W., 859 (vol. ii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Penitentiaries Branch (Justice) in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 986-998 (vol. ii).
- Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).
- Personal Explanations (Speech in [Local Legislature], 1837; (Dominion and Ontario Politics), 2093; (on insertion of remarks in Official Debates.) 2541, 2621 (vol. iii).
- Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) and Rule read, 1891-1894 (vol. iii).
- Pickles and Sauces, in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (vol. ii).
- Plans and Surveys of St. Laurent Settlement, Receipt of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Plate Glass, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
- Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co. B., on M. to refer back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Rys., &c., 713 (vol. i).
- Postmaster, Asst., of Ottawa, allowance to, conc., 3397 (vol. iv).
- Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii).
- Post Office Savings Bank, depositors in, on M. for Ret. 822 (vol. ii).
- Prince Albert Colon. Co.'s Township Surveys (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Prince Albert Colon. Co.'s land, Settlers' or Squatters' improvements (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert and St. Laurent Settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Printing and Printing Paper, in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2801 (vol. iv).
- Printing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
- Printing Com., 2nd Rep., on M. to conc. in, 149 (vol. i).
- Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
- Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 171 (vol. i); article in *Hamilton Spectator re* Disturbance in the N.W., 813; article in *Toronto News*, French Aggression, &c., 1679 (vol. ii); on personal explanation of Mr. Edgar, 1955 (vol. iii); *re* J. E. Brown's Cor., 3246; personal allusions, 3248 (vol. iv).
- Privy Council: in Com. of Sup., 899 (vol. ii).
- Proof of Entries and Books of Acct. B. 113 (*Mr. Chapleau*) 2398 (vol. iii).
- Provincial Acts, disallowance of (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 52 (vol. i).
- Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c., in Com. of Sup., 3434 (vol. iv).
- Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished Lord Lorne and party, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).
- Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Railways, in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3413, 3415, 3418 (vol. iv).
- Ry. Lands in B.C., Claims of Canada upon (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Rys. outside of Man. and N.W.T., aid to (M. for copies of Cor.) 92 (vol. i).
- Rebellion in the N.W. *See* "Disturbance."
- Receipts of Department of Interior (M. for Stmt.) 54 (vol. i).
- Refund of duties to persons in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
- Relief of Distressed in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
- Repatriation of French Canadians, Cor., Reps., O. C., &c., relating to (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i).
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3406 (vol. iv).
- Returns, enquiries for, 455, 715, 746 (vol. i); 895, 966, 1039, 1132, 1167, 1608 (vol. ii); 2392 (vol. iii).
- Returns, enquiries for, N.W. papers, 2676 (vol. iv).
- Returns, imperfect (remarks) 113, 504 (vol. i); 1206 (vol. ii).
- Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (vol. i).
- Resumé* of Events in the N.W., in Com. on Ways and Means, 3075-3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105,) 3213 (vol. iv.)
- Richelieu Out., and Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on prop. Amt., 1210; in Com., 1349 (vol. ii).
- Rideau Canal, Land Damages in Township of Pittsburgh, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Riel's proposal to accept money (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Rites of religion refused prisoners in the N.W. (remarks) 2998 (vol. iv).
- River lots (N.W.) Claims, settlement of, *Mr. Pearce's* letter respecting (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Roache, M., and Pilotage Commission (Ques.) 3427 (vol. iv).
- Roundhouse at Selkirk erected on private property, Issue of Patent (Ques.) 2171 (vol. iii).
- Rubber, re-covered, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- St. Clair Rancho Co., Rent paid, &c., (Ques.) 2240 (vol. iii).
- St. Laurent, Land and Surveys of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Laurent river lots, re-survey (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Louis de Langevin, petition from Settlers (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Peter and St. Paul: on M. for adjmt., 2889 (vol. iv).
- St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 81 (vol. i).
- St. Vincent De Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 986-988 (vol. ii).
- Salmon Fishing in Bathurst Harbor, regulations, &c., (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Salt Cake, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
- Saunders & Wood, Trial of, for Criminal Libel in N.W.T. (M. for copies\*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Schmidt, Louis, answer to letter of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Schmidt, Louis, and others, of Prince Albert District, employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 1915 (vol. iii).
- Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name, 2321 (vol. iii).
- Sea Lots of P. E. I., Deptl. instructions, &c. (M. for copies) 61 (vol. i).
- Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 900 (vol. ii).
- Sessional Business (remarks) 211 (vol. i).
- Senate Expenses, extra, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).
- Settlement of claims of Man. half-breed Minors (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
- Settlement of Settlers Claims at Prince Albert, &c. (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Settlers' and Half-breed claims, Prince Albert District, &c., incomplete Rets. (remarks) 1645 (vol. ii).
- Settlers' Claims, Prince Albert District (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Settlers in the Dom. during calendar year 1884 (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
- Settlers in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
- Select Standing Com., on M. for Sp. Com., 28 (vol. i).
- Sheep Scab, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
- Sheet Iron hollow ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
- Short Line Ry. between Oxford and New Glasgow, in Com. of Sup., 3413 (vol. iv).
- Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic Ports, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 193; Ret. with ref. to (Ques.) 289 (vol. i.); Govt. grants to (Ques.) 1678 (vol. ii); (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii); on Res., 2974-2978, 2988 (vol. iv).
- Simpson, G. A., Govt. Land Agent (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
- Sir James Douglas*, steamer, repairs, &c., on M. for copies of Cor., 832 (vol. ii).
- Sleeping Cars, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Small Savings, encouragement of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 90 (vol. i).
- Spirits taken out of bond (Ques.) 3371 (vol. iv).
- Standing Committees, non-meeting of, for organisation (remarks) 54, 67 (vol. i).
- Starr, J. E., Fishery Overseer of Port Williams, N. S., removal of (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Statutes, Consolidation of, on presentation of Rep. of Commissioners, 32 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 777 (vol. ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. Mc. Lelan*) on prop. Res., 1279 (vol. ii); on 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).
- Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 803 (vol. ii).
- Stoney Indian rising, further information, 863 (vol. ii).
- Subsidies to Rys. other than the C. P. R. (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 56 (vol. i).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res. 2974-2978, 2988-2990; in Com. on B., 3399; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts., 3403; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79), 3404 (vol. iv).

Superannuation Fund (M. for Stmt.) 56 (vol. i).

Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 271 (vol. i).

Superior Court Judges, Quebec, B. 161 (*Sir John*) on prop. Res., 3375 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice*, 3411 (vol. iv).

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1025; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1033; (Criminal Statistics) 1026; (Dominion Exhibition) 1026; (Mortuary Statistics) 1029 (vol. ii).

*Canals—Income*: Rideau (Land damages in Township of Pittsburgh) 3418 (vol. iv).

*Charges of Management* (Asst. Rec. Genl., Montreal) 895; (Auditor and Rec. Genl., St. John) 895; (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 895; (Brokerage and Commission) 896; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 896; (Financial Inspector) 895; (Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes) 897; (Printing Dom. Notes) 897; (Printing, &c.) 897 (vol. ii).

*Civil Govt.* (Agriculture, Dept. of) 905, (contingencies) 922; (Customs Dept., contingencies) 924; (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 898; (Inland Revenue Dept., Contingencies) 917; (Interior, Dept. of) 972; (Justice, Dept. of) 898, (Penitentiaries Branch) 914; (Marine, Dept. of) 907; (Militia, Dept. of) 899; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902; (Privy Council) 899; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 900 (vol. ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office (Allowance to Asst. Postmaster of Ottawa) conc., 3397 (vol. iv).

*Immigration*, 2831-2838 (vol. iv).

*Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); conc., 3371 (vol. iv); (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Com.) 3449; (increased Indemnity to Members) 3450; Miscellaneous (printing and printing paper, &c.) 2798 2801. Senate (extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).

*Liquor License Act*, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2943; (Can. and Germany) 2945; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 2939 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (Aiding civil power at Lingan Mines, C.B.) 3452; (Barracks at London) 3412 (vol. iv).

*Miscellaneous* (American Mining Engineers' visit to N. S.) 3457 (vol. iv); (Disturbance in the N. W., Vote of \$700,000) 1304 (vol. ii), (Vote of \$1,000,000) 2234, conc., 2235 (vol. iii); (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453 (vol. iv); (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N. W. T.) 3454; (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (N. W. Council, salaries) conc., 3396; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c.) 3434; (Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished to Lord Lorne and party) 3452; (Refund of duties to persons in P. E. I.) 3455; (Relief of distressed in N. W. T.) 3455 (vol. iv).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. steamers) 2945 (vol. iv).

*Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 989; (Kingston) 986; (St. Vincent de Paul) 986-988 (vol. ii).

*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii).

*Quarantine* (Sheep scab) 3411 (vol. iv).

*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Inspecting Engineers' salaries, &c.) 3417; Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415; I. C. R. (sleeping cars) 3418. Repairs, &c. (I. C. R.) 3300; (Eastern

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

Extension) 3301; Short Line Ry. between Oxford and New Glasgow, 3413 (vol. iv). *Income*: Cape Breton Ry. (Survey, &c.) 3418 (vol. iv).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Order for 2°, 102; on M. for 2°, 157 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction Limitation B. 68, on M. to introd., 246 (vol. i).

Surveys and Plans of Battleford and Edmonton (Ques.) 2357 (vol. iii).

Surveys of River Lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ques.) 3424; Mode of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).

Taché, Archbishop, Communication from, *re*-Half-breeds (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).

Tagging Metal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).

Tariff, The. See "Ways and Means."

Tariff Chagnes, Notice of, by Govt. (remarks) 714 (vol. i).

Telegraphic communication west of Winnipeg (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).

Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. 2935 (vol. iv).

Timber Licenses and Permits granted on lands outside disputed Territory (M. for Rets.\*) 209 (vol. i).

Timber on Indian Lands, non-printing of Rets. as ordered by House (remarks) 56 (vol. i).

Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).

Trade relations with U.S. (remarks) 3163 (vol. iv).

Treasury Board, constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1°, 630 (vol. i); in Com., 1670.

Trent Valley Canal, Plans and Estimates of cost, &c. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 144 (vol. i); Contracts (M. for copies) 823 (vol. ii).

Troops, Movements of (remarks) 838, 872, 887 (vol. ii). Umbrella or parasol ribs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).

Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).

Volunteer Corps organised in the N. W. in 1879 (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).

Volunteers in the N. W., Recognition of services of (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3370 (vol. iv).

Volunteers on active service, Increase of pay (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).

Volunteers of 1837-38, on Res. recognising services of, 38 (vol. i).

Vote of \$700,000 for expenses in the N. W., in Com. of Sup. 1304 (vol. ii); \$1,000,000 for same purpose, in Com. of Sup., 2234; \$1,700,000, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2559 (vol. iii).

War Supplies, carriage of, by American Rys. (Ques.) 838 (vol. ii).

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses. on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901, (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Transport Regulations, Papers, &c. (Ques.) 3249 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: conclusion of Deb. (remarks) 662; on M. for Com. (Res.) Disturbance in the N. W., 756-761; neg. (Y. 57, N. 122) 771; in Com., 772-775; (buckram) 807; (carpet mats) 856; (chains, iron and steel) 849; (cotton yarns) 808; (cutlery) 844; (damask of cotton) 858; (duck) 808; (earthenware and stoneware) 847; (extract of fluid beef) 857; (fish) 859; (glucose syrup) 851; (hoop iron) 807; (house furnishing hardware) 849; (imitation precious stones) 846; (jute cloth) 806; (musk) 806; (pickles and sauces) 843; (plate glass) 856; (rubber, re-covered) 807; (salt cake) 806; (sheet iron hollow ware) 857; (steel) 803; (tagging metal) 806; (towels) 858; (umbrella or parasol ribs, &c.) 858; (winceys) 840 vol. ii; (whiskey) 3220, vol. iv; (white shellac) 806; (woollen fabrics) 841, (vol. ii); on Res. granting \$1,700,000 for N. W. Troubles, 2559 (vol. iii); (Res.) *Resumé* of Events in the N. W. T. 3075-3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213; Excise Duties, on conc., 3295 (vol. iv).
- Weights and Measures Inspection Acts. Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 832, 834-836; in Com., 1676 (vol. ii).
- Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 216 (vol. i).
- Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports, on M. for Ret., 139 (vol. i).
- Whiskey, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 3230 (vol. iv).
- White Shellac, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 806 (vol. ii).
- Winceys, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 840 (vol. ii).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 82 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 428 (vol. i).
- Woollen Fabrics, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 841 (iv).
- Woollen Rags, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 783, 785, 792; Legislation respecting (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Writ for Levis (Ques.) 633 (remarks) 661 (vol. i).

**Blondeau, Mr. C. B., Kamouraska.**

- Agricultural Ins. Co. of Can., incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1386 (vol. ii).
- Caron, Clovis, Salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 290; (M. for copies of Rep.\*) 532 (vol. i).
- Gauvreau, Jules, salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 290; (M. for copies of Rep.\*) 532.
- Gregory, J. U., Rep. of enquiry made by, *re* Fisheries (M. for copies\*) 532 (vol. i).
- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*), in Com., 2977 (vol. iv).

**Bossé, Mr. J. G., Centre Quebec.**

- Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 283 (vol. i).
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497 (vol. i).

**Bossé, Mr. J. G.—Continued.**

- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langetier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3282-3284 (vol. iv).

**Bourassa, Mr. F., St. John's, Q.**

- Militiamen of 1812, Pensions to, names and residences (M. for Stmt.) 101 (vol. i).

**Bourbeau, Mr. D. O., Drummond and Athabaska.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 99, 1°) 605 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*), in Com. (Amt.) 955, 962; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1047; in Com., 1058, 1059 (vol. ii).

**Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.**

- Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
- Administration of Justice N. W. T., in Com. of Sup. 3433 (vol. iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (B. 143, 1°\*) 2356 (vol. iii).
- Analysts, Public, Remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2544, 2547 (vol. iii).
- Asbestos, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 857 (vol. ii).
- Auditor Genl.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
- Axle Grease, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 857 (vol. ii).
- Bank of B. C. B. 205 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2396 (vol. iii).
- Barrels containing Petroleum or its products, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 843 (vol. ii).
- Beet-root Sugar, importation of (Ans.) 744 (vol. i).
- Bonded Machinery in use (Ans.) 3321 (vol. iv).
- Borax, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 808 (vol. ii).
- Bounty to Fishermen, Payment of, in Guysboro', N.S. (Ans.) 2751 (vol. iv).
- Brosseau & Lisabelle, Customs Brokers, frauds, &c., by (Ans.) 1387 (vol. ii).
- Buckram, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 807 (vol. ii).
- Campbellton and Gaspé, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
- Can. and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942-2944; conc., 2596, (vol. iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 955, 967 (vol. ii).
- C. P. R. Advances to Co. by Govt. (Ans.) 1306 (vol. ii).
- Floating Debt of Co. (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).
- Interest payments by Co. (Ans.) 1955 (vol. iii).
- Length of gaps on (explanation) 838 (vol. iii).
- Rolling Stock, payment of Duties on by Co., 889 (vol. ii).
- Sums paid or advanced to Co. as Interest or Subsidy (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).
- Canals, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3303, 3307, 3311 (vol. iv).
- Canned Goods (B. 142 1°\*) 2345 (vol. iii).
- Carleton Branch Ry., Purchase of, in Com. of Sup., 3416 (vol. iv).
- Chains, Iron or Steel, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 849 (vol. ii).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

- Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 896, 897 (vol. ii); conc., 2763 (vol. iv).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 901, 904, 915, 916, 921, 923, 927, 957, 977 (vol. ii); 3408, 3410, 3411, 3433 (vol. iv).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1114–1117, 1119, 1120, 1124, 1125; on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Ques. of Order) 1299 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 975, 977 (ii).
- Clearing vessels without Harbor Master's certificate (Ans.) 862 (vol. ii).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3233–3241, 3393 (vol. iv).
- Colored Labels for Fruit, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 2<sup>o</sup> m. (remarks) 1671 (vol. ii); in Com., 2306 (vol. iii).
- Commutation of Stamp Duty, in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2529 (vol. iii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2433, 2438; on Order for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2432 (vol. iii); M. to recom. and in Com., 2768 (vol. iv).
- Cotton Bed-quilts, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- Cotton Yarns, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- Customs Appraiser at Summerside, P.E.I. (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
- Customs and Excise Duties (B. 157) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3520; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3434; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3435 (vol. iv).
- Customs Dept., in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
- Customs Dept., French Canadian employés in (Ans.) 1914 (vol. iii).
- Customs Detectives or Police in N.S. (Ans.) 889 (vol. ii).
- Customs, in Com. of Supply, 3233–3241, 3393 (vol. iv).
- Customs Seizures at Winnipeg, on M. for Stmnt., 293 (vol. i).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (vol. ii).
- Damask of Cotton, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
- Debates, Official Rep. (M. for Sel. Com.) 28 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Debt of Canada, Floating and Unfunded (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Supply, 916, 921, 923, 915, 927 (vol. ii).
- Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3358 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N.W.T., Expenses (B. 149, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 2559 (vol. iii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2855 (vol. iv).
- Further Intelligence, 812 (vol. ii).
- On Question of Order, 3161 (vol. iv).
- Drawbacks on manufactured Exports, on M. for Ret., 139 (vol. i).
- Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- Duties, collection of unauthorised (remarks) 427 (vol. i).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

- Duty on Grain, abolition of, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 54 (vol. i).
- Earthenware and Stoneware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 848 (vol. ii).
- Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).
- Estimates. See "Message."
- Excise Duties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3294; conc., 3470 (vol. iv).
- Excise Revenue for May, 1884, and May, 1885 (Ans.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Expenses of Elections under Can. Temp. Act, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (vol. iv).
- Exports of Canadian produce (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
- Extract of Fluid Beef, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
- Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 901, 915 (vol. ii).
- Financial Commissioner in England, in Com. of Sup., 896 (vol. ii).
- Fishery Clauses, termination of (Ans.) 3249 (vol. iv).
- Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3391; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).
- Fish, in Com. on Ways and Means, 859 (vol. ii).
- Five per cent. Loan Sinking Fund (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- France and Quebec fortnightly line, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2936, 3041 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, 1435, 1465, 1619 (vol. ii); 1920 (vol. iii); in Com., "actual value," 1596–1607; on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1497 (vol. ii); 1758, 1799, 2189 (vol. iii); "occupant," 1483; (corrections) 1419, 1491; on M. to adjn. deb., 1430; "tenant," 1478–1480; on M. that Com. rise, 1497 (vol. ii); on personal explanation of Mr. Blake, 2542; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1995; "in counties," 2061; "revision of voters' lists," 2348; "appeal," 2361; "general provisions," 2344 (remarks) 2015 (vol. iii).
- Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2025 (vol. iii).
- Foot Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
- French Canadians in Customs Dept. (Ans.) 2171 (iii).
- Gas Coke, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (vol. ii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1315 (vol. ii).
- Geneva Gin and Brandy, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224, 3229.
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3348 (vol. iv).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 840–862, 855 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Bonds, disappearance of, from Vaults, 3371 (iv).
- Govt. Loans (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Loan (B. 145) prop. Res., 2461–2463; in Com., 2463 (M. to conc. in Res.) 2523.
- Govt. Notes in circulation (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- Grant of \$1,700,000 for N.W. Expenses, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2532, 2559 (vol. iii).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

- G.T.R., Importation of Rails (Ans.) 1566 (vol. ii).  
 Hoop Iron, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).  
 House Furnishing Hardware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 848 (vol. ii).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2818, 2839, 2853 (vol. iv).  
 Imports for Consumption, on M. for Stmt., 30 (vol. i).  
 Importation of Prison Manufs. (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).  
 Indemnity to Members, increased, 3450 (vol. iv).  
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3410 (vol. iv).  
 Insurance, Superintendence of, in Com. of Sup., 2957; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3403 (vol. iv).  
 Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).  
 Jute Cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2765, 2796, 3448–3450 (vol. iv).  
 Library, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).  
 Life-boats and Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2949 (iv).  
 Liverpool, or London, and St. John, N.B. or Halifax, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).  
 Loans contracted by Govt. (Ans.) 1305, 1744 (vol. ii); 1914, 2530 (vol. iii).  
 Loans for the Public Service, prop. Res., 2392 (vol. iii).  
 Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).  
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).  
 McManus, C., widow of, gratuity to, conc., 3374 (vol. iv).  
 Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 2936–2944, 2957, 2953, 3041 (vol. iv).  
 Manitoba Claims Settlement (B. 155) prop. Res., 2420 (vol. iii); M. for Com. on Res., 2775 (vol. iv); in Com., 2789, 2791–2795; in Com. on Res., 2823, 2924 (vol. iv); 2° m. and in Com., 3047; 3° m., 3075 (vol. iv).  
 Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Message from His Ex., Estimates, The (presented) 289 (vol. i).  
 ——— Supplementary Estimates, 1884–85 (presented) 2820 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Further Suppl. Estimates for 1885–86 (presented) 3423 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Supplementary Estimates for 1885–86 (presented) 3359 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Grant of \$1,000,000 for expenditure in the N. W., (presented) 2234 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Vote to Genl. Middleton (presented) 3470 (iv).  
 Military Branch and District Staff, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 2903.  
 Mineral Waters, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. iii).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

- Micellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 2234, 3245, 3358 (vol. iii); 3387, 3388, 3391, 3392, 3396, 3420, 3434, 3452, 3454–3456, 3470 (vol. iv).  
 Mouldings and Picture Frames, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).  
 Mounted Police, N. W., in Com. of Sup., 3421 (vol. iv).  
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303, 3307 (vol. iv).  
 Musk, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).  
 N. B. and P. E. I. to Great Britain. Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).  
 Newfoundland and Dom., Trade relations between (Ans.) 3042 (vol. i).  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2946, 2949 (vol. iv).  
 Order Paper, on omission from, of a question (remarks) 2774 (vol. iv).  
 Partridge, Prairie Fowls, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).  
 Peachy, J. W., Superannuation of (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 3374, 3411 (vol. iv).  
 Pitch Pine, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).  
 Plate Glass, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).  
 Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C. B., Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).  
 Port Mulgrave, N.S., as a sub-port, on M. for papers, &c., 446 (vol. i).  
 Postmaster Genl.'s Dept., in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).  
 Post Office and Finance Dept., computing interest, in Com. of Sup., 927 (vol. ii).  
 Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (Ans.) 2465 (iii).  
 Printing Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in Ottawa *Free Press*, 3163 (vol. iv).  
 Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c., conc., 3434 (vol. iv).  
 Public Debt of Can., amount of (Ans.) 927 (vol. ii); 2465 (vol. iii).  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2917, 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Pumice and Pumice Stone, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).  
 Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished Lord Lorne and party, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).  
 Quercitron or Oak Bark, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).  
 Ques. of Order, in Com. on Ways and Means, 852 (ii).  
 Railways, in Com. of Sup., 3416 (vol. iv).  
 Rand's Miemac Indian Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Receipts and Expenditures, Consolidated Fund (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).  
 Red Liquor, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).  
 Refund of Bank Imposts, in Com. of Sup., 3387; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).  
 Refund of Duties to persons in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 3455; conc., 3470 (vol. iv).  
 Relief of Distressed in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).  
 Removal of prisoners, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

- Return, on enquiries for (remarks) 211 (i); 2854 (iv).  
 Ross, N.N., of Quebec, name and salary of successor to (Ans.) 862 (vol. ii).  
 Rubber, re-covered, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).  
 St. Croix Cotton Mills, payment of Duties (Ans.) 632 (i).  
 Salt Cake, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).  
 Senate Expenses, extra, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).  
 Seizures by Customs Dept. at Montreal (Ans.) 1387 (ii).  
 Sessional Clerks, extra, in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).  
 Sheet Iron Hollow Ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).  
 Silver and German Silver, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).  
 Spirits and Tobacco, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3212-3216 (vol. iv).  
 Spirits taken out of bond (Ans.) 3371 (vol. iv).  
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 803-805, 808, 810 (ii).  
 Subsidies to Man. (prop. Res.) 2889 (vol. iv).  
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3219-3222 (iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice*, 3411, 3433 (vol. iv).  
*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303, 3307; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3311 (vol. iv).  
*Charges of Management*, conc., 2763 (vol. iv); (Commutation of Stamp Duty, &c.) 897; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 896; (Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes) 897 (vol. ii).  
*Civil Govt.* (Auditor Genl.'s Office) 901; (Civil Service Examiners) 975, 977; (Customs, Dept. of) 901, (contingencies) 916, 921, 923; (Finance and Treasury Board) 901, (contingencies) 915 (vol. ii); (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 3410; (Interior, Dept. of) 3408 (vol. iv); (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904; Deptl. Contingencies (Post Office and Finance Depts., computing interest) 927 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs, 3233-3241, 3393 (vol. iv).  
*Geological Survey*, 3348 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2818, 2839, 2853 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 2765; (Election Expenses) 3451; (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450; (Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2796. Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796; printing, paper, &c.) 2798, 2801, 2806. Senate (Extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Campbellton and Gaspé) 2942; (Can. and Antwerp) 2942-2944, conc., 2958; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2936, 2942, 3041; (Liverpool or London and St. John, N.B., or Halifax) 2942; (New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to Great Britain) 3457; (Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B.) 2942 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2903 (iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Commercial Agencies) 3245; (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3358 (vol. iv); (Disturbance in the N. W., Vote of \$1,000,000) 2234 (vol. iii); (Expenses of Election under Can. Temp. Act) 3388; (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3391, conc., 3396; (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N. W. T.) 3454; (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c.) conc., 3434; (Printing Commission) 3392; (Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished Lord Lorne and party) 3452; (Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary) 3420; (Refund of Bank Imposts) 3387, conc., 3396; (Refund of Duties to persons in P. E. I.) 3455, conc., 3470; (Relief of Distressed in N. W. T.) 3454 (vol. iv).  
*North-West Mounted Police*, 3421 (vol. iv).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Examination of Masters and Mates) 2946; (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2949 (vol. iv).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Gratuity to widow of C. McManus) conc., 3374; (Removal of prisoners) 3411 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Consld. Fund* (Telegraphs) 3420. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2917 (vol. iv).  
*Railways—Capital*: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3416 (vol. iv).  
*Superintendence of Insurance*, 2957; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
 Supply (B. 163) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3470 (vol. iv).  
 Tagging Metal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).  
 Tariff, The. See "Ways and Means."  
 Tar Pine, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).  
 Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).  
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan (B. 150, 1<sup>o</sup>) 2751 (vol. iv); M. for Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2934; in Com., 2935 (vol. iv).  
 Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 28 (vol. i).  
 Trade Relations with U. S. (remarks) 3163 (vol. iv).  
 Transportation Charges, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (vol. iv).  
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3311 (vol. iv).  
 Umbrella or Parasol ribs, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).  
 Vote of \$1,000,000 for the N. W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 2234 (vol. iii).  
 Washington Treaty, Transport Regulations, papers, &c. (Ans.) 3249 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*: in Com., 772-776; (asbestos) 857; (axle grease) 857; (barrels containing petroleum, &c.) 843; (borax) 808; (buckram) 807; (chains, iron or steel) 849; (colored labels for fruit) 857; (cotton bed quilts) 857; (cotton yarns) 808; (cutlery) 844; (damask of cotton) 858; (duck) 808; (earthenware and stoneware) 848; (extract of fluid beef) 857; (fish) 859; (foot grease) 806; (gas coke) 783; (Geneva gin and brandy) 3224, 3229; (glucose syrup) 849-852, 855; (hoop iron) 807; (house furnishing hardware) 848; (jute cloth) 806; (mineral water) 808; (mouldings and picture frames) 846; (musk) 806; (partridge, prairie fowl, &c.) 853; (pine tar) 810; (pitch pine) 810; (plate glass) 856; (pumice and pumice stone) 810; (quercitron or oak bark) 810; (red liquor) 803; (rubber, re-covered) 807; (salt cake) 806; (sheet iron hollow ware) 857; (silver and German silver) 808 (vol. ii); (spirits and tobacco) 3212, 3216, 3225 (vol. iv); (steel) 803-805; (steel, in sheets) 808; (steel, No. 20 gauge) 808; (steel railway bars or rails) 810 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3219-3222 (vol. iv); (tagging metal) 806; (towels) 857 (ii); (transportation charges) 3224 (vol. iv); (umbrella or parasol ribs, &c.) 858 (vol. ii); (whiskey) 3225 (vol. iv); (white shellac) 806; (woollen fabrics) 800, 841; (woollen rags), 783, 786, 792 (vol. ii); conc., 3520, Excise Duties, in Com., 3294; conc., 3470 (vol. iv); (Res.) granting \$1,700,000 for N. W. Expenses, 2532, 2559 (vol. iii).

**Bowell, Hon. M.**—*Continued.*

- Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).  
 Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports, on. M for Ret., 138 (vol. i).  
 Whiskey, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225 (vol. iv).  
 White Shellac, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).  
 Woollen Fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 800, (ii).  
 Woollen Rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 786, 792; legislation respecting (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).

**Bryson, Mr. J., Pontiac.**

- Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1215 (vol. ii).

**Burns, Mr. K. F. Gloucester.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. "qualifications in cities and towns," 1809 (vol. iii).  
 Way and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 595-599 (vol. i).

**Burpee, Mr. C., Sunbury.**

- Administration of Justice in N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3429 (vol. iv).  
 Bounty to Fishing Vessels (M. for Stmtnt.) 98 (vol. i).  
 Can. and Jamaica, Confederation of (M. for copies of Cor.) withdn., 505 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to conc. in Amt. (Amt.) 1047 neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050 (vol. ii).  
 Charlottetown Public Buildings, construction of (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 Coal entered ex-warehouse, free, or for exportation (M. for Stmtnt.) 100 (vol. i).  
 Drawback on Shipbuilding Materials (M. for Ret.) 100 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian), 1522 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1810, 1987, 1991, 2001; "manhood suffrage," 1959; "qualifications in counties," 2004, 2058, (Amt.) 2060, 2073, 2079; "who shall not vote" (Indians) (Amt.), 2120; "registration of voters," 2251 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1502 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3058; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063 (vol. iv).  
 I. C. R. Casualties to Trains, &c. (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).  
 ——— Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 101 (vol. i).  
 ——— Rolling Stock, Purchase and Building of (M. for Ret.\*) 101 (vol. i).  
 Lughrin, Charles H., and Sec. of State, Cor between, re Can. Temp. Act (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1004 (vol. ii).  
 St. Stephen's, N.B., Post Office, receipts, &c. (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 1100 (vol. ii).

**Burpee, Mr. C.**—*Continued.*

- Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, in Com. on Res., 2986; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts. 3403 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys., B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2986; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts, 3403 (vol. iv).  
 Trade Relations with foreign Countries (Ques.) 78; with Jamaica, 429 (vol. i).

**Cameron, Mr. D. M., West Middlesex.**

- A. B. and C. Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Officers and men, pay and allowances (M. for Ret.\*) 313 (vol. i).  
 Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2905 (vol. iv).  
 Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 119 (vol. i).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1107, 1111-1114, 1117-1119, 1121, 1122, 1126; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1292 (vol. ii).  
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 979, 982 (ii).  
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).  
 Doutre, J., services re Halifax Commission, 3392 (iv).  
 Drill pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2911 (vol. iv).  
 Duty on Grain, Abolition of (M. for copies of Cor.) 54 (vol. i).  
 Fisheries protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).  
 Fishery Commission, Increased remuneration to Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3391 (vol. iv).  
 Flour, corn and cornmeal imported and exported (M. for Ret.) 56 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1373-1379 (vol. ii); in Com., "woman suffrage," 1440; "person" (Indian) 1493; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1699-1707, 1890, 1895-1900, 1994, (Amt.) 1999, 2002; "manhood suffrage," 1973; "registration of voters," 2193-2197, 2263; "qualifications in counties," 2061, (Amt.) 2071, 2073, 2077, 2084, 2085, 2395; "who shall not vote," 2102, (Indians) 2149-2152, (Amt.) 2274, (Amt.) 2285, 2289, 2291; "appeal," 2395; on M. for consideration of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066 (vol. iv); on M. that Com. rise, 2209 (vol. iii).  
 G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure (M. for Ret.) 816 (vol. ii).  
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 2451 (vol. iv).  
 Liquor License Act, administration of, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).  
 Military Branch, &c., Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).  
 Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 2906, 2909 (vol. iv).  
 Morgan, J. H., Appointment as Forestry Commissioner (M. for O. C., &c.\*) 147 (vol. i).  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).  
 Private Banks and Brokers, legislation respecting (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).

**Cameron, Mr. D. M.—Continued.**

Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 979, 982 (vol. ii); (Militia, Dept. of, contingencies) 2913 (vol. iv).

*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3310 (vol. iv).

*Legislation* : H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3451 (vol. iv).

*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2914; (Ammunition) 2905; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2906-2909; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2911; (Royal Military College) 2913; (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2903 (vol. iv).

*Miscellaneous* (Fishery Commission, Increased remuneration to Counsel) 3391; (Doutre, J., Services on Halifax Commission) 3392 (vol. iv).

Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, names of officers (M. for Ret.\*) 312 (vol. i).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (re-covered rubber) 807 (vol. ii).

**Cameron, Mr. Hector, North Victoria.**

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 949; in Com., 954, 956, 957, 961, 962 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2644, 2650, 2652, 2654, 2655, 2660, 2673; (Amt.) 2674 (vol. iv).

Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, &c., on M. for Papers, 931 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Resolutions, &c., in Com., 2746, 2748 (vol. iv).

Dom. Drainage Co.'s Bill 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).

Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for resuming adjd. deb. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 941 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1393; (correction) 1397; "tenant," 1477; "registration of voters," 2180, 2230, 2233 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1424; on M. that Com. rise, 1435; on Ques. of Order, 1435 (vol. ii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310, 1313, 1315, 1316 (vol. ii).

G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure, on M. for Ret., 817 (vol. ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2491, 2493 (vol. iii).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497, 499 (vol. i).

North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2491, 2493 (vol. iii).

Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1219 (vol. ii).

Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 349; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 428; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 428; (B. 91, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 428.

**Cameron, Mr. Hugh, Inverness.**

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1057 (vol. ii).

**Cameron, Mr. Hugh—Continued.**

Cape Breton Island, claims of, under terms of Confederation (prop. Res.) 607-615; withdn., 615 (vol. i).

Eastern Extension Ry., N.S., Earnings and Working Expenses (Ques.) 148; (M. for Stmt.\*) 313 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage" (correction *re* Indians) 1419; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1629-1632, 1836 (vol. ii); "in counties," 2395; "registration of voters," 2278, 2283 (vol. iii).

Great American and European Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret., 79 (vol. i).

McIsaac's Pond, Inverness, N.S., as a harbor of refuge (Ques.) 36; Engineers' Reps. respecting (M. for copies) 60 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., as a sub-port, on M. for papers, &c., 445 (vol. i).

Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1015 (vol. ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Railways—Capital*: Eastern Extension Ry., 3384 (vol. iv).

Telegraph System in Cape Breton, extension of (Ques.) 78 (vol. i).

**Cameron, Mr., M. C., West Huron.**

Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2962 (vol. iv).

Bell and Kavanagh, Land Claims (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 479 (vol. i).

Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825, 2827 (vol. iv).

Boots for the Toronto Militia Corps (Ques.) 1744 (iii).

Business of the House, on M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1745 (vol. iii).

Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 901, 913, 918, 921, 925 (ii).

Claims of unenumerated Half-breed Minors, Man. (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).

Cox Divorce (B. 138, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 1473 (vol. ii).

C. P. R., Change of Arrangements with Govt. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).

—— Postal and Transport Service (Ques.) 1744 (iii).

—— Res. respecting further Loan (Speech) 2630; (Amt.) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; on M. to rec. Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 2858 (vol. iv).

—— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 108 (vol. i).

Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3356 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N. W., communication with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1744; Half-breed grievances (*Mr. Blake*) 2045-2051 (vol. iii); on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3154-3160, 3163-3175 (vol. iv).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921 (vol. iv).

Elections Acts Amt. (B. 14, 1<sup>o</sup>) 41 (vol. i).

Emerson, Town of, Govt. aid to (Ques.) 148; (M. for copies of Claims, &c.\*) 448 (vol. i).

Evidence, Law of, in Criminal Cases (B. 6, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 29; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 176; 2<sup>o</sup> on a div. and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496-498 (vol. i).

**Cameron, Mr. M. C.—Continued.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1138-1143; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1394, 1438; "owner," 1472; "tenant" (Amt.) 1475, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indian) 1502, 1527, 1580; "farm," 1591, 1592; "farmers' sons" (Amt.) 1591; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1692-1699 (vol. ii), 1924-1931; "in counties," 2074; "registration of voters," 2216-2220, (Amt.) 2227, 2241, 2274-2277, 2281-2284, (Amt.) 2286, 2300, 2302-2305, 2313, 2317, 2319; "revision of voters' lists," 2321, 2326-2329, 2332, 2345-2348; "general provisions," 2344, 2345, 2351-2354; "officers and duties," 2356, 2389; "appeal," 2360-2366; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1421, 1437, 1531; on taking up items consecutively, 1471; (Ques. of Order) 1494 (vol. ii), 1919 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3060; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3067, neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Business, on, M. to take in Thursdays, 452 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2920 (vol. iv).
- High Commissioner, in Com. of Sup., 925 (vol. ii).
- Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
- Indians, Man. and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3319, 3339 (vol. iv).
- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 918, 921 (ii).
- I. C. R. Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1066, 1073, 1092; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1325; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) 1329 (vol. ii).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2508-2511, 2521 (vol. iii).
- Land Sales or Settlement in the N.W. south of 24-mile Belt (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases, compellable witness (B. 6, 1°\*) 29; 2° m., 176; 2° on a div. and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496-498 (vol. i).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2797 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parliament B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1666 (vol. ii).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
- License Commissioners, Board of, appointments by Govt. under Act of 1883, receipts and expenditures, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 46 (vol. i).
- Liquor License Act, administration of, conc. 3398 (iv).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, litigation in Supreme Court (M. for copies of O.C., Factum of Govt. and Provs., Notes of Shorthand Reporters, Rep. of Court, &c., &c.) 45 (vol. i).
- Liquor License Act, 1883 (prop. Res.) 928, 1211; conc. in Res. asked, 1226; M. to conc. in Res., 1281 (ii).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2400 (vol. iii); in Com., 2894; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2959 (iv).

**Cameron, Mr. M. C.—Continued.**

- Loans contracted by Govt. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (vol. iii).
- Man., Claim for a subsidy (Ques.) 188 (vol. i).
- Man. Half-breed minors, temporarily absent, and claims of unenumerated (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
- Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., Land Grants to, in Com. on Res., 2508-2511 (vol. iii).
- Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 130 (vol. i).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3356 (vol. iv).
- Ontario Law Reports, in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).
- Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, re Timber Regulations in B. C., 2240 (vol. iii).
- Proof of Entries in Books of Acct. B. 113 (*Mr. Chapleau*) 2397 (vol. iii).
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2920, 2921 (vol. iv).
- Rys. and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 913 (ii).
- Rebellion. See "Disturbance."
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 292 (vol. i).
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. (B. 45, 1°\*) 147; 2° m., 362, 490 (vol. i).
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404; neg. (Y. 35, N. 77) 3408 (vol. iv).
- Returns, non-production of (remarks) 427 (vol. i).
- Settlement of Claims of Man. Half-breed minors (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
- Sessional Clerks, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Govt.*:—Deptl. Contingencies (High Commissioner) 925; (Inland Revenue) 918, 921; (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 901; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).
- Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 3319, 3339 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (Coms., extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2796; Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796, 2797 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act*, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3356; (Ont. Law Reps.) 3351 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Income*: Dredging, 2921; Harbors and Rivers, (Ont.) 2920 (vol. iv).
- Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 2828; in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).
- Squatters in Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24 west (M. for Ret.) 231 (vol. i).
- Timber Licenses or Permits to cut (Amt.) to M. for Ret., 30 (vol. i).
- Ways and Means*—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N.W., 3154-3160, 3163-3175 (vol. iv).

**Campbell, Mr. C. J., Victoria, N.S.**

- Argyle Highlanders, payment of Arrears due (Ques.) 888; (M. for Ret.\*) 1444 (vol. ii).
- Bird Island Lighthouse, N. S., Management of (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Volunteers disbanded in Military District No. 9 (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

# INDEX.

101

## **Campbell, Mr. R., South Renfrew.**

- Franchise B. 108 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (remarks) 2385 (vol. iii).  
Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3471 (vol. iv).

## **Carling, Hon. J., London.**

- Assistant Postmaster at Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (vol. iv).  
Brandon, Postmaster at, Salary and allowances (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).  
Calgary and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).  
Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii); conc., 2764 (vol. iv).  
Charlinch Post Office, appointment or removal of Postmaster, &c., on M. for papers, 708 (vol. i).  
C.P.R. Postal and Transport Service (Ans.) 1744 (ii).  
Depositors in Post Office Savings Banks, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. i).  
Glamis Post Office, enquiry respecting (Ans.) 1131 (ii).  
G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, on M. for Ret., 818 (vol. ii).  
Le Fonds Post Office, establishment of (Ans.) 816 (ii).  
Letter Postage, reduction of (Ans.) 33; on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 292 (vol. i).  
Mail Bags, furnishing of (Ans.) 964 (vol. ii).  
Mail Service between Antigonish and Sherbrooke (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).  
Mail Service on the Canada Southern Ry., on M. for Ret., 120 (vol. i).  
Mails between Shiloh and Fergus (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).  
Maitland, Postmaster at, removal of (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).  
Medicine Hat and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).  
Militia Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).  
Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract (B. 151) prop. Res., 2420; M. for Com. on Res., 2555; in Com., 2557 (vol. iii); M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2751; on M. to conc. in Res., 2756; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 2757 (vol. iv).  
Postal Privileges, Extension to Local Govts. (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).  
Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii); conc., 2764 (vol. iv).  
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 76 (vol. i).  
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3308-3310, 3393; conc., 3398 (vol. iv).  
Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (Ans.) 2359, 2559 (vol. iii).  
Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res., (*Mr. Chapleau*) 271 (vol. i).  
U. S. and Victoria, B. C., Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 2936 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:**  
*Civil Govt.* (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902 (vol. ii), conc., 2764 (vol. iv).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3308-3300; (Allowance to Asst. Postmaster at Ottawa) 3393; conc., 3398 (vol. iv).  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (U.S. and Vic., B.C.) 2936 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Barracks at London) 3412 (vol. iv).

## **Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A., Quebec County.**

- A. B. and C. Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).  
Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Res.) 2957; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 2958; in Com., 2961, 2963, 2967; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 3001, 3427 (vol. iv).  
Administration of the N. W. T. prop. Res., 2531 (iii); in Com. on Res., 2926, 2929, 2932 (vol. iv).  
Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2903-2906 (vol. iv).  
Argyle Highlanders, payment of Arrears due (Ans.) 889 (vol. ii).  
Artillery Association, Dom., in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).  
Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).  
Barrack Huts, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).  
Batoche, Battle of, telegram from Genl. Middleton giving details (read) 1822; second despatch, 1835 (iii).  
Batoche, capture of, rumored indignities committed by Volunteers, 2999, (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
Bergin, Surgeon Genl., Services of (Ans.) 1914 (vol. iii).  
Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. (B. 131) 2<sup>o</sup> m. and in Com., 2824-2826 (vol. iv).  
Big Bear, release of Prisoners by (tel. read) 2750 (iv).  
Blais, Achille, funeral expenses of (Ans.) 2169 (vol. ii).  
Boots for the Toronto Militia (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).  
Census in Man. and N. W. T. (Ans.) 149 (vol. i).  
Census of the N. W. T., &c. (Res.) 74 (vol. i).  
Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 898; conc., 914 (vol. ii) 2913 (vol. iv).  
Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1127 (vol. ii).  
Clarke's Crossing, arrival of Troops at (telegrams read) 1205 (vol. ii).  
Clothing and Great Coats, in Com. of Sup., 2906 (vol. iv).  
Copyright, Law of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Edgar*) 712 (vol. i).  
Corpsdnts., Dismissal of, from Camp (Ans.) 1608 (ii).  
C. P. R., Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, extension of time (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).  
Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (vol. i).  
Death of Col. Williams (remarks) and telegram read from Genl. Middleton, 3073 (vol. iv).  
Despatches, Official, respecting engagements in the N.W. (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii), 2999 (vol. iv).  
Disturbance in the N. W., arrival of troops at Clarke's Crossing (telegrams read) 1205 (vol. ii).  
—— Battle of Batoche, telegram from Genl. Middleton giving details (read) 1822; 2nd despatch, 1835 (iii).  
—— Batoche, capture of, rumored indignities committed by Volunteers, 2999 (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
—— Carriage of War Supplies by Am. Rys., 839 (ii).  
—— Col. Ouimet's absence from duty 1167, 1205 (ii).  
—— Col. Otter's march to Battleford 1386 (vol. ii).  
—— Col. Scott's Battalion (Ans.) 1064 (vol. ii).  
—— Cost of Expedition (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii).  
—— Despatch from Genl. Middleton announcing capture of Poundmaker and other Indians, 2139 (vol. iii).

**Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.**

- Disturbance in the N. W., Dismissal of Correspondents from Camp (Ans.) 1608 (ii).
- Disposition of Insurgents by Genl. Middleton (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Duck Lake, Engagement at, despatch of Troops (Ans.) 790 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 2855; in Com., 2856-2858 (vol. iv).
- Free transport of bodies of Volunteers killed (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Funeral expenses of Blais (Ans.) 2169 (vol. ii).
- Further intelligence (Ans.) 811, 813 (vol. ii).
- Indians at Touchwood (tel. read) 1566 (ii).
- Instructions issued to Genl. Middleton respecting Insurgents (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Houghton, Col., Mission of (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Montreal Garrison Artillery (Ans.) 1566 (ii).
- Official despatches respecting Engagements (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii); 2999 (vol. iv).
- Personal explanations, 966 968 (vol. ii).
- Pillage of houses of Half-breeds by Volunteers (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Release of Prisoners by Big Bear (telegram read) 2750 (iv).
- Rescue of Mrs. Delaney, Gowanlock, and other prisoners, telegram from Genl. Middleton (read) 2357 (vol. iii).
- Riel, capture of, telegram from Genl. Middleton (read) 1895 (vol. iii).
- Skirmish with Poundmaker (Ans.) 1646 (vol. ii).
- Troops, movements of, from N. S. (Ans.) 838 872; tel. from Col. Amyot, 1328 (vol. ii).
- Victoria Rifles, Montreal (Ans.) 1983 (vol. iii).
- Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3459 (Res.) 3463 (vol. iv).
- Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
- Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2910 (vol. iv).
- Duck Lake, Engagement at, despatch of Troops (Ans.) 790 (vol. ii).
- Eastern Extension Ry., N.S., Earnings and Working Expenses (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Elgin Station, L'Islet, Erection of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Employment of Prisoners outside of Gaols B. 87 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 1063; 2° m., 1658 (ii).
- Equipment of the 90th Battalion (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
- Expedition to the N. W., Cost of (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii).
- Expense (N. W. T.) B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2° 2855; in Com., 2856-2858 (vol. iv).
- Flannel Shirts for Militia, Contract (Ans.) 1306 (ii).
- General Middleton's Instructions (Ans.) 1306 (vol. ii).
- Grant, G., Militia Dept., Superan. of (Ans.) 2531 (iii).
- Houghton, Col., Mission of, to N. W. (Ans.) 3425 (iv).
- Improved Rifled Ordnance, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).
- Indians at Touchwood (tel. read) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Instructions issued to Genl. Middleton respecting insurgents (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Insurgents, Disposition of, by Genl. Middleton (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).

**Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.**

- Justices of the Peace, Summary proceedings before B. (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).
- Kits served out to the Militia (Ans.) 1568 (vol. ii).
- Laurie, Maj. Genl., Mission of, to the N. W. (Ans.) 2997 (vol. iv).
- Lavis's patent Pole and Militia Tents (Ans.) 2029 (iii).
- Man. Legislature, Session of 1884, Man. Central Ry. Co. (Ans.) 862 (vol. ii).
- Martin, John, continuation of Pension to Widow of, on M. for copies of Pet., 201 (vol. i).
- Medals for Volunteers who served in the N. W. (Ans.) 2274 (vol. iii).
- Middleton, Genl., despatches from, 1822-1835 (vol. ii); 1895, 2139, 2357, 2750 (vol. iii).
- Military Branch, &c., Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2889 2903 (vol. iv).
- Military Col. Graduates in the Militia (Ans.) 1040 (ii).
- Military Magazine at St. John, N.B., Disposal of, on M. for Ret. 606 (vol. i).
- Military Organisations in Man. and N. W. T. (Ans.) 863 (vol. ii).
- Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
- Military Storehouse, Quebec, Lease (Ans.) 1039 (ii).
- Militia Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 152, 1°) 2853; 2° m., 3045; in Com., 3046 (vol. iv).
- Militia and Defence, Annual Rep. (presented) 40 (vol. i).
- Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 898, 914 (vol. ii); 2913 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 2235, 2434.
- Montreal Garrison Artillery (Ans.) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Mounted Infantry, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
- North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 2412-2414, 2418 (vol. iii).
- Otter's, Col., march to Battleford (remarks) 1386 (vol. ii).
- Onimet's, Col., absence from duty (remarks) 1167, 1205 (vol. ii).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 266 (vol. i).
- Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).
- Personal Explanation, 966; (remarks) 968 (vol. ii).
- Pillage of houses of Half-breeds by Volunteers (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Poundmaker and other Indians, capture of, despatch from Genl. Middleton (read) 2139 (vol. iii).
- Powder Magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B. (Ans.) 247 (vol. i).
- Protestant Volunteers in the 65th Battalion (remarks) on newspaper paragraph, 2998; telegram from Col. Onimet (read) 3094 (vol. iv).
- Rebellion. See "Disturbance."
- Rescue of Mrs. Delaney, Gowanlock and other prisoners, telegram from Genl. Middleton (read) 2357 (iii).
- Riel, capture of, tel. from Genl. Middleton (read) 1895 (vol. iii).
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2913; conc., 2932 (vol. iv).

**Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.**

Scott's Col. Battalion (Ans.) 1064 (vol. ii).  
 Settlers in the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).  
 Skirmish with Poundmaker (Ans.) 1646 (vol. ii).  
 Summary proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 2420 (iii); 2° m, 2827 (iv).

**SUPPLY:**

*Civil Govt.* (Militia, Dept. of) 898; (contingencies) 914 (vol. ii); 2913 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2914; (Ammunition) 2903-2906; (Barracks at London) 3412; (Barrack Huts, B.O.) 3412; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 2903; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2906, 2908-2910; (Dom. Artillery Association) 2913; (Dom. Rifle Association) 2913; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2910; (Improved Rifled Ordnance) 2915; (Military Properties, care of) 2916; (Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg) 3411; (Royal Military College) 2913, conc., 2922; (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2889, 2903 (vol. iv).

*Miscellaneous*: Disturbance in the N.W. (Vote of \$700,000) 1304 (vol. ii); (Vote of \$1,000,000) 2235, 2434 (vol. iii).

*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii).

Supreme Court of N. B., causes entered, &c., on M. for number, 294 (vol. i).

Transfer of Batteries (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).

Troops, movements of (Ans.) 838, 872; telegram from Col. Amyot, 1328 (vol. ii).

Veterans of War of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).

Veterans of 1812, extension of Pensions to Widows of, (Ans.) 36 (vol. i).

Victoria Rifles, Montreal (Ans.) 1983 (vol. iii).

Volunteers killed, Free Transport of bodies (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).

Volunteers in the N. W. and Intoxicating Liquors (Ans.) 1131 (vol. ii).

Volunteer Corps in the N.W., organization of, in 1879 (Ans.) 1474 (vol. ii).

Vote of \$1,000,000 for N.W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 2434, 2235 (vol. iv).

Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3459, (Res.) 3463 (vol. iv).

Williams, Col., Death of (remarks, and tel. read) 3073 (iv).

War Supplies, carriage of, by American Rys., 839 (vol. ii).

Waterproof Blankets for Volunteers, purchase of (Ans.) 2171 (vol. iii).

*Ways and Means*—Disturbance in the N. W. (Res. granting \$1,700,000) in Com., 2532 (vol. iii).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J., Huron, South Riding.**

A. B. and C. Batteries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2914 (iv).

Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).

Address, on The, 24 (vol. i).

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 3411, 3433, 3448 (vol. iv).

Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3428 (vol. iv).

Advances to Provinces B. 7 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. to introd., 32 (vol. i).

Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 906, 921 (vol. ii).

Air Brakes, application of, on I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3299 (vol. iv).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

Allan Line, payments to, for assisted passages (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).

Allowance to Assistant Postmaster at Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 3392; conc., 3397 (vol. iv).

American Gold, substitution of, for Sovereigns (Ques.) 505 (vol. i).

Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2904, 2906 (vol. iv).

Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (vol. ii).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1023, 1027, 1034 (vol. ii) 3452; conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

Axle Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).

Baillairgé, G. F., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).

Bank Advances to Govt. (M. for Rets. of amounts) 37; (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).

Bank of B. C. B. 105 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1°, 631 (i).

Bolton, Staff Commander and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Aud. Genl., &c., 138 (i).

Budget, The (Ques.) 76, 149; (reply) 333 (vol. i).

Can. and Antwerp Steamship subvention, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).

Can. and Germany Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 65 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1°, 235 (vol. i).

C. P. R. Advances to Co. by Govt. (Ques.) 1305 (vol. ii).

— Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res. (remarks on adjmt. of deb.) 2643; in Com., 2724, 2729, 2730, 2738; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2859 (vol. iv).

— Engineers' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3417.

— Expenditure to complete Govt. construction (Ques.) 1130 (vol. ii).

— Loan, \$30,000,000 payments on account of (Ques.) 1130 (vol. ii).

— Publication of prop. Res. in *Mail* newspaper (remarks) 1712 (vol. ii).

— Rets. ordered by House since date of contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).

— Section B, Judge Clarke's Report on award to contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).

— Subsidy to Co., in Com. of Sup., 3296 (vol. iv).

Canals, in Com. of Sup., 3301, 3303, 3433 (vol. iv).

Capital Account, Expenditure on (M. for Stmt.) 45 (i).

Catholic population of Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 363 (i).

Census, Quinquennial, of Man. and N.W.T., &c., B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) on 1°, 46; in Com. on Res., 76; in Com. on B., 171; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 212; neg. (Y. 62, N. 120) 215 (vol. i).

Census, The, Fourth and Fifth vols., issue of (Ques.) 48, 455 (vol. i).

Census of 1881, Absentees from Canada during (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).

Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 2763 (vol. iv).

Chinese Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3287; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res., 3023 (vol. iv).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 906, 908, 910, 912, 914.  
916, 921, 969 (vol. ii); 2764, 3408, 3411, 3448; conc.,  
2764, 3433 (vol. iv).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com.  
on Res., 276, 280 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res.,  
892; in Com., 1097, 1100, 1104, 1114; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>  
(Amt.) to recom., 1286 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in  
Sen. Amts., 2396 (vol. iii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973 (vol. ii).
- Clark, G. M., sums paid to, apart from salary as Judge  
(Ques.) 235; (M. for Ret.) 697 (vol. i).
- Clothing and Great Coats (Militia) in Com. of Sup., 2906  
(vol. iv).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3232-3237,  
3241, 3242, 3397 (vol. iv).
- Collins, J. E., sums paid to, for services, on M. for Ret.,  
699 (vol. i).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibitions B. 126 (*Mr. Pope*) on  
M. to conc. in Res., 1064 (vol. ii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard  
Tilley*) in Com., 2430, 2433, 2436 (vol. iii).
- Consolid. Receipts and Expend. (M. for Ret.\*) 30 (vol. i)
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act, 1883, Amt. B. 146 (*Mr.  
Costigan*) in Com., 2970 (vol. iv).
- Cornwall Canal, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154, in  
Com., 3043 (vol. iv).
- Calling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Customs and Excise Receipts for June, 3073 (vol. iv).
- Customs Collections in Algoma, on M. for Ret., 40 (i).
- Customs, Dept. of (contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 925  
(vol. ii); 3233-3237 (vol. iv).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (vol. ii).
- Debates, Official Rep. of, delay in distributing daily  
edition to newspapers (remarks) 595 (vol. i); omission  
from (remarks) on adjmt. of Hse., 3249; on M. to  
conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 3459; in Com. of Sup.,  
3383 (vol. iv).
- Deposits in Banks, Govt. (M. for Stmt.) 29 (vol. i).
- Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3353 (iv).
- Dep. Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26, on  
Amt. (*Mr. Royal*) 72 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Assistance to families of  
Militiamen (remarks) 894 (vol. ii).
- Dismissal of correspondents from camp (Ques.)  
1608 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2857 (iv).
- Further information asked, 886 (vol. i).
- On adjmt. of deb. (remarks) 3160, 3212 (iv).
- On Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Ways  
and Means, 765 (vol. i).
- Half-breed grievances (*Mr. Blake*) 2042-2044  
(vol. iii).
- Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volun-  
teers, 3463 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands, Rev. for 7 months, 1884-85 (Ques.) 290.

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Sales of, for 1884-85 (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).
- Sales for 1884-85 (Ques.) 3072 (vol. iv).
- Sales and receipts, on account of (Ques.) 2854  
(vol. iv).
- Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 989 (vol. ii).
- Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3300 (vol. iv).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to (prop. Res.) 295,  
363; (reply) 390; neg. (Y. 59, N. 118) 394 (vol. i).
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Excise Revenue for May, 1884, and May, 1885 (Ques.)  
2531 (vol. iii).
- Excise Revenue for 6 months, 1884-85 (Ques.) 290 (i).
- Expenditure on Capital Account (M. for Stmt.) 45 (i).
- Expense, N.W.T., B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2857  
(vol. iv).
- Exports and Imports, distinguishing products of Can-  
ada (M. for Ret.\*) 30 (vol. i).
- Exports of Canadian produce (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).
- Extra Clerks, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2795 (vol. iv).
- Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, in Com. of Sup.,  
3244 (vol. iv).
- Factories, operatives in (M. for Rets., &c.) 37 (vol. i).
- Factory Rep., printing and distribution of (remarks) 211  
(vol. i).
- Fish-breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 910 (vol. ii).
- Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Coun-  
sel, in Com. of Sup., 3389 (vol. iv).
- Fishery Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 915 (ii).
- Five per ct. Consolid. Loan, retirement of (M. for copies  
of O.C., &c.) 484 (vol. i).
- Five per cent Loan, Sinking Fund (Ques.) 2465 (iii).
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies  
of Cor., &c., 222 (vol. i).
- Flour, increase of Duty on (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).
- Foot Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means 806 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>,  
1134; (Amt.) 1137, neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) 1166; on  
M. for Com. (remarks) 1385; in Com., "woman suf-  
frage," 1459; "tenant," 1479; "person" (Indian)  
1573 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns,"  
1817, 1915-1918, 1988, 1992, 1995; "in counties,"  
2068, 2071, 2073, 2079, 2082, (Amt.) 2085; "regis-  
tration of voters," 2220-2223, 2232, 2279, 2281,  
2285, 2288, 2297, 2299, 2300; "revision of voters'  
lists," 2326, 2338, 2340, 2349; "general provisions,"  
2344, 2355; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2382;  
(remarks) 2146 (vol. iii) 3063 (vol. iv); (Ms. that  
Com. rise) 2207, 2137 (vol. iii); on M. that Com.  
rise, 1509, 1514 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman  
(remarks) 1798; appeal from Chair to House, 1923;  
(Ques. of Order) 1969 (vol. iii); reading extracts,  
1462; on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to  
House, 1511, 1619 (vol. ii).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2028 (vol. ii); 2274, 2281 (vol. iii).
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2419 (vol. iii).
- Gas Coke, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (vol. ii).
- Geneva Gin and Brandy, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (vol. iv).
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3347 (vol. iv).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849-852, 854, 855 (vol. ii).
- Gold Reserve, Govt. (M. for copies of Cor.) 351 (vol. i).
- Govt. Deposits in Banks (M. for Stmt.) 29 (vol. i).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 453 (vol. i); Saturdays, 1824 (vol. iii); Conduct of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3444 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) on prop. Res., 2461-2463; on M. to conc. in Res., 2524 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
- Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) conc., 2920; (Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 2919, 2921; conc., 3433 (vol. iv).
- Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
- Histoire Genealogique des Familles Francaises, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
- Hoop Iron, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- Hospitals, Marine, in Com. of Sup., 2957 (vol. iv).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Huron and Superior, Lakes, Surveys of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2809-2816, 2836, 2839-2843 (vol. iv).
- Printing and Advertising (M. to ref. charges to Public Accounts Com.) 202 (vol. i).
- Imports for Consumption (M. for Stmt.) 30 (vol. i).
- Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).
- Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 916 (vol. ii); 3410 (vol. iv).
- Indian and Colonial Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1034 (vol. ii); suppl., 3452 (vol. iv).
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 3242, 3343, 3392; conc., 3373 (vol. iv).
- Infectious and Contagious diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065, 1069, 1091; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1331 (vol. ii).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2526 (vol. iii).
- Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 85 (vol. i).
- Inspection of Staples, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).
- Inspectors or Clerks of Works, persons employed as (M. for Stmt.) 139 (vol. i).
- Insurance Act, 1879, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 127 (vol. i).
- I.C.R. Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 1744, 1914 (iii).
- Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3299 (vol. iv).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 969 (vol. ii), 3408; conc., 2764, 3433 (vol. iv).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 256 (vol. i).
- Justice, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 985.
- Keewatin, Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).
- Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (vol. iv).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2505-2508 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2892 (vol. iv).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 991, 992 (vol. ii); 2795, 2798, 3448, 3451 (vol. iv).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798 (vol. iv).
- Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
- Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, in Com. of Sup., 2950, 2952, 3252 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act, putting in force of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2400 (vol. iii).
- Loan, recent (Ms. for copies of Prospectus, Advertisements, &c.) 37 (vol. i).
- Loans contracted by Govt. (Ques.) 1744, 1914 (vol. iii).
- Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N. W., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).
- McManus, gratuity to widow of, in Com. of Sup., 3350; conc. 3374 (vol. iv).
- Mail Subsidies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2945, 3457; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
- Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2824; on M. for Com. on Res., 2776 in Com., 2789-2791, 2795, (vol. iv).
- Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 990 (vol. ii).
- Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., in Com. on Res., 2505-2508 (vol. iii).
- Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 906-908 (vol. ii).
- Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).
- Military properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
- Militia Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 2904, 2906, 2913-2916, 3411, 3412 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 3244, 3245, 3351, 3353, 3387-3389, 3453, 3454; conc., 3396, 3434 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous Printing, paper, &c., in Com. of Sup. 3392 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous works (I.C.R.) in Com. of Sup., 3296; suppl., 3383 (vol. iv).
- Model Farm, Establishment, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
- Money borrowed by Govt. in Canada (Ques.) 743 (i).
- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (vol. ii).
- Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (iv).
- Murray Canal, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3303 (iv).
- Nav. of River St. Lawrence B. 159 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3470 (vol. iv).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).  
 New Militia Pensions, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 North Saskatchewan River improvements, on M. for copies of Repts., &c., 696 (vol. i).  
 N. W. Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2770 (vol. iv).  
 N. W. Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 3243; suppl., 3392, 3421, (vol. iv).  
 N. W. T., Govt. of the, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2946, 2950 (iv).  
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract, on M. for Com. on Res. (*Mr. Carling*) 2556; in Com., 2557 (vol. iii).  
 Operatives in Factories (M. for Rets., Stmnts.) 37 (i).  
 Optional Subjects, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).  
 Oxford and New Glasgow Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3413 (vol. iv).  
*Parliamentary Companion*, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).  
 Pembina Branch, C.P.R., in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).  
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 985, 989, 990 (vol. ii), 3350; conc., 3374 (vol. iv).  
 Pensions, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Plate Glass, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).  
 Port Arthur Harbor, construction of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).  
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 2764 (iv).  
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing interest, in Com. of Sup., 927 (vol. ii).  
 Printing and Advertising, Ret. respecting (remarks) 28 (vol. i).  
 Printing Com., on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep., 149 (vol. i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on article in *Toronto News*: French aggression, &c. (remarks) 1680 (vol. ii).  
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).  
 Prorogation (Ques.) 3473 (vol. iv).  
 Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c., in Com. of Sup., 3421; conc., 3434 (vol. iv).  
 Public Accounts and Auditor Genl.'s Rep. (M. for ref. to Standing Com. on Public Accounts) 76 (vol. i).  
 Public Buildings, Ottawa and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).  
 Public Debt of Canada, amount of (Ques.) 927 (vol. ii).  
 Public Expenditure (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2868-2877; neg. (Y. 42, N. 79) 2889 (vol. iv).  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2916, 2919-2921; conc., 3433 (vol. iv).  
 Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).  
 Railways, in Com. of Sup., 3296, 3299, 3300, 3383, 3413, 3417, 3418 (vol. iv).  
 Receipts and Expenditures, Consolidated Fund (Ques.) 1677 (vol. ii).  
 Recognition of Volunteers' Services in the N.W. B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3379; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 3384 (vol. iv).  
 Red Liquor, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).

**Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Returns, enquiries for, 363, 714 (vol. i); 832, 1064, 1608 (vol. ii); 1913, 2393 (iii); incomplete Ret., 1209 (ii).  
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 3245, 3388 (vol. iv).  
 Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. 61, (*Mr. Desjardins*) on prop. Amt. (remarks) 1210; in Com., 1351 (vol. ii).  
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Number and names of graduates, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 313 (vol. i).  
 St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 81 (vol. i).  
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 985, 989 (vol. ii).  
 Savings Bank (Post Office or otherwise) Depositors in (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).  
 Senate extra Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).  
 Settlers in the Dom. during calendar year 1884 (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).  
 Settlers in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).  
 Sleeping cars, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).  
 Small Savings, encouragement of, on M. for Ret., 91 (vol. i).  
 Spirits and Tobacco, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225 (vol. iv).  
 Spirits taken out of bond (remarks) 3371 (vol. iv).  
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 803, 805, 808 (vol. ii).  
 Stipendiary Magistrates, N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3470 (vol. iv).  
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3215, 3219 (vol. iv).  
 Superintendence of Insurance, in Com. of Sup., 2957; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 273 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 889 (vol. ii).  
 Superior Court Judges, Quebec, B. 161 (*Sir John*) on prop. Res., 3376 (vol. iv).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Administration of Justice*, 985 (vol. ii), 3433; (Stipendiary Magistrates, N. W. T.) 3448 (vol. iv).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1023 (vol. ii); (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv); (Indian and Colonial Exhibitions) 1034 (vol. i); suppl. 3452, (vol. iv); (Mortuary Statistics) 1027 (vol. ii).  
*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Cornwall) 3301; (Murray) 3303; (Welland) 3302; (Williamsburg) 3301. *Income*: (Welland) 3418; (Rideau, Land damages) conc., 3433 (vol. iv).  
*Charges of Management*, 2763 (vol. iv).  
*Civil Government* (Administration of Justice) 3411 (vol. iv); (Agriculture, Dept. of) 906, (contingencies) 921; (Civil Service Examiners) 973; (Customs, contingencies) 925; (Finance and Treasury Board, contingencies) 915; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 910 (vol. ii); (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 3410 (vol. iv), (contingencies) 916; (Interior, Dept. of) 969 (vol. ii), 3408, conc., 2764, 3433 (vol. iv); (Marine, Dept. of) 906-908 (vol. ii); (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 2764 (vol. iv); (Post Office and Finance Depts., contingencies, computing interest) 927;

## Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

- (Privy Council, contingencies) 914; (Public Works, Dept. of) 912 (vol. ii), suppl., 3448 (vol. iv); (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 914 (vol. ii); (Optional Subjects) 3411 (vol. iv).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3232-3237; (Culling Timber) 3241; (Excise) 3241; (Inspection of Staples) 3242; (Post Office, allowance to Asst. Postmaster at Ottawa) 3392, conc., 3397; (Weights and Measures and Gas) 3241 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands—Capital*: Surveys (Examination of Survey Rets.) 3344; *Income* (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3344 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2955; (Fishery Protection Steamers) 2956 (vol. iv).
- Geological Survey*, 3347 (vol. iv).
- Immigration*, 2809, 2816, 2836, 2839-2843 (vol. iv).
- Indians* (Grant to supplmt. Fund) 3242; (Man. and N. W. T.) 3343, conc., 3373; (Assistance to Institutions) 3392 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); (Committees, Extra Clerks, &c.) 2795; (increased Indemnity to Members) 3451. Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2798 (vol. iv); (Printing, paper, &c.) 992 (vol. ii). Senate (Extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, construction) 2952; (Salaries, &c.) 2950, 3250 (vol. iv).
- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2943, conc., 2958; (Can. and Germany) 2945; (N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain, &c.) 3457 (vol. iv).
- Marine Hospitals*, 2957 (vol. iv).
- Militia* (A, B and C Batteries, &c.) 2914; (Ammunition) 2904, 2906; (Barracks at London) 3412; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2906; (Military Properties, care of) 2916; (Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg) 3411; (Royal Mil. Coll.) 2913 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Chinese Commission) 3337, conc., 3395 (vol. iv); (Dept. Speaker's Salary) 3351, 3353 (vol. iv); (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453; (Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies) 3244; (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3389; (Govt. of Keewatin) 3244; (Govt. of the N.W.T.) 3244; (*Histoire Genealogique des Familles Francaises*) 3456; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3215; (Liquor License Act, putting in force) 3244; (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N.W.T.) 3454; ("Parliamentary Companion") 3387; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor, &c.) 3421, conc., 3434; (Returns, preparation of) 3245, 3358 (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 3244 (vol. iv); (Vote of \$1,000,000 for N.W. Troubles) 2235 (vol. iii).
- N. W. Mounted Police*, 3243; suppl., 3392, 3421 (vol. iv).
- Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2946; (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2946; (Water and River Police) 2950 (vol. iv).
- Pensions* (new Militia) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 989; (Kingston) 985 (vol. ii), (gratuity to widow of C. McManus) 3350, conc., 3374 (vol. iv); (Manitoba) 990; (St. Vincent de Paul) 935-989 (vol. ii), (payment to G. F. Baillairgé) 3350 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Capital*: B.C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 2916; Ottawa (additional buildings) 2916; Port Arthur (construction of Harbor) 2916 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2919. Harbors and Rivers, 2919; (Ont.) 2921, conc., 3133; (N.B.) 2920.
- Railways—Capital*: C. P. R., 3383; (Engineers' Salaries, &c.) 3417; (Subsidy) 3296; (Pembina Branch) 3417. Eastern Extension (repairs, &c.) 3300. I. C. R. (applying air brakes), 3299; (miscellaneous works) 3296; suppl. 3283; (repairs, &c.) 3299; (sleeping cars) 3418. Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).
- Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observatories) 2956.
- Superintendence of Insurance*, 2957, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
- Survey Rets., Examination of*, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv)

## Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii).
- Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
- Trade Relations with U. S. (Ques.) 3163 (vol. iv).
- Transfer of Batteries (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 631 (vol. i).
- Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 2676 (vol. iv).
- Vote of \$1,000,000 for N.W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 2235 (vol. iv).
- Voyageurs to Egypt, number, names, residence, &c., of officers and men (M. for Ret.\*) 210 (vol. i).
- Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—Budget Speech (reply to) 333; The Tariff (remarks) conclusion of Deb., 662; Disturbance in the N. W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com., 765-768 (vol. i); in Com. (cutlery) 844; (axle grease) 857; (duck) 808; (foot grease) 806; (gas coke) 783 (vol. ii); (Geneva gin and brandy) 3224 (vol. iv); (glucose syrup) 849, 852, 854, 855; (hoop iron) 807; (plate glass) 856; (red liquor) 808 (vol. ii); (spirits and tobacco) 3225 (vol. iv); (steel) 803, 805, 808 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3215, 3219 (vol. iv); (towels) 858 (vol. ii); (whiskey) 3225-3229 (vol. iv); (wineys) 840; (woollen fabrics) 795, 840; (woollen rags) 783, 787 (vol. ii); (Excise duties) 3295 (vol. iv).
- Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).
- Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3302, 3433 (vol. iv).
- Whiskey, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225-3229 (iv).
- Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).
- Wineys, in Com. on Ways and Means, 840 (vol. ii).
- Woollen fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 795, 840 (vol. ii).
- Woollen rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 787 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin*.

- Administration of Justice in the N.W. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3429 (vol. iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2469-2474 (vol. iii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2480-2483 (vol. iii).
- Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (vol. ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1024, 1030, 1032 (vol. ii).
- Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 119 (vol. i).
- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com. 48 (vol. i).
- Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of, on M. for copies, 358 (vol. i).
- Canada Temp. Act, 1873, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; in Com., 1054-1055;

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.**

- on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2648, 2652, 2667 (vol. iv).
- Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, &c., on M. for Papers, 929, 933 (vol. ii).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 284 (vol. i).
- C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further loan (remarks) on adjmt. of deb., 2643; in Com., 2725, 2727, 2729, 2733, 2736; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863 (vol. iv).
- Port Arthur and Winnipeg, construction between, sums paid (M. for Stmnts.) 123 (vol. i).
- Section B. Arbitration, Evidence taken (Ques.) 112 (vol. i).
- Section B, Award of damages to contractors, validity of, case submitted to Counsel, &c. (M. for copy) 131 (vol. i).
- Section B, case submitted by Govt and contractors to Arbitrators, Evidence taken, &c. (M. for copies) 206 (vol. i).
- Section B, claim of contractors on which award of \$395,600 was based (M. for copy) 134 (vol. i).
- Section B, Engineers' Reps. on re-measurement and re-classification, &c. (M. for copies) 121 (vol. i).
- Section B, Judge Clarke's Rep. on Award to contractors (Ques.) 78; (M. for copy) 132, 134 (vol. i).
- Section B, opinion of Counsel as to binding character of Award (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
- Section B, payment of Award of \$395,600 to contractors (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
- Timber dues to Govt. by Co. (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
- Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amts. to M. for Ret., 100, 110 (vol. i).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 969, 972, 984 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 274, 278, 280 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 899; on M. for 2°, 1097; in Com., 1097-1105, 1110-1117, 1123, 1127-1130; on M. for 3°, 1286; (Amt.) 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service B. (Ques.) 28 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 984 (vol. ii).
- Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3237 (vol. iv).
- Debates*, Official Rep. of, First Rep. (remarks) 34 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Third Rep., 3360 (vol. iv).
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) for Special Com. to report to House, 71 (vol. i).
- Deputy Speaker, on M. to appoint Malachy Daly, Esq., 72 (vol. i); Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3354, 3357 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N.W., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 768 (vol. i).
- Stoney Indian rising (remarks) 863 (vol. ii).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.**

- Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Berghin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for resmg. adj. deb. for 2°, 943 (ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1263-1266; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1401-1408, 1459; "usufructuary," 1452, 1453; "owner," 1470; "tenant," 1477; "person" (Indian) 1496, 1528-1530, 1578, (Chinese) 1532, 1590; "farm," 1592; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1739-1743 (vol. ii), 1828; (Indians) 1837 (Amt.) 1845; "manhood suffrage," 1956-1959, 1988; "qualifications in counties," 2052, 2061; (Amts.) 2064, 2070, 2079, 2080, 2394; on disqualifying barristers, 2086; "who shall not vote," 2086, 2093; "registration of voters," 2254-2258, 2270, 2272, 2282, 2283, (Amt.) 2238, 2290, 2308-2310; "revision of voters' lists," 2321, 2323, 2325, 2333, 2343; "general provisions," 2344, 2347, 2350; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2383-2385 (vol. iii); scarcity of copies of B. (remarks) 1131; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1422, 1497 (vol. ii), 2208 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1436, unparliamentary language, 1466; (Ques. of Order) 1619 (vol. ii), 1825 (vol. iii); taking up items consecutively (remarks) 1471 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1309-1316; (Ques. of Order) 1317 (vol. ii).
- Gosselin, Eugène, record in the matter of, on M. for copy, 703 (vol. i).
- G. T. R. mail trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 817 (vol. ii).
- Hughes, D. J., Charges against, on M. for Ret., 99 (i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1068, 1072, 1087 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1326; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332 (vol. ii).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2528 (vol. iii).
- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 969, 972 (vol. ii).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2807 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1664; in Com., 1663 (vol. ii).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3354, 3357 (iv).
- Morgan, H. J., payment for "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).
- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (vol. ii).
- O'Malley, Lieut.-Col., Charges against (M. for copy of Rep. of Maj. Genl., 45 (vol. i).
- Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1892 (vol. iii).
- Port Moody, B.C., Dock, Tenders for repair of (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Pringle, H. H., of Cobourg, employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.**

- Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2807 (vol. iv).  
 Railways in the Co. of Groy, refund of Bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for copy of memorial, 60 (vol. i).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. Municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 576 (vol. i).  
 Returns, incomplete, *re* N. W. Troubles (remarks) 1209 (vol. ii).  
 Returns, non-production of (remarks) 289, 427, 455 (i).  
 Ridgetown as a port of entry, Pets., &c. (M. for copies\*) 532 (vol. i).  
 Riel, Louis, employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 743 (i).  
 Short Line Ry., Plans and Reps. (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).  
 St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 880 (vol. ii).  
 Stoney Indian rising in the N.W. (remarks) 863.

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 984; (Interior, Dept. of) 969, 972 (vol. ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1024; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032; (Mortuary Statistics) 1030 (vol. ii); Customs, 3227 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation* : Miscellaneous (printing and printing paper, &c.) 2798, 2802, 2807 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3251, 3354, 3357; (payment to H. J. Morgan, for "Annual Register") 3351 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* : on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. (remarks) 539, 599-605, 633-641; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) Disturbance in the N.W.T., 763 (vol. i); in Com. (woollen rags) 788; (woollen fabrics) 797 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com., 1675 (ii).  
 Woollen rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 797 (vol. ii).

**Casgrain, Mr. P. B., L'Islet.**

- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 47 (vol. i).  
 Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 935 (vol. ii).  
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2654 (vol. iv).  
 Cape St. Ignace, Station at (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).  
 Court of Claims for Can. B. 93 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1°, 450 (vol. i).  
 C. P. R. Short Line Ry. from Montreal to the Atlantic on M. for Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c., 38 (vol. i).  
 DeChene, Capt. A. M., enquiry respecting (M. for copies of complaint\*) 30 (vol. i).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 770 (vol. i).  
 ——— Col. Ouimet's absence from Duty (remarks) 1167, 1205 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Distinctive rewards for Bravery (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 Elgin Station, L'Islet, erection of (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).  
 Employment of Prisoners without the walls of Gaols B. 87 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 1658 (vol. ii).

**Casgrain, Mr. P. B.—Continued.**

- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on proposed Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 369 (vol. i).  
 Fabre, Mr., agent in Paris, Rep. of (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1384; "woman suffrage," 1385; "usufructuary," 1447; "person" (Indian) 1516, 1519, 1536; (Chinese) 1538; "farm," 1591; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1690-1692 (vol. ii); (Amt.) 1791; "who shall not vote," 2099 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1423; on Ques. of Order, unparliamentary language, 1466; Appeal from Chair to House, 1511 (vol. ii).  
 Gold, Reserve, Govt., withdrawals, on M. for copies of Cor., 355 (vol. i).  
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 451 (vol. i).  
 Inspection of Banks, legislation respecting (Ques.) 51; (prop. Res.) 81 (vol. i).  
 Lieut. Gov. of Quebec, Oath of Office (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).  
 Lower Traverse Lighthouse, Supply of wood to, M. for Ret.\* 30 (vol. i).  
 Man. Indian Agency, management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).  
 Post Office at village of Montmagny (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).  
 Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 198 (vol. i).  
 Returns, enquiry for, 363 (vol. i).  
 Short Line Ry. to the sea coast, survey by *Mr. Wicksteed, C. E.* (M. for copy of Rep.) 52; Plans, Reps. &c. (Ques.) 246, 429, 479 (vol. i).  
 Stationery used in H. of C., expense of (Ques.) 290 (i).  
 St. Patrick's Day, on M. (*Mr. Curran*) for adjmt., 594 (i).  
 Superior Court of Quebec, Chief Justice (Ques.) 129 (i).  
**SUPPLY :**  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1024; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1035; (Mortuary Statistics) 1028 (vol. ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Relief of Distress in N.W.T.) 3455 (vol. iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction, limitation B. 68 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. to introd., 246 (i).  
 Translation of *Debates* and Votes and Proceedings, (remarks) 594 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* : on Res. (*Mr. Blake*). (Disturbance in the N. W.) in Amt. to Com., 770 (i).

**Catudal, Mr. M., Napierville.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1441 (vol. ii).  
 French Canadians in Customs Dept. (Ques.) 2171 (iii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067, 1069, 1089; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328 (vol. ii).  
 Waterproof Blankets for Volunteers, purchase of (Ques.) 2171 (vol. iii).

**Chairman, Mr.**

- [For Rulings, &c., see "Order," "Privilege" and "Procedure" under SUBJECTS.]

**Chapleau, Hon. J. A., Terrebonne.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467, 2470 (vol. iii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122, 2° m., 2476; in Com., 2479-2483 (vol. iii).
- B. C. Penitentiary, suspension of Rules, on M. for copies of Cor., 824 (vol. ii).
- Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 933 (vol. ii).
- C. P. R., on Resolutions respecting further Loan (speech) 2565-2586; in Com., 2731, 2732 (vol. iv).
- Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 212; on presentation of (remarks) 235 (vol. i).
- Commission, rooms rented and payment of Secretary (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- Immigration, legislation respecting (Ans.) 505, 632 (vol. i).
- Restriction (B. 124, 1°) 1037 (vol. ii); withdn., 3023 (vol. iv).
- Restriction (B. 156) prop. Res., 3002; in Com., on Res. and 1°\* of B., 3023; 2° and in Com., 3050; Order for 3° dschgd., 3075 (vol. iv).
- Interpreter, prop. Res., 2421 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3024 (vol. iv).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 900, 914, 973-976, 983-985 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. (B. 31, 1°) 101; prop. Res. and in Com., 273-277, 279, 282 (vol. i); M. to conc. in Res., 889; 2° m., 1095; in Com., 1097-1106, 1109-1122, 1126-1130; 3° m., 1281; on Order for 3° (M. to recom) 1281; in Com., 1282 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 1823; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2396 (iii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973-976, 983-985 (vol. ii).
- Criminal Laws of Canada, 1869-1871, publication in French (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).
- Dept. of Sec. of State Acts Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 629 (vol. i).
- Deptl. Contingencies (Sec. of State) in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).
- Duties on Hay, Cor. between Canada and U.S., on M. for copies, 444 (vol. i).
- Fabre, M., agent in Paris, Rep. of (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1171-1177; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590; on Ques. of Order, reading extracts, 1461 (vol. ii).
- G. T. R., imperfect Ret. presented by Mr. Hickson (remarks) 862 (vol. ii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2834, 2839, 2842 (vol. iv).
- Imperial Federation, Cor. between High Commissioner and Govt. (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases Affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1090, 1092 (vol. ii).
- Jones, W. H., Sec. of State's Dept., superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W., on M. for Ret., 95 (vol. i).

**Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—Continued.**

- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497, 499, 502 (vol. i).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2797, 2804 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1663; in Com., 1668 (vol. ii).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2797 (vol. iv).
- Message from His Ex., Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 234 (vol. i).
- Offences Against the Person B. 123, 2° m., 2767 (vol. iv).
- Official Reporters of the *Debates*, employment of, during recess (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 987 (vol. ii).
- Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1892-1894 (iii).
- Proofs of Entries in Books of Accounts (B. 113, 1°\*) 964 (vol. ii.); 2° m., 2397, 2465 (vol. iii).
- Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2804 (vol. iv).
- Returns, Imperfect (remarks) 67, 534 (vol. i); 862 (ii).
- Returns, non-production of (remarks) 211, 504 (vol. i); 1206 (vol. ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 987 (vol. ii).
- Sec. of State, Dept. of, Act. Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 629; 2° m., 894 (vol. ii).
- Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 900 (vol. ii).
- Sec. of State's Rep. (presented) 127 (vol. i).
- Sunday Excursions prohibition B. 19 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 264 (vol. i).
- Superintendents of Letter Carriers (prop. Res.) 218; in Com., 270 (vol. i); (M. to conc. in Res.) 889 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 973-976, 983-985; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 900, (contingencies) 914 (vol. ii).
- Immigration* 2834, 2839, 2842 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2797; (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2804 (vol. iv).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 987 (vol. ii).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 1671 (vol. ii).
- Writ for Lévis County, issue of (Ans.) 633; (remarks) 661 (vol. i).

**Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.**

- Agricultural, Timber, Pasture and Mineral Lands and Town sites (M. for Ret.\*) 209 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to M. for 3°, 1061 (ii).
- C. P. R., Amounts due Contractors, &c., non-payment of, by Co. (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).
- Debt, floating and unsecured (Ques.) 219 (vol. i); 1677 (vol. ii).
- Laborers' Wages, payment of, on construction (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).
- Loan (Ques.) 29 (vol. i); payment of interest on, 1131 (vol. ii).

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- C.P.R., Interest, payment of by Co. (Ques.) 1677 (ii).  
 — Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2676-2688; in Com., 2731; on M. to conc. in Res., 2860; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861 (vol. iv).  
 — Sums paid or advanced to Co. as Interest or Subsidy (Ques.) 1677 (vol. ii).  
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 103 (vol. i).  
 Canned Goods B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2°, 2439 (vol. iii).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Chapleau) on Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283 (vol. ii).  
 Coal Lands, Sales and Leases (M. for Stmt.)\* 209 (i).  
 Cruelty to Animals, prevention (B. 47, 1°\*) 147 (i).  
 Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 2476 (vol. iii); on M. for 3°, 3043 (iv).  
 Debates, Official Rep., on First Rep. (remarks) 34 (vol. i).  
 Debt of Can., Floating and Unfunded (Ques.) 2465 (iii).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., Engagement at Duck Lake, despatch of Troops (remarks) 791; cost of Expedition (Ques.) 1678 (vol. ii).  
 Dredging, conc., 2923 (vol. iv).  
 Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2°, 1158-1160; in Com. "woman suffrage," 1390, 1439; "person" (Indian) 1503, 1523; (Chinese) 1587; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1608, (Amt.) 1623 (vol. ii), 1770-1773; (Indians) 1850, 1864-1871; "manhood suffrage," 1947-1952; "registration of voters," 2279, 2282, 2286, 2287, (Amt.) 2288, 2289, 2306-2308, (Amt.) 2317; "revision of voters' lists," 2340, 2350; "general provisions," 2344, (Amt.) 2344; "appeal," 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2377; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3053, neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053 (vol. iv); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1436, 1500, 1529 (vol. ii); (personal explanation) 1872; (Ques. of Order) 1920 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. Pets. (remarks) 1856 (vol. iii); on personal explanation of Mr. Sproule, 2772 (vol. iv).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1308, 1312 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Loans (Ques.) 2465 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Notes in circulation (Ques.) 2465 (vol. iii).  
 Grazing Land Leases, geographical position, &c. (M. for Ret.)\* 209 (vol. i).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2813 (vol. iv).  
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 84 (vol. i).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1079 (vol. ii).

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (Sir Hector Langevin) on prop. Res., 2449-2452 (vol. iii); on Amt. (Mr. Blake) to M. for 3°, 2893 (vol. iv).  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2798 (vol. iv).  
 Letter Postage, reduction of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 291 (vol. i).  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2798 (iv).  
 Licenses or Permits to cut Timber, &c., applications for, and not granted (M. for Ret.)\* 209 (vol. i).  
 Loans obtained by Govt. from Banks, &c. (Ques.) 1305 (vol. ii).  
 Loan of £4,000,000 recently effected (Ques.) 2998 (iv).  
 Loans to Govt., Temporary (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).  
 Man. Indian Agency, management of (M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission) 61; withdn., 67 (i).  
 National Policy pamphlet (M. for copy\*) 124 (vol. i).  
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. to conc. in Res., 2426 (iii).  
 Observance of the Lord's Day (B. 19, 1°\*) 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (vol. i).  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Offences against the Person B. 123 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 2767; in Com. (Amt.) 2767; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767 (vol. iv).  
 Order Paper, omission from, of a question (remarks) 2774; (explanation) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1891 (vol. iii).  
 Pensions, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (Ques.) 2359, 2465 2559 (vol. iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on article in Toronto News (Ques. of Order) 1680 (vol. ii).  
 Protestant Volunteers in the 65th Battalion, remarks on newspaper paragraph, 2998 (vol. iv).  
 Public Debt of Canada (Ques.) 29, 76 (vol. i); 927 (vol. ii); 2465 (vol. iii).  
 Public Expenditure, on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. for Com. of Sup., 2883-2889 (vol. iv).  
 Public Works, conc., 2923 (vol. iv).  
 Receipts and Expenditures, Consolidated Fund (Ques.) 1677 (vol. ii).  
 Reciprocal Trade Relations between U.S. and Canada (M. for Ret.)\* 1444 (vol. ii).  
 Returns, enquiries for 1038, 1608 (vol. ii); 1955 (vol. iii); 2676, 3000 (vol. iv).  
 Seduction and like Offences (B. 27, 1°) 76; 2° m., 619 (i).  
 Sunday Excursions, prohibition (B. 19, 1°\*) 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (vol. i).  
 SUPPLY :  
 Immigration, 2813 (vol. iv).  
 Legislation, : Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796, 2798 (vol. iv).  
 Ocean and River Service (Lifeboats, Stations, &c.) 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Pensions (Veterans of 1812) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Public Works—Income : Dredging, conc., 2923 (vol. iv).

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Temporary Loans to Govt. by Banks (Ques.) 350 (i).  
 Timber Licenses and Permits granted on Lands outside of disputed Territory (M. for Ret.\*) 209 (vol. i).  
 ——— in the N.W. (M. for Ret.), 30, 121 (vol. i).  
 ——— issued since Jan., 1882, in N.W.T., &c. (Ques.) 863 (vol. ii).  
 ——— or Berths in B.C., total applications, date, names and addresses, &c., (M. for Ret.\*) 210 (vol. i).  
 Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 2676 (vol. iv).  
 Veterans of War of 1812, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Volunteers in the 65th Battalion, Protestant (remarks) 2998 (vol. iv).  
 Washington Treaty, termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2902 (vol. iv).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 463–478 (vol. i); in Com. (woollen fabrics) 796 (vol. ii).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).  
 Woollen Fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 796 (vol. ii).

**Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland.**

- Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) to M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 3363 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Canals—Capital (*Murray*) 3307 (vol. iv).  
 Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 973 (vol. ii).

**Cockburn, Mr. A. P., North Ontario.**

- C. P. R. Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 484 (vol. i).  
 ——— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmt., 112 (vol. i).  
 Forests, protection of, J. H. Morgan's Rep. (M. for copies) 202 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1258; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1438 (vol. ii).  
 Indian Advancement Act of 1884, application of (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).  
 Morgan, J. H., services as Forestry Commissioner (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).  
 Murray Canal Route, Cor. and Pets. (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1217 (vol. ii).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1279 (vol. ii).  
 Trent Valley Canal, occupation of building by Govt. employés (Ms. for copies of Cor., &c.) 56, 202 (vol. i).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 715–719 (vol. i).

**Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 963 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2663 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1087 (vol. ii).

**Colby, Mr. C. C.—Continued.**

- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 269 (vol. i).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 623 (vol. i).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1350 (vol. ii).  
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic ports, in Com. on Res., 2982–2987; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3277–3281 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982–2987; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3277–3281 (vol. iv).

**Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590 (vol. ii); "registration of voters," 2213–2216 (vol. iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1308 (vol. ii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1085–1090 (vol. ii).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 627 (vol. i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, re Col. Amyot and movement of Troops (remarks) 1336 (vol. ii).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting (M. for copy) 569; (reply) 592 (i).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1280 (vol. ii).

**Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N. B.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (B. 143) in Com., 2751 (vol. iv).  
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 955 (vol. ii).  
 Canned Goods (B. 142, 1°\*) 2345; in Com., 2767 (iv).  
 Canned Goods, Law respecting (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1122 (vol. ii).  
 Consolid. Inland Revenue Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 146), 2° m., 2935; in Com., 2968–2971; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3433 (vol. iv).  
 Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. (B. 154) 2° m. and in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).  
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3234 (vol. iv).  
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 916–921 (vol. ii).  
 Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3355, 3357 (iv).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., Dumont, Gabriel, Ferry license granted to (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).  
 Excise Revenue for 6 months, 1884–1885 (Ans.) 290 (i).  
 Fish Inspector in the City of St. John (Ans.) 2997 (iv).

**Costigan, Hon. J.—Continued.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1502 (vol. ii); in Com., "qualifications of voters in cities and towns," 1990; "revision of voters' lists," 2343 (vol. iii).  
 Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Act Amt. B. 119 (prop. Res.) 837 (vol. ii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (prop. Res.) 1306; in Com., 1307-1312, 1315, 1319 (vol. ii).  
 Inland Revenue Collector at Summerside, P.E.I. (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).  
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901, 916-921 (vol. ii); Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).  
 Inspection of Staples, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).  
 International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 255 (vol. i).  
 Kinnee, D., increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).  
 License Commissioners in Essex (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).  
 License Inspectors, pay of, under Act of 1883 (Ans.) 1568 (vol. ii).  
 Liquor License Act, conc., 3398; in Com. of Sup. 3421 (vol. iv).  
 Returns, non-production of (remarks) 428 (vol. i).  
 Scott Act, prosecutions under (Ans.) 41 (vol. i).  
 Spirits taken out of Bond (Stmnt.) 3395 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 15 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2977 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals—Income* : Welland (land damages) conc., 3433 (vol. iv).  
*Civil Government* (Inland Revenue, Dept. of) 901, contingencies, 916-921 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Adulteration of Food) 3242; (Culling Timber) 3241; (Customs) 3234; (Excise) 3241; (Inspection of Staples) 3241; (Weights and Measures and Gas) 3241, 3457 (vol. iv).  
*Liquor License Act*, conc., 3398; (administration of) 3421 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3355, 3357 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (whiskey) 3226, 3231 (iv).  
 Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).  
 Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. (B. 118) prop. Res., 832-837; 1°\* of B., 837; in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).  
 Welland Canal, land damages, conc., 3433 (vol. iv).

**Coughlin, Mr. T., North Middlesex.**

- Carriers by Land (B. 5, 1°\*) 29; 2° m., 102 (vol. i).

**Coursol, Mr. C. J., East Montreal.**

- Disturbance in the N. W., criticisms of Press as to cause, and slur on French Members commanding Battalions, 888 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1248; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1389 (vol. ii).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 169 (vol. i).

**Curran, Mr. J. J., Centre Montreal.**

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3431 (vol. iv).

**Curran, Mr. J. J.—Continued.**

- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Special Com., 48 (vol. i).  
 Can. Co-operative Sup. Association (B. 81, 1°\*) 349 (i).  
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2664 (vol. iv).  
 Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 284; neg. (Y. 64, N. 74) 289 (vol. i).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., on Res., 275 (vol. i); in Com., 1125 (vol. ii).  
 Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3356 (iv).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., Victoria Rifles, Montreal (Ques.) 1983 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1408; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1623-1626 (vol. ii).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2811, 2831 (vol. iv).  
 Insolvent Debtors' Assets Distribution (B. 4, 1°\*) 29 (i).  
 Martin, John, continuation of Pension to Widow of (M. for copies of Pets.\*) 201 (vol. i).  
 Nav. of River St. Lawrence B. 159 (*Mr. McLellan*) on Order for 2°, 3436 (vol. iv).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, veracity questioned (remarks) 725 (vol. i).  
 Royal Canadian Insurance Co.'s Capital Stock Reduction (B. 43, 1°\*) 125 (vol. i).  
 St. Patrick's Day (M. for adjmt.) 593 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Immigration*, 2811, 2831 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Deputy Speaker's Salary) 3356 (vol. iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 161 (vol. i).  
 Supreme Court, contested cases before, and judgments (M. for Ret.) 210 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 521-527 (vol. i).

**Daly, Mr. M. B., Halifax (DEPUTY SPEAKER).**

- Sable Island, telegraphic communication with (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3402 (vol. iv).  
 [For Rulings see "Order," "Privilege" and "Procedure," under SUBJECTS.]

**Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467, 2468, 2471, 2474, 2541 (vol. iii).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Townshend*) 1051; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061; on Amt. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 1062 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2656 (vol. iv).  
 C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2692, 2702; in Com., 2739, 2741, 2744, 2745; on M. to conc. in Res., 2863 (iv).  
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2534, 2536-2540 (vol. iii).  
 Cape Tormentine Ry., connection (Ques.) 2997 (iv).

**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.**

Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 288 (vol. i).  
 Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 907-911, 913, 914, 916, 918, 922-924 (vol. ii).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 276, 281 (vol. i); on M. for 3° of B., 1296; (Amt.) 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) (vol. ii) 1301.  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2431, 2434-2437; on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2770 (vol. iv).  
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 150 (vol. i).  
 Depl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 914, 916, 918, 922-924 (vol. ii).  
 Dom. Buildings in Charlottetown, construction of (Ques.) 1039 (vol. ii).  
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 384 (vol. i).  
 Explosive Substances B. 95 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1167 (vol. ii).  
 Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).  
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 222 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1153-1156; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1418, 1458; "tenant," 1476, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1576 (Chinese) 1583; "farm," 1592; "farmers' sons," 1594; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1638-1643 (vol. ii), 1824-1828, 1939-1945; "manhood suffrage," 1987, 1991, 1992, 1996; "qualifications in counties," 2054, 2058, 2066-2069, 2071, (Amt.) 2072-2074, 2077; "who shall not vote," 2090, 2096 (Indians) 2157-2160, (Amt.) 2160; "registration of voters," 2210, (Amt.) 2211, 2229, 2230, (Amt.) 2234, 2269, 2271-2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2281, 2286, 2287, 2289, 2291, (Amt.) 2292, 2301, 2313, 2316, (Amt.) 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2326, 2329, 2331, 2347; "general provisions," 2353; "appeal," 2361; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2378, 2389 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1496, 1497, 1501, 1527, 1529 (vol. ii), 2137, 2208 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1435-1436, 1437; reading extracts, 1462, 1465 (vol. ii), 1921 (vol. iii); irregularity of procedure 1470; (explanation) 1658 (vol. ii); ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1800 (vol. iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 1307; in Com., 1308, 1315, 1319, 1320 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2548-2551 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 453 (vol. i).  
 Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLellan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2522 (vol. iii).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2835, 2845-2849, 2852 (iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases Affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067, 1090, 1093; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1331; on M. for 3° (Amt. neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334 (vol. ii).

**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.**

I. C. R., Freight and Passenger Earnings, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Judges in N. B., appointment for year's circuit (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).  
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497 (vol. i).  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2804, 2805 (vol. iv).  
 Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1664 (vol. ii).  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).  
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) in Com. on Res., 2556 (vol. iii); on M. to conc. in Res., 2756 (vol. iv).  
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 907-911 (vol. ii).  
 Offences against the Person (assault and battery) Act Amt. B. 42 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 218 (vol. i).  
 Piers and Wharves in P. E. I., expenditure on maintenance and construction (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 P. E. I. Ry., Cape Traverse Branch, payment of laborers on (M. for copies of Pets., &c.) 143 (vol. i).  
 ——— Freight and Passenger Earnings, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2804 (iv).  
 Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 913 (vol. ii).  
 Reciprocity with the U.S. (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 995-1001; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1023, (vol. ii).  
 Refund of Duties to merchants and fishermen in P. E. I., Commissioner's Rep. (M. for copy) 831 (vol. ii).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co's B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1348, 1351 (vol. ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government*: Depl. Contingencies (Agriculture) 922, (Customs) 916, 924, (Inland Revenue) 918, 919, (Privy Council) 914, (Sec. of State) 914; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 911; (Marine, Dept. of) 907-911, (contingencies) 923; (Public Works, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).  
*Immigration*, 2835, 2845-2849, 2852 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796; (Printing and Printing Paper, &c.) 2804-2805 (vol. iv).  
 Statutes of Can., Revision of, Commissioners' Rep., on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 781 (vol. ii).  
 Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 162 (vol. i).  
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii).  
 Trade Relations between Canada and the U. S. (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).  
 Treaty Negotiations by Sir Ambrose Shea (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2897 (vol. iv).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 545-555 (vol. i).  
 Weights and Measures Inspection Act, Amt. (B. 118) (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 837 (vol. ii).

**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.**

- Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 216 (vol. i).  
Wharves on P. E. I., Grant for construction (Ques.) 351 (vol. i).

**Dawson, Mr. S. J., Algoma.**

- C. P. R., Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2718–2720 (vol. iv).  
Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 3409 (vol. iv).  
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).  
Customs Collections in Algoma (M. for Ret.) 39 (i).  
*Debates*, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3368 (vol. iv).  
Disturbance in the N. W., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 769 (vol. i).  
Troops, Transport of (remarks) 887, 1380 (vol. ii).  
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1160; in Com. "woman suffrage," 1408; "owner," 1473; "person" (Indian) 1486, 1491, 1492, 1521, 1569 (explanation) 1503 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1775; "manhood suffrage," 1979; (Indians) 2006–2008, 2012; "in counties" 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2122, 2149; "registration of voters," 2248–2268, 2298; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2369, 2387 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2758 (vol. iv); (Ques. of Order) 2143 (vol. iii).  
Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).  
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2816 (vol. iv).  
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3392 (vol. iv).  
Keewatin, Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).  
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).  
Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 3048 (vol. iv).  
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2947 (vol. iv).  
Ontario's Boundaries (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (vol. iv).  
Ont., Westerly Boundary of, shorthand notes of argument before P. C., on M. for copies, 440 (vol. i).  
Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1218 (vol. ii).  
Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2917 (vol. iv).  
Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 247 (vol. i); article in Port Arthur *Herald* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).  
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 587 (vol. i).  
Representation in Parlt. of the N. W. T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3408 (vol. iv).  
Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co.'s (B. 52, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY:**  
*Civil Govt.* (Dept. of Interior) 3409 (vol. iv).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).  
*Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2816 (vol. iv).  
*Indians* (Assistance to institutions) 3392 (vol. iv).

**Dawson, Mr. S. J.—Continued.**

- Indian Affairs* (Grant to supplement Fund) 3243 (vol. iv).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, constr.) 2952 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Govt. of Keewatin) 3244; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245 (vol. iv).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2947 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Port Arthur (construction of harbor) 2917 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. 769 (vol. i); in Com. (steel) 810 (vol. ii).

**De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., Portneuf.**

- Customs Department, French Canadian employés (Ques.) 1914 (vol. iii).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1533 (vol. ii).  
Indian Lands sold in the Viger Agency (M. for Stmt.)\* 1443 (vol. ii).  
Lebel, Antoine, Indian Agent, acting without sureties (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).  
Pointe aux Trembles, construction of Wharf (M. for copies of Cor.) 234 (vol. i).  
Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 195 (vol. i).  
Supervisor of Cullers, accounts due to (M. for Ret.)\* 1443 (vol. ii).

**Desaulniers, Mr. A. L., Maskinongé.**

- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2995 (vol. iv).

**Desjardins, Mr. A., Hochelaga.**

- Copyright, Law of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Edgar*) 711 (i).  
*Debates*, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).  
Disturbance in the N.W., treatment of natives by the Volunteers, 2998 (vol. iv).  
Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).  
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1451, 1455 (vol. ii).  
International Coal Co.'s (B. 51, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).  
Liquor License Act, 1883, Supreme Court Judgment (Ques.) 29 (vol. iv).  
Mail Subsidies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).  
Model Farm, Establishment of, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (vol. iv).  
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 587 (vol. i).  
Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°\*) 188 (vol. i); notice of prop. Amt., 1210; in Com., 1348 (vol. ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); (Election Expenses) 3452 (vol. iv); (Salaries) 991 (vol. ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453 (vol. iv).  
(Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies) 3244 (vol. iv).  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec) fortnightly line) 2938, 2942 (vol. iv).

**Dickinson, Mr. M. K.,** *Russell.*

- Dom. Drainage Co. incorp. (B. 28, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 88 (vol. i); M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 729-733 (vol. i).

**Dodd, Mr. M.,** *Cape Breton.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Mr. Trow's pair with Mr. Williams (remarks) 1470 (vol. ii).  
 Life-saving Apparatus in C.B. (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on personal explanation of Mr. Edgar, 1955 (vol. iii).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2977 (vol. iv).

**Dundas, Mr. J. R.,** *South Victoria, Ont.*

- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1309 (vol. ii).  
 G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 818 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—In Com., 776 (vol. i); (woollen fabrics) 796 (vol. ii).

**Dupont, Mr. F.,** *Bagot.*

- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. to adjn. deb., 3432 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1234 (vol. ii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070 (vol. ii).

**Edgar, Mr. J. D.,** *West Ontario.*

- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2962, 2965 (vol. iv).  
 Cape Breton Ry., construction (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).  
 Colonization Co.'s, modification of agreements (Ques.) 2241 (vol. iii).  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2434 (vol. iii).  
 Copyright, Law of (prop. Res., 708-711 (vol. i)).  
 C. P. R., Ability of Co. to fulfil engagements under prop. Res. (Ques.) 2238 (vol. iii).  
 — Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3024-3026 (vol. iv).  
 — Connection with Quebec (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).  
 — Curves, Grades and Tangents (Ques.) 2239 (iii).  
 — Eastern Section, quantities, classifications, and prices, Engineers' Estimates (M. for copies) 299 (i).  
 — Eastern Section, Western Division (M. for copies of Estimates, &c.) 302 (vol. i).  
 — Location in B.C., Change of (Ques.) 2239 (iii).  
 — Progress Estimates, Eastern Section (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).  
 — Rolling Stock on Eastern Section, Change in Western Division (M. for Ret.) 302 (vol. i).  
 — Section B., Award of \$34,179.17, credits in Public Accounts (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).  
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of (M. for Stmt.) 100, 105 (vol. i).

**Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.**

- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 913 (vol. ii).  
 Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3353 (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., Col. Otter's march to Battleford (remarks) 1386 (vol. i).  
 — Civil Service Volunteers (remarks) 3043 (iv).  
 — Poundmaker, Surrender of prisoners by (Ques.) 2065 (vol. iii).  
 — Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of Confidence, on M. to adjn. deb., 3212 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1007 (vol. ii).  
 Dom. Lands in B. C., Timber dues (Ques.) 2240 (vol. iii).  
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Can. B. 60 (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) in Com., 693 (vol. i).  
 Evans Divorce (B. 106, 1<sup>o</sup> on a div.) 672; 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i).  
 Export Duty on Oak, Pine and Spruce Logs (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Federation of the Empire, proposals for (Ques.) 51 (i).  
 Fisheries Protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).  
 Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1197-1200; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1399; "owner," 1473; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1553, (Chinese) 1582, 1584 (vol. ii); "farm," 2393; "qualifications in counties," "manhood suffrage" 1968-1970, 1993, 2001, (Amt.) 2003, (Indian) 2022, 2053, 2066, 2080, 2394; "registration of voters," 2282, 2289, 2305, 2312, 2316-2319; "revision of voters' lists," 2330, 2331, 2334, 2337 (vol. iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3057 (vol. iv); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799; (personal explanation) 1872 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1510; appeal from Chair to House, 1510 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2025, 2274, 2319 (vol. iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1320 (vol. ii).  
 Imperial Federation, Cor. between High Commissioner and Govt. (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).  
 Insolvency, attention of Govt. called to Rep. of Com., 1095 (vol. ii).  
 — Legislation (Ques.) 1038 (vol. ii).  
 Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c. (B. 127, 1<sup>o</sup>) 1094 (vol. ii).  
 Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., Act Amt. (B. 66, 1<sup>o</sup>) 235 (vol. i).  
 I. C. R., Sale of Tickets on Chatham Branch (Ques.) 2238 (vol. iii).  
 Land Grants to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2518, 2521, 2533 (vol. iii).  
 Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. and the C. P. R. (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1893 (vol. iii).

**Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.**

Privilege, Ques. of, article in Toronto News (Ques. of Order) 1680 (vol. ii); paragraph in Ottawa Citizen (personal explanation) 1955; Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures, 2103 (vol. iii).

Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Stmbt. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (iii).  
Rys. and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3353 (iv).  
Returns, enquiry for (remarks) 1039 (vol. ii).

St. Clair Ranche Co., rent paid, &c. (Ques.) 2240 (iii).  
St. Croix Cotton Mills, payment of Duties (Ques.) 632 (i).  
Short Line Ry. to the Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).

## SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).

Fisheries (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3353 (vol. iv).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. McLelan) in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (Sir Hector Langevin) in Com. on Res., 2995 (vol. iv).

**Fairbank, Mr. J. H., East Lambton.**

Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (Mr. Caron) in Com. on Res., 2330; in Com. on B., 2965; on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 2967 (vol. iv).

Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on Amt. to prop. Res., 253 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1057; on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2653, 2669 (vol. iv).

C.P.R., Res. respecting further Loan, in Com., 2734.

— Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 484 (vol. i).

Canned Goods B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 2536, 2538 (vol. iii).

Factories B. 85 (Mr. Bergin) on Amt. (Mr. Jamieson) to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 948 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) "qualifications in cities and towns," 1779, 1784 (vol. iii); "actual value," 1605; "person (Indian) 1519, 1531; "woman suffrage," 1415; on M. for 2°, 1226 (vol. ii); "qualifications, &c." "manhood suffrage" 1971-1973, 1993, 1997; "qualifications in counties," 2082; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2152; "revision of voters' lists," 2338, 2342, 2348 (vol. iii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068 (vol. iv).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1070, 1081; on Amt. (Mr. Armstrong) to M. for 3°, 1333 (vol. ii).

Land Grants to Rys. B. 147 (Sir Hector Langevin) in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).

Life-boats and Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2949 (iv).

Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).

Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (Mr. Bowell) on M. for Com. on Res., 2789 (vol. iv).

Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in (Ms. for Rets.) 819, 823 (vol. ii).

**Fairbank, Mr. J. H.—Continued.**

Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 591 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2949 (iv).

Volunteers, Recognition of Services in the N. W. B. 160 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 3379 (iv).  
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 793 (vol. ii).

**Farrow, Mr. T., East Huron.**

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 2468 (vol. iii).

Census in Man. and N. W. T., &c. (Ques.) 149 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1121 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).

Divorce Court, creation of a (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).

Dynamite, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).

Fishery Commission, remuneration of Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (vol. iv).

Fort Francis Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3385 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., "tenant," 148? (vol. ii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 2552 (vol. iii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 454 (vol. i).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2844 (vol. iv).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (Sir Hector Langevin) in Com. on Res., 2513, 2521 (vol. iii).

Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 2895 (iv).

Man. and North-Western Railway Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (vol. iii).

Man. and South-Western Col. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2513 (vol. iii).

Members Indemnity Act Amt. (B. 116, 1°\*) 813 (vol. ii).

Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

Canals (Fort Francis, amount due Hugh Sutherland) 3385 (iv).

Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 985 (vol. ii).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3310 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2844 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3388; (Parliamentary Companion) 3387 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 801 (vol. ii).

**Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.**

Agricultural Fertilizers, Sale and Inspection of (B. 122) prop. Res., 936 (vol. ii).

Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junc. Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt (B. 38, 1°\*) 125 (vol. i).

International Ferries B. 17 (Mr. Patterson, Essex) on M. for 2°, 255 (vol. i).

Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in Ottawa Free Press, re Timber Regulations in B.C., 2240 (vol. iii).

## SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2833 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 786; (woollen fabrics) 794 (vol. ii).

**Ferguson, Mr. C. F., North Leeds and Grenville.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 962, 1057, on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2654 (vol. iv).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "actual value," 1601 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2203 (iii).  
Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii).  
Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2489, 2491-2493 (vol. iii).  
Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).

**Fisher, Mr. S. A., Brome.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467-2470 (vol. iii).  
Agricultural Fertilizers, Sale and Inspection of, B. 122 (*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*) on prop. Res., 938 (vol. ii); on M. for 2°, 2477; in Com., 2478-2482 (vol. iii).  
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1032, 1034, 1035 (vol. ii).  
Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 242; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 74) 253 (vol. i).  
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, voting on the (M. for Stmt.) 121 (vol. i).  
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Pub. Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); in Com., 955, 956, 959, 960, 962, 963 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2646, 2649, 2653, 2661 (vol. iv).  
Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) to M. for 3°, 1299 (vol. ii).  
Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032, 1034 (ii).  
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3393 (vol. iv).  
Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 947 (ii).  
Fisheries Protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 703 (vol. i).  
Fishery Commission, remuneration of Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3391 (vol. iv).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1254-1258; "usufructuary," 1455; "tenant," 1479, 1482; "person" (Indian) 1504, 1538; "actual value," 1595, 1599, 1602, 1604, (Amt.) 1595; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1647-1654 (vol. ii), 1804, 1994, 1996, 2080; "manhood suffrage," 1967; "who shall not vote," 2098, (Indians) 2116-2119; "registration of voters," 2211, 2294 (vol. iii); consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3070, neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3071 (vol. iv); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1425, 1434 (vol. ii).  
House of Commons, Commissioners' Rep. re Staff (Ques.) 2750 (vol. iv).  
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2831, 2833, 2837, 2839, 2841, 2842, 2850 (vol. iv).  
Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067, 1071, 1081, 1090; on M. for 3°, 1321 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) 1323; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 1326 (vol. ii).

**Fisher, Mr. S. A.—Continued.**

- Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2401 (vol. iii).  
Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).  
Reciprocity with the U. S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1021 (vol. ii).  
Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3284 (vol. iv).  
Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3284 (vol. iv).  
SUPPLY:  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032, 1034; (compiling Agricultural and other Statistics in Man. and N. W. T.) 1035 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3393 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2831, 2835, 2837, 2839, 2841, 2842, 2850 (vol. iv).  
*Liquor License Act* (administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3391 (vol. iv).

**Fleming, Mr. J., Peel.**

- Bonuses granted to Rys., Memorials, &c., respecting (M. for copies\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1146-1149; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1410; "usufructuary," 1457; "owner," 1473; "tenant" (Amt.) 1476, 1477, 1479; "person" (Indian) 1545; on M. that Com. rise, 1531 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1994, (Amt.) 1997; "in counties," 2062, 2080; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2164; "registration of voters," 2197-2199, 2298; "revision of voters' lists," 2341 (vol. iii).  
Indian Lands unsold in Township of Toronto (M. for List\*) 147 (vol. i).  
Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1325 (vol. ii).  
Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 186 (vol. i).  
Port Credit Harbor, Repairs to (Ques.) 188 (vol. i).  
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).  
**Forbes, Mr. J. F., Queen's, N.S.**  
Allan Steamship Co. and claim of Govt. re *Newfield* and *Moravian* (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).  
Automatic Buoys, Liverpool Harbor (Ques.) 479 (vol. i); 1914 (iii).  
Brooklyn, N.S., Breakwater, Wharfage Collections (Ques.) 478 (vol. i).  
Coffin's Island Lighthouse protection (Ques.) 1915 (iii).  
Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii).  
Customs Detectives or Police in N. S. (Ques.) 889 (ii).  
Fish-ladders in La Have River, N.S. (Ques.) 2239 (iii).  
Flour and Cornmeal, increase of duty (Ques.) 148 (i).  
Free Fishing to American Fishermen (Ques.) 3321 (iv).  
Grant, Alpin, position under Govt. (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).  
Hardware and Ry. Supplies, purchase of, by Dept. of Rys. and Canals (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).

**Forbes, Mr. J. F.—Continued.**

Hardware and Supplies furnished Dept. Marine and Fisheries at Halifax (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).

Liverpool Harbor, Automatic Buoys (Ques.) 479 (vol. i); 1914 (vol. iii).

Marine Stores, purchase in Halifax (Ques.) 1914 (iii.)

Milliard, Mr., Fines imposed, collection (Ques.) 1211 (ii).

Railway Supplies, purchase in Halifax (Ques.) 1915 (iii).

Rogers' Fish-ladders, purchase or use (Ques.) 3073 (iv).

Rogers, W. H., Fishery Inspector for N. S., breach of Sawdust Law (M. for Ret.\*) 147 (vol. i).

Sawdust in La Have River, N. S. (Ques.) 2259 (vol. iii).

Shingle Shavings in the Mersey River (Ques.) 1039 (ii).

Somerville Breakwater, repair of (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.* (Customs, Dept. of) 902 (vol. ii).

White Point Breakwater, repair of (Ques.) 52 (i).

**Fortin, Mr. P., Gaspé.**

Fishery Bounties, number and amount of Claims paid, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 56 (vol. i).

**Foster, Mr. G. E., King's, N.B.**

Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on Amt. to prop. Res., 243-247 (vol. i).

C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2702-2708 (vol. iv).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Pets. respecting (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).

Can. Tem. Act, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 960-963, 1046; on Amt. (*Mr. Townshend*) 1051; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. for 3°, 1053; in Com., 1058 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2646, 2650, 2660, 2670 (iv).

Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (vol. iv.)

Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).

Civil Service Acts Amt., B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. to conc. in Res., 891; in Com. on B., 1112, 1114 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 978 (vol. ii).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 919 (vol. ii).

Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act, to M. for rsmng. adjl. deb. for 2°, 944 (ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1156-1158; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1558 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1819, 1822-2001; "in counties," 2055, 2057; "who shall not vote," 2089, 2098 (vol. iii); Ques. of Order, 1619 (vol. ii), 1825 (vol. iii); (remarks) 1715 (vol. ii), 2164 (vol. iii).

Liquor License Act, 1883, Boards of Commissioners under (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).

Liquor License Act, Amt. (B. 58, 1°) 170; 2° m., 620 (vol. i).

Liquor License Act, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. 2896 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 978; (Inland Revenue, contingencies) 919 (vol. ii).

*Liquor License Act*, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (Cavalry and Infantry School Corps) 2915 (vol. iv).

*Railways—Capital*: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415 (iv).

**Foster, Mr. G. E.—Continued.**

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) to M. for 2°, 165 (vol. i).

Supreme Court of N. B., causes entered for Argument (M. for number, &c.) 294 (vol. i).

Volunteers in the N. W. and Intoxicating Liquors (Ques.) 1131 (vol. ii).

Prohibitory Liquor Law of the N. W. T., relaxation of provisions (M. for Cor.) 101 (vol. i).

Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 706 (i).

Scott Act Pets. (M. to erase name) 2320 (vol. iii).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3274-3276, (vol. iv).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 535-545 (vol. i); in Com. (woollen fabrics) 800 (vol. ii).

**Gault, Mr. M. H., West Montreal.**

C. P. R. Employés Relief Ass. incorp. (B. 75, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i).

Canned Goods, Law respecting (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1120-1124 (vol. ii).

Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).

Disturbance in the N. W., Arms, description of (Ques.) 814; Troops ready to start (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. "person" (Chinese) 1582; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1638 (vol. ii).

Government yards in Montreal (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071 (vol. ii).

Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, personal paragraph in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 49 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.* (Customs, Dept. of) 801; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Disturbance in the N.W., vote of \$700,000) 1305 (vol. ii).

Vote of \$700,000 for N.W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 1305 (vol. ii).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (umbrella and parasol ribs, &c.) 858 (vol. ii).

Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com. on B., 1673 (vol. ii).

**Gigault, Mr. G. A., Rouville.**

Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Act Amt. (B. 46, 1°) 147 (vol. i).

Bureau of Agriculture, Establishment (Ques.) 76 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 743 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1062 (vol. ii).

Criminal Laws of Canada, 1869-1871, publication in French (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).

**Gigault, Mr. G. A.**—*Continued.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1245-1248 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1789 (vol. iii).  
Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 3400 (vol. iv).

**Gillmor, Mr. A. H.**, *Charlotte.*

- Arts, Agricul. and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1033 (ii).  
Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 893 (vol. ii).  
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1058 (vol. ii).  
Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3416 (vol. iv).  
Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1033 (vol. ii).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1226-1269; "person" (Indians) 1534, (Chinese) 1585; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1707-1709 (vol. ii), 1807, 1984, 1990, 1997; "in counties," 2054, 2060, 2072, 2074; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2114-2116; "registration of voters," 2258 (vol. iii), on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38 N. 87) 3069 (vol. iv); on M. that Com. rise, 1437 (vol. ii).  
General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1317 (vol. ii).  
I. C. R. Free Passes during 1834 (M. for Ret.) 234 (i).  
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2840, 2843 (vol. iv).  
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951, 2952 (vol. iv).  
Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract, B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).  
Rand's Micmac Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3421 (iv).  
St. Stephen's, N.B., public buildings, construction of, (Ques.) 1148 (vol. i).  
Settlers in the Maritime Provs. (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).  
Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2978; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3281 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1033 (ii).  
*Immigration*, 2840, 2843 (vol. iv).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction) 2952; (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951 (iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary) 3421 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Consol. Fund*: Telegraphs, 3420 (vol. iv).  
*Railways—Capital*: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3416 (iv).  
Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 648-656 (vol. i).  
Weirs in the County of Charlotte, N.B., Licenses, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1444 (vol. ii).

**Girouard, Mr. D.**, *Jacques Cartier.*

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2668 (vol. iv).  
Consol. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2432-2436 (vol. iii).  
Disturbance in the N. W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3128-3154 (vol. iv).

**Girouard, Mr. D.**—*Continued.*

- Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 309 (i).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1446; "tenant," 1480 (vol. ii).  
*Histoires Genealogique des Familles Françaises*, 3456 (vol. iv).  
La Banque du Peuple (B. 53, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).  
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 3449 (vol. iv).  
Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 171 (vol. i); paragraph in *Globe* (personal explanation) 3393 (vol. iv); paragraph in *Montreal Times* (personal explanation) 3161 (vol. iv).  
Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3407 (vol. iv).  
Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3267 (vol. iv).  
SUPPLY :  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (increased expenses under Internal Econ. Commissioners' Rep.) 3449 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (*Histoires Genealogique des Familles Françaises*) 3456 (vol. iv).  
Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 157 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) *re* Disturbance in N.W., 3128-3154 (vol. iv).

**Glen, Mr. F. F.**, *South Ontario.*

- Ways and Means*—in Com. (duck) 809; (hoop iron) 807; (steel) 808 (vol. ii).

**Gordon, Mr. D. W.**, *Vancouver Island.*

- Alaska and B. C. Boundary line (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 705 (vol. i).  
Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3022 (vol. iv).  
Indian Affairs in B. C., Cor. between Govt. of Can. and B. C., on M. for copies, 870 (vol. ii).  
Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 304 (vol. i).  
Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press, re* Timber Regulations in B.C., 2239 (vol. iii).  
Railway Belt on Vancouver Island (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).

**Guay, Mr.**, *Levis.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1633 (vol. ii).  
St. Romuald d'Etchemin, Station at (Ques.) 1567 (ii).

**Gunn, Mr. A.**, *Kingston.*

- License Inspectors, pay of, under Act of 1883 (Ques.) 1568 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (glucose syrup) 850-852 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3218 (vol. iv).

**Hackett, Mr. E.**, *Prince, P.E.I.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., (Ques. of Order) 1431; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1654-1657 (vol. ii); "who shall not vote," 2095 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3°, 3054-3056 (vol. iv).

**Hackett, Mr. E.**—*Continued.*

- P. E. I. Ry., Cape Traverse Branch, payment of Laborers (M. for copies of Pets., &c.) 142 (vol. i).  
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1001 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 687-692 (vol. i).  
 Winter Crossing from P.E.I., on M. for copies of Cor., 63 (vol. i).

**Haggart, Mr. J. G.**, *South Lanark.*

- Dom. Drainage Co.'s (B. 28, 1°\*) 88; 2° m., 1007 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) conc., 3372 (iv).

**Hall, Mr. R. N.**, *Sherbrooke.*

- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2434, 2438 (vol. iii).  
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com. (Amts.) 150 (i).  
 Fort Macleod Ranch and Tel. Co.'s B. 80 (M. to conc. in Sen. Amts.) 2357 (vol. iii).  
 Geological Survey of the Dom., Management of (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).  
 Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1348 (vol. iii).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2979-2982, 2987; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3274 (vol. iv).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dominion Exhibition) 1026 (ii).

**Hay, Mr. R.**, *Centre Toronto.*

- Patent Act., 1872, Amt. (B. 89, 1°\*) 362 (vol. i).

**Hesson, Mr. S. R.**, *North Perth.*

- Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36. (*Mr. Orton*) on Res. 117 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1047 (vol. ii).  
 C. P. R. Res. respecting further Loan (remarks on adjmt. of deb.) 2643; in Com., 2742, 2750 (vol. iv).  
 — Rets ordered by House since date of Contract (M. for Stmt.) 481, 483 (vol. i).  
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmt., 111 (vol. i).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1130; (remarks) 1209, (vol. ii).  
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 977, 982 (ii).  
*Debates*, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in First Rep. (remarks) 35 (vol. i).  
 Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3355, 3358 (iv).  
 Fisheries' Act, extension of, to the N.W. (Ques.) 51 (i).  
 Fisheries protection in the N.W. (M. for copies of Cor.) 700 (vol. i).

**Hesson, Mr. S. R.**—*Continued.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "farmers' sons," 1595; "actual value," 1599, 1605 (vol. ii), (explanation) 1752; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1987; "in counties," 2059, 2081, 2082, 2084, 2085; "who shall not vote," (Indians) 2133; "registration of voters," 2246, 2283, 2295, 2305, (explanation) 2185, (correction) 2214; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1497 (vol. ii); 2208 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1494 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2028 (vol. iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2552 (vol. iii).  
 Gold Reserve, Govt., withdrawals, on M. for copies of Cor., 353 (vol. i).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2835, 2836, 2853 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1072 (vol. ii).  
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 918 (vol. ii).  
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 83 (vol. i).  
 Lands in Ry. Belt, in B. C. and Homestead Act (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).  
 Letter Postage reduction (Ques.) 33; on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 291 (vol. i).  
 Liquor License Act, administration of, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).  
 N. W. Central Ry., Land grant to, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3382 (vol. iv).  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).  
 Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2809 (iv).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1351 (vol. ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 977, 982; (Inland Revenue, Dept. of, contingencies) 918 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2835, 2836, 2853 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (printing and printing paper, &c.) 2809 (vol. iv).  
*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Deputy Speaker's Salary) 3355, 3358 (vol. iv).  
 Towels, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 858 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 747-756 (vol. i); in Com. (towels) 858 (vol. ii).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).

**Hickey, Mr. C. E.**, *Dundas.*

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) M. to adja. deb. on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3431 (vol. iv).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com. (Amts.) 955, 956, 959, 963, 1055; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1051 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2645, 2650, 2653 (vol. iv).

**Hickey, Mr. C. E.**—*Continued.*

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2437 (vol. iii).

*Debates*, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr Tassé*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 3369; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 3370 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "actual value," 1600 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1887-1890, 1989; "revision of voters' lists," 2330; "registration of voters" (Amt.) 2279 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1461 (vol. ii).

Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (vol. ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Mortuary Statistics) 1029 (ii).  
*Immigration*, 2852 (vol. iv).

*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 993; conc., 1812 (vol. ii) 2766 (vol. iv).

Volunteers of 1837-38 (Res. recognising services) 37 (vol. i).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1676 (vol. ii).

**Hilliard, Mr. G.**, *West Peterborough.*

Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).

Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1224 (vol. ii).

**Holton, Mr. E.**, *Chateauguay.*

A. B. and C. Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).  
Cherrier, Geo. E., Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, dismissal of (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

County Court Judges' Salaries (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).

Exchange Bank of Canada, Govt. Claim against (Ques.) 89; on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 368 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) 1430 (vol. ii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070 (vol. iv).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).

Heney, John, Govt. property occupied by (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Government* (Interior, Dept. of) 3408 (vol. iv).

*Geological Survey*, 3346 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2914 (vol. iv).

*Public Works—Consolid. Fund: Quebec*, 3385 (vol. iv).

**Homer, Mr. J. A. R.**, *New Westminster.*

Alaska and B.C. boundary line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 705 (vol. i).

C.P.R., Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, extension of time (Ques.) 146 (vol. i).

Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3022 (vol. iv).

— Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1582 (vol. ii).

**Innes, Mr. J.**, *South Wellington.*

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1736-1739 (ii); "registration of voters" (Amt.) 2279 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065 (vol. iv).

Mails between Shiloh and Fergus (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).  
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).

**Irvine, Mr. D.**, *Carleton, N.B.*

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 960, 1055 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 2674 (iv).

Duties on Hay, Cor. between Canada and U. S. (M. for copies) 443 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1544 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1814-1817; "who shall not vote," 2097 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1425 (vol. ii).

Obstructions in Rivers, Cor. between Canada and U. S. (M. for copies) 443; withdn., 445 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.* (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen rags) 784, 786, 792; (woollen fabrics) 800 (vol. ii).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Public Buildings, Inspector of (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).

**Ives, Mr. W. B.**, *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on 1°, 449; on Ques. to fix day for 2°, 713 (vol. i); on M. for 2° (Amt.) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; in Com., 956; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. for 3°, 1053; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan (speech) 2622-2630 (vol. iv).

Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 284 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 280 (vol. i).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973 (vol. i).

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2432-2435, (Amt.) 2438; on Order for 3°, 2532 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768; (Amt.) 2768 (vol. iv).

Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., out in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com., 150 (vol. i).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3233, 3234 (vol. iv).

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Res., 72 (vol. i).

**Ives, Mr. W. B.—Continued.**

- Disturbance in the N. W., Engagement at Duck Lake, despatch of Troops (Ques.) 790; (remarks) 815; (personal explanation) par. in *Toronto Globe*, 1063 (ii).  
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1008; on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).  
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 372 (vol. i).  
 Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act, to M. for rsmng adjd. deb. for 2°, 940 (ii).  
 Fort Macleod Ranch and Telegraph Co.'s (B. 80, 1°\*) 349 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1986-1988; (Ques. of Order) 1794, 2242 (vol. iii).  
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 83 (vol. i).  
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2760 (vol. iv).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2960 (vol. iv).  
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for Reprs., &c., 697 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 973 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3233, 3234 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2833 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen rags) 788 (vol. ii).

**Jackson, Mr. J., South Norfolk.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to M. for 3°, 1061 (ii).  
 Divorce Cases, Evidence in (remarks) 428 (vol. i).  
 Dredges, Tugs and Scows, building (M. for Ret.) 53 (i).  
 Dummy Lighthouse Fog-horn (M. for copies of Cor.) 293 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1342; "person" (Indian) 1538; "qualifications in cities and towns" 1711-1715 (vol. ii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1312 (vol. ii).  
 Life-saving Service at Port Rowan (M. for copies of Cor.) 142 (vol. i).  
 Long Point Fishing Grounds (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).  
 Mail Bags, furnishing of (Ques.) 964 (vol. ii).  
 Port Rowan as a Harbor of Refuge, construction of (M. for Ret.) 297 (vol. i).  
 Ports Stanley and Burwell harbors of refuge, on M. for Ret. 62 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 662-666 (vol. i).  
 Weights and Measures Inspection Act Amt. B. 118, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 837: in Com., 1672 (ii).

**Jamieson, Mr. J., North Lanark.**

- Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) to prop. Res., 252 (vol. i).

**Jamieson, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 92, 1°) 448; (Ques. to fix day for 2°) 713; M. to make B. 2nd Order of Public Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); 2° m., 949; 2° agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; in Com., 955-964; consent of Govt. asked for 3°, 1040; 3° m., 1045; in Com., 1047; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) 1053; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060; on Amt. (*Mr. Gigault*) 1062 (vol. ii); Ques. to fix day for consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2529 (vol. iii); M. to disagree with Sen. Amts., 2644; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; (Amt.) 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2552; (Amts.) 2653, 2655, 2657 (iv).  
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. to resume adjd. deb. for 2° (Amt.) to substitute Can. Temp. Act, 940; agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (vol. ii).  
 Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Beaty*) M. to pass to Pub. Bills and Orders, 1045 (ii).

**Jenkins, Mr. J. T., Queen's, P.E.I.**

- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2482 (vol. iii).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1056 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2655 (vol. iv).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1127 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1344 (vol. ii); in Com. "manhood suffrage," 1981 (vol. iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3053; agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1080 (vol. ii).  
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1019 (vol. ii).  
*Lansdowne*, Steamer, and communication with P.E.I. (Ques.) 927 (vol. ii).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1674 (vol. ii).  
 Winter Crossing from P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 65 (i).

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Lunenburg.**

- Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 701 (vol. i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, re N. S. Volunteers, 1094 (vol. ii); (explanation) vote on Sen. Amts. to Can. Temp. Act, 3073 (vol. iv).  
 Rogers' Patent Fish-ladder, Cor. and Reprs., on M. for copies, 871 (vol. ii).  
 Wharves and Docks in navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 216 (vol. i).

**Kilvert, Mr. F. E., Hamilton.**

- Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i).  
 Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 114) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).  
 Hatzfeld Divorce (B. 107, 1° on a div.) 672, 694; 2° agreed to (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i).  
 Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 114, 1°\*) 783 (vol. ii).

**King, Mr. G. G., Queen's, N.B.**

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1261-1263; in Com. "person" (Indian) 1524 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1806; "who shall not vote" (Indian) 2164; "registration of voters," 2266, 2285, (Amt.) 2285 (vol. iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration*, 2833 (vol. iv).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 561-566 (vol. i).

**Kinney, Mr. J. R., Yarmouth.**

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1313 (vol. ii).

Windsor Branch Ry., O.C., Agreements, &c., respecting (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i).

**Kirk, Mr. J. A., Guysborough.**

Bounty to Fishermen, payment of, in Guysborough, N.S. (Ques.) 2751 (vol. iv).

Buildings in N.S., in Com. of Sup., 2917 (vol. iv).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, certificates, Liquor sold under, in N.S. (M. for Ret.\*) 147 (vol. i).

Coal, purchase of, for Public Buildings, quantity and value (M. for Stmt.\*) 313 (vol. i).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921 (vol. iv).

Fish-breeding, in Com. of Sup., 2954 (vol. iv).

Fishery Bounty, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

Fishery Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1259-1261 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1834; "in counties," 2067, 2072, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (vol. iii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1308, 1312 (vol. ii).

Harbors and Rivers, N.S., in Com. of Sup., 3419 (iv).

Harbors in Guysboro' Co., re-survey of (Ques.) 51 (i).

Indians and Half-breeds, Education of, in Man. and the N.W.T. (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Indian Schools in the N.W. and Man. (Ques.) 568 (i).

Laurie, Maj. Gen., mission of, to the N.W. (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2950, 2952 (vol. iv).

Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).

Military Col. Graduates in the Militia (Ques.) 1040 (ii).

New Harbor and Indian Harbor, N.S., Breakwaters, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies, &c\*) 147 (vol. i).

N. S. Claims for a Subsidy (Ques.) 189 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave and East Bay, Steamship subvention in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).

Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, Canso and Arichat, communication between (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., as a sub-port (M. for Papers, &c.) 445; (reply) 448 (vol. i).

Returns, enquiries for, 490, 504, 534 (vol. i).

**Kirk, Mr. J. A.—Continued.**

Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1011 (vol. ii).

St. Francis Lake, road dyke, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).

*Rimouski*, steamer, subsidy to (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).

Subsidy to N.S., increase of (Ques.) 567.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 3293; on M. to conc. in Amts. (Amt.) 3400; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Canals—Income*: Miscellaneous (road dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3418 (vol. iv).

*Fisheries* (distribution of Bounties) 2956; (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2954; (Fishery protection Steamers) 2956 (vol. iv).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service, Salaries, &c.*, 2950, 2952 (vol. iv).

*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).

*Public Works*:—*Consolid. Fund*: Harbors and Rivers (N. S.) 3419. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2917; Dredging, 2921. (iv).

Vacancy in a Judicial District, N.S. (Ques.) 2750 (iv).

**Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., Frontenac.**

[See SPEAKER, Mr.]

**Kranz, Mr. H., North Waterloo.**

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2474 (vol. iii).

Brewers and Distillers, compensation to (prop. Res.) 236 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, memorials, &c., respecting (M. for copies\*) 448 (vol. i).

Private Bills, reception of (M. to extend time) 88 (i).

**Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.**

Analysts, Public, Remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2542-2546 (vol. ii).

British Medical Acts, Ret. respecting (remarks) 939 (ii).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1108 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973 (vol. ii).

Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1353-1360; "tenant," 1482; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1539; "actual value," 1602 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns" (Indians) 1845-1849, 1985, 1997, (Amt.) 2000, 2021; "qualifications in counties," 2074; "registration of voters," 2267, 2301; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2385; (personal explanation) 2025, 2027 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1432; on M. to adja. deb., 1433 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798 (vol. iii).

Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures, on personal explanation of Mr. McNeill, 2172; (letter read) 2496 (vol. iii).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3348 (vol. iv).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1333 (vol. ii).

**Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.**

- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 917, 919 (ii).  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).  
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1669 (vol. ii).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, application for and licenses granted, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 46 (vol. i).  
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3421 (vol. iv).  
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 906 (vol. ii).  
*Parliamentary Companion*, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (ii).  
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (*Mr. Sproule*) remarks, 89 (vol. i).  
 Rys. centreing in Ottawa, bounties granted to (M. for Ret.) 86 (vol. i).  
 Rys. in the County of Grey, refund of bonuses to County Council, &c. (M. for copy of memorial) 58 (vol. i).  
 Returns, enquiry for, 455 (vol. i), 1205 (vol. ii).  
 Superintendent of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 272 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.* (Customs, Dept. of) 901; (Civil Service Board of Examiners) 973; (Inland Revenue, Dept. of, contingencies, 917, 919; (Marine, Dept. of) 906; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902 (vol. ii).

*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).

*Geological Survey*, 3348 (vol. iv).

*Legislation*: H. of C. (increased Indemnity to Members) 3450 (iv).

*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3421 (vol. iv).

*Miscellaneous* (*Parliamentary Companion*) 3387.

Trutch, J. W., employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 801 (ii).

**Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N.B.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 962, 1059 (vol. ii).  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. 2436 (vol. iii).  
*Debates*, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3370 (vol. iv).  
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 946 (ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1449; "person" (Indians) 1554; (Chinese) 1584, 1588 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1812; "in counties," 2057; "who shall not vote," 2100; (explanation) 2195; "registration of voters," 2230, 2232, 2260 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. for 3°, 3058 (vol. iv); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1465 (vol. ii).  
 Foot and Carriage Bridge on the St. John River (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Richibucto and Kingston Ports, Customs business (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3276 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res. 3276 (iv).

**Landry, Mr. P. A.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY :

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (N. B. and P. E. I. to Great Britain, &c.) 3457 (vol. iv).

Winter crossing from P. E. I., on M. for copies of Cor., 65 (vol. i).

**Landry, Mr. P., Montmagny.**

- Bolduc, Capt., Resignation of (M. for Ret.) 29 (vol. i).  
 C. P. R. Short Line Ry. (M. for copies of O. C., instructions given, Reports, &c., of Engineers) 33 (vol. i).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., criticisms of Press as to cause, and slur upon French members commanding Battalions, 887 (vol. ii).  
 Drill Shed at Quebec, tenders for construction of (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1635, 1637 (ii).  
 Immigration Office (Ques.) employés names, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 30 (vol. iv).  
 Library and Mr. Bourinot's work (remarks) 40 (i).  
 Plante, J. B., Claim of (M. for copies\*) 147 (vol. i).  
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic ports, in Com., on Res., 2978, 2982, 2995; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3273.  
 Short Line Ry., Second Rep. of Mr. Light (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
 Short Line Ry. Survey from St. Charles (Ques.) 350 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. further B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2978, 2982, 2995; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3273 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2939 (vol. iv.)

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction (B. 3, 1°) 28; Order for 2° read, 102; 2° m., 151; (reply) 167; 2° neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction, limitation (B. 68) M. to introd., 246; 1°, 270 (vol. i).

Supreme Court, Judgments rendered by, since establishment (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i.)

**Langelier, Mr. F., Mégantic.**

- Administration of the N.W. in Com. on Res., (*Mr. Caron*) 2928, 2934 (vol. iv).  
 Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2477 (vol. iii).  
 Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).  
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (vol. ii).  
 Bolduc, Capt., Resignation of, on M. for Ret., 29 (vol. i).  
 Bras St. Nicholas, deepening of (M. for copies of Pet.\*) 312 (vol. i).  
 Brosseau & Lisabelle, Customs Brokers, frauds, &c., by (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).  
 Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).  
 Calling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).

**Langelier, Mr. F.—Continued.**

- Disturbance in the N. W., funeral expenses of Achille Blais (Ques.) 2169; pillage of houses of half-breeds by Volunteers (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii), 2990 (vol. iv). Fog-horns and letter-box fronts, tenders for (M. for copies of advertisements, &c.)\* 313 (vol. i). France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2937-2942 (vol. iv). Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1364-1373; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1388; "usufructuary" 1444, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1452, 1454, 1455, 1457; "tenant," 1475, (Amt.) 1476, 1480; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1632-1638 (vol. ii), 1984, 1996, 1903-1908; "in counties," 2064, 2067, 2070, 2394; "registration of voters," 2185-2190, (Amt.) 2228; "revision of voters' lists," 2331, 2333, 2342; "appeal," 2365; "officers and duties," 2388; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066 (vol. iv). Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv). Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2816-2818, 2831, 2834, 2837, 2838, 2892 (vol. iv). Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1011 (vol. ii). I. C. R., Cost of working, &c., from 1879 to 1884, on Amt. (*Mr. Pope*) to M. for Stmt., 202 (vol. i). Lavis's patent pole and Militia tents (Ques.) 2029 (iii). Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1028 (vol. ii). Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. for Com on Res., 2556; in Com., 2557 (vol. iii); on M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2754 (vol. iv). Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 2353 (vol. iv). Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 193 (vol. i). St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 987 (vol. ii). Seizures by Customs Dept. at Montreal (Ques.) 1387 (ii). School of Cavalry at Quebec (M. for Papers, &c.) 88 (i). Simard, Joseph, Rep. recommending payment to Geo. Lavoie (M. for copies\*) 1443 (vol. ii). Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2932, 2986; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3259; (Amt.) 3266; neg. (Y. 39, N. 107) 3289; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 3292 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1025; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032; (Mortuary Statistics) 1028 (ii). *Immigration*, 2816-2818, 2831, 2834, 2837, 2838, 2892 (vol. iv). *Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 2942 (vol. iv). *Miscellaneous* (Vote of \$700,000 for N. W. Troubles) 1304 (vol. ii); (Vote of \$1,000,000) 2236 (vol. iii). *Militia* (Ammunition) 2903 (vol. iv).

**Langelier, Mr. F.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2946 (vol. iv). *Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 987 (vol. ii). *Quarantine*, 2853 (vol. iv). Quebec, advances on account of Provincial Subsidy (Ques.) 235 (vol. i). Vote of \$700,000 and \$1,000,000 for N. W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 1304 (vol. ii), 2236 (vol. iii).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector, Three Rivers.**

- Adulteration of Food, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) remuneration to Analysts, prop. Res., 2497 (vol. iii). Agent and contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv). Alaska and B. C. boundary line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 705 (vol. i). Amherst and P.E.I. Ry. incorp. B., on M. to introduce, 349 (vol. i). Ascension Day, adjmt. for (M.) 1822 (vol. iii). Baillairge, G. F., in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv). Bank of B. C. (B. 105, 1°) 631; 2° m., 894 (vol. ii). Bankrupt Estates and Official Assignees, on M. for Ret., 304 (vol. i). Bankruptcy and Insolvency, Petitions respecting (M. to ref. to Sel. Com.) 125 (vol. i). Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater, Extension of (Ans.) 77 (i). Bolduc, Capt., Resignation of, on M. for Ret., 29 (vol. i); Bridges, Booms, &c., on navigable waters, Act Amt. (B. 101, 1°) 606 (vol. i); 2° m., 893 (vol. ii). Can. Agricultural Insurance Co., receipts and expenditures of liquidators, &c., on M. for Stmt., 303 (i). Can. Southern Ry. Co. and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. B. 9 (*Mr. Bergin*) in Com., 245 (vol. i). Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for 1°, 448 (i); in Com., 955, 960-964, 1046 (ii). Can. Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 931 (vol. ii). C. P. R. Extension to Canadian ports on the Atlantic, Vernon Smith's Rep., on M. for copies, 294 (vol. i). ——— Land grant accepted by Co., number of acres (Stmt.) 862 (vol. ii). ——— North Shore Ry., subsidy to, on M. for copies of Cor., 43 (vol. i). ——— Short Line Ry., on M. for O. C., instructions given, Reports, &c., of Engineers, 33, 39 (vol. i). Cape St. Ignace, Station at (Ans.) 246 (vol. i). Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2917 (iv). Cascumpec Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 479 (vol. i). Charlottetown Public Buildings, construction of (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii). Chenevert, J. A., employment of, in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 429 (vol. i). Church Point and Trout Cove Piers, Engineers' Rep., on M. for copy, 54 (vol. i). Chinese Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3387, 3421; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

## Langevin, Hon Sir Hector—Continued.

- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1102, 1104, 1118, 1128 (vol. ii).
- Court of Claims for Canada (B. 93, 1<sup>o</sup>) 449 (vol. i); prop. Res., 777 (vol. ii); M. to dschg. Order, 2439 (iii).
- Collins, J. E., sums paid to, for services, on M. for Ret., 700 (vol. i).
- Commercial Relations between France and Canada, on M. for copies of Cor., 831 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Treaty with Jamaica (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
- Consolid. Ry. Act., 1879, Amt. B. 111 (*Mr. Mulock*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 743 (vol. i).
- Cornwall Public Buildings (Ans.) 2997 (vol. iv).
- Coste, Louis and Eugène, employment of (Ans.) 1131 (vol. ii).
- County Court Judges, Man. (B. 162) prop. Res., 3395 (iv).
- Customs and Excise Receipts for June (Ans.) 3073 (iv).
- Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 3361; in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, on M. to appoint Malachy Daly, Esq., 72 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N. W., Jackson, Mr., communications from, *re* Half-breed Claims (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Murder of Payne and Applegarth and rising of Stoney Indians, 859 (vol. ii).
- on adjmt. (remarks) 3160, 3212 (vol. iv).
- Prisoners held for trial (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3441 (vol. iv).
- Stoney Indian rising (Stmnt.) 886 (vol. ii).
- Telegraphic communication west of Winnipeg (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
- Dredges, Tugs and Scows, building of, on M. for Ret., 53; (remarks) 56 (vol. i).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921; conc., 2923 (vol. iv).
- Dry Docks, encouragement of construction (B. 108, 1<sup>o</sup>) 693 (vol. i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 894 (vol. ii).
- Dundas and Waterloo Road (B. 120) prop. Res. and M. for Com., 451 (vol. i); Res. conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 892 (vol. ii); M. to dschg. Order, 2396 (vol. iii).
- Dundas Public Buildings, erection of (Ans.) 290 (i).
- Easter, adjmt. for (M.) 888 (vol. ii).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, length of (Ans.) 743; substitution of granite for sandstone (Ans.) 743 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
- Expiring Laws continuation (B. 165 1<sup>o</sup>\*), 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3458 (vol. iv).
- Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (M. to adjn. deb.) 886 (vol. ii).
- France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2937 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1137; on M. for Com. (remarks) 1385 (vol. ii); "qualifications in counties," 2085; on personal explanation of Mr. Mills, 2140; "registration of voters," 2299; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1528 (vol. ii), 2137 (vol. iii).

## Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.

- Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2028 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Business (Ms. to sit on Saturdays) 3246, 3459 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Officials in the N.W., names, &c., on M. for Ret., 66 (vol. i).
- Govt. Rights to Water Lots on Rivers (Ans.) 2238 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Yards in Montreal (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
- Guerin, Mr., Rep. of Survey of Improvements on the Ottawa Riv., 1040 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Claims, communication from Mr. Jackson, (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Harbor Commissioners at Three Rivers (B. 150) Govt. Loan, prop. Res., 2497 (vol. iii).
- Harbors in Guysborough Co., re-survey (Ans.) 51 (i).
- Hatzfeld Divorce B. 107 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 672 (i).
- High Commissioner, in Com. of Sup., 3386 (vol. iv).
- Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
- House of Commons Commissioners' Rep. *re* Staff (Ans.) 2750 (vol. iv).
- Immigrant Buildings at Lévis, construction of (Ans.) 89 (vol. i).
- Immigrant Sheds at Medicine Hat, construction of (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2819 (vol. iv).
- Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 304 (vol. i).
- Inspector of Public Works, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
- Internal Economy Commission, increased expenses of, in Com. of Sup., 3449 (vol. iv).
- Land and Cable Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).
- Land grants to Railways in the N. W. (B. 147) prop. Res., 2440; in Com. on Res., 2483, 2488, 2517, 2518, 2521; M. to conc. in Res., 2533 (vol. iii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2770; in Com., 2855 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1660 (vol. ii); in Com., 2759-2761 (iv).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (M. to adjn. deb.) 620 (vol. i).
- Longueuil and Lévis Ry., Survey of (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).
- Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, 2517, 2518 (vol. iii).
- Man. Indian Agency, management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).
- Man. Judiciary (B. 162) prop. Res., 3395 (vol. iv).
- Mattawa, Mountain Rapids and Long Sault, Improvements (Ans.) 1040 (vol. ii).
- Military Storehouses in Quebec, lease (Ques.) 1039 (ii).
- Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3045; in Com., 3046 (vol. iv).
- McCarthy, C., Public Works Dept., Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.**

McIsaac's Pond as a harbor of refuge (Ans.) 36 (vol. i).  
 Mounted Police Barracks at Fort Macleod, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).  
 Napanee Public Buildings (Ans.) 77 (vol. i)  
 Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. and the C.P.R. (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).  
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copy of Reps., &c., 696 (vol. i).  
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2483-2488 (vol. iii).  
 Official Arbitrators, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 88 (i).  
 Optional Subjects, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).  
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1225 (vol. ii).  
 Ottawa River Survey and Exploration (Ans.) 131 (i).  
*Parliamentary Companion*, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iv).  
 Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1892 (vol. iii).  
 Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).  
 Postmaster, Assistant, at Ottawa, Allowance to, on conc., 3397 (vol. iv).  
 Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 63 (*Mr. Watson*) on M. to refer back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Rys., &c., 713 (vol. i).  
 Port Credit Harbor, Repairs to (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).  
 Port Rowan Harbor of Refuge, on M. for Ret., 299 (i).  
 Post Office at village of Montmagny (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).  
 Printing and Advertising, Ret. (remarks) 28 (vol. i).  
 Private Bills, Reception of Reps. (M. to extend time) 1094 (vol. ii).  
 Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).  
 Qn'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Stm't. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (iii).  
 Ry. from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 189, 193; (M. to adjn. deb.) 200 (vol. i).  
 Rys. in the Co. of Grey, Refund of bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for copy of memorial, 59 (vol. i).  
 Real Property in the N.W.T. (B. 109, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 742 (vol. i).  
 Red Point Harbor Breakwater (Ans.) 1039 (vol. ii).  
 Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3405 (iv).  
 Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. B. 45 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (M. to adjn. deb.) 495 (i).  
 Return, imperfect (remarks) 101 (vol. i), 1386 (vol. ii); on enquiries for (remarks) 363, 455 (i), 3395 (iv).  
 Riel, Louis, employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).  
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).  
 St. Peter and St. Paul, adjmt. for (M.) 2889 (vol. iv).  
 St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 80 (vol. i).  
 Sable Island telegraphic communication (Ans.) 57 (i).  
 Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).  
 Select Standing Com. on Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines (M. to add name of Mr. Bain) 125 (vol. i).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.**

Sittings of the House (M. for two sittings on each day) 3459 (vol. iv).  
 Short Line Ry. See "Subsidies."  
 Short Line Ry., Plans, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).  
 Somerville, N.S., Breakwater, repair of (Ans.) 57 (i).  
 Statistics relating to the Public Service (Ans.) 2854 (iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. (B. 158) M. for Com. on Res., 2971-2974; in Com. on Res., 2975-2977, 2986, 2989, 2994-2996; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3250, 3257-3259; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 3293; 2<sup>o</sup> m. and in Com., 3380, 3399-3401; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts., 3401 (vol. iv).  
 Superior Court of Quebec (prop. Res.) 3293 (vol. iv).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Govt.* (Justice, Dept. of) 898 (vol. ii); (Optional Subjects) 3411 (vol. iv); Public Works, Dept. of) 911, suppl., 3448 (vol. iv), (contingencies) 921 (vol. ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 3350 (vol. iv).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office (allowance to Asst. Postmaster at Ottawa) conc., 3397; Public Works (Agent and contingencies, B.C.) 3308; Repairs, &c. (Harbors and Slides) 3307; (Land and Cable Telegraphs) 3307; (Telegraph and Signal Service) 3307; (Telegraph Lines, B. C.) 3307 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2819 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) conc., 2765 (vol. iv); (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Commission) 3449 (vol. iv).  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Chinese Commission) 3421, 3387, conc., 3396; (*Histoire, Généalogique des Familles Françaises*) 3455; (Mounted Police Barracks at Fort Macleod) 3387; (*Parliamentary Companion*) 3387 (vol. iv).  
*Penitentiaries*: St. Vincent de Paul (payment to G. F. Baillairge) 3350 (vol. iv).  
*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Capital*: B. C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 2916; Ottawa (additional buildings) 2916; Port Arthur (construction of harbor) 2916. *Consolid. Fund*: Buildings (Ont.) 3385; Harbors and rivers (N. S.) 3409, (N. W.) 3420, (Ont.) 3386, (Quebec) 3385, 3419; Miscellaneous (High Commissioner) 3386; Roads and Bridges, 3420; Telegraphs, 3386, 3420. *Income*: Buildings (Man.) 2919, (N. B.) 2918, (N. S.) 2917, (N. W. T.) 2919, 3452, (Ont.) 2918, (P. E. I.) 2918, (Quebec) 2918, (Repairs, &c.) 2919; Dredging, 2922, conc., 2923; Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 2921, (Mar. Provs. generally) 2923, (N. B.) 2920, (Ont.) 2920, 3433, (P. E. I.) 2919, (Quebec) 2920; Telegraphs, 2922 (vol. iv).  
 Telegraph and Signal Service in B.C. (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).  
 ——— and Signal Service, in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).  
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 2922, 3386, 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Telegraph System in Cape Breton, Extension of (Ans.) 78 (vol. i).  
 Translation of *Hansard* and Votes and Proceedings (remarks) 594 (vol. i).  
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii), 2935 (iv).  
 Trutch, J. W., employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 744 (i).  
 Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 2676 (vol. iv).  
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Water Lots in N.S., application for (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.**

- White Point, N. S., Breakwater, repair of (Ans.) 52 (i).  
 Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 82  
 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 428 (vol. i).  
 Woodstock, N.B., Public Buildings, Inspector of (Ans).  
 606 (vol. i).  
 Wharves on P.E.I., grant for construction, &c. (Ans.)  
 351 (vol. i).  
 Wood supplies for Govt. Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 429  
 (vol. i), 1387 (vol. ii).

**Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.**

- Can. Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers,  
 982 (vol. ii).  
 C. P. R. Extension to Canadian ports on the Atlantic  
 (Ques.) 290; Vernon Smith's Rep., on M. for copies,  
 294; St. Martin's Junction to Quebec (M. for copies  
 of Cor.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 ——— North Shore Line, Subsidy to (M. for copies of  
 Cor., &c.) 41 (vol. i).  
 ——— Res. respecting further Loan, on M. to conc. in  
 Res. (Amt.) 2863; neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Short Line Ry., Montreal to the Atlantic, on M.  
 for Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c., 39 (vol. i).  
 Chenevert, J. A., employment of, by Public Works  
 Dept. (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).  
 Commercial relations between France [and Canada, on  
 M. for copies of Cor., 831 (vol. ii).  
 Commercial Treaty with Jamaica (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of  
 confidence, 3119-3128; on M. to adjn. deb., 3212 (iv).  
 ——— Prisoners held for Trial (remarks) on M. for  
 Com. of Sup., 3440 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°,  
 1167; (Amt.) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; in  
 Com., "usufructuary," 1445, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1454,  
 1455, 1456; "tenant," 1480; "actual value," 1596,  
 1604; "parish," 1593; "qualifications in cities  
 and towns," 1626-1629 (ii), 1984 (iii); on Amt. (*Mr.*  
*McIntyre*) to M. for 3° 3057; on Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*)  
 to M. for consdn. of B., 3070 (vol. iv); (Ques. of  
 Order) 1510, 1619; on M. that Com. rise, 1424  
 (vol. ii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals  
 B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067 (vol. ii).  
 Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and  
 N.W., on M. for Ret., 96 (vol. i).  
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in  
 Com., 2761; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65)  
 2763 (vol. iv).  
 Meredith, Chief Justice, resignation of (M. for copy)  
 43 (vol. i).  
 Nav. of River St. Lawrence B. 159 (*Mr. McLelan*) on  
 Order for 2°, 3436 (vol. iv).  
 North Shore Ry., purchase of, by Govt. (Ques.) 189 (i).  
 Ry. from Montreal to the sea-board (Res.) 189 (vol. i).  
 Return, enquiry for, 895 (vol. ii).

**Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.**

- Riel, Treatment of, in Prison (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*)  
 in Com., 2976, 2986, 2994; on M. to conc. in Res.,  
 3250; (Amt.) 3257; in Com on B., 3399 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) conc., 3373 (vol. iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry*,  
*Montmagny*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) to M. for 2°, 167 (i).  
*Ways and Means*—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in  
 the N.W., 3119-3128; on M. to adjn. deb., 3212 (iv).

**Lesage, Mr. C. A., Dorchester.**

- C. P. R. Extension to Canadian ports on the Atlantic,  
 Vernon Smith's Rep. (M. for copies) 294 (vol. i).  
 ——— Short Line Ry. from Montreal to the Atlantic  
 (M. for Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c.) 38 (i).  
 Etchemin River Line, Survey of (Ques.) 350 (vol. i).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*)  
 in Com. on Res., 2992-2994; (Amt.) 3289; neg.  
 (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292 (vol. iv).  
 Short Line Ry., Mr. Wicksteed's Rep. (Ques.) 1744 (iii).

**Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.**

- Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of, on M. for  
 copies, 357 (vol. i).  
 Brandon, Postmaster at, Salary and Allowances (Ques.)  
 2029 (vol. iii).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M.  
 for 3°, 1301; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1303 (ii).  
 Cornwall Public Buildings (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).  
 Coste, Louis and Eugène, employment of (Ques.) 1131 (ii).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., Trial of Riel (Ques.) 2358 (iii).  
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 309 (i).  
 Dumont, Extradition of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res.  
 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 390 (vol. i).  
 Fishing Licenses, Lake Erie, names of persons granted  
 (M. for Ret.) 964 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir*  
*Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1150-1153; on M.  
 for Com., 1344-1347, 1352; "qualifications in cities  
 and towns," 1732-1736 (vol. ii), 1860-1864; (Indians)  
 2009-2012; "qualifications in counties," 2066, 2070,  
 2075; "who shall not vote," 2088, (Indians) 2153-  
 2155; "registration of voters," 2264, 2283, 2286,  
 2316; "revision of voters' lists," 2324, 2338, 2343;  
 "general provisions," 2344; "appeal," 2364;  
 "officers and duties" (Indians) 2371; on consdn. of  
 B. (Amt.) 3066 (vol. iv).  
 Indian Superintendents, office of (Ques.) 88 (vol. i).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals  
 B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1082, 1084 (vol. ii).  
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr.*  
*Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to  
 M. for 2°, 184 (vol. i).  
 License Commissioners in Essex (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).

**Lister, Mr. J. F.—Continued.**

- Maritime Court of Ont. Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 128 (vol. i).  
 Moody, John, employment of (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).  
 Northerly and Westerly Boundaries of Ont., proceedings, moneys paid, &c. (M. for Ret.) 210 (vol. i.)  
 Personal Explanation, *re* statement made by Min. of Marine (remarks) 693 (vol. i).  
 Rys. in the Co. of Grey, refund of bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for copy of memorial, 59 (vol. i).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. Municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 585 (vol. i).  
 Squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley (M. for Ret.) 205 (i).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1279 (vol. ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Ammunition) 2905; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2908; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2910 (vol. iv).

Watson, Ebenezer, of Sarnia, office of (Ques.) 188 (i).

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P.E.I.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1047; (Amt.) 1062 (vol. ii).  
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice, B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 150 (i).  
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 944, (ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns" (Amt.) 1623 (vol. ii); telegram read *re* election in P.E.I., 1903 (iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3°, 3054 (iv).  
 Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).  
 Red Point Harbor Breakwater (Ques.) 1039 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income* : P.E.I., 2918 (vol. iv).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1674 (vol. ii).  
 Weight and Measurement of Root Crops (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 201 (vol. i)  
 Winter Crossing from P.E.I. (M. for copies of Cor.) 62 (vol. i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., Carleton, Ont.**

- Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).  
 Address, on The, 19; M. for Com. to draft, 27; draft Rep., 27; His Excell. reply, 113 (vol. i).  
 Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. (B. 141, 1°\*) 2345 (vol. iii); in Com., 2962, 2967; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3002, 3427 (vol. iv).  
 Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°\*) 1 (vol. i).  
 Administration of the N.W.T. (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 2934 (vol. iv).  
 Advances to Provinces B. 7 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. to introd., 32 (vol. i).  
 Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 1320 (vol. ii).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- American Engineers' visit to N.S., in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).  
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2546 (vol. iii).  
 André, Father, Letter from, in 1883 (Ans.) 3425 (iv).  
 Annunciation Day, adjmt. for (M.) 714 (vol. i).  
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (vol. ii).  
 Ash Wednesday, adjmt. for (M.) 125 (vol. i).  
 Banking Facilities for Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 120 (vol. i).  
 Bankruptcy or Insolvency (M. for Sp. Com.) 47; Pets. respecting (M. to refer to Sp. Com.) 125 (vol. i).  
 Bell and Kavanagh Land Claims, on M. for copies of O.C., &c., 481 (vol. i).  
 Benson, Mr., M.P., Death of (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).  
 Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825, 2827 (vol. iv).  
 Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (vol. iv).  
 Boundary between Ont. and Man. (Ans.) 51 (i).  
 B.C. Penitentiary, suspension of Rules, on M. for copies of Cor., 824; in Com. of Sup., 990 (vol. ii).  
 British Medical Acts Return (remarks) 939 (vol. ii).  
 Bureau of Agriculture, Establishment of (Ans.) 76 (i).  
 Business of the Session (remarks) 211 (vol. i); (M.) to meet at 1 o'clock, 1744 (vol. iii).  
 Cabinet Representation for B.C. (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (Ans.) 363 (vol. i).  
 — Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on ques. to fix day for 2°, 713; procedure, 714 (vol. i); (Ans.) to fix day for consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2530 (vol. iii); on Sen. Amts., 2645, 2650, 2652–2656 (vol. iv).  
 — Druggists' Licenses (Ans.) 1306 (ii).  
 — Expenses of prosecutions under (Ans.) 1306 (ii); 3320 (vol. iv).  
 Can. Contingent for the Soudan (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).  
 C.P.R. Agreement by Co. to Terms of Resolution (Ans.) 1915 (vol. iii).  
 — Change in existing arrangements (Ans.) 695 (vol. i), 1744 (vol. iii).  
 — Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) prop. Res. 2420 (vol. iii); in Com., 3032 (vol. iv).  
 — Debt, floating and unsecured (Ans.) 219 (i).  
 — Extension of, to Quebec (Ans.) 291 (vol. i).  
 — Length of gaps (explanation) 838 (vol. ii).  
 — Forty Mile Belt in B.C. (Memo. read) 1983 (iii).  
 — Govt. Mortgage, changes (Ans.) 36 (vol. i).  
 — Homesteads within Ry. Belt (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).  
 — Land Area in the 48-mile belt accepted by Co. (Stmnt.) 782 (vol. ii).  
 — Land Grant accepted by Co., number of acres (Ans.) 568, 744 (vol. i).  
 — Land rejected by Co. in Ry. Belt (Stmnt.) 965; (Ans.) 927 (vol. ii).  
 — Legislation respecting (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).  
 — Payment of Interest by Co. (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

C. P. R. Proposals by Co. (remarks) 746 (vol. i).  
 ——— Relief of, by Govt. (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).  
 ——— Res. respecting further Loan (remarks) on adjmt. of deb., 2643; in Com., 2724, 2725, 2727, 2729–2731, 2733, 2734, 2737–2741, 2743–2747, 2862; on M. to rec. Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 2359 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Timber dues to Govt. by Co. (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).  
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2535–2539 (vol. iii).  
 Capital Account Expenditure, on M. for Stmt., 46 (i).  
 Cape Breton Island Claims under terms of Confederation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 615 (i).  
 Carlton, Evacuation of, Rep. (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).  
 Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 102 (vol. i).  
 Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).  
 Census of the N.W.T., &c., B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. on Res., 75; in Com. on B., 171; on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 214 (vol. i).  
 Central Prison of Ont. Acts Amt. (B. 129, 1°\*) 1226 (vol. ii); 2° m., 2402 (vol. iii).  
 Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 29; on presentation (remarks) 236 (vol. i).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction B., notice of Res., 2497 (vol. iii).  
 Civil Service B. (Ans.) 28 (vol. i).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1097; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1284 (vol. ii).  
 Clark, G.M.K., sums paid, on M. for Ret., 697 (vol. i).  
 Clothing and Great Coats, in Com. of Sup., 2909 (iv).  
 Colonisation Co.'s modification of agreement (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii), 2241 (vol. iii).  
 Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) (remarks) 1671 (vol. ii).  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2430 (vol. iii).  
 Consolidn. of the Statutes, Rep. of Commissioners (presented) 32 (vol. i).  
 Contingencies, Deptl., in Com. of Sup., 915 (vol. ii).  
 Corpus Christi, adjmt. for (M.) 2301 (vol. iii).  
 Copyright, Law of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Edgar*) 713 (i).  
 County Court Judges, Man. (B. 162) in Com. on Res., 3435, 3436 (vol. iv).  
 County Court Judges' Salaries (Ans.) 3073 (vol. iv).  
 Crozier, Supt., Rep. of, *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds, 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Debates, Official Rep., in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3363 (vol. iv).  
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Coms. (B. 26) prop. Res., 67; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to appoint Sel. Com. to rep. to House, 70; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 72; on Ques. of Order, 73; 2° and in Com., 175; 3° on a a div., 212 (vol. i).  
 Deputy Speaker (M.) appointing Malachy Daly, Esq., 72 (vol. i); Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3353 (iv).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

Dewdney, Gov., communications from (Ans.) 3425 (iv).  
 Disputed Boundaries of Ont., Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N. W. (Ans.) 693, 714 (vol. i), 783; (remarks) 1832 (vol. ii).  
 ——— André, Father, letter from (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Assistance to families of Militiamen, 894 (ii).  
 ——— Assistance to Settlers (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Civil Service Volunteers (Ans.) 3043 (iv).  
 ——— Claims, &c., of Half-breeds (Ans.) 1474 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Compensation for losses (Ans.) 3321 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Crowfoot, communication from (read) 1038 (ii).  
 ——— Crozier, Supt., Rep. of, *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Dewdney, Lieut.-Gov., communications with Govt. (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Duck Lake, Engagement at (Tels. read) 790 (vol. ii); Rep. of Fight (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Dumas, Michel, appointment as farm instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2856 (iv).  
 ——— Fort Pitt Disaster, confirmation of news, 1281; (Tel. read) 1301 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Frog Lake, Massacre at (Stmnt.) 994 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Govt. officials in the N.W., communications with (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Grandin, Bishop, communications from (Ans.) 3321, 3423 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Half-breed grievances (*Mr. Blake*) 2040–2042 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Half-breed Commission (letter read from Mr. Street) 1607; work of (remarks) 1566, 2169 (ii).  
 ——— Imp. Govt., commn. with (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Indemnity to Members in the field, on prop. M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 812 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Indians at Fort Qu'Appelle, loyalty of (Tel. read) 1320 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Isbester, James, appointment as far instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Mounted Police Officers, Reps. from, of Engagements (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 761–765 (vol. i).  
 ——— on further information (remarks) 745, 813 (ii).  
 ——— Poundmaker, Skirmish with, Tel. from Herchmer (read) 1649 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Prisoners held for Trial, 3443 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Prisoners surrendered by Poundmaker (Ans.) 2065 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Raid on Houses at Battleford, 889 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Relief of destitute families (remarks) 3321 (iv).  
 ——— Religious Rites refused prisoners 2998 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence (reply) 3110–3119 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Rewards for Bravery (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Riel's proposal to accept money (Ans.) 3426 (iv).  
 ——— Riel, Trial of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Stoney Indian rising (Stmnt.) 863 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Volunteers, recognition of Services of (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii); prop. Res., 3321 (vol. iv).  
 Divorce Court, creation of a (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).  
 Dom. and Prov. Franchises, despatch from Mr. Fielding (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).  
 Dom. Day, Sitting of the House on (Ans.) 2773 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1007; on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).  
 Dom. Lands, frauds in Dept. (Ans.) 1915, 2170 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Dumont's lot on Saskatchewan (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).  
 ——— in B. C., Timber dues (Ans.) 2240 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Revenue for 7 months 1884-85 (Ans.) 290 (i).  
 ——— Sales, receipts on account (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. Police, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).  
 Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 989 (vol. ii).  
 Dumas, Michel, appointment as farm instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Duck Lake Engagement, Rep. of (Ans.) 1567 (ii).  
 Dumont, Extradition of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Dynamite, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).  
 Easter, adjmt. for (Ans.) 713 (vol. i).  
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Colon. Co.'s Township Surveys (Ans.) 2171 (vol. iii).  
 Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).  
 Etchemin River Line, Survey of (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).  
 Exchange Bank, Claims against (Ans.) 89; Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 393 (vol. i).  
 Expenditure on Capital Account, on M. for Stmnt., 46 (i).  
 Explosive Substances (B. 95, 1°\*) 545 (vol. i); 2° m., 893; in Com., 1167; 3° m., 1335 (vol. ii).  
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Can. B. 60 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 693 (vol. i).  
 Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).  
 Factory B. (Ans.) 29 (vol. i).  
 Federation of the Empire, proposals for (Ans.) 51 (i).  
 Finance Minister, Health of (Ans.) 2497 (vol. iii).  
 Fish taken in the Miramichi, on M. for Ret., 295 (i).  
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 221 (vol. i).  
 Fishery Arrangements with U.S. (remarks) 2890 (iv).  
 Franchise (B. 103, 1°) 629 (vol. i); Order for 2° read (remarks) 1095; 2° m., 1133; in Com., 1385; "woman suffrage, 1388, 1458; "owner," 1444, 1445, 1449, 1452, 1453, 1457; "tenant," 1475, 1481; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1484, 1486, 1487, 1489, 1563, 1574 (vol. ii), 2023 (vol. iii); (Chinese) 1582, 1558; "farm," 1591; "parish," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1596, 1600 (vol. ii), "qualifications in cities and towns," 1745, 1932, 1937, 1983-1988, 1992-2003, 2757-2759 (vol. iv); "qualifications in counties," 2053, 2060, 2062, 2064, 2065, 2079, 2080, 2394; on disqualifying revising barristers, 2086 (vol. iii); "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104, (Amts.)

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- 2139; "registration of voters," 2172, 2177-2180, 2228, 2231, 2241, 2244, 2269, 2273, 2279-2294, 2300, 2310-2319; revision of voters' lists," 2321, 2326-2335, 2339-2345, "general provisions," 2344, 2351, 2353-2356; "appeal," 2360-2365, 2395; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2370, 2373, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "farm," 2393 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2758; M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052; on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3°, 3056; "remuneration of revising officers, &c.," prop. Res., 2420 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059 (vol. iv); on procedure, 1470; on Mr. Trow's pair with Mr. Williams (remarks) 1470; on taking up items consecutively (remarks) 1471 (vol. ii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 2137, 2207 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1510, 1512, 1513 (vol. ii); on Ques. of Order, 1825, 1969, 2143; on personal explanation of Mr. Mills, 2140; (remarks) 2146, 2160 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2026, 2028, 2496 (vol. iii).  
 French Half-breeds at St. Laurent, Claims of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1316, 1319 (vol. ii).  
 Geological Survey, Management of (Ans.) 114 (i).  
 Govt. Agents in the N.W.T., Fees from Settlers (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Business (Ms.) to take in Thursdays, 451 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965; Mondays, 1336 (vol. ii); Saturdays, 1824 (vol. iii), 2676; (remarks) 3293 (vol. iv).  
 Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2464; on M. to conc. in Res., 2525 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Officials in the N. W., communications from (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Grandin, Bishop, commn. from (Ans.) 3423 (iv).  
 G. T. R. Returns, on enquiry respecting (remarks) 662 (vol. i); 964 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Stockholders, Ret. respecting (remarks) 28, 101, 113, 350, 566 (vol. i); Ans. of Mr. Hickson (Ans.) 927, 1094, 1278 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2210 (iii); enforcement of Order of House, 3426 (iv).  
 ——— Rivière du Loup Branch, Sale of (Ans.) 1039 (ii).  
 Guns used in fight with Poundmaker (Ans.) 2170 (iii).  
 Half-breed Minors, Man., Claims of unenumerated (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).  
 Half-breed Commission, information respecting (Ans.) 1567, 1607 (vol. ii); Claims recognized and rejected (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).  
 Half-breed Indian Reserves and Homesteads (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Plots on the Saskatchewan (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Scrip (Ans.) 1914 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Settlement, undisturbed occupation (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).  
 Homesteads within Ry. Belt (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Horses for Troops in N.W., purchase of (Ans.) 1306 (ii).  
 Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).  
 Hughes, D. J., Official conduct of (Ans.) 77; on M. for Ret., 98 (vol. i).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2841, 2846 (vol. iv).  
 Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3450.  
 Indian Advancement Act, application of (Ans.) 77 (i).  
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).  
 Indian Reserve, Victoria Arm, B.C. (Ans.) 1211 (ii).  
 Indian Schools in the N.W. and Man. (Ans.) 568 (i).  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 867 (vol. ii); 3243, 3314-3320, 3341, 3392, 3393; conc., 2922, 3373 (vol. iv).  
 Indian Superintendents, office of (Ans.) 88 (vol. i).  
 Indian Titles in Ont. acquired by Govt. (Ans.) 632 (i).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii).  
 Insolvent Debtors, distribution of Assets prov. B. 4 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 1280 (vol. ii).  
 Insolvency, on ques. as to Legislation (remarks) 1033 (vol. ii).  
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 85 (vol. i).  
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3296, 3297 (vol. iv).  
 Interior, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 915, 968-973 (vol. ii), 2764 (vol. iv).  
 International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).  
 Isbester, J., appointment as farm instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 Jamaica, Trade relations with (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).  
 Judges in N.B., appointment for year's circuit (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).  
 Judicial Reform in the N.W.T., petitions, &c. (Ans.) 1306 (vol. ii).  
 Justice, Penitentiaries Branch, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).  
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).  
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3345 (vol. iv).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. (B. 147) prop. Res., 782 (vol. ii); 2443-2445, 2503 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 2891, 2894 (vol. iv).  
 Lands in Ry. Belt in B.C., and Homestead Act (Ans.) 289 (vol. i).  
 Law Reports, Ont., in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).  
 Lebel, Antoine, Indian Agent, acting without sureties (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).  
 Librarian of Parliament, office of (Ans.) 41 (vol. i).  
 Library of Parlt. Joint Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 36 (vol. i).  
 Library of Parlt. (B. 139) prop. Res., 1659, 1661; in Com., 1668-1670; 2° m., 2402 (iii); in Com., 2760 (iv).  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).  
 Lieut.-Gov. of N.B. (Ans.) 362 (vol. i).  
 Lieut.-Gov. of Quebec, Oath of Office (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).  
 Lingan Mines, C. B., aiding civil power at, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Liquor License Act, 1833, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1211; on M. to conc. in Res. (remarks) 1226 (ii).  
 ——— (B. 134, 1°) 1281 (vol. ii); 2° m., 2400 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768, 2894, 2897; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2959 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Boards of Commissioners under (Ans.) 77 (i).  
 ——— Constitutionality of (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).  
 ——— Putting in force, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Regulations directing License Fund under (Ans.) 76 (vol. i).  
 ——— Supreme Court Judgment (Ans.) 29 (vol. i).  
 Loan of £4,000,000 recently effected (Ans.) 2998 (iv).  
 Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).  
 McLeod, N., Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).  
 McManus, C., gratuity to widow of, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).  
 Man., Claim for a Subsidy (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2780-2783 (explanation) 2785; in Com., 2791, 2794, 2824, 3047-3050 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Half-breed Minors, Claims preferred and rejected (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii); temporarily absent (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).  
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 989 (vol. ii).  
 Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2503 (vol. iii).  
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 908 (vol. ii).  
 Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 129, 131; on Order for Com., 215; in Com., 496 (vol. i).  
 Members' Indemnity, payments to those absent through sickness (Ans.) 3473 (vol. iv).  
 Meredith, Chief Justice, resignation of, on M. for copy, 43 (vol. i).  
 Messages from His Ex.: Ans. to Address, 113 (i).  
 ——— Claims of Man., 202 (vol. i).  
 ——— Internal Economy Commission, 40 (vol. i).  
 ——— Pets., Res., &c., on Bankruptcy, 101 (vol. i).  
 ——— Thanks of Queen for condolence on Death of Duke of Albany, 32 (vol. i).  
 ——— Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses, Cor. and Papers, 3232 (vol. iv).  
 Meeting of the House, irregularity (remarks) 2996 (iv).  
 Minister of Interior, absence of (Ans.) 964 (vol. ii).  
 Minister of Rys., office of (Ans.) 41, 52 (vol. i).  
 Model Farm, Establishment, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).  
 Morgan, H. J., payments to, by Govt. for services, on M. for Stmt., 120 (vol. i); for "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).  
 Morgan, J. H., Services as Forestry Commissioner (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).  
 Mounted Police Barracks, Tenders or (Ans.) 351 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).  
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3392 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Recruits (Stmt. of number, and horses purchased) 1607; (remarks) 1566 (vol. ii).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- N. S. Rys., Consolid. and completion (Ans.) 2530 (iii).  
 North Shore Ry., purchase of, by Govt. (Ans.) 189 (vol. i); use of by C. P. R. (Ans.) 1915 (vol. ii).  
 N. W. Mounted Police Augmentation (B. 144) prop. Res., 994 (vol. ii); in Com. on Res., 2402; M. to conc. in Res., 2421, 2426, 2428; Res. conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 2430 (vol. iii); 2<sup>o</sup> m, 2770; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2820 (vol. iv).  
 ——— (B. 140, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 1670 (vol. ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m, 2772; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2822 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 2359 (vol. ii); (presented) 2820 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Increase of force (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).  
 ——— Officers Repts. of Engagements (Ques.) 3425 (iv).  
 N. W., Papers respecting (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 1 (vol. i).  
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2556 (vol. iii); M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2753; on M. to conc. in Res., 2756 (vol. iv).  
 Offences against the Person (assault and battery) Act Amt. B. 42 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (M. to adjn. deb.) 219 (vol. i).  
 Offences against the Person Act Amt. (B. 123, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 1037 (vol. ii); on 3<sup>o</sup> (remarks) 2768 (vol. iv).  
 Ontario's Boundaries, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 51, 115, 567 (vol. i), 2998, 3321 (vol. iv).  
 ——— on M. for copies of O.C.'s Imp., Can. or Provl., 52 (vol. i).  
 Ontario's Claims to country north of height of land and south of Hudson's Bay, &c. (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).  
 Ontario, Northern Boundary of, Res. of Govt. (Ans.) 1133 (vol. ii).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 628 (vol. i).  
 Patents issued to Settlers, Prince Albert (Ans.) 964 (ii).  
 Payment of Depl. Clerks, delay in (Ans.) 2170 (iii).  
 Pensions, New Militia conc. 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Permits granted in Territory awarded Ont. (Ans.) 115 (vol. i).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks and rule read) 1891-1894 (vol. iii).  
 St. Laurent Settlement, Plans and Surveys, Receipt of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works Act Amt. (B. 131, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 1278 (vol. ii).  
 Prince Albert Colonization Co.'s Township Surveys (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).  
 Printing and Printing Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2803, 2805 (vol. iv).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, Disturbance in the N.W., on article in *Hamilton Spectator*, 813 (vol. ii).  
 ——— on article in *Toronto News*: French aggression, &c. (remarks) 1679 (vol. ii).  
 ——— on paragraph in *Free Press* (remarks) 171 (i).  
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 899; contingencies, 914 (vol. ii).  
 Prorogation (Ans.) 3473 (vol. iv).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Provincial Leg., compilation of Cor., &c., conc., 3434 (iv).  
 Provincial Rys. taken over by Govt. (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).  
 Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co.'s agreement (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).  
 Queen's Birthday, adjmt. for (M.) 2030 (vol. iii).  
 Ry. Belt on Vancouver Island (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).  
 Ry. from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 199 (vol. i).  
 Rys. and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).  
 Rys. centreing in Ottawa, on M. for Ret. (M. to adjn. deb.) 88 (vol. i).  
 Relief of distress in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (iv).  
 Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 45 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 362 (vol. i).  
 Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 293 (vol. i).  
 Returns, on enquiries for (remarks) 427 (vol. i), 966, 1038, 1132, 1167, 1209 (vol. ii), 2936 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Preparations of, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).  
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).  
 Revised Statutes of Canada B. 130 (M. to dschg. Order) 2402 (vol. iii).  
 Richelieu Navigation Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on prop. Amt. (remarks) 1210 (vol. ii).  
 Rideau Canal, increase of water supply, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).  
 Riel's proposal to accept money (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).  
 Riel, Treatment of, in prison (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).  
 Roundhouse at Selkirk erected on private property issue of Patent (Ans.) 2030, 2171 (vol. iii).  
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).  
 St. Clair Ranch Co., Rents paid, &c. (Ans.) 2240 (iii).  
 St. George's Day, on M. for adjmt., 1395 (vol. ii).  
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 986-989 (vol. ii).  
 Salaries, H. of C., in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).  
 Salaries of Ministers (Ans.) 3073 (vol. iv).  
 Schmidt, Louis, and others, of Prince Albert District, employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1915 (vol. iii).  
 Seduction, &c., punishment of, B. 27 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 619 (vol. i).  
 Settlers' Claims, Prince Albert District (Ans.) 1567 (ii).  
 Settlement of Claims of Man. half-breed Minors (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).  
 Settlement of Settlers Claims at Prince Albert, &c. (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).  
 Select Standing Coms. (M.) 2; M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 27; Committees appointed and Lists prepared (presented) 30; conc. in, 32 (vol. i).  
 Short Line Ry., Engineers' Repts. (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).  
 ——— Govt. Grants to (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Plans and Repts. (Ans.) 479, 567 (vol. i).  
 ——— Rep. of Mr. Wicksteed (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Mr. Light (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
 ——— from Montreal to Atlantic, in Com. on Res., 2977; (Amt.) 2982 (vol. iv).  
 Short Line Survey from St. Charles (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Simpson, G. A., Govt. Land Agent (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).  
 Speech from the Throne, consideration of (M.) 2.  
 Squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley, on M. for Ret., 205 (vol. i).  
 Standing Committees, non-summoning of, for organization (remarks) 67 (vol. i).  
 — on Colonization and Immigration (M.) to add Messrs. Baker, Vic., and Jackson to Com., 299 (vol. i).  
 Stationery used in H. of C., Expense of (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).  
 Statutes of Canada Consolidation (B. 130, 1<sup>o</sup>) 1226 (vol. ii).  
 — Revision of, Commissioners' Rep. (M.) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 777 (vol. ii).  
 — Distribution of (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).  
 Stipendiary Magistrates in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. (B. 158) prop. Res., 2531 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 2977; (Amt.) 2982; in Com. on B., 3380 (vol. iv).  
 Sunday Excursions, prohibition B. 19 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 266 (vol. i).  
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 271 (vol. i).  
 Superior Court of Que., Chief Justice of (Ans.) 429 (i).  
 Superior Court Judges, Que. (B. 161), prop. Res., 3375; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 3395 (vol. iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 163 (vol. i).  
 Surveys and Explorations in the N.W. (Ans.) 2929 (iii).  
 Surveys and Plans of Battleford and Edmonton (Ans.) 2357 (vol. iii).  
 Sutherland, Dr., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice*, 985 (vol. ii), 3448 (vol. iv).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1024 (vol. ii).  
*Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c.* (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3312. *Income: Rideau Canal* (increase of water supply) 3313 (vol. iv).  
*Civil Govt.* (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 901, contingencies, 915; (Interior, Dept. of) 968, 973, contingencies, 915 (vol. ii), conc., 2764 (vol. iv); (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) 914; (Marine, Dept. of) 908; (Privy Council Office) 899, contingencies, 914; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 914 (vol. ii).  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345 (iv).  
*Dominion Police*, 985 (vol. ii), suppl., 3350 (vol. iv).  
*Indians* (Assistance to Institutions) 3392; (B.C.) 3314; (Grant to supplmt. Fund) 3242; (Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River) conc., 2922; (Man. and N.W.T.) 3314, 3317-3320, 3341, conc., 3373; (N.S.) 3243; (N.W.T., to complete service) 3393 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation: H. of C. (Debates, publishing)* 991 (vol. ii); (Election Expenses) 3452 (vol. iv); (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450 (vol. iv); (Salaries) 991 (vol. ii). *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796; (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2803, 2805 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Aiding civil power at Lingan Mines, C.B.) 3452; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2909; (Royal Mil. Coll.) 2914 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (American Engineers' Visit to N.S.) 3457; (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3351, 3353; (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453; (Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies) 3244; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245; (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N.W.T. (3454); (Liquor License Act, putting in force of) 3244; (Mounted Police Barracks) 3244;

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- (Ontario Law Reports) 3351; (Payment to H. J. Morgan for "Annual Register") 3351; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c) conc., 3434; (Relief of Distress in N.W.T.) 3455; (Returns, preparation of) 3245; (Transport of families from Oka to Township of Gibson, Indian Reserve) 3457 (vol. iv); (Vote of \$1,000,000) conc., 2237 (vol. iii).  
*Immigration*, 2841, 2846 (vol. iv).  
*N. W. Mounted Police*, 3243; suppl., 3392 (vol. iv).  
*Penitentiaries: B.C.*, 990; Dorchester, 989; Kingston, 985 (vol. ii), (gratuity to widow of McManus) 3350; (vol. iv); Manitoba, 989 (vol. ii), (payment to Dr. Sutherland) 3351 (vol. iv); St. Vincent de Paul, 986-989 (vol. ii).  
*Pensions* (New Militia) conc., 2765 (vol. iv); (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii).  
*Rys.—Capital: I. C. R.* (miscellaneous works) 3296, 3297 (iv).  
 Timber Licenses issued since 1882 in N.W.T., &c. (Ans.) 863 (vol. ii).  
 Timber Limits in Territories awarded Ont., 115 (vol. i).  
 Trade Relations between Canada and U.S. (Ans.) 1387, (vol. ii); with Jamaica (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).  
 Transport of families from Oka to Township of Gibson, Indian Reserve, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).  
 Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 630 (vol. i); in Com., 1670 (vol. ii).  
 Treaty Negotiations by Sir A. Shea (Ans.) 1387 (vol. ii).  
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3312 (vol. iv).  
 Vacancy in a Judicial District, N.S. (Ans.) 2750 (vol. iv).  
 Veterans of War of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).  
 Volunteers on Active Service, increase of pay of (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).  
 Volunteers in the N.W., recognition of Services (Ans.) 1566 (vol. ii); M. for Com. on Res., 3376; in Com., 3377-3380; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3380; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 3380 (vol. iv).  
 Volunteers of 1837-38, on Res. recognizing Services, 38 (vol. i).  
 Vote for relief of Settlers in the N.W. (Ans.) 1744 (iii).  
 Vote to Genl. Middleton (notice) 3457 (vol. iv).  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559 (vol. iii), 2773, 2899, 2901, 3075; on M. for Com. of Sup. (reply) to Mr. Weldon, 3330-3333 (vol. iv).  
 Watson, Ebenezer, of Sarnia, office of (Ans.) 183 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff: on Res. (Mr. Blake) re Disturbance in the N.W.*, in Amt. to Com., 761 (vol. i), 3110-3119 (vol. iv); (personal explanation) *re* workmen of Montreal, 521; (remarks) as to time for concluding deb., 662 (vol. i); in Com. (whiskey) 3226; Excise Duties, 3295 (iv).  
 Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 216 (vol. i).  
 Writ for Lévis County, issue of (Ans.) 633; (remarks) 661 (vol. i).

**Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York.**

- Administration of the N.W., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2927, 2930, 2932 (vol. iv).

**Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.**

- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 48 (vol. i).
- Bank of Upper Canada, Stmnts. respecting (Ques.) 112 (vol. i).
- Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 893 (vol. ii).
- Business of the House, on M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1745 (vol. iii).
- C. P. R. Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmnt., 111 (vol. i).
- Section B., Engineers' Reports on re-measurement and re-classification, on M. for copies, 123 (i).
- Section B., Judge Clark's Rep. on Award to Contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
- Census of the N.W. B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 172 (i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 280 (vol. i).
- Clark, G. M. K., sums paid to, on M. for Ret., 698 (i).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2434 (vol. iii).
- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 3045 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Stoney Indian rising (remarks) 863 (vol. ii).
- Dom. Lands sold or leased for timber, logs, staves, cordwood, &c. (M. for Stmnt.\*) 40 (vol. i).
- Evangelical Lutheran Church of Can. B. 60 (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) in Com., 693 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1510 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. Pets., presentation of (remarks) 2024 (iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310 (vol. ii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070 (vol. ii).
- Inspectors of Public Works Ret. (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).
- Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2776; (Ques. of Order) 2786 (vol. iv).
- Man. Indian Agency, management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).
- Meeting of the House, irregularity of time, 2997 (iv).
- North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copies of Reps., &c., 697 (vol. i).
- Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, reflecting on Mr. Galt (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
- Protestant Volunteers in the 65th Battalion (remarks) on newspaper paragraph, 2998 (vol. iv).
- Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. Municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).
- St. Thomas Public Buildings, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 81 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY:
- Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Williamsburg) 3301; (Welland) 3202 (vol. iv).
- Civil Govt.* (Militia, Dept. of) 898 (vol. ii).
- Railways—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (I. C. R.) 3300 (vol. iv).
- Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 273 (vol. i).

**Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.**

- Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) on 1°, 2751 (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559 (vol. iii).
- Ways and Means*—on explanation of Mr. McLelan (remarks) 535 (vol. i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 423 (vol. i).

**Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., Ottawa City.**

- Disturbance in the N.W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3175-3190 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1241-1245; on M. for Com. (explanation) 1376 (ii).
- High Commissioner, Instructions issued to, respecting Immigrants (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).
- Privilege, Ques. of, personal allusions in deb. (remarks) 3247 (vol. iv).
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2387 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:
- Legislation* (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2308 (vol. iv.)
- Ways and Means*—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N. W., 3175-3190 (vol. iv).

**Macmaster, Mr. D., Glengarry.**

- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 387 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "revision of voters' lists," 2324, 2343; "general provisions," 2352; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2350-2382, 2386 (vol. iii); personal explanation, correction in *Official Debates*, 2619 (vol. iv).
- Privilege, Ques. of, article in *Port Arthur Herald* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:
- Miscellaneous* (Doutre, J., claim re Halifax Commission) 3392 (iv).
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 160 (vol. i).

**Macmillan, Mr. D., East Middlesex.**

- Bankrupt Estates and Official Assignees (M. for Ret.) 303 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N. W., on Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3468 (vol. iv).
- Fish taken in the Miramichi (M. for Ret.) 295 (vol. i).
- London Life Insurance Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 76, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i); in Com., 1723 (vol. ii).

**McCallum, Mr. L., Monck.**

- C. P. R. Resolutions, &c., in Com., 2742, 2744 (vol. iv).
- Clothing and Great Coats, in Com. of Sup., 2908 (iv).
- Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1871, 1994-1996; "registration of voters," 2258, 2272, 2283, 2284; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2373, 2383, (remarks)

**McCallum, Mr. C.—Continued.**

1965 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1424, 1496 (vol. ii); (Ques. of Order,) 1467 (vol. ii), 1733, 1867; (personal explanations) 1873, 1970 (vol. iii); member not speaking to ques. before Com. (remarks) 1919 (vol. iii).

Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303 (vol. iv).

North Saskatchewan River Improvements (M. for copy of Repts., &c.) 615, 695 (vol. i).

Oxford and New Glasgow Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).

Refund of Ry Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 570, 616 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303; (Welland) 3302. *Income* (Welland) 3418 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (Clothing and Great Coats) 2908 (vol. iv).

*Railways—Capital*: Short Line between Oxford and New Glasgow, 3415 (vol. iv).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 801 (ii).

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 2302, 3418 (vol. iv).

Western Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 94, 1°\*) 534 (i).

**McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.**

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 65, 1°) 235 (vol. i).

— B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com. (Amt.) 1058; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2688-2692; in Com., 2728, 2740, 2744-2746 (vol. iv).

Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) 2° m., 282; on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) 6 m. h., 287; 2° on a div., 289; (B. 13) 2° m., 254 (vol. i).

Court of Railway Commissioners (B. 12, 1°) 40 (vol. i).

Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada incorp. (B. 60, 1°\*) 180 (vol. i).

Fort Macleod Ranch Tel. Co.'s B. 80 (*Mr. Hall*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2357 (vol. iii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 454 (vol. i).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 496-499, 502, 504 (vol. i).

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 622 (vol. i).

Patent Act Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 268; (B. 64, 1°) 234; 2° m., 622; M. withdn. and Order dschgd., 629 (vol. i).

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 86, 1°) 362 (vol. i).

**McCraney, Mr. W., Halton.**

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 958, 1059 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061; on Sen. Amts., 2647, 2651 (vol. iv).

— Druggists Licenses (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii).

— Prosecutions under (Ques.) 1306 (ii) 3320 (iv).

— Liquor Certificates granted under, in Halton (M. for Ret.\*) 67 (vol. i).

C. P. R. Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract on M. for Stmnt., 484 (vol. i).

**McCraney, Mr. W.—Continued.**

"Dominion Annual Register," payments on account of (M. for Stmnt.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1410; "person" (Indian) 1541; (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1773-1775 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065 (vol. iv).

Indian Lands in Trafalgar, unsold (M. for List\*) 533 (vol. i).

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2960 (vol. iv).

Morgan, H. J., payments to, by Govt., for services (M. for Stmnt.) 120 (vol. i).

Return, imperfect (remarks) 101 (vol. i); enquiry for, 1064 (vol. ii).

*Ways and Means*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. (explanation) 514 (vol. i); in Com. (mouldings and picture frames) 846 (vol. ii).

Wood Supplies, Govt. Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.) 429 (i).

**McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.**

Fish caught in Bras d'Or Lakes, bounty paid on (M. for Stmnt.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Subsidies to Rys. in N.S. and Cape Breton (M. for Stmnt.) 140 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Fisheries*, 3387 (vol. iv).

**McDougald, Mr. J., Pictou.**

Albion Mines Savings Bank (B. 15, 1°\*) 46 (vol. i).

Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 110, 1°) 742 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Miscellaneous* (American Mining Engineers' visit to N.S.) 3456- (vol. iv).

*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R., 3299; Short Line Railway (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (steel) 805 (vol. ii).

**McGreevy, Mr. T., West Quebec.**

Finance Minister, Health of (Ques.) 2497 (vol. iii).

**McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.**

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1790 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY :**

*Public Works—Income*: P.E.I. 2918 (vol. iv).

**McIsaac, Mr. A., Antigonish.**

Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater, extension of (Ques.) 77 (i).

Mail Service between Antigonish and Sherbrooke (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).

Tracadie Breakwater, N.S., expenditure on (M. for Stmnt.\*) 147 (vol. i).

**McLelan, Hon. A. W., Colchester.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143, 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2466 ; in Com., 2467-2475, 2541 (vol. iii).
- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 921 (vol. ii).
- Allan Steamship Co. and claim of Government *re Newfield and Moravian* (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2541, 2544, 2546, 2548 (vol. iii).
- Automatic Buoys, Liverpool Harbor, N.S. (Ans.) 479 (vol. i), 1914 (vol. iii).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Auditor Genl., &c., 135, 137 (vol. i).
- Bounty to Fishing Vessels, on M. for Stmt., 98 (vol. i).
- Brooklyn, N.S., Breakwater, Wharfage collections (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
- Buoys in Victoria and Nanaimo Harbors (Ans.) 479 (i).
- C. P. R. Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmt. (Amt.) 100, 107 (vol. i).
- Can. Fisheries Exhibit, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).
- Can. registration of Shipping, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2439 ; in Com., 2534-2540 (vol. iii).
- Cape Race Light, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (vol. iv).
- Caron, Clovis, salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from, *re* outbreak in the N. W., 3426 (vol. iv).
- Coffin's Island Lighthouse, protection (Ans.) 1915 (iii).
- Communication with P.E.I. (*Str. Lansdowne*) in Com. of Sup., 927 (vol. ii).
- Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) prop. Res., 2419 ; in Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (vol. ii).
- Deep-water fisheries off coast of B. C. (Ans.) 3073 (iv).
- Discovery Island, B. C., Lighthouse on (Ans.) 479 (i).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from, *re* outbreak, 3426 (vol. iv).
- Land Surveys of St. Laurent (Ans.) 3424 (iv).
- Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Govt. (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Memorials, &c., respecting grievances, answers to (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- North-West Council, Res. *re* Half-breed Claims, (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Petitions and Res., &c., Half-breeds and Settlers Claims (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert and St. Laurent Settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ans.) 3426 (iv).
- Prince Albert Colonization Co.'s Land, Settlers and Squatters Improvements (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- River Lots, Claims, settlement of, Mr. Pearce's letter respecting (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Laurent River Lots, re-survey (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

- Disturbance in the N. W., St. Louis de Langevin, Petition from Settlers (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Schmidt, answer to letter of (Ans.) 3424 (iv).
- Surveys of River Lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ans.) 3324 (vol. iv).
- Surveys on Rivers, mode of (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Taché, Archbishop, communication from, *re* Half-breeds (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).
- Surveys and Examinations of Survey Rets., in Com. of Sup., 3344 (vol. iv).
- Sales of, for 1884-85 (Ans.) 2997, 3073 (vol. iv).
- Doutre, J., *re* Halifax Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).
- Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries Act, extension of, to the N.W. (Ans.) 51 (i).
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 910 (vol. ii).
- Fisheries Inspector, B.C., name and date of appointment (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).
- Fisheries, protection of, after July (Ans.) 2360 (iii).
- Fisheries protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).
- Fishery Bounty distribution, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- Fishery Bounties, number and amount of Claims paid, &c., on M. for Stmt., 56 (vol. i).
- Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3390 (vol. iv).
- Fishery Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2955 (iv).
- Fish-breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2953-2955 (vol. iv).
- Fish Ladders in La Have River, Ans. 2239 (vol. iii).
- Fish taken in the Miramichi, on M. for Ret., 295 (vol. i).
- France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2938 (vol. iv).
- Free Fishing allowed American Fishermen (Ans.) 3321 (vol. iv).
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2419 ; in Com., 2439 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2548 ; in Com., 2549-2554 (vol. iii).
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).
- Gauvreau, Jules, salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Govt. of the N. W. T., in Com. of Sup., 3243 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Harbor Master at Halifax Acts Amt. (B. 148) prop. Res., 2421 ; M. for Com. on Res., 2522 ; in Com., 2522 ; M. to conc. in Res. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 2534 (vol. iii).
- Half-breed and Settlers' Claims, Pets. and Res. (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Heney, J., Govt. property occupied by (Ans.) 3426 (iv).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, Supplies furnished to (Ans.) 783 (vol. ii).

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

- Huron and Superior, Lakes, Surveys of, in Com. of Sup. 3244 (vol. iv).  
 Indians, Man. and N. W. T., conc., 3374 (vol. iv).  
 Inland Revenue Acts Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) prop. Res. 2421; M. for Com. on Res., 2526; in Com. on Res., 2528 (vol. iii).  
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals, B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1080 (vol. ii).  
 Inside Service, Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).  
 Interior Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3408; conc., 3433 (iv).  
 Lake Simcoe Fisheries, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 3073 (vol. iv).  
 Land and Surveys of St. Laurent (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3345 (iv).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2522 (vol. iii).  
 Land Sales or Settlement in N.W. south of 24-mile Belt (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).  
*Lansdowne*, Steamer, and communication with P.E.I. (Ans.) 927 (vol. ii).  
*Lansdowne*, Steamer, engine and boiler (Ans.) 189 (i).  
 Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Govt. (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Life-boats and Stations, in Com. of Sup., 2947 (vol. iv).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951, 3250 (vol. iv).  
 Lighthouse and Fog Alarms, construction of, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (vol. iv).  
 Life-saving Apparatus in C.B. (Ans.) 239 (vol. i).  
 Life-saving Service at Port Rowan (Ans.) 149; on M. for copies of Cor., 142 (vol. i).  
 Lindsay, D., Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue, Superannuation of (Ans.) 2531 (vol. iii).  
 Liverpool Harbor, N.S., Automatic Buoys (Ans.) 479 (vol. i), 1914 (vol. iii).  
 Longley, G. C., Collector of Inland Rev., Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).  
 Long Point Fishing Grounds (Ans.) 289 (vol. i).  
 Maintenance and Repairs, in Com. of Sup., 2951 (iv).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2790; on Res., 2925 (vol. iv).  
 Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 113 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 906-911, 922 (vol. ii).  
 Marine Hospitals, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).  
 Marine Stores, purchase of, in Halifax (Ans.) 1915 (iii).  
 Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Memorials, &c., respecting Half-breed grievances, answers to (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).  
 Millard, Mr., collection of Fines imposed upon (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).  
 Moody, John, employment of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).  
 Narrows, Erection of a Lighthouse at (Ans.) 112 (vol. i).

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

- Navigation in Canadian Waters Act Amt. (B. 132) prop. Res. and in Com., 1278; 1°\* of B., 1279 (vol. ii); M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 2399 (vol. iii).  
 Navigation of River St. Lawrence (B. 159, 1°\*) 3293; on Order for 2°, 3436; 2° m., 3470 (vol. iv).  
 N. W. Central Ry., Land grant to, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3382 (vol. iv).  
 N.W. Council, Res. re Half-breed Claims (Ans.) 3425 (iv).  
 N.W. Council, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).  
 Obstructions in nav. waters, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).  
 Oxford and New Glasgow Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3414 (vol. iv).  
 Parrsborough Breakwater, construction of, on M. for copy of tenders, 66 (vol. i).  
 Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, Canso and Arichat, communication between (Ans.) 114 (vol. i).  
 Prince Albert and St. Laurent Settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).  
 Prince Albert Colon. Co.'s Land, Settlers or Squatters' Claims, Improvements (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).  
 Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2377-2883 (vol. iv).  
 Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Strmbt. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2522 (iii).  
 Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).  
*Queen of the Isles*, Str., employment of (Ans.) 1131 (ii).  
 Returns, production of (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).  
 Return, on enquiries for (remarks) 838, 1133 (vol. ii).  
*Rimouski*, Steamer, Subsidy to (Ans.) 114 (vol. i).  
 Rivers and Streams, Rental of (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 River lots, N.W., settlement of Claims, Mr. Pearce's letter respecting (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Roach, Mr., and Pilotage Commission (Ans.) 3427 (iv).  
 Rogers' patent Fish Ladder, Cor. and Reps., on M. for copies, 872 (ii); purchase and use of (Ans.) 3073 (iv).  
 Russell, A., Dept. of Interior, Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530; Russell, L., 2531 (vol. iii).  
 St. Laurent River Lots, re-survey (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 St. Louis de Langevin, petitions from Settlers (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Salmon Fishing in Bathurst Harbor, regulations, &c. (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 Satuma Island, B. C., Lighthouse on (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).  
 Sawdust in La Have River, N. S. (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).  
 School of Navigation at Quebec (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).  
 Schmidt, Louis, answer to letter of (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).  
 Shingle Shavings in the Mersey River (Ans.) 1039 (ii).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. (B. 133) prop. Res., 1279; in Com. and 1°\*, 1280 (vol. ii); 2° m. and in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).  
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 805 (vol. ii).  
 Supplies for Steamer *Neptune*, on M. for copies of Accts., &c., 229 (vol. i).

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY :

- Civil Govt.* : Deptl. Contingencies (Agriculture) 921, (Inland Revenue) 917; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 910 (vol. ii); (Interior, Dept. of) 3408, conc., 3433 (vol. iv); (Marine, Dept. of) 906-911, contingencies, 922 (vol. ii).
- Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys and Exam. of Survey Rets.) 3344. *Income* (Inside Service, extra Clerks, &c.) 3346; (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345; (Outside Service, Agencies) 3346 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries* (Canadian Fisheries Exhibit) 2956; (Distribution of Bounty) 2956; (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953-2955. *Consolidated Fund*, 3387; (Fishery protection Steamers) 2955 (vol. iv).
- Geological Survey*, 3346 (vol. iv).
- Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) conc., 3374 (vol. iv).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service*, 3250; (Agencies, Rents, &c.) 2951; (Cape Race Light) 2952; (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms) 2952; (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951; (Salaries, &c.) 2950 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Doutre, J., re Halifax Commission) 3392; (Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies) 3245; (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3390; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 3243; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245; (N. W. Council, Salaries, &c.) 3392; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 3244 (vol. iv).
- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2938 (vol. iv).
- Marine Hospitals*, 2956 (vol. iv).
- Ocean and River Service* (Can. Registration of Shipping) 2950; (Examination of Masters and Mates) 2946; (Govt. Steamers) 2945; (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2946, 2947, 2950; (Obstructions in nav. waters) 2950; (Water and River Police) 2950; (Wrecks and Casualties) 2950 (vol. iv).
- Rys.—Capital*: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3297; (Repairs, &c.) 3300; (Short Line Ry., Oxford and New Glasgow) 3414 (iv).
- Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observatories) 2956 (iv).
- Surveys of Lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Surveys on Rivers in N.W., mode of (Ans.) 3424 (iv).
- Taché, Archbishop, communication from, re Half-breeds (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3336 (vol. iv).
- Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (Sir Leonard Tilley) for Com., 505-512; (explanation) 534 (vol. i); in Com. (cutlery) 845; (steel) 805 (vol. ii).
- Wrecks and Casualties, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).

**McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.**

- Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36 (Mr. Orton) on Res., 117, 120 (vol. i).
- Bergin, Surgeon Genl., Services of (Ques.) 1914 (iii).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries (M. for Rep. of Aud. Genl., &c.) 135, 136 (i).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and dispute with Mr. Tilton (M. for Ret.\*) 312 (vol. i).
- Bonded machinery in use (Ques.) 3320 (vol. iv).
- C. P. R., Government employés along line (M. for names, &c.\*) 56 (vol. i).
- Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2708-2712 (vol. iv).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- C. P. R., Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 482 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Jamieson) on Sen. Amts., 2650 (vol. iv).
- Chinese Commission (M. for copy of Commission; names of Commissioners, date, salary, &c.) 56 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com. on Res., 277 (vol. i); on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to M. for 3°, 1297 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 977 (vol. ii).
- Collins, J. E., sums paid to, for services (M. for Ret.) 699 (vol. i).
- Debates*, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Riel, Trial of (Ques.) 2358 (iii); on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res., 3212 (iv).
- Dumont, Extradition of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 390 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier, to M. for 2°, 1200-1204; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1395; "tenant," 1476, 1477, 1479; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1685-1690 (vol. ii), 1853, 1856, 1860; "manhood suffrage," 1961-1964, 1992, 1995, 2000; "qualifications in counties" (Amt.) 2052, 2059, 2063, 2067, 2070, 2075, 2080, 2082; "who shall not vote," 2100, (Indians) 2135-2137; "registration of voters," 2190-2193; "revision of voters' lists," 2396; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2386; "farm," 2393 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1438, 1509, 1514 (vol. ii).
- G. T. R., Returns required under Act of 1879, &c., miles of Main Line, &c., on M. for Stmt., 230 (vol. i).
- Rivière du Loup Branch, Sale (Ques.) 1039 (ii).
- Grant, G., Militia Dept., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Officials in the N. W., names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 66 (vol. i).
- High Commissioner, amounts paid on account of (M. for Ret.) 210 (vol. i).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2832, 2834, 2842, 2849 (iv).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1078, 1090 (vol. ii).
- Indemnity to Members, increase of, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
- I. C. R., Coal, Carriage of, from Spring Hill Mines (M. for Ret. of quantity) 533 (vol. i).
- Free Passes and reduced fare Tickets (M. for Ret.\*) 505 (vol. i).
- Miscellaneous works, in Com. of Sup., 3299 (iv).
- Jones, W. H., Sec. of State's Dept., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2797 (vol. iv).
- Lindsay, D., Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue, Superannuation of (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Longley, G. C., Collector of Inland Rev., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- McCarthy, C., Public Works Dept., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- McLeod, N. (Indian Affairs) Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).
- Printing and Advertising, Ret. respecting (Ques.) 28 (i).
- Printing and Publishing Co.'s, sums paid to and services rendered (M. for Ret.\*) 147 (vol. i).
- Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 1131 (vol. ii).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
- Post Office Savings Bank, depositors in, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).
- Ry. Comrs. and Dom. Arbitrators (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).
- Rys. in the Co. of Grey, refund of Bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for memorial, 60 (vol. i).
- Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 578 (vol. i).
- Queen of the Isles*, Str., employment of (Ques.) 1131 (ii).
- Returns, on enquiries for (remarks) 211, 490 (vol. i), 1038, 1063, 1913 (vol. iii).
- Returns, imperfect, Govt. advertising (remarks) 67 (i).
- Rivers and Streams, Rental of, sums received by Dept. of Fisheries (M. for Ret.\*) 448 (i); (Ques.) 2359 (iii).
- Ross, N. N., of Quebec, name and salary of successor to (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).
- Russell, A., Dept. of Interior, Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530; Russell, L., 2531 (vol. iii).
- Speaker, Dep., Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3353 (vol. iv).
- Superan. Fund, number on list, &c. (M. for Ret.) 56 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 977 (vol. ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
- Immigration*, 2832, 2834, 2842, 2849 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450; (*Publishing Debates*) 991 (vol. ii); (*Miscellaneous Salaries, Library, &c.*) 2797 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3353 (vol. iv).
- Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (miscellaneous works) 3299 (vol. iv).
- Terry, Charles Hunter, gratuity to (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).
- Tilton, Mr., and Staff Commander Bolton, dispute between (M. for Ret.\*) 312 (vol. i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 722–729 (vol. i); in Com. (winneys) 842 (vol. ii).
- Wilkinson, J. A., sums paid to, and for what services (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).
- Wood and Wilkinson, sums paid to, and services rendered (M. for Ret.\*) 147 (vol. i).

**McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 955, 962 (vol. ii).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 285 (i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1121, 1125, 1126 (vol. ii).

**McNeill, Mr. A.—Continued.**

- Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt to substitute Can. Temp. Act for resuming adjd. deb. for 2°, 948 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1412; "qualifications in counties," 2073; (remarks) 1946, 2204; (Ques. of Order) 1468 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (personal explanation) 2171; (affidavits) 2495 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2554 (vol. iii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1069; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1330 (vol. ii).
- Medals for Volunteers who served [in the N.W. (Ques.) 2274 (vol. iii).
- Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. (*Mr. Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2556; in Com., 2558 (iii).
- Privilege, on Ques. of, Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2103 (vol. iii).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Govt.* (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 903 (vol. ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3395 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 798 (ii).

**Massue, Mr. L. H., Richelieu.**

- Antwerp International Exhibition, on M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Commissioner, 306 (i).
- Debates*, Official Rep. of, delay in distributing French translation (remarks) 746 (vol. i).
- Dom. properties in County of Richelieu (M. for Stmt.\*) 147 (vol. i).

**Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.**

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2961, 2963, 2964; (Amt.) 2967; neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; on M. for 3°, 3000; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (vol. iv).
- Administration of the N. W., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2926, 2931 (vol. iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2466; in Com., 2471–2474 (vol. iii).
- Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 3308 (iv).
- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).
- Alaska and B. C. Boundary Line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 706 (vol. i).
- Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2543–2547 (vol. iii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 47 (vol. i).
- Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825 (vol. iv).
- B. C. Eastern Boundary, Cor. with Govt. of B. C. and Imp. Govt., &c. (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i).
- Business of the House, on M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1744 (vol. iii).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Canada and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2944 (vol. iv).
- Canada and Germany, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. for 2°, 953; in Com., 1047 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2652, 2656, 2664 (vol. iv).
- C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan (remarks) on adjmt. of deb., 2643; in Com., 2736, 2741-2743, 2745; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864 (vol. iv).
- In Com. of Sup., 3383 (vol. iv).
- Section B, Judge Clark's Rep. on Award to Contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2534-2536 (vol. iii), 2767 (vol. iv).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 288 (vol. i).
- Census Commissioners and Enumerators in the N. W., &c.; in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Pope*) 75 (vol. i).
- Census of Man. and the N.W. B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 171; (Amt.) to recom. neg. on a div., 215 (vol. i).
- Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1097; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283 (ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823 (vol. iii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973, 981 (ii).
- Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Committees, Sessional Clerks, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2795 (vol. iv).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 127 (vol. i); in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2770 (vol. iv).
- Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii).
- Debates, Official Rep. of, on First Rep. of Com. (remarks) 35 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep., 3362 (vol. iv).
- Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii); conc., 3372 (vol. iv).
- Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 915, 920 (ii).
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Coms. (Amt.) to Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 72 (vol. i).
- Disputed Territory, Indian title, information relating to (Ques.) 594 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Commission, work of the (Ques.) 791; (remarks) 1566.
- Duck Lake, Engagement at, 791 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 2855 (vol. iv).
- Major Walsh's Rep. (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
- on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3190-3199; on adjmt. of deb., 3160 (vol. iv).
- Dundas and Waterloo Road, on prop. Res. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 451 (vol. i).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Employment of prisoners without the walls of Gaols B. 87 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 1658 (vol. ii).
- Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. for 2°, 882-886 (ii).
- Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 225 (vol. i).
- France and Quebec, fortnightly line, in Com. of Sup., 2937, 3042 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1161-1166; in Com., 1388; "woman suffrage," 1391, 1458; "usufructuary," 1449, 1453, 1454, 1455; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1477; "occupant," 1483; "farm," 1591 (vol. ii), 2393 (vol. iii); "person" (Indians) 1484, (Amt.) 1485, 1507, 1568, (Chinese) 1583, 1589; "city," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1599, 1605 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1747, 1761, (Indians) 1849, 1910-1913, 1934-1937; "manhood suffrage," 1964-1967, (Indians) 1976, 1988, 1991-2003, 2004-2006 (vol. iii), 2758 (vol. iv); "qualifications in counties," 2053, 2056, 2060, 2063, 2065-2069, 2072, 2075, 2078-2083, 2085, 2394; "disqualifying revising barrister," 2086; "who shall not vote" (Amt.) 2087, (Indians) 2149, 2160; "registration of voters," 2181-2185, 2229, 2233, (Amt.) 2227, 2243, 2266, 2270, 2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2282, 2285, 2287, 2288, 2293, 2300, 2315, 2316, 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2322, 2325, 2332, 2336, 2340-2343, 2345-2349; "general provisions," 2353, 2354; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indians) 2373-2376, 2387, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "appeal," 2361, 2364, 2366, 2396; "preamble," 2759 (vol. iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052, 3062; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3052; on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) 3054; on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059; on M. for consdn. of B., on Amt. (*Mr. Holton*) 3070; (Amt.) 3 m. h., 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072 (vol. iv); (Ques. of Order) 1432; reading extracts, 1461-1465, 1619 (vol. ii), 1920, 2242 (vol. iii); appeal from Chair to House, 1510; on M. that Com. rise, 1422, 1432; (Ques. of Order) 1435; taking up items consecutively (remarks) 1471 (vol. ii); ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798; (personal explanation) 2139 (vol. iii).
- Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2024 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1320 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 452 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) on prop. Res., 2463; in Com., 2465 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2917, 2921, 2923 (vol. iv).
- Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Hughes, D. J., charges against, on M. for Ret., 99 (i).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2330 (vol. iv).  
 Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).  
 Indian affairs in B. C., Cor. between Govt. of Canada and B. C. (M. for copies) 863-867 (vol. ii).  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 2922, 3242, 3313, 3314, 3318, 3342; conc., 3373 (vol. iv).  
 Indian Titles in Ont. acquired by Govt. (Ques.) 632 (i).  
 Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 304 (vol. i).  
 Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2922 (vol. ii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071, 1090; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1326; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1330 (vol. ii).  
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3297 (vol. iv).  
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 970 (vol. ii); conc., 2764 (vol. iv).  
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3345 (iv).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2446-2448 (vol. iii).  
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497 (vol. i).  
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1662; in Com., 1667 (vol. ii), 2762 (vol. iv).  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2798 (iv).  
 License Act, Dom., working of, on M. for Cor., 312 (i).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 621 (vol. i).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2784-2786; in Com., 2792-2795, 2924 (vol. iv).  
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 909 (vol. ii).  
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).  
 Mining and Timber Lands north of Lakes Superior and Huron, ownership of (M. for O.C., &c.) 66 (vol. i).  
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2427 (iii).  
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2753 (iv).  
 Offences against the Person (assault and battery) Act Amt. B. 42 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 219 (vol. i).  
 Ont. and Man., Boundary between (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).  
 Ontario's Boundaries (M. for copies of O.C., Imp., Can. or Provl.) 52 (vol. i).  
 Ontario's Claims to country north of Height of Land, and south of Hudson Bay, &c. (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).  
 ——— Disputed Boundaries of, Imperial legislation (Ques.) 51, 115 (vol. i); 2854, 2998, 3321; (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3437 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Northern Boundary of, Res. of Govt. (Ques.) 1132 (vol. i).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 628 (vol. i).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1893 (vol. iii).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Port Arthur Harbor, construction of, in Com. of Sup., 2917 (vol. iv).  
 Postmaster Genl., in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii);  
 Powder Magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).  
 P.E.I., Refund of Duties to merchants and fishermen, Commissioners' Rep. (M. for copy) 831 (vol. ii).  
 Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2805-2807 (vol. iv).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on interpolation of words in despatch 3247 (vol. iv).  
 Proofs of Entries in Books of Accounts B. 113 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 2466 (vol. iii).  
 Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 200 (vol. i).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 570 (vol. i).  
 Representation in Parlt. of N. W. T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3406, 3408 (vol. iv).  
 Returns, enquiries for, 427, 715 (vol. i), 1955, 2393 (vol. iii), 2936 (vol. iv).  
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).  
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3312 (vol. iv).  
 Robertson, John D., compensation to, for premises and land taken for I.C.R. (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Rys. and Canals, Minister of (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3436 (vol. iv).  
 Secretary of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 900 (ii).  
 Senate, Salaries, &c., conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Statutes of Can., revision of, Commissioners' Rep., on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 781 (vol. ii).  
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (vol. iv).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv).  
*Canals—Income* : Rideau Canal (increase of water supply) 3312 (vol. iv).  
*Civil Govt.* (Agriculture, Dept. of) 904; (Civil Service Examiners) 975, 981; Deptl. Contingencies (Indian Affairs) 915, (Inland Revenue) 920; (Interior, Dept. of) 970 (vol. ii), conc., 2764 (vol. iv); (Marine, Dept. of) 909; (Militia, Dept. of) 898; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 900 (vol. ii).  
*Coll. of Revenues* : Post Office, 3308, 3310; Public Works (Tel. lines, B. C.) 3307; (Agent and contingencies, B. C.) 3308 (iv).  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys and Examination of Survey Rets.) 3344. *Income* (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345; (Inside Service, extra Clerks, &c.) 3346 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2830 (vol. iv).  
*Indians* (S. O.) 3313; (Grant to suppl. Fund) 3242; (Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River) 2922; (Man. and N. W. T.) 3314, 3318, 3342, conc., 3373 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation* : H. of C. (Coms., extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2795; (increased Indemnity to Members) 3450 (vol. iv); (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii), conc., 3372. *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796, 2798; (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2798, 2808, 2805-2807. *Senate* (Salaries, &c.) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2944; (Can. and Germany) 2945; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 3042 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Commercial Agencies) 3245; (Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies) 3244; (Returns, preparation of) 3245 (iv).
- Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2345 (vol. iv.)
- Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 993 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (iv).
- Public Works—Capital*: Port Arthur (construction of Harbor) 2917. *Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2923; (Ont.) 2921 (vol. iv).
- Railways—Capital*: C. P. R., 3383; I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3297 (vol. iv).
- Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 272 (vol. i).
- Surveys and Exam. of Returns, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv).
- Surveys and Exploration in N. W. (Ques.) 2029 (iii).
- Telegraph lines, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 3307 (vol. iv).
- Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2935 (vol. iv).
- Timber Permits granted in Territory awarded Ont. (Ques.) 114, 115; M. for Ret., 115; (M. for copies, &c.\*) 124, 210 (vol. i).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 631 (vol. i).
- Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 993 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Volunteers Services in the N. W., Recognition of, B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3378; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 3384 (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2902, 3333-3336 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 512-521, (explanation) 539 (vol. i); in Com. (sugar) 3224 (vol. iii); (woollen rags) 784; (woollen fabrics) 793, 795 (vol. ii); (whiskey) 3228; disturbance in the N. W., on Res. granting \$1,700,000, 2532 (vol. iii); on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com., want of confidence, 3190-3199 (vol. iv).
- Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com. on B., 1675 (ii).

**Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N.B.**

- Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3001 (iv).
- Australian and Tasmanian Colonies, trade with (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 36 (vol. i).
- Bankrupt Estates and Official Assignees, on M. for Ret., 303 (vol. i).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Aud. Genl., 136, 137 (i).
- Business of the House, Tariff deb. (Ques.) 595 (vol. i).
- C. P. R., Res. respecting further loan, in Com., 2860 (iv).
- Casualties on G. T. R. and C. P. R. and Branches (M. for Stmnt.) 226 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1097, 1111; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 3 m. h., 1282; neg.

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.**

- (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823 (vol. iii).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3233 (vol. iv).
- Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., out in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 150 (i).
- Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (ii), 3233 (iv).
- Debates*, Official Rep. of, First Rep. (remarks) 35 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep., 3370; on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 3362 (iv).
- Disturbance in the N. W., movement of Troops from N. S. (remarks) 873 (vol. ii).
- Skirmish with Poundmaker (Ques.) 1646 (ii).
- Financial Commissioner in Eng., in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).
- Fishery arrangements with the U.S. (remarks) 2890 (iv).
- Fishery protection Steamers, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
- Fish taken in the Miramichi (M. for Ret.) 295 (vol. i).
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 224 (vol. i).
- France and Quebec, fortnightly line, in Com. of Sup., 2938, 2940 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1145, (explanation) 1149; in Com. "person" (Indians) 1577, (Chinese) 1582 (vol. ii) "qualifications in cities and towns," 1807, (Amt.) 1938; "manhood suffrage," 1959, 1980, (Amt.) 1987, 1991; "qualifications in counties," 2069, 2072; on personal explanation of *Mr. Blake*, 2542; on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1800 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1467; reading extracts, 1463 (vol. ii).
- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 50 (*Mr. Temple*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1386 (ii).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 453 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).
- G. T. R. Double Track, Montreal and Toronto, assurance, &c., given to Govt. (M. for copy, &c.) 143 (i).
- Importation of Rails (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 817 (vol. ii).
- Returns, enquiries for, 566, 662 (vol. i), 964 (vol. ii), 2393 (vol. iii), 3000, 3395 (vol. iv).
- Return, imperfect, presented by *Mr. Hickson* (remarks) 860; (Ques.) 1278 (vol. ii).
- Returns required under Act of 1879, &c., miles of Main line, &c. (M. for Ret.) 229 (vol. i).
- Stockholders' List, Ret. respecting (Ques.) 28, 101, 350; (remarks) 113; (M. for Ret.) 234 (vol. i); (remarks) 2210 (vol. iii); and Ans. of *Mr. Hickson* (Ques.) 927; and action of *Mr. Hickson* (Ques.) 1094 (vol. ii); enforcement of Order of House (Ques.) 3426 (iv).
- Indians, Man. and N.W. T., in Com. of Sup., 3340 (iv).
- Insolvent Debtors Assets Distribution B. 3 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 29 (vol. i).
- I. C. R., conc., 3395 (vol. iv).

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.**

- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 970 (vol. ii).  
 Interior, Dept. Rep. (appeal to Members to speak louder) 49 (vol. i).  
 Land Grants and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W., on M. for Ret. (personal explanation) 94 (vol. i).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2453-2456; (Ques. of Order) 2459; (personal explanation) 2460 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2891 (vol. iv).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2924; in Com. on B., 3048, 3050 (vol. iv).  
 Maritime Court of Ont. Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 130 (vol. i).  
 Newfoundland and the Dom., Trade Relations between (Ques.) 3042 (vol. iv).  
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2425 (iii).  
 Official Assignees under Bankrupt Act, 1869 (M. for Ret. of Estates, &c.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 903 (vol. ii).  
 P. E. I. and G. B., &c., Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).  
 Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).  
 Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2799, 2800, 2801 (vol. iv).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on remarks of Mr. McMullen, 1131 (vol. ii).  
 Volunteers' Services, recognition of, in the N. W. B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3380; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3380 (iv).  
 Refund of Duties to persons in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).  
 Salaries, Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951 (vol. iv).  
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3287 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3287 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Charges of Management* (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 897; (Printing Dom. Notes) 898 (vol. ii).  
*Civil Government* (Customs, Dept. of) 901; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 911; (Interior, Dept. of) 970; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 903 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3233 (vol. iv).  
*Fisheries* (Fishery Protection Steamers) conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
*Indians* (Man. and N. W. T.) 3340 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper) 2799-2801 (vol. iv).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c.) 2951 (vol. iv).  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2938-2940; (P. E. I. and G. B., &c.) 2942 (iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Refund of duties to persons in P. E. I.) 3455 (iv).  
*Railways—Capital*: I. C. B., conc., 3395 (vol. iv).

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.**

- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 630 (vol. i).  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559-2773 (vol. iii); on M. for Com. of Sup., 2899, 3336-3338; (personal explanation) 2902 (vol. iv).  
 Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports, on M. for Ret., 138 (vol. i).

**Moffat, Mr. R., Restigouche.**

- Customs Law, violation of, in N.S., by John Leander Mackenzie (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Dodge, Brenton, of Kentville, N.S., dismissal of (M. for Ret.\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B., in Com. "qualifications in counties," 2056 (vol. iii).

**Mulock, Mr. W., North York.**

- Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2543, 2546 (vol. iii).  
 C. P. R. connection with Ont. system of Rys. (M. for copy of offers, &c.\*) 532; (Ques.) 569 (vol. i); offers to construct line (M. for copies) 1444 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Res. respecting further Loan, in Com., 2731, 2736, 2738, 2744 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 482 (vol. i).  
 ——— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 102 (vol. i).  
 Canadian Fisheries (M. for copies of O. C., &c., &c., &c.) 55 (vol. i).  
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2537, 2540 (vol. iii).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 279 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 889; in Com., 1106, 1113, 1118, 1121; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1283; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1295; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 1303; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1304 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823 (vol. iii).  
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 974 (vol. ii).  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 126 (vol. i); in Com., 2768 (iv).  
 Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 111, 1<sup>o</sup>) 742 (vol. i).  
 Controverted Elections Acts Amt. (B. 98, 1<sup>o</sup>) 605 (vol. i).  
 Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3354 (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., luxuries for the Volunteers, forwarding of (remarks) 968 (vol. ii); Duck Lake, Rep. of engagement (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).  
 Dominion Lands Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).  
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 370 (vol. i).  
 Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 90, 1<sup>o</sup>) 426 (vol. i).  
 Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 701 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1379, 1384; "woman suffrage," 1421, 1426-1430;

**Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.**

"owner," 1473; "tenant," 1482; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1538; "actual value," 1607; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1715-1723 (vol. ii), 1882, 1887; "manhood suffrage," 1978, (Amt.) 1985, 1992, 2000; "qualifications in counties," 2053; (Amt.) 2054, 2059, 2064, 2070; (Amt.) 2072, 2073, 2076; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2137; "registration of voters," 2223-2227, 2248, 2272, 2286, 2287, 2291, 2300, 2302, 2317; "revision of voters' lists," 2322, 2327, 2329, 2331, 2335, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2354; "appeal," 2360, 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2372 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2758; on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3°, (Amt.) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; in Com., 3052; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3052 (vol. iv); (remarks) 1933; on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1800; on procedure, 1470; (Ques. of Order) 1619 (vol. ii), 1920 (vol. iii).  
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3349 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1066, 1068, 1074-1078, (Amt.) 1090; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1324, neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327 (vol. ii).  
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3296 (vol. iv).  
 Lake Simcoe Fisheries, permits granted (M. for Ret.\*) 1444 (ii); Legislation respecting (Ques.) 3073 (iv).  
 Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2759-2762 (vol. iv).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2897; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 2958 (iv).  
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3423 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2783; in Com., 3049 (vol. iv).  
 Militia, Active, number of members of (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 3045 (vol. iv).  
 Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co. and Northern Ry. Co. of Can., &c. (M. for copy of Lease) 56 (vol. i).  
 N. W. Council Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).  
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 267, 624 (vol. i).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1891 (vol. iii).  
 Postmaster at Maitland, removal of (Ques.) 1743 (iii).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).  
 Returns, production of (Ques.) 188 (vol. i); (remarks) 1133 (vol. ii).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).  
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).  
 Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name, 2320 (vol. iii).  
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 270 (vol. i).

**Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.****SUPPLY:**

*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Trent River Nav.) 3311 (iv).  
*Income*: Rideau Canal (increase of water supply) 3313 (iv).  
*Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 974 (vol. ii).  
*Dom. Lands—Income* (Outside Service, Agencies) 3346 (vol. iv).  
*Geological Survey*, 3349 (vol. iv).  
*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3423 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3354; (N.W. Council, Salaries, &c.) 3392 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Consolidated Fund* (Ont.) 3385. Telegraphs, 3420 (vol. iv).  
*Rys.—Capital*: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3296 (vol. iv).  
 Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle incorp. (B. 39, 1°\*) 125 (vol. i).  
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Tolls on certain Railway Companies (M. for Stmt., &c.) 54 (vol. i).  
 Trent Riv. Navigation, in Com. of Sup., 3311 (vol. iv).

**O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.**

Charlinch Post Office, appointment or removal of Postmaster, &c., on M. for Papers, 708 (vol. i).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., description of Arms, (remarks) 814 (vol. ii).  
 Inland Fisheries of the Dom., Queen vs. Robinson (M. for copy of Judgment of Supreme Court) 229 (vol. i).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).  
 Sunday Excursions prohibition B. 19 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 265 (vol. i).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen rags) 783; (woollen fabrics) 794 (vol. ii).

**Orton, Mr. G. T., Centre Wellington.**

Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 3002; on M. to adjn. deb., 3432 (vol. iv).  
 Administration of the N. W. T., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2929-2931 (vol. iv).  
 Banking Facilities for Agriculturists (B. 36, Res.) 115, 118; 1°\* of B., 120; 2° m., 620 (vol. i).  
 Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on prop. Res., (*Mr. Kranz*) 238 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); on Sen. Amts., 2646, 2649, 2653 (vol. iii).  
 Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) 6m. h., to M. for 2°, 288 (vol. i).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 2893 (iv).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2925 (vol. iv).  
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2428 (iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, article in *News Record* (explanation) 3000; on explanation of *Mr. Kaulbach* of vote

**Orton, Mr. G.—Continued.**

on Can. Temp. Act, 3073; on reading newspaper paragraphs (remarks) 3161 (vol. iv).

Squatters in Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24 west, on M. for Ret., 234, (vol. i).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3472 (vol. iv).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen rags) 787, 789 (ii).

**Ouimet, Mr. J. A., Laval.**

Criminal Law Amt., Houses of ill-fame, gambling and disorderly houses (B. 56 1°), 170 (vol. i).

Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W., on M. for Ret., 97 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 164; (Amt.) 165 (vol. i).

**Paint, Mr. N., Richmond, N.S.**

Clearing Vessels without Harbor Master's certificate (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).

*Debates*, Official Rep., omissions from (remarks) 3474 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1991; "in counties," 2072, 2077, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (vol. iii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1311, 1313 (vol. ii).

Great American and European Short Line Ry., Cor. between Dom. Govt. and Govt. of N. S., Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 78 (vol. i).

Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 2523 (vol. iii).

**Rand's Indian Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).**

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts., 3403 (iv).

**SUPPLY:**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Mortuary Statistics) 1029 (ii).

*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (St. Peter's Canal) 3312. *Income*: Miscellaneous (road dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3419 (vol. iv).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, construction) 2953 (vol. iv).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 2941 (vol. iv).

*Miscellaneous* (Rand's Indian Dictionary) 3420 (vol. iv).

*Railways—Capital*: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3417; I.O.R. (miscellaneous works) 3298; (Short Line between Oxford and New Glasgow) 3415 (vol. iv).

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observatories) 2956 (iv).

*Ways and Means*—in Com. (glucose syrup) 850 (vol. ii).

**Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.**

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467-2474 (vol. iii).

Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2542-2546, 2548 (vol. iii).

Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 2766 (vol. iv).

Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).

**Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.**

Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3447 (vol. iv).

C. P. R., Immigration to Man. and N. W., Cor. between the Govt. and Co. (M. for copies\*) 147 (vol. i).

— Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2720-2723 (vol. iv).

Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2537-2540 (vol. iii).

Colonial and Indian Exhibitions B. 126 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).

Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).

Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2527; in Com., 2528 (vol. iii), 2968-2971; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3433 (vol. iv).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3235 (vol. iv).

Customs Seizures at Winnipeg (M. for Stmt.) 293 (vol. i); (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).

*Debates*, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3363 (vol. iv).

Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3352, 3357 (vol. iv).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 915, 917, 921, 923 (vol. ii).

Division List, correction (remarks) 994 (vol. ii).

Drawbacks on Manufactured Exports (M. for Ret.) 139 (vol. i).

Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road, Sale by Govt. (M. for copies of Papers, &c.\*) 147 (vol. i).

Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1360-1364; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1489, 1492, 1571, 1574 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1793-1798, 1800-1804, 1931; "manhood suffrage," 1981, 2004, (Indian) 2013-2019; "qualifications in counties," 2056, 2059, 2074, 2079, 2084; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2123-2127, 2162; "registration of voters," 2259-2263, 2199-2205, 2269, 2273, 2279, 2283, 2285, 2291, 2298, 2300, 2315, 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2337; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indian) 2367-2369, 2376, 2387; "appeal," 2367; "offences," 2391 (vol. iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068; neg. (Y. 38 N. 87) 3068; on M. to conc. in Amts., 3071 (vol. iv); on procedure, 1470; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1430, 1435, 1507, 1556 (vol. ii), 2138, 2209 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, reading extracts, 1463, 1765; appeal from Chair to House (rule read) (Ques. of Order) 1921; (Ques. of Privilege) 2102; (remarks) 2146 (iii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1309, 1312, 1317, 1320 (vol. ii), 2551 (vol. iii).

Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 850-853, 856 (vol. ii).

**Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.**

- Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).  
 Indian Lands unsold in Township of Toronto (M. for List\*) 147 (vol. i).  
 Indian Supplies in the N.W., Tenders, &c. (M. for Rets.\*) 532 (vol. i).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070, 1089; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) 1331 (vol. ii).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2456-2460 (vol. iii).  
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1669 (vol. ii).  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798 (vol. iv).  
 License Act, Dom., working of, on M. for Cor., 311 (i).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2791, 2792 (vol. iv).  
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).  
 Morgan, J. H., appointment as Forestry Commissioner (M. for O.C., &c.\*) 147 (vol. i).  
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).  
 Printing Com., on M. to conc. in Second Rep., 149 (i).  
 Rand's Micmac Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).  
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Senate, extra Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3472; in Com., 3472 (vol. iv).  
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3215, 3218 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions) 2766 (vol. iv); (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032 (vol. ii).  
*Civil Government*: Deptl. Contingencies (Agriculture) 921; (Customs) 916, 921, 923; (Inland Revenue) 917, 921; (Finance and Treasury Board) 915; (Interior) 915; (Militia) 914 (Public Works) 921; (Railways and Canals) 923 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3235 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2819, 2832, 2836, 2840, 2844-2846, 2849-2852 (iv).  
*Indians* (Man. and N. W. T.) 3315-3318; (Assistance to Institutions) 3392 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (Election Expenses) 3452; (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450. (Miscellaneous (Salaries, Library, &c.) 2798. Senate (extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3352, 3357; (Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary) 3420 (vol. iv).  
*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (iv).  
*Public Works—Consolidated Fund*: Roads and Bridges, 3420. Telegraphs, 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Trade Relations with Mexico (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).  
 Veterans of War of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (vol. iv).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1675 (vol. ii).  
 Wheat and Flour, Duties on, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies\*) 532 (vol. i).  
 Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports (M. for Ret.) 138 (vol. i).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 412-426; in Com., 772-775 (vol. i); (earthenware and stoneware) 848; (glucose syrup)

**Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.**

- 850-853, 856; (steel) 804 (vol. ii); (spirits and tobacco) 3229; (sugar) 3215, 3218; (whiskey) 3226 (vol. iv); (winceys) 842 (vol. ii).

**Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1986 (vol. iii).  
 International Ferries (B. 17, 1°\*) 46; 2° m., 254 (i).  
 Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co. (B. 24, 1°\*) 67 (vol. i).  
 Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 121, 1°\*) 927 (ii).

**Platt, Mr. J. M., Prince Edward, Ont.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; in Com., 1059 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2647 (vol. iv).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1119, 1127 (vol. ii).  
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2911 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1336-1341; "woman suffrage," 1439; "person" (Indian) 1525; "actual value," 1606 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1784-1789; "manhood suffrage" and (Indians) 1977; "revision of voters' lists," 2343; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2127-2129 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Steamers, in Cora. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).  
 Importation of Prison Manufactures (Ques.) 2169 (iii).  
 Life-boats and Stations, in Com. of Sup., 2947-2950 (iv).  
 Market Battery, Kingston, lease of property (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 210 (vol. i).  
 Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 2909 (vol. iv).  
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).  
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303-3306 (vol. iv).  
 Port Credit Harbor Co., Reports made to Govt., &c. (M. for copies\*) 124 (vol. i).  
 Salmon Point Breakwater, construction (M. for Cor., &c.) 210 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Mortuary Statistics) 1032 (ii).  
*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303-3306; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3312 (vol. iv).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951; (Salaries, &c.) 2951 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Clothing and Great Coats) 2909; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2911 (vol. iv).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2916; (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2947-2950; (Wrecks and Casualties) 2950 (iv).  
 Tête du Point Barracks, lease of (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 210 (vol. i).  
 Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3312 (vol. iv).  
 Ways and Means—in Com. (hoop iron) 807; (salt cake) 806; (steel) 805 (vol. ii).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1677 (vol. ii).  
 Weller's Bay, "Range Lights" at (M. for Cor., &c.) 210 (vol. i).  
 Wrecks and Casualties, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).

**Pope, Hon. J. H., Compton.**

- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904, 921 (vol. ii).  
 Agricultural, &c., Statistics, compilation, in Com. of Sup., 1036 (vol. ii).  
 Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2478; in Com., 2479-2481 (vol. iii).  
 Air-Brakes, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3299 (vol. iv).  
 Allan Line, payments to, for assisted passages (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).  
 Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).  
 Antwerp International Exhibition, on M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com., 306 (vol. i).  
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1023, 1025 (vol. ii).  
 Bradley, W. Ingles, services of, on M. for Ret., 479 (i).  
 Canada and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2943 (vol. iv).  
 Canada and Germany, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).  
 C. P. R., Ability of Co. to fulfil engagements under prop. Res., 2238 (vol. iii).  
 — Amended Plans and Profiles, B.C. (Ans.) 362 (i).  
 — Avalanches in the Selkirk Range (Ans.) 694 (i).  
 — Branch Lines (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).  
 — B. C. Sections, work on, on M. for Reps., &c., 204 (vol. i).  
 — Change in arrangements between Govt. and Co. (Ans.) 1913 (vol. iii).  
 — Connection with Ont. system (Ans.) 569 (i).  
 — Connection with Quebec (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).  
 — Construction near Lytton, B.C., on M. for Ret., 226 (vol. i).  
 — Cor. between Co. and Govt. re change in arrangements (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).  
 — Cost of construction from Winnipeg to 615 miles west, on M. for Stmt., 228 (vol. i).  
 — Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 153, 1°\*), 2858; in Com., 3031; 3° m., 3293; 3° agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (vol. iv).  
 — Eastern Division, Earnings and Working Expenses (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).  
 — Eastern Section, Progress Estimates (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).  
 — Eastern Section, quantities, classifications and prices, Engineers' Estimates, on M. for copies, 300, 301 (vol. i).  
 — Expenditure to complete Govt. construction (Ans.) 1130 (vol. ii).  
 — Govt. Sections in B. C., working of, by contractors (Ans.) 632 (vol. i).  
 — Grades and Curves, number of (Ans.) 632; maximum and minimum (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).  
 — Grades, Tangents and Curves (Ans.) 694 (vol. i); 2239 (vol. iii).  
 — In Com. of Sup., 3383 (vol. iv).  
 — Laborers' wages, payment of, on construction (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).  
 — Levels, Grades, Tangents, &c., from summit of Rockies to Moody (Ans.) 888 (vol. ii).

**Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.**

- C. P. R., Location, change of, in B.C., 2239 (vol. iii).  
 — North American Contracting Co., and grades, curves, main line, &c., on M. for Stmt., 145 (vol. i).  
 — Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, extension of time (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).  
 — Port Moody Wharf and Freight Shed, on M. for copies of Reps., Plans, &c., 296 (vol. i).  
 — Progress Estimates (Ans.) on adjmnt. of House, 188; for Feb., 429 (vol. i).  
 — Prop. Res. and *Mail* Newspaper (remarks) 1712 (vol. ii).  
 — Resolutions respecting further Loan (speech) 2559-2565; in Com., 2724, 2733, 2741, 2748-2750; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2858 (vol. iv).  
 — Rails for Govt. section in B.C. (Ans.) 1914 (iii).  
 — Rates in B. C. (Ans.) 1474 (vol. ii).  
 — Rolling Stock, Eastern Section, Western Division, change in, on M. for Ret., 303 (vol. i).  
 — Route, construction, rolling stock, extensions, cash subsidy, land grant bonds, &c., &c., on M. for Stmnts., 45 (vol. i).  
 — Section B, Award of \$395,609 to contractors, payment of (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).  
 — Section B, Award of \$34,179.17, credits in Public Accounts (Ans.) 114 (vol. i).  
 — Section B, Arbitration, Evidence taken (Ans.) 112 (vol. i).  
 — Section B, Engineers' Reports on re-measurement and re-classification, on M. for copies, 122 (vol. i).  
 — Section B, opinion of Counsel as to binding character of Award (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).  
 — Section B, Rep. of Judge Clark on Award (Ans.) 73, 133 (vol. i).  
 — Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 3295 (vol. iv).  
 — Tangents and Curves, number and aggregate length (Ans.) 744 (vol. i).  
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 103, (vol. i).  
 — Western Division, Earnings and Working expenses (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).  
 — Western Terminus, route or routes from Port Moody to English Bay, on M. for plan, &c., 145 (i).  
 Cape Breton Ry., construction of (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).  
 — Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).  
 Cape Tormentine Ry., connection with (Ans.) 2997 (iv).  
 Cape Traverse Branch Ry., payment to contractors for construction (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).  
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).  
 Catholic population of Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 363 (i).  
 Census Commissioners and Enumerators in the N.W.T., (prop. Res.) 46; M. for Com. on Res., 74; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 125 (vol. i).  
 Census of 1881, Absentees from Canada during (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).  
 Census, Quinquennial, of Man., N.W.T., &c. (B. 21, 1°) 46; in Com., 171; consdn. of B. m., 212 (vol. i).  
 Census, Fourth and Fifth Vols., issue of (Ans.) 48 (i).

**Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.**

- Change of Names in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 Cholera, precautions against (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).  
 Clark, G. M., Sums paid to, apart from salary as Judge (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).  
 Colonial and Indian Exhibitions (B. 126) prop. Res., 451 (vol. i); Res. in Com., 892; in Com. of Sup., 1032-1035; Res. conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1064 (vol. ii); in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).  
 Contagious Diseases affecting Animals (B. 44) in Com., 1065-1073, 1089-1094 (vol. ii).  
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).  
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).  
 Dams at Lakefield and Young's Point (Ans.) 1130 (ii).  
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 921, 923 (vol. ii).  
 Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).  
 Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3384 (vol. iv).  
 Fort Francis Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3385 (vol. iv).  
 G. T. R., Double Track between Montreal and Toronto, assurance, &c., given to Govt., on M. for copy, 144 (i).  
 ——— Imperfect Ret. presented by Mr. Hickson (remarks) 861 (vol. ii).  
 Grant, Alpin, position of, under Govt. (Ans.) 429 (i).  
 Great American and European Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret., 79 (vol. i).  
 Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).  
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 2766 (vol. iv).  
 High Commissioner, Instructions issued to, respecting Immigrants (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).  
 Immigrant Patients in Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 3358 (vol. iv).  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2810, 2813, 2816, 2831-2853 (vol. iv).  
 Immigrants to the N. W., on M. for Stmt., 45 (vol. i).  
 Immigrants settled in B. C. (Ans.) 189 (vol. i).  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 3342 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals (B. 44, 1<sup>o</sup>) 125 (vol. i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 892; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1321; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) 1321; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1325; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. 2397 (vol. iii).  
 Inspecting Engineers' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).  
 Inspectors or Clerks of Works, persons employed as, on M. for Stmt., 139 (vol. i).  
 I. C. R., Claims of Contractors, Sec. 16 (Ans.) 505 (i).  
 ——— Construction to Indiantown (Ans.) 744 (vol. i), 816 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Cost of Equipment (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Cost of Working, &c., from 1879 to 1884, on M. for Stmt. (Amt.) 203 (vol. i).  
 ——— Equipment, valuation of (Ans.) 888 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Earnings and Working Expenses: 3073 (vol. iv); monthly (Ans.) 76, 114; for Jan., 1885, 428 (vol. i); for March and April, 2029 (iii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 3296, 3299, 3300, 3417; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

**Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.**

- I. C. R. Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 1744, 1914 (iii).  
 ——— Sale of Tickets on Chatham Branch (Ans.) 2289 (vol. iii).  
 Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).  
 Lake St. Francis Road Dyke, in Com. of Sup., 3419 (iv).  
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 3049 (vol. iv).  
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1027-1031 (ii).  
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303 (vol. iv).  
 Muskoka Lakes and River Severn Canal System (Ans.) 289 (vol. i).  
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., N.S., projected line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 146 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 3413 (vol. iv).  
 Patent Act 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1<sup>o</sup>, 234; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 627 (vol. i).  
 Pembina Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).  
 P. E. I. Ry., Cape Traverse Branch, payment of laborers, on M. for copies of Petitions, &c., 142 (i).  
 Pringle, H. H., employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 744 (i).  
 Port Moody Dock, Tenders for repair (Ans.) 816 (ii).  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).  
 Purcell & Ryan, payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (iv).  
 Quarantine, appointment of Physicians to accompany Steamships (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).  
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 2853, 3358, 3411 (vol. iv).  
 Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 76 (vol. i).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 913, 923, 975 (vol. ii).  
 Ry. Commissioners and Dom. Arbitrators (Ans.) 114 (i).  
 Ry. Supplies, purchase of, in Halifax (Ans.) 1915 (iii).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 593 (vol. i).  
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).  
 Returns, production of (Ans.) 188; (remarks) 113, 455 (vol. i), 1132 (vol. ii), 2393 (vol. iii).  
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3312, 3418 (vol. iv).  
 Richelieu River Floods, Memorials from Riparian owners (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).  
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. (Ans.) 569 (i).  
 St. Romuald d'Etchimin, Station (Ans.) 1567 (ii).  
 Settlers in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 113 (vol. i).  
 Settlers in the Dom. during calendar year 1884 (Ans.) 113 (vol. i).  
 Settlers in the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).  
 Sheep Scab, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).  
 Short Line Ry. to the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).  
 Simard, J., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).  
 Sleeping Cars, I.C.R., 3417 (vol. iv).  
 Statistics relating to the Public Service (Ans.) 2531 (vol. iii).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2988 (vol. iv).  
 Subsidies to Rys. (B. 164) prop. Res., 3457; on M. for Com. on Res., 3470; in Com., 3472 (vol. iv).

**Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions) conc., 2766 (vol. iv); (Archives, care of) 1023, 1025; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032-1035 (vol. ii), 3452 (vol. iv); (Compiling Agricultural and other Statistics in Man. and N.W.T.) 1036; (Criminal Statistics) 1026; (Dominion Exhibition) 1026 (vol. ii); (Health Statistics) 2766 (vol. iv); (Mortuary Statistics) 1027-1031 (ii).

*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Cornwall) 3301; (Murray) 3303; (Lachine) 3301; (Trent River Nav.) 3311; (Welland) 3301, 3311; (Williamsburg) 3301; (Amount due Hugh Sutherland) 3385 (vol. iv). *Income*: (Rideau, Land damages in Township of Pittsburg) 3418; (Increase of water supply) 3312; (Greenville, payment to J. Simard) 3418. Miscellaneous (road dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3419; (Surveys and Inspections) 3313; (Welland) 3418 (vol. iv).

*Civil Govt.* (Agriculture, Dept. of.) 904, (contingencies) 921; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913, 975, (contingencies) 923 (vol. ii).

*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3308 (vol. iv).

*Immigration*, 2810, 2813, 2816, 2831-2853 (vol. iv).

*Indians* (Man. and N. W. T.) 3342 (vol. iv).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp); 2943; (Can. and Germany) 2945 (vol. iv.)

*Miscellaneous* (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (Purcell & Ryan, for supplies furnished to Lord Lorne and party) 3452 (vol. iv).

*Quarantine*, 2853; (Immigrant Patients) 3358; (Sheep Scab) 3358, 3411 (vol. iv).

*Rys.—Capital*: C. P. R., 3383; (Inspecting Engineers' Salaries, &c.) 3417; (Pembina Branch) 3417; (Subsidy) 3295. Cape Breton Ry. (Surveys) 3418; Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415; Eastern Extension Ry., 3300, 3384; I. C. R., 3383, conc., 3396; (applying Air Brakes) 3299; (miscellaneous works) 3296-3299; (Repairs, &c.) 3300; (Sleeping Cars) 3417. Short Line Ry. (Orford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).

Surveys and Inspections (Canals) in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).

Sutherland, H., amount due, in Com. of Sup., 3385 (iv).  
Trent Valley Canal, plans and estimates of cost, &c., on Ms. for copies of Cor., &c., 145, 202 (vol. i).

Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3311 (vol. iv).

Turkish Pauper Immigrants (Ans.) 3475 (vol. iv).

Welland and Williamsburg Canals, in Com. of Sup., 3301, 3418 (vol. iv).

Wilkinson, J. A., sums paid to, and for what services (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).

**Pruyn, Mr. M. W., Lennox.**

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1425 (vol. ii).

Napanee, Public Buildings (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).

**Reid, Mr. J., Cariboo.**

C. P. R. Rates in B. C. (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).

**Rinfret, Mr. C. J., Lotbinière.**

Flannel Shirts for the Militia, Contract (Ques.) 1306 (ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1506, 1538; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1680-1683 (vol. ii).

House of Commons Commissioners' Rep. *re* Staff (Ques.) 2750 (vol. iv).

**Rinfret, Mr. C. J.—Continued.**

Le Fonds Post Office, establishment of (Ques.) 816 (ii).

Peachy, J. W., Superannuation of (Ques.) 1743 (iii).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 527-532 (vol. i).

**Robertson, Mr. A., West Hastings.**

Criminal Law Amt, Punishment of Burglars (B. 71, 1°) 270 (vol. i); (B. 136, 1°) 1335 (vol. ii).

*Debates*, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. (Ques.) 3362 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N. W., Gatling Guns for use of Troops (Ques.) 813 (vol. ii).

Veterans of 1812, Extension of Pensions to widows of (Ques.) 36 (vol. i).

**Robertson, Mr. T., Hamilton.**

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders, 714 (i).

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2769 (vol. iv).

Criminal Law Amt., openings cut in the Ice, &c. (B. 22, 1°\*) 57; 2° m., 131; M. for Com., 150; Order for Com. dshgd. and B. ref. to Sel. Com., 496 (vol. i).

Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjl. deb. for 2°, 943 (ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 1922 (vol. iii).

Govt. Business, conduct of (remarks) 3445 (vol. iv).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 501, 503 (vol. i).

Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2797 (vol. iv).

Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2947 (vol. iv).

Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 3047 (vol. iv)

Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1894 (vol. iii).

Soundings taken in Burlington Bay Canal, Rep. of Supdt. (M. for copies\*) 1533 (vol. i).

South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°\*) 125 (vol. i).

Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2830 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration*, 2818, 2843 (vol. iv).

*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2797 (iv).

*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3423 (vol. iv).

*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2947 (iv).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 719-722 (vol. i).

**Robertson, Mr. T., Shelburne.**

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (Ques.) 363 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 92, 1°) 448 (vol. i).

Coal, tenders to supply Fog-whistles, &c, in Bay of Fundy (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 919 (vol. ii).

Fraser, D. M., and Dept. of Agriculture, Cor. between (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i).

**Robertson, Mr. T.—Continued.**

- Great Village River Improvements, Colchester, N.S., (M. for Stmt. in detail\*) 67 (vol. i).  
*Lion*, seizure of Schooner, in N.S. (M. for copies of Rep., &c.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).  
 Parrsborough Breakwater, construction of (M. for copies of Tenders) 66 (vol. i).  
 Rogers' Patent Fish Ladder, Cor. and Repts. (M. for copies) 870 (vol. ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.*: Deptl. Contingencies (Inland Revenue) 919 (vol. ii).

**Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar.**

- C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2712-2718 (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., Assistance to Settlers through outbreak (Ques.) 2854; Compensation for losses (Ques.) 3321; Relief of destitute families, 3321 (iv).  
 Equipment of the 90th Battalion (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2491 (vol. iii).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2777; in Com., 2793, 3050 (vol. iv).  
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2491 (vol. iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration*, 2843 (vol. iv).

**Royal, Mr. J., Provencher.**

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3002; on M. to adjn. deb., 3431 (vol. iv).  
 C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 2867 (vol. iv).  
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Res. (Amt.) 72 (vol. i).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., Assistance to settlers through outbreak (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Batoche, capture of, rumored indignities committed by Volunteers (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Compensation for losses (Ques.) 3321 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Duck Lake, Engagement at, Rep. of (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).  
 ——— on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3199-3212 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Relief of destitute families (Ques.) 3321 (vol. iv).  
 Equipment of the 90th Battalion (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1390 (vol. ii).  
 Half-breed Commission, information respecting (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).  
 Land grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2448 (vol. iii).  
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 74, 1°\*) 313 (i).  
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copy of Repts., &c., 695 (vol. i).

**Royal, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Privilege, Ques. of, interpolation of words in despatch, 3247 (vol. iv); par. in *Free Press* (remarks 170 (i).  
 Representation in Parl. of the N. W. T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3406 (iv).  
 Statistics relating to Public Service (Ques.) 2854 (iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 168 (vol. i).  
 Ways and Means—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N. W., 3199-3212 (vol. iv).

**Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln and Niagara.**

- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 982 (vol. ii).  
 Customs Seizure of School Books at Toronto (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1450; "tenant," 1477 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1761-1770, 2002; "in counties," 2058; "revision of voters' list," 2342 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1435, 1465; on M. that Com. rise, 1437, 1500 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799, 1849 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2274, 2320 (vol. iii).  
 Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s B. 69 (M. to conc. in Sen. Amts.) 1386 (vol. ii).  
 Mackinley, A. & W., of Halifax, entry of School Books at undervaluation (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) in Com., 496 (vol. i).  
 Ont., Westerly Boundary of, argument before P. C., shorthand notes (M. for copy) 430-440 (vol. i).  
 Printing, Public, changes in Contract (M. for copies of O.C.) 246 (vol. i).  
 Railways centreing in Ottawa, Bonuses granted to, on M. for Ret., 87; adjn. deb. rsmnd., 89 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 982 (vol. ii).  
 Wines, spirits, ale, beer, porter, &c., imported, amount of Rev. (M. for Ret.\*) 313 (vol. i).

**Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.**

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1058 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2649, 2664 (iv).  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3234 (vol. iv).  
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2912 (vol. iv).  
 Duties on Hay, Cor. between Can. and U.S., on M. for copies, 443 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1447, 1448, 1451; "occupant," 1484 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1995; (Indians) 2018 (vol. iii).  
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*)<sup>1</sup> on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjn. deb. for 2° 943 (remarks) 944 (vol. iii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals, B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1334; on Amt. (*Mr. Catudal*) to M. for 3°, 1327 (vol. ii).

**Scriver, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Lake St. Francis Road Dyke, in Com. of Sup., 3419 (iv).  
Oka Indians, transport of, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).  
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).  
Sheep Scab, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).  
Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 3472 (iv).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Income*: Miscellaneous (Road Dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3419 (vol. iv).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3310; (Customs) 3234 (iv).  
*Indians* (Transport of families from Oka) 3457 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 2912 (vol. iv).  
*Quarantine* (Sheep Scab) 3411 (vol. iv.).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (barrels containing petroleum or its products) 843; (umbrella and parasol ribs, &c.) 858; (woollen rags) 787 (vol. ii).  
Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 832 (vol. ii).

**Shakespeare, Mr. N., Victoria, B. C.**

B. C. Penitentiary, suspension of Rules (M. for copies of Cor.) 823 (vol. ii).  
Cabinet Representation for B. C. (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).  
Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 29, 211 (vol. i).  
Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3011 (vol. iv).  
Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1391; "person" (Chinese) 1583, 1591 (vol. ii); "qualifications" (Indians and Chinese) 1974; (remarks) 1944 (vol. iii).  
Indian Affairs in B. C., Cor. between Govt. of Canada and B. C., on M. for copies, 869 (vol. ii).  
Indian Troubles at Metlakatla (M. for copies of Cor.) 304 (vol. i).  
Manufacturing Industries of Canada, Rep. on (remarks) on absence of information respecting B. C., 594 (i).  
Rice, increased duty on (Ques.) 695 (vol. i).  
St. George's Day, Adjmt. for (M.) 1305 (vol. ii).

**Shanley, Mr. Walter, South Grenville.**

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res. (*Mr. Light's Rep.*) 3266 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Welland) 3301, 3311: (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3311 (vol. iv).  
*Rys.—Capital*: C.P.R. (Pembina Branch) 3417; (Subsidy) 3296; I.C.R. (miscellaneous works) 3298 (vol. iv).

**Small, Mr. J., East Toronto.**

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2660, (vol. iv).  
Federal Bank of Canada Capital Stock reduction (B. 10, 1°\*) 2°, 57 (vol. i).  
Intoxicating Liquors, traffic in, further provision (B. 70, 1°) 270 (vol. i).

**Small, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Justices of the Peace, &c., Summary Proceedings B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) 1°\*, 1130 (vol. ii).  
Kootenay Ry. Co. of B.C. incorp. (B. 83, 1°\*) 349 (i)  
Pawnbrokers' Provision (B. 137, 1°\*) 1474 (vol. ii).  
Volunteers in the N.W., recognition of Services (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).

**Smyth, Mr. H., Kent, Ont.**

Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (B. 16, 1°\*) 46 (vol. i).  
Patents of Invention Acts Amt. (B. 29, 1°) 88 (vol. i).

**Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.**

Bradley, W. Ingles, services of (M. for Ret.) 479 (vol. i).  
*Debates*, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in First Rep. (remarks) 35 (vol. i).  
Expenses of Members of the Govt., &c., in Eng. or elsewhere (M. for Ret.\*) 124 (vol. i).  
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1269–1272 (vol. ii); in Com., "woman suffrage," 1441; "person" (Indian) 1549 (vol. ii); "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2129–2133; "registration of voters," 2276, 2291, 2296 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065 (vol. iv).  
Govt. Printing and Advertising (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3033–3039 (vol. iv).  
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2812, 2836, 2843–2845 (iv).  
Mounted Police, compensation for injuries (M. for Ret.\*) 505 (vol. i).  
Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2799–2802, 2804, 2806–2809 (vol. iv).  
Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Citizen*, 3162, 2213; personal allusions in deb., 3248 (vol. iv).  
Rental of Offices for use of Govt. in Ottawa (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
Salaries of Ministers (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration*, 2812, 2836, 2843–2845 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2799–2802, 2804, 2806–2809 (vol. iv).

**Speaker, Mr. (HON. G. A. KIRKPATRICK) Frontenac.**

Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).  
Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141, interruptions by Members not in Order, 3430 (vol. iv).  
Address, Ans. to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 113 (i).  
Amherst and P. E. I. Ry. Co's. incorp. B., on M. to introd., Rep. of Com. on Stndg. Orders ref. to, 349 (i).  
Bankruptcy, Pets., Res., &c., Message from His Ex. (read) 101 (vol. i).  
Beauce, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).  
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92, on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders (procedure) 714 (vol. i); on Sen. Amts. (rulings) 2657, 2664.  
Cape Breton, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).

**Speaker, Mr.—Continued.**

- Census of the N. W. B. 21, Member called to Order on imputing motives, 213 (vol. i).  
 Chinese Commissioners' Rep., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 234 (vol. i).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31, on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) (ruling) remarks must be confined to Amt., 1300 (ii).  
 Claims of Man., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 202 (vol. i).  
 Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117, suggestion to refer B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1677 (ii).  
 Controverted Elections, Judge's Reps. (read) 1, 593 (i).  
 Cumberland, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).  
*Debates*, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).  
 Disturbance in the N.W., Engagement at Batoche, despatch respecting (read) 1380 (vol. ii).  
 Disturbance in the N. W. (ruling) speech must be finished before corrections can be made, 3161 (vol. iv).  
 Divorce Cases, Evidence in (explanation) 428 (vol. i).  
 Dundas and Waterloo Road, on prop. Res. (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 451 (vol. i).  
 Estimates, The, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 289 (vol. i); Suppl. for 1884-85, 2820; Suppl. for 1885-86, 3359; Further Suppl. for 1885-86, 3423 (vol. iv).  
 Factory B. 85, on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act (ruling on procedure) 944 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. 103, Chairman's ruling in Com. sustained (Y. 76, N. 46) 1513, (Y. 67, N. 41) 1944 (vol. ii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., Signatures to, English practice quoted, 2027-2029; (remarks) 2274; on presentation of, 2320 (vol. iii).  
 Grenville, South, Election, Ret. of Member elect (announcement) 3072 (vol. iv).  
 Gov. Genl.'s Secretary, letter from, *re* Royal Assent to Bills (read) 1514 (vol. ii).  
 H. of C. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).  
 Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s B. 69, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. (remarks) 1387 (vol. ii).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44, on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, full discussion of B. not in Order on an Amt., 1330 (vol. ii).  
 Insolvent Debtors Assets B. 4, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to transfer to Govt. Orders (Votes and Proceedings quoted) 1281 (vol. ii).  
 Inspection of Factories Res., suggestion that same stand first on Public Bills and Orders, 607 (vol. i).  
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 40 (vol. i).  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. i), 2795, 2796, 3449 (vol. iv).  
 Library, The, and Mr. Bourinot's work (remarks) 40 (i).  
 Lennox Election, Judge's certificate, &c. (read) 1; Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).  
 Levis Electoral District, Judge's Rep. (read) and Warrant issued, 593; Ret. of Member elect (announcement) 1385 (vol. ii).  
 Man. Claims Settlement Res. (ruling) reference to what has taken place in Com. not in Order, 2783, 2786 (iv).

**Speaker, Mr.—Continued.**

- Manitoba Indian Agency, missing Ret. (produced) 67 (i).  
 Maskinongé, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).  
 Megantic, Ret. of Member to represent (announcement) 1 (vol. i).  
 Members, New, Ret. of (announcement) 1, 133 (vol. i), 1192, 1385 (vol. ii), 3072 (vol. iv).  
 Messages from His Ex. (read), 1, 40, 101, 113, 202, 234, 289 (vol. i), 1064 (vol. ii), 2234 (vol. iii), 2820, 3232, 3359, 3423, 3470, 3475 (vol. iv).  
 Middleton, Genl., Grant to, Mess. from His Ex., 3470 (vol. iv).  
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (procedure) 3046 (iv).  
 Nicolet, Ret. of Member to represent (announcement) 1 (vol. i).  
 Northumberland, West, Election, Judge's Rep. (read) and Warrant issued, 593; Ret. of Member elect, (announcement) 1192 (vol. ii).  
 Ontario, West, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and return of Member, 1 (vol. i).  
 Parl., opening of, Commons summoned to Senate, 1 (vol. i); Prorogation, 3475 (vol. iv).  
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks and authorities quoted) 1891, 1893, 2027-2029, 2274, 2320 (vol. iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (ruling) should conclude with a motion, 3161 (vol. iv).  
 Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors (ruling) in Order to move the previous question, &c., 1045 (vol. ii).  
 Prorogation, Letter from Acting Sec. to Gov. Gen. (read) 3473; Mess. from His Ex., 3475 (vol. iv).  
 Queen's County, P. E. I., Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and return of Member, 1 (i).  
 Royal Assent to Bills (announcement) 1516 (ii), 3475 (vol. iv).  
 Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name (remarks) 2320 (vol. iii).  
 Sessional Clerks, extra, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2795 (iv).  
 Soulanges Election, Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 1; Ret. of Member elect (announcement) 113 (vol. i).  
 Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 2 (vol. i).  
 Staff of the House, Res. and Schedules adopted by Commissioners (presented) 2497 (vol. iii).  
 Stationery used in H. of C., Expense of (Ans) 290 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Legislation*, H. of C. (Committees, extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2795; (Contingencies) 2796 (vol. iv); (Publishing *Debates*) 991 (vol. ii); (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Comm.) 3449 (vol. iv).  
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction, Limitation B. 68, on M. to introd. B. (remarks) 246, 270.  
 Vacancies, notification of, 1 (vol. i).  
 Volunteers in the N. W., Recognition of Services B. 160 (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 3380 (vol. iv).  
 Warrants issued for new Elections (announcement) 1, 593 (vol. i).  
 Washington Treaty, Cor. and papers (read) 3232; (ruling) allusion to previous deb. not in order, 2899 (iv).

**Speaker, Mr.—Continued.**

- West Middlesex Election, Judge's Rep. (read) 1 (vol. i).  
 Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 82, on M. for 2°, suggestion that Order be dschgd., 428 (vol. i).  
 \$700,000 for N.W. Troubles, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1064 (vol. ii).  
 \$1,700,000 for N.W. Expenses, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2234 (vol. iii).

**Speaker, Mr. Deputy.**

[See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE" AND "PROCEDURE."]

**Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2463 (vol. iii).  
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2547 (vol. iii).  
 Brewers and Distillers, compens. on prop. Res., 241 (i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 956, 957, 958; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. for 3°, 1052; in Com., 1054, 1057; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2648 (vol. iv).  
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 980 (vol. ii).  
 Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2437 (vol. iii).  
 Debates, Official Rep. on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3365 (vol. iv).  
 Duties on Hay, Cor. between Canada and U.S., on M. for copies, 445 (vol. i).  
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. for 2°, 831 (vol. ii).  
 Fish-breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2954 (vol. iv).  
 Fishery Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3390 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492, 1551; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications in cities and towns" (Indians) 1850, 2012; "qualifications in counties," 2073; "registration of voters," 2248; explanation, 2257; "appeal," 2361, 2366; "officers and duties," 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); explanation of vote on *Mr. Langelier's* Amt. (remarks) 3062 (vol. iv); on M. that Com. rise, 1437; (Ques. of Order) reading extracts, 1464 (vol. ii), 1920 (vol. iii).  
 Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures 2392 (iii).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2550 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 966 (ii).  
 Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1038.  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2492 (vol. iii).  
 Land Improvement Fund Settlement (Ques.) 1039 (ii).  
 Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2948 (vol. iv).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2400 (vol. iii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.**

- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (vol. ii).  
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2492 (vol. iii).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 267 (vol. i).  
 Personal Explanation, article in *Canada Presbyterian and Meaford Monitor*, 2772 (vol. iv).  
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 903 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 89, 566 (vol. i).  
 Provincial Rys. taken over by Govt. (Ques.) 188 (i).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 583 (vol. i.)  
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Mortuary Statistics) 1030 (ii).  
*Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 980; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 903 (vol. ii).  
*Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2954 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration* 2812 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3390; (Histoires Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 3456; (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456 (iv).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2948 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 733-739 (vol. i).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1674 (vol. ii).

**Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William, West Halifax.**

- Animal Charcoal, importations of (M. for Ret.)\* 533 (i).  
 Canada and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2943 (vol. iv).  
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2534, 2538, 2540 (vol. iii).  
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1119, 1120, 1124 (vol. ii).  
 Customs Seizures at N. S. ports of entry (M. for Stmt.)\* 532 (vol. i).  
 Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 809 (vol. ii).  
 France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2941, 3041 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3°, 3057 (vol. iv).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310, 1314 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2550 (vol. iii).  
 Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 854 (ii).  
 Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLellan*) in Com. on Res., 2523 (vol. iii).  
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3298 (vol. iv).  
 N. S. Rys., consolid. and completion (Ques.) 2530 (iii).  
 Post Office Savings Banks in the Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).  
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, in Com. on Res., 2991 (vol. iv).  
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 804 (vol. ii).

**Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William—Continued.**

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2991 (vol. iv).

Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3216, 3218 (iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 3318 (vol. iv).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2943; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2941, 3041 (iv).

*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 994 (vol. ii).

*Rys.—Capital*: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3298 (vol. iv).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 994 (vol. ii).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 641-648; in Com. (duck) 809; (glucose syrup) 854; (steel) 804 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3216, 3218 (vol. iv).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).

**Sutherland, Mr. H., Selkirk.**

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1315 (vol. ii).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii).

**Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.**

Can. Temp. Act, 1877, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2648-2652 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) 1496, 1497 (ii).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071, (Amt.) 1085; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2397 (vol. iii).

Prisoners, employment of, outside Gaols (B. 87, 1°\*) 362 (vol. i).

**Taschereau, Mr. T. L., Beauce.**

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1236; in Com., "usufructuary," 1447 (vol. ii).

Quarantine, appointment of Physicians to accompany Steamships (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).

Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3268.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3268 (vol. iv).

**Tasse, Mr. J., Ottawa City.**

Change of Names in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).

*Debates*, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 3364, neg. (Y. 18, N. 127) 3369; on conc., 3373; on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 3458 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N.W., on Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3465 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "who shall not vote," 2093, 2097 (vol. iii).

Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1219-1224 (vol. ii).

**Tasse, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Statistics relating to the Public Service (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii), 2854 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Legislation*: H. of C. (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Commissioners) 3450 (vol. iv).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 677-687 (vol. i).

**Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.**

Fish Breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1502 (vol. ii); in Com., "qualifications in counties," 2061 (vol. iii).

Terry Divorce (B. 97, 1° on a div.) 605 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1676 (vol. ii).

**Temple, Mr. T., York, N.B.**

Central Bank of N. B. (B. 40, 1°\*) 939 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1129 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in counties," 2054, 2058, 2084; "revision of voters' lists," 2341 (vol. iii).

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 50, 1°\*) 170 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1386 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2494 (vol. iii).

Northern and Western Ry., Cor. between Dom. and Local Govt. of N.B. (M. for copies\*) 533 (vol. i).

North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2494 (vol. iii).

Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3271 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3271 (vol. iv).

**Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard, St. John, N.B.**

Advances to Provinces (B. 7, 1°) 32; 2° m., 102 (i).

American Gold, substitution of, for Sovereigns (Ans.) 505 (vol. i).

Ascetic Acid, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).

Assistant Rec. Genl.'s, Montreal, St. John and Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).

Auditor Genl.'s Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).

Bank Advances to the Govt. (Ans.) 113 (vol. i).

Bank of B. C. (B. 105, 1°) 631 (vol. i).

Bank of Upper Can., Stmnts. respecting (Ans.) 112 (i).

Budget, The (Ans.) 76, 149, 211, (annual Stmnt.) 313 (i).

Brokerage and Commission, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

Business of the House, Tariff deb. (Ans.) 595 (vol. i).

C. P. R., Interest paid to Govt. by Co. on Loans (Ans.) 350 (vol. i), 1131 (vol. ii).

——— Loan \$22,500,000, payments to Co. (Ans.) 29 (i).

**Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard—Continued.**

- C. P. R. Loan, \$30,000,000, payments on account of (Ans.) 1130 (vol. ii).
- Carpet Mats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
- China and Porcelain ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1104 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor (B. 117, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 832 (vol. ii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. (B. 20, 1<sup>o</sup>) 46; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 126 (vol. i).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 814 (vol. ii).
- Dominion Notes, issue and redemption, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
- Earthenware and Stoneware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Emerson, Town of, aid to (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 367; (explanations) 371, 391 (i).
- Factories, Operatives in, on M. for Rets., Stmnts., &c., 37 (vol. i).
- Factory Commission, Rep. of, distribution of (remarks) 478 (vol. i).
- Financial Commr. in Eng., in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- Financial Inspector, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
- Five per cent. Consolid. Loan, retirement of, on M. for copies of O. C., 487; (explanations) 489 (vol. i).
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 220 (vol. i).
- Flour and cornmeal, increase of Duty on (Ans.) 148, 744 (vol. i).
- Gas Coke, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (vol. ii).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Gold Reserve, Govt. withdrawals, on M. for copies of Cor., 353, 355; (remarks) 361 (vol. i).
- Gov. Genl.'s Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
- Imitation precious stones, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 82 (vol. i).
- Inspection of Banks, Legislation (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).
- Land Improvement Fund Settlement (Ans.) 1040 (ii).
- Library of Parl. (B. 139) prop. Res., 594 (vol. i).
- Loan, recent, Prospectus and Advertisements, on M. for Ret., 37 (vol. i).
- Manila Hats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Manufacturing Industries of Can., Rep. on (remarks) on absence of information respecting B. C., 594 (i).
- Mess. from His Ex. recommending grant of \$700,000 for N. W. Troubles (presented) 1063 (vol. ii).
- Money borrowed by Govt. in Can. (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).
- Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- N. S.'s Claims for a Subsidy (Ans.) 189 (vol. i).
- Operatives in Factories, on M. for Rets., Stmnts., &c., 37 (vol. i).
- Pickles and Sauces, in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (vol. ii).

**Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard—Continued.**

- Picture Frames, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Polariscopic Test for Sugar (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
- Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in, on M. for Ret., 821 (vol. ii).
- Post Office Savings Banks in the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Printing Com., on M. to conc. in Second Rep., 149 (i).
- Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
- Private Banks and Brokers, Legislation (Ans.) 51 (i).
- Prussiate of Potash, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Public Debt of Can. (Ans.) 29 (vol. i).
- Public Debt, the gross amount of (Ans.) 76 (vol. i).
- Quebec, Advances on account of Provincial Subsidy (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
- Returns, on Enquiry for (Ans.) 363 (vol. i).
- Rice, increased Duty on (Ans.) 695 (vol. i).
- St. Stephen's, N.B., Public Buildings, construction of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Savings Banks in Mar. Provs., in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- Stamp Duty, commutation of, in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- Steam Communication with France (Ans.) 567, 568 (i).
- Small Savings, encouragement of, on M. for Ret., 91 (i).
- Subsidy to N. S., increase of (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY (Res. for Com.) 28 (vol. i) :
- Charges of Management* (Asst. Rec. Genl., Montreal) 895; (Auditor and Rec. Genl., St. John) 895; (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 895; (Brokerage and Commission) 896; (Commutation of Stamp Duty, &c.) 897; (Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S. and B.C.) 896; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 896; (Financial Inspector) 895; (Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes) 897; (Printing Dom. Notes) 898 (vol. ii).
- Civil Govt.* (Gov. Genl. Sec.'s Office) 898 (vol. ii).
- Temporary Loans to Govt. by Banks (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
- Terry, Charles Hunter, gratuity to (Ans.) 632 (vol. i).
- Tissue Paper, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Trade Relations with Foreign Countries (Ans.) 78; with Mexico, 632 (vol. i).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of (B. 104, 1<sup>o</sup>) 630 (i).
- Umbrella or parasol ribs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Ways and Means* (Res. for Com.) 27; (Budget Speech) 313; time for conclusion of Deb. (remarks) 662; in Com., 771 (vol. i); (acetic acid) 849; (carpet mats) 856; (china and porcelain ware) 847; (cutlery) 844; (earthenware and stoneware) 847; (gas coke) 783; (glucose syrup) 849; (imitation precious stones) 846; (Manila hats) 847; (pickles and sauces) 843; (picture frames) 846; (prussiate of potash) 846; (tissue paper) 849; (woollen fabrics) 840; (woollen rags) 785 (vol. ii).
- Wheat and Flour Duties, alteration of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).

**Trow, Mr. J., South Perth.**

- Bounty to Fishermen, payment of, in Guysborough, N.S. (Ques.) 2751 (vol. iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Townshend*) 1050 (vol. ii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2437 (vol. iii).
- C. P. R. Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmnt., 483 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 982 (vol. ii).
- Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1034 (vol. ii).
- Customs and Excise Receipts for June (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
- Debates*, Official Rep. of, on omissions (remarks) 3474; on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 3458 (vol. iv).
- Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 918, 921 (vol. ii).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Duck Lake, Rep. of fight at (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii); on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands Sales for 1884-85 (Ques.) 3072 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1460; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1596 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1908; "in counties," 2056, 2073, 2076; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2133, (Amt.) 2163; "registration of voters," 2240, 2280; "revision of voters' lists," 2343 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3063, neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064 (vol. iv); on pairing with Mr. Williams (explanation) 1470 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799; M. to print extra copies, 1855 (iii).
- Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures questioned (remarks) 2024 (vol. iii).
- Harbors and Rivers N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).
- Horses for Troops in N.W., purchase of (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44, in Com., 1065; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1326 (vol. ii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2831-2833, 2834 (iv).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).
- Land Sales or Settlement in N.W. south of 24-mile Belt (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Lake Simcoe Fisheries, Legislation (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 3470 (vol. iv).
- Loans to Govt., Temporary (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, 3456 (vol. iv).
- Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).
- Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2787; in Com., 2792, 2795, 3050 (iv).
- Members' Indemnity, payment to those absent through sickness (Ques.) 3473 (vol. iv).
- Military organizations in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).
- Model Farm, Establishment, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
- Pauper Turkish Immigrants (Ques.) 3475 (vol. iv).

**Trow, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
- Postmaster at Maitland, removal of (Ques.) 1743 (iii).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
- Post Office Savings Bank Deposits (Ques.) 2559 (iii).
- Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Tenth Rep. of Com., 3394 (vol. iv).
- Prorogation, closing remarks, 3474 (vol. iv).
- Purcell & Ryan, payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
- Refund to Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 592 (vol. i).
- Statutes, Distribution of (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY:
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1034 (ii).
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 982; Deptl. Contingencies (Inland Rev.) 918, 921 (vol. ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
- Immigration*, 2831-2834 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (increased Expenditure under Rep. of Internal Economy Commission) 3470 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453 (*Lynch's* Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (Purcell & Ryan, for supplies furnished to Lord Lorne and party) 3453 (vol. iv).
- Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 993 (vol. ii).
- Public Works—Capital*: Port Arthur (construction of Harbor) 2916 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Consolid. Fund*: Harbors and Rivers (N.W.T.) 3420 (vol. iv).
- Vacancy in a Judicial District, N.S. (Ques.) 2750 (iv).
- Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 993 (vol. ii).

**Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1643, 1832; "registration of voters," 2250 (vol. iii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067 (vol. ii).
- Justices of the Peace, Duties of (B. 41, 1°) 125 (vol. i).
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 180; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 182, neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 187; in Com., 497 (vol. i).
- Offences against the Person, Criminal Law Amt. (B. 43, 1°\*) 125; 2° m., 218 (vol. i).
- Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 79, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i).
- Scott Act, prosecutions under (Ques.) 41 (vol. i)
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 156 (vol. i).
- Truro Bank incorp. (B. 78, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i).
- Water Lots in N. S., applications for (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 455-463 (vol. i).
- Wharves, Docks and Piers in Navigable Waters (B. 18, 1°) 46; 2° m., 215; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 218 (vol. i).

**Townshend, M. C. J., Cumberland.**

- Amherst and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. (M. to introd.) 349 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 88, 1°\*) 362 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 1050 (vol. ii).

**Townshend, Mr. C. J.—Continued.**

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1249-1254; in Com. (Amt.) "woman suffrage," 1388; agreed to, 1442 (vol. ii).

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.***

Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 69, 1°\*) 269 (i).

**Vail, Hon. W. B., *Digby.***

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2751 (vol. iv).

Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res. 2548 (vol. iii).

Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2905 (vol. iv).

Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).

Beet-root Sugar, importation of (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).

C. P. R. Res. respecting further loan, on M. to conc. in Res., 2861 (Amt.) 2861 (vol. iv).

— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 100 (vol. i).

Can. and Antwerp Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942-2945; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).

Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2538 (iii).

Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).

Church Point and Trout Cove Piers, Engineers' Rep. (M. for copy) 54 (vol. i).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 976, 934 (ii).

Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2476 (vol. iii).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3226-3238, 3240 (iv).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 914, 917, 922 (ii).

Digby Pier, Wharfage Collections for 1884 (M. for Ret.\*) 532 (vol. i).

Disturbance in the N.W., on M. to adju. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2910 (vol. iv).

Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 2964 (vol. iv).

Fisheries negotiations (remarks) 3074 (vol. iv).

Fisheries, protection of, after July (Ques.) 2359 (iii).

Fishery Bounty distribution in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 219 (vol. i).

France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2930, 2941 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1274-1277; in Com., "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1606 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns" (Amt.) 1829-1832, 1990, 1994, 1999-2002; "in counties," 2394, 2084, 2085; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2165; "registration of voters," 2190, 2249, 2278, (Amt.) 2280, 2288, 2294, 2316 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order (reading extracts) 1461 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2146 (vol. iii).

Free Fishing allowed Americans (Ques.) 3321 (vol. iv).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310 (vol. ii).

Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945, 3396 (vol. iv).

**Vail, Hon. W. B.—Continued.**

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2922 (vol. iv).

Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2522; in Com., 2523 (vol. iii).

Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

Hudson Bay Expedition Supplies (Ques.) 783 (vol. ii).

Inspection of Staples, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).

*Lansdowne*, steamer, engine and boiler (Ques.) 189 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).

Metaghan River Pier, Wharfage Collections for 1884 (M. for Ret.\*) 532 (vol. i).

Military Branch and District Staff, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).

Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 2909 (vol. iv).

Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).

Obstructions in nav. waters, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).

Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3413 (iv).

Polariscopic Test for Sugar (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave as a sub-port, on M. for Papers, 447 (i).

Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).

Post Office Savings Banks Depositors, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).

Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2806 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, personal allusions (remarks) 3248 (vol. iv).

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).

Returns, Enquiries for, 211, 455, 714 (vol. i), 838 (ii).

Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (vol. i).

Sleeping Cars, conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2977 (vol. iv).

Sugars, importation of, at Halifax, from Jamaica (M. for Ret.) 40 (vol. i).

Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3216-3218, 3222-3224 (vol. iv).

Supplies for the Hudson Bay str. *Neptune* (M. for copies of Accts., &c.) 229 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY:**  
*Arts, Agr. and Statistics* (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

*Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Trent River Nav.) 3311; (Wellingland) 3302, 3311 (vol. iv).

*Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 976, 984; (Deptl. Contingencies), 914, 917, 922; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).

*Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3233, 3236-3238, 3240; (Inspection of Staples) 3242; (Post Office) 3310; (Public Works) 3308; (Weights and Measures and Gas) 3241 (vol. iv).

*Fisheries* (Distribution of Bounty) 2956 (vol. iv).

*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2806 (vol. iv).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2942-2945, conc., 2958; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2936 (vol. iv).

*Marine Hospitals*, 2957 (vol. iv).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c.) 2950 (vol. iv).

*Militia* (Ammunition) 2905; (Barracks at London) 3412; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2909; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2910; (Military Properties, care of) 2916; (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2903 (vol. iv).

*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2945, 3396; (Obstructions in nav. waters) 2950 (vol. iv).

**Vail, Hon. W. B.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 ; (vol. ii), 2766 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2917 ; Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2922 (vol. iv).  
*Rys—Capital*: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415 ; Eastern Extension Ry. (Repairs, &c.) 3301. I.C.R., conc., 3396, (Sleeping Cars) 3417 ; Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).  
*Superintendence of Insurance*, 2957 (vol. iv).  
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3302, 3311 (vol. iv).  
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii), 2766 (iv).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 666–676 (vol. i) ; in Com. (sugar) 3216–3218, 3222–3224 (vol. iv).  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559, 2774 ; on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901, 3339 (vol. iv).  
 Wheat, flour, cornmeal and corn, Duty collected in N.S. (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).

**Valin, Mr. P. V., Montmorency.****SUPPLY :**

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly service) 2941 (vol. iv).

**Vanasse, Mr. F., Yamaska.**

- Expenditure for Rys, Canals, &c., in B.C., N.W.T., and other Provs. (M. for Stmt.\*) 964 (vol. ii).  
 Govt. rights to Water Lots on Rivers (Ques.) 2238 (iii).  
 Longueuil and Lévis Ry. Survey (Ques.) 429 (i).

**Wallace, Mr. N. C., West York, Ont.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1341 ; in Com., "tenant," 1477, 1478 ; "person" (Indian) 1491 ; "actual value," 1602, 1604 (ii) ; "qualifications in counties," 2002, 2066, 2083 (iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on Rep. of speech in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 1824 (vol. iii).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 578 (vol. i).  
 School Books, consignment by Nelson & Sons (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 796 (vol. ii).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. 1673 (vol. ii).

**Watson, Mr. R., Marquette.**

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3001 (iv).  
 Administration of the N. W. (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res., 2931 (vol. iv).  
 Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 62, 1°\*) 210 (vol. i).  
 Bonuses granted to Rys., memorials, &c., respecting (M. for copies\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Calgary and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ques.) 351 (i).  
 C. P. R., Completion of line west of Winnipeg, dates, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 964.

**Watson, Mr. R.—Continued.**

- C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, in Com., 2743, 2744 ; on M. to conc. in Res., 2865 (Amt.) 2867, neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868 (vol. iv).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. for 2°, 954 (vol. ii).  
 Civil Service Acts. Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1113–1115 (vol. ii).  
 Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1058 (vol. ii).  
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice, B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (i).  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3236 (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., Col. Scott's Battalion (Ques.) 1064 (vol. ii).  
 ——— further intelligence, 812 (vol. ii).  
 ——— organization of Companies in the N. W., 816 (ii).  
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).  
 Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Lands Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).  
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921 ; conc., 2923 (vol. iv).  
 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).  
 Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 809 (vol. ii).  
 Duties, Imposition of (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 Fisheries protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 701 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1274 ; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1468 ; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1522, 1542 ; "occupant," 1484 ; "actual value," 1606 (vol. ii) ; "qualifications in cities and towns" (Indians) 1853, (Amts.) 1933, 1990, 1992, (Indian) 2008 ; "qualifications in counties," 2058 ; "registration of voters," 2268, 2295 ; "revision of voters' lists," 2344 (vol. iii) ; on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061 (vol. iv).  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1315, 1316, 1319 (vol. ii) ; in Com., 2550–2554 (vol. iii).  
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2921, 3420 (iv).  
 Immigrant Sheds at Medicine Hat, construction of (Ques.) 350 (vol. i).  
 Indians, Man. and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3318 (iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1085, 1093 ; on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1332 (vol. ii).  
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com., of Sup., 3345 (iv).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2448 ; in Com. on Res., 2492, 2493, 2512, 2513, 2517, 2519, 2521 (vol. iii).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2776 ; (remarks) 2788 ; in Com., 2793–2795, 2924–2926, 3047, 3049 ; on M. for 3°, 3075 (iv).  
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 990 (vol. ii).  
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2517, 2519, 2521 (vol. iii).  
 Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2512, 2519 (vol. iii).

**Watson, Mr. R.—Continued.**

- Medicine Hat and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ques.) 351 (vol. i).  
 Mounted Police Barracks, Tenders for (Ques.) 351 (i).  
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copy of Repts., &c., 696 (vol. i).  
 N. W. Central Ry., Land grant to, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3380 (vol. iv).  
 N. W. Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 2414; on M. to conc. in Res., 2429 (vol. iii); in Com. on B., 2771 (vol. iv).  
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2492, 2493 (vol. iii).  
 Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co. (B. 63, 1°\*) 210; M. to refer back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Rys., &c., 713 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1035; (Dominion Exhibition) 1027 (vol. ii).  
*Canals—Income*: Miscellaneous (Surveys and Inspections) 3313 (vol. iv).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3236 (vol. iv).  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Agencies) 3346; (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345 (vol. iv).  
*Indians* (Man. and N. W. T.) 3318 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (Drill Shed and Rifle Ranges) 2915 (vol. iv).  
*Penitentiaries* (Man.) 990 (vol. ii).  
*Public Works*: Dredging, 2921; conc., 2923. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 2921; (N. W. T.) 3420 (vol. iv).  
 Surveys and Inspections, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (iv).  
 Tug-barges, dredge and machinery on Red River (M. for Ret.\*) 964 (vol. ii).  
 Volunteers' Services in the N. W., recognition of B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3377; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 3380 (vol. iv).  
 Vote for Relief of Settlers in the N. W. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*: on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to M. for Com., 769 (vol. i); in Com. (duck) 809 (vol. ii).  
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W., St. John (N.B.) City and County.**

- A, B and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).  
 Administration of Justice in N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2961 (vol. iv).  
 Administration of the N. W., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2929 (vol. iv).  
 Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2824–2826 (vol. iv).  
 Bounty to Fishing Vessels (M. for Stmt.) 98 (vol. i).  
 Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 893 (vol. ii).  
 Campbellton and Gaspé, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).  
 C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865 (iv).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 959–964; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1045; in Com., 1046, 1050 (vol. ii).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**

- Cape Tormentine, Ry. connection (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).  
 Central Bank of N. B. (B. 40, 1°\*) 939 (vol. ii).  
 Charlottetown Public Buildings, construction of (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).  
 Coal entered ex-Warehouse, free or for exportation (M. for Stmt.\*) 100 (vol. i).  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3233–3235, 3240 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 29 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1008 (vol. ii).  
 Drawback on Ship-building Mtrls. (M. for Ret.\*) 100 (i).  
 Fish Inspector in City of St. John (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).  
 Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).  
 Fishery Leases and Licenses issued by Dept. of Marine and Fisheries (M. for Ret.\*) 533 (vol. i).  
 Fishery protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).  
 Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 222 (vol. i).  
 France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2938 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1149; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1478; "person" (Indian) 1493, (Chinese) 1583; "farm," 1592; "parish," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1595; "actual value" (Amt.) 1596, 1600; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1727–1731 (vol. ii), (Amt.) 1805; "registration of voters," 2253, 2277, (Amts.) 2278, 2282, 2283, 2286, 2288, 2289, 2291, 2297, 2316, 2310; "revision of voters' lists," 2323, 2328, 2339, 2341, 2343, 2349 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) 3058, neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060 (vol. iv); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; on M. that Com. rise, 1425; on taking up items consecutively, 1471, 1472; on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1512 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799 (vol. iv).  
 Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 50, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1386 (vol. ii).  
 Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).  
 Halifax Fishery Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1090, 1092; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1322; on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) 1333 (vol. ii).  
 Instructions to Health Officers in N. B., and Quarantine Regulations (M. for Ret.\*) 1443 (vol. ii).  
 I. C. R., Casualties to Trains, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 100 (i).  
 ——— Claims of Contractors of Sec. 16 (Ques.) 505 (i).  
 ——— Commissioners appointed to settle claims (M. for copies of O. C., &c. \*) 100 (vol. i).  
 ——— Construction to Indiantown (Ques.) 744 (vol. i), 816 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Erection of Wire Fences, Contracts for (M. for Ret. \*) 532 (vol. i).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 3384, 3298 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmt.) 101 (vol. i).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**

- I.C.R. Rolling Stock, purchase of (M. for Ret.) 101 (i).  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).  
 Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).  
 Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).  
 Lighthouse at Quaco, Memorials or Cor. (M. for copies\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).  
 Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 2956; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
 Military Magazine at St. John, N.B., disposal of (M. for Ret.) 606 (vol. i).  
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 3047 (vol. iv).  
 Mill St., St. John, Ry. crossing on, Memorials and Cor. (M. for copies\*) 1442 (vol. ii).  
 Navigation of Canadian Waters B. 132 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1278 (vol. ii).  
 Offences against the Person B. 123 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 2767 (vol. iv).  
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3414 (iv).  
 Partridge, prairie fowl, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).  
 P.E.I. or N.B. and G.B. Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).  
 Powder Magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2918, 3307 (vol. iv).  
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 913 (vol. ii).  
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1016 (vol. ii).  
 Registration of Shipping, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).  
 Returns, enquiries for, Fisheries Cor., 2936, 3000 (iv).  
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys. (M. for Ret.) 706 (vol. i).  
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. (Ques.) 569 (i).  
 St. John, City and County, issue of Writ for Election (Ques.) 3427 (vol. iv).  
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3266 (vol. iv).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1280 (vol. ii).  
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 153 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3266; in Com. on B. (vol. iv).  
 Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Government* (Fisheries, Dept. of) 911; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Public Works) 3307; (Customs) 3233-3235, 3240 (vol. iv).  
*Fisheries* (Fishery protection Steamers) 2956 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2833 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation: Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796 (vol. iv).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, construction) 2952; (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951 (vol. iv).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Campbellton and Gaspé) 2942; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2938; (P. E. I. and G. B., &c.) 2942 (vol. iv).  
*Militia* (A, B and C Batteries) 2915 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3388 (vol. iv).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Canadian registration of Shipping) 2950; (Govt. Steamers) 2945; (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2950 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (P. E. I.) 2918 (vol. iv).  
*Railways—Capital: I. C. R.*, 3384; (miscellaneous works) 3298; Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3414 (iv).  
*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observatories) 2956, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).  
 Telegraph and Signal Serv., in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).  
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' B. 150 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 2935 (vol. iv).  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, Cor. and papers (Ques.) 3249; on M. for Com. of Sup., 3322-3330 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (partridge, prairie fowl, &c.) 858 (vol. ii).  
 Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters, B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 217 (vol. i).

**Wells, Mr. R. M., East Bruce.**

- Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Kranz*) 236 (vol. i).  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2168; (Amts.) 2432-2439 (vol. iii).  
 Consolid. Ry. Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°) 101 (vol. i).

**White, Mr. J., East Hastings.**

- Administration of Justice in the N.W. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3001 (iv).  
 Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of, on M. for copies, 361 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 956, 958; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1049 (vol. ii).  
 C. P. R., Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).  
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).  
*Debates*, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3359; on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) 3369; Fourth Rep., 3458; remuneration of amanuensis (remarks) 3474 (vol. iv).  
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 308 (i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492; "qualifications, &c." "manhood suffrage" and (Indians) 1983, 2008; "qualifications in counties," 2067; "who shall not vote," 2088, 2092, (Indians) 2155-2157 (vol. iii); (explanations) 1494, 1527; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1497; (remarks) 1652, 1701 (ii), 2151, 2214, 2203, 2206 (iii).  
 ——— Scarcity of copies (remarks) 1131 (vol. ii).  
 ——— Pets. on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2027 (vol. iii).

**White, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 452 (vol. i).  
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).  
 Insolvent Debtors, distribution of Assets provision B. 4, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1281 (vol. ii).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2511 (vol. iii).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2960 (vol. iv).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155, on M. for Com. on Res. (personal explanation) 2786 (vol. iv).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 625 (vol. i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).  
 Printing, printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2806 (iv).  
 Superintendent of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 273 (vol. i).

## SUPPLY :

- Legislation*: H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3451.  
 Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2806 (iv).  
*Liquor License Act* (Administration of) 3421 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works—Consolidated Fund* (Telegraphs) 3420 (vol. iv).  
*Rys.—Capital*: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3417 (iv).  
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).

**White, Mr. P., North Renfrew.**

- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1996 (vol. iii).  
 G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 818 (vol. ii).  
 Guerin, Lister, Rep. of Survey of Improvements on Ottawa River (Ques.) 1040 (vol. ii).  
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1084; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1322 (vol. ii).  
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).  
 Mattawa, Mountain Rapids and Long Sault, Improvements (Ques.) 1040 (vol. ii).  
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, prop. Res., 1211 (reply) 1225 (vol. ii).  
 Ottawa River Survey and Exploration (Ques.) 131 (i).  
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. (B. 25, 1°\*) 67; 2° m., 266; (reply) 268; 2° neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (vol. i).  
 Printing done outside of Contract (M. for Ret.) 860 (ii).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 581; (explanations) 588, 591, 593 (vol. i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3471 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY :

- Legislation*: H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3451 (vol. iv).  
 Miscellaneous (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456 (vol. iv).

**White, Mr. T., Cardwell.**

- Annuity and Guarantee Fund of the Bank of Montreal (B. 48, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).  
 C.P.R., Resolutions respecting further Loan, in Com., 2726-2729 (vol. iv).  
 ——— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. (*Mr. McLelan*) to M. for Stmt., 108 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, voting on the, on M. for Stmt., 121 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for 2°, 950; on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 951, 953; in Com., 958, 963, 1056; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2650, 2663 (vol. iv).  
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2539 (iii).  
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2432, 2438 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2769 (vol. iv).  
 Davis Divorce (B. 84, 1° on a div.) 426; M. to appoint day for 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 426; 2° on a div., 567 (vol. i).  
 Debates, Official Rep. of, First Rep. (presented) 32; (remarks) 33; (M. to conc. in Second Rep.) 40; on Delay in distributing Daily Issue (remarks) 595; on delay in distributing French Translation (remarks) 746 (vol. i); Ms. to conc. in Third Rep. 2168 (vol. iii), 3359; on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) 3367; on omissions, 3249, 3474; M. to conc. in Fourth Rep., 3458; on conc., 3372; (vol. iv).  
 Disturbance in the N. W., Indemnity to Members in the Field (prop. M.) 812 (vol. ii).  
 Dom. Grange Mutual Fire Ins. Association (B. 55, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).  
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 310 (i).  
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada (B. 60) in Com., 693 (vol. i).  
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on proposed Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 380 (vol. i).  
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 946 (ii).  
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 223 (vol. i).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1192-1197 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns" (manhood suffrage) 1945, 1996, (remarks) 2015, (Indian) 2019; "registration of voters," 2245, 2283, (remarks) 2261 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1498, 1529; on Ques. of Order, 1620 (vol. ii), 1921; on ruling of Chairman, 1798 (vol. iii).  
 Govt. Printing and Advertising, on Res. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3039-3041 (iv).  
 Inland Rev. Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2528 (vol. iii).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2452 (vol. iii).  
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2783 (vol. iv).

**White, Mr. T.—Continued.**

- Man. South-Western Col. Ry. Co., Land Grants to, in Com. on Res., 2511 (vol. iii).  
 Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal (B. 49, 1°\*) 170 (vol. i).  
 Printing Com., Second Rep. (M. to conc. in) 149 (vol. i); Seventh Rep., 1822 (vol. iii); 9th Rep., 3293; Tenth Rep., 3393 (vol. iv).  
 Printing, printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2805 (vol. iv).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 573 (vol. i).  
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (vol. iv).  
 Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name, 2320 (vol. iii).  
 Sessional Clerks, extra, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2896 (iv).  
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3223 (vol. iv).

**SUPPLY:**

- Immigration*, 2814 (vol. iv).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (Committees, extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2896. *Miscellaneous* (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2802, 2805 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Rets., preparation of) 3388 (vol. iv).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 394-412; in Com., 774 (vol. i); (sugar) 3223 (vol. iv).

**Wigle, Mr. L., South Essex.**

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1501 (vol. ii).  
 Mail Service on Can. Southern Ry. (M. for Ret.) 120 (i).  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 795 (ii).

**Williams, Mr. A. T. H., East Durham.**

- Calgary, Edmonton and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°\*) 313 (vol. i).  
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 23, 1°\*) 67 (vol. i).

**Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin.**

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2474 (vol. iii).  
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).  
 Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 905 (vol. ii).  
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2548 (vol. iii).  
 Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of (M. for copies) 356 (vol. i).  
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 1058 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2656 (iv).  
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).  
 Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1417; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1515, 1536; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1723-1727 (vol. ii) 1901; "manhood suffrage," 1960, 1986, 1989; "qualifications in counties," 2060, 2068, 2073, 2077; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2120-2122; "registration of voters," 2205-2207, 2265, 2287; "appeal," 2362, 2367 (vol. iii).

**Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.**

- Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).  
 Hughes, D. J., Charges against (Ques.) 77; (M. for copies of Papers and Cor.) 98 (vol. i).  
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065, 1091; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1322 (vol. ii).  
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1027-1030 (vol. ii).  
 O'Malley, Lieut Col., Charges against and suspension (M. for copy) 101 (vol. i).  
 Ports Stanley and Burwell Harbors of Refuge (M. for Ret.) 62 (vol. i).  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).  
 Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).  
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).  
 St. Thomas Public Buildings, amount expended on (M. for Ret.) 79 (vol. i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv); (Mortuary Statistics) 1027-1030 (vol. ii).  
*Canals—Income*: Rideau Canal (water supply) 3313 (vol. iv).  
*Civil Government* (Agriculture, Dept. of) 905; (Public Works, Dept. of) 911 (vol. ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Adulteration of Food) 3242; (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).  
*Immigration*, 2833, 2842 (vol. iv).  
*Miscellaneous* (Commercial Agencies) 3245; (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3351 (vol. iv).  
*Penitentiaries* (Man., payment to Dr. Sutherland) 3350 (vol. iv).  
*Public Works: Consolidated Fund*: (Ont.) 3385 (vol. iv).  
 Refund of Ry. Bonusus to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 589, 618 (i).  
 Sutherland, Dr., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (iv).

**Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.**

- Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (i).  
 Debates, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 3361; neg. (Y. 63, N. 82) 3369 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "actual value," 1600 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2203; "registration of voters," 2317 (vol. iii).  
 Islands in River St. Lawrence, Lease of, &c. (M. for Ret.)\* 147 (vol. i).  
 Narrows, Erection of a Lighthouse at (Ques.) 112 (i).  
 Squatters in Qu'Appelle Valley, on M. for Ret., 205 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 3472 (iv).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 656-661 (vol. i).

**Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.**

- Amherst and P. E. I. Ry. Co's. incorp. B., on M. to introd., 349 (vol. i).  
 Debates, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3365 (vol. iv).  
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1731 (vol. i).  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 58, 1°) 170 (vol. i).  
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).

**Wood, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) on M. to conc. in Res., 3269–3271 (vol. iv).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration*, 2848 (vol. iv).

Winter Crossing from P.E.I., on M. for copies of Cor., 63 (vol. i).

**Woodworth, Mr. D. B., King's, N.S.**

C.P.R., Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1126 (vol. ii).

*Debates*, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N. W., Half-breed grievances (remarks) 2045 (vol. iii); on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).

—— Transport of Troops (remarks) 887 (vol. ii).

—— Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3467 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1228–1234; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1584; on M. that Com., rise, 1422; (Ques. of Order) 1467; reading extracts, 1464; unparliamentary language, 1540; (explanation) 1561 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2023 (iii).

Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 854 (ii).  
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2848 (vol. iv).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 2°, 2892 (iv).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 182; in Com., 501 (vol. i).

Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2787 (vol. iv).

Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3414 (iv).

Reciprocity with the U. S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1010 (vol. ii).

**Woodworth, Mr. D. B.—Continued.**

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 121, 1°\*) 927 (vol. ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Immigration*, 2848 (vol. iv).

*Legislation*: H. of C. (*Publishing Debates*) 2765 (vol. iv).

*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 993 (vol. ii).

*Railways—Capital*: Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3414 (vol. iv).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 993 (vol. ii).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 555–561 (vol. i); in Com. (glucose syrup) 854 (vol. ii).

Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835 (vol. ii).

Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 217 (vol. i).

**Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa County.**

C. P. R. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for 2°, 3026–3031 (vol. iv).

*Debates*, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3370 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N.W., on Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3466 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1143 (vol. ii).

**Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.**

Cape Traverse Branch Ry., payment to Contractors for construction (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).

Cascumpec Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

Customs Appraiser at Summerside, (Ques.) 350 (i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1647 (vol. ii).

Inland Rev. Collector at Summerside (Ques.) 350 (i).

Reciprocity with the U. S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1004 (vol. ii).



# INDEX—PART II.

## SUBJECTS.

- A, B AND C BATTERIES, OFFICERS AND MEN, pay and allowances : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Cameron, *Middlesex*) 313 (i).
- ABOLITION OF DUTY ON GRAIN. See "CUSTOMS."
- ACCIDENTS. See "CASUALTIES."
- ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 49 (i).
- ACTIVE MILITIA, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Mulock) 533 (i).
- ACTS, CONTINUED. See "EXPIRING LAWS."
- ADDRESS, ANS. TO: Mess. from His Ex., 113 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 985 (ii), 3448 (iv).
- Administration of Justice, &c., in the N. W. T. B. No. 141** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°\*, 2345; Res. prop., 2531 (iii); Res. in Com., 2926; 2° of B, 2934; M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; in Com. on B., 2961; M. for consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Mills) neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3000; deb. adjd., 3002; Order for rsmng. adjd. deb., 3427; Amt. neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°\*, 1 *pro forma* (i).
- ADJOURNMENTS:**
- ANNUNCIATION DAY : M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 714 (i).
- ASCENSION DAY : M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 1822 (iii).
- ASH WEDNESDAY : M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 125 (i).
- CORPUS CHRISTI : M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2301 (iii).
- DOMINION DAY : Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2773 (iv).
- EASTER : Ques. (Mr. Blake) 713 (i); M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 888 (ii).
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY : M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2030 (iii).
- ST. GEORGE'S DAY : M. (Mr. Shakespeare) 1305 (ii).
- ST. PATRICK'S DAY : M. (Mr. Curran) 593 (i).
- ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL : M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 2889 (iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. No. 143** (Mr. Costigan). 1°\*, 2356; 2°, 2466; in Com., 2467-2541; Res. (remuneration of Analysts) prop., 2497; in Com., 2541, 2542 (iii), 2751; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751; 3° of B., 2751 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVTS.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- ADVANCES TO C.P.R. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1305 (ii).
- Advances to Provinces B. No. 7** (Sir Leonard Tilley). 1°, 32; 2°, 102 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1064 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- ADVERTISING AND PRINTING, GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Somerville, Brant) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3033 (iv).
- AGREEMENT BY C.P.R. Co. TO TERMS OF RES.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii).
- AGRICULTURAL INS. CO. OF CAN., INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. Blondeau) 1386 (ii).
- AGRICULTURAL, &c., STATISTICS, COMPILATION: in Com. of Sup., 1036 (ii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. No. 122** (Mr. Ferguson, Welland). Res. prop., 936; in Com. and 1°\*, 939; M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1320 (ii); 2°, 2476; in Com., 2478; 3°\*, 2497 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- AGRICULTURAL, TIMBER, PASTURE, AND MINERAL LANDS AND TOWN SITES : M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 209 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, BUREAU OF, ESTABLISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. Gigault) 76 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, DEPT. OF : in Com. of Sup., 904, 921 (ii).
- Agriculturists.** See "BANKING."
- AID TO RYS. See "LAND GRANTS" AND "SUBSIDIES."
- AIR BRAKES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3299 (iv).
- ALASKA AND B.C. BOUNDARY LINE: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Gordon) 705 (i).
- ALBANY, DUKE OF, THANKS OF QUEEN FOR CONDOLENCE : Mess. from His Ex., 32 (i).
- Alberta and Athabaska Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73** (Mr. Williams). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (i); in Com., 791; 3°\*, 816 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- Albion Mines Savings Bank B. No. 15** (Mr. McDougald). 1°\*, 46; 2°\*, 113; in Com. and 3°\*, 616 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- ALGOMA, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS. See "CUSTOMS."
- ALLAN LINE, PAYMENTS TO, for assisted passages : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 567 (i); M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- ALLAN STEAMSHIP CO. AND CLAIM OF GOVT. *re Newfield and Moravian* : Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 148, 312 (i).
- ALLISON, MR. D. W.: Election declared null and void on Judges' Rep. on Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- ALLOWANCES TO CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS : M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
- AMERICAN ENGINEERS' VISIT TO N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).
- AMERICAN GOLD, SUBSTITUTION OF, FOR SOVEREIGNS : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 505 (i).
- AMOUNTS COLLECTED IN WESTERN ONTARIO. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- AMOUNTS DUE CONTRACTORS ON C.P.R.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 533 (i).
- ANDRÉ, FATHER, LETTER FROM, IN JAN., 1883 : Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- ANIMAL CHARCOAL, IMPORTATIONS OF : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Stairs) 533 (i).

- Animals, Cruelty to, Prevention B. No. 47** (Mr. *Charlton*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 147 (i).
- Animals, Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting, B. No. 44** (Mr. *Pope*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 125 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 892; in Com., 1064-1094; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1321; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) to recom., 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to recom., 1324; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327; Amt. (Mr. *Catudal*) to recom., 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328; Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) to recom., 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332; Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to recom., 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; Amt. (Mr. *Scriver*) to recom., neg. on a div., 1334; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to recom., neg (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334; 3<sup>o</sup>, 1335 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2397 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- ANNUAL REGISTER. See "DOMINION."
- Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of Bank of Montreal B. No. 48** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 245; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\* 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- ANNUNCIATION DAY, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 714 (i).
- ANTWERP AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION: conc., 2766 (iv).
- ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION: M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
- APPRAISER AT SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- ARBITRATORS. See "OFFICIAL."
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 1023, 1025 (ii).
- ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS, PAYMENT OF ARREARS DUE: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 888; (M. for Ret.\*) 1444 (ii).
- ARMOUR, MR. JUSTICE: Rep. on Lennox Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- ARMS, DESCRIPTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 814 (ii).
- ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION, DOM.: in Com. of Sup. 2913 (iv).
- ASBESTOS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- ASCENSION DAY, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1822 (iii).
- ASCETIC ACID: in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 125 (i).
- ASSETS, DISTRIBUTION OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS. See B. 4.
- ASSIGNEES. See "OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES."
- ASSISTED PASSAGES: See "ALLAN LINE."
- ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS, &c., THROUGH REBELLION: See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W."
- ASSISTANT POSTMASTER OF OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (iv).
- ASSISTANT REC. GEN., MONTREAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 895, 896 (ii).
- ASSOCIATIONS, &c.:
- ANNUITY AND GUARANTEE FUNDS SOCIETY OF BANK OF MONTREAL. See B. 48.
- CANADA CO-OPERATIVE SUPPLY ASSOCIATION. See B. 81.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC EMPLOYÉS RELIEF ASSOCIATION. See B. 75.
- CONGREGATIONAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY. See B. 54.
- HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY. See B. 114.
- LUTHERAN CHURCH OF CANADA. See B. 60.
- PENSION FUND SOCIETY OF THE BANK OF MONTREAL. See B. 49.
- "A TRIP TO DOM. OF CAN.," PAMPHLET: M. for copies (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- AUDITOR GENL. AND DEPT. OF MARINE, RENTAL OF RIVERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i).
- AUDITOR AND REC. GENL. OF ST. JOHN AND WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup. 895 (ii).
- AUDITOR GENL.'S REP.: presented (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28; M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to ref. to Public Accounts Com., 76 (i).
- AUSTRALIAN AND TASMANIAN COLONIES, TRADE WITH: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 36 (i).
- AUTOMATIC BUOY, LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- AVALANCHES IN THE SELKIRK RANGE: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 694 (i).
- AXLE GREASE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- BAIN, MR. J. W.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 1; re-elected 113 (i).
- BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT.: M. for Rets. of amounts (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37; (Ques.) 113 (i).
- Banking and Loan Facilities to Agriculturists B. No. 36** (Mr. *Orton*). Res. prop., 115; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 120 (i).
- Bank of British Columbia B. No. 105** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 631; 2<sup>o</sup>, 894 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2396 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- Bank of Montreal Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society B. No. 48** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 245; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- Bank of Montreal Pension Fund Incorp. B. No. 49** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 245; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BANK OF UPPER CANADA, STMENTS. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 112 (i).
- Bank of Winnipeg Act Amt. B. No. 62** (Mr. *Watson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 210; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 281 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\* 1007 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com. 47; Mess. from His Ex., 101; ref. to Com., 102; M. to ref. Petitions to Com., 125 (i).
- BANKRUPT ESTATES AND OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*) 303 (i).
- BANKS AND BANKING:
- ALBION MINES SAVINGS BANK. See B. 15.
- BANK OF WINNIPEG. See B. 62.
- BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. See B. 105.
- BANKING AND LOAN FACILITIES TO AGRICULTURISTS. See B. 36.
- BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES. See Bs. 18, 46 and 100.
- BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37; Ques. 113, 743 (i).
- BANK OF UPPER CANADA, STMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 112 (i).
- CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK. See B. 40.
- COMMERCIAL BANK OF WINDSOR. See B. 117.
- DEPOSITS, GOVT., IN BANKS: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 29 (i).
- EXCHANGE BANK, ADVANCES TO: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) censuring Govt., 295 (i).
- FEDERAL BANK OF CANADA. See B. 10.
- GOVT. NOTES IN CIRCULATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- INSOLVENT BANKS. See Bs. 66 and 127.

## BANKS AND BANKING—Continued.

- INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION OF BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 51; prop. Res., 81 (i).
- LA BANQUE DU PEUPLE. See B. 53.
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (ii).
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 2359, 2465, 2559 (iii).
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS IN THE MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Stairs) 148 (i); in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- PRIVATE BANKS AND BROKERS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 51 (i).
- SAVINGS BANKS (P. O. OR OTHERWISE) DEPOSITORS: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).
- TRURO BANK. See B. 78.
- BARRACKS AT LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- BARRACK HUTS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- BARRELS CONTAINING PETROLEUM OR ITS PRODUCTS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (ii).
- BATOCHÉ, BATTLE OF: Despatch respecting first Engagement, 1380; telegram from Gen. Middleton giving details of second fight, 1822; second despatch, 1835 (iii).
- BATOCHÉ, CAPTURE OF: Rumored indignities committed by Volunteers: Ques. (Mr. Royal) 2999, 3425 (iv).
- BATTERIES, A, B AND C. See "MILITIA."
- BAYFIELD, N.S., BREAKWATER, EXTENSION OF: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 77 (i).
- BEAUCE: Vacancy in the Representation, Warrant issued and Ret. of Member to represent, 1 (i).
- BEAVER LINE OF STEAMERS AND I.C.R., FREIGHT RATE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 144 (i).
- BERT-ROOT SUGAR, IMPORTATION OF: Ques. (Mr. Vail) 744 (i).
- BELL AND KAVANAGH, LAND CLAIMS: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 479 (i).
- BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458; in Com., 3473 (iv).
- BENSON, MR., M.P., DEATH OF: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2357 (iii).
- BERGIN, SURGEON GENERAL, SERVICES OF: Ques. (Mr. Mc Mullen) 1914 (iii).
- BIG BEAR. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W."
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.) 1°\*, 1 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 2) To regulate the Employment of children and young persons and women in the Workshops, Mills and Factories of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Bergin.) 1°\*, 29; Order for 2° dschgd, 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 3) To limit the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.) 1°, 28; Order for 2° read., 102; 2° m., 151; Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 165; neg., 167; 2° neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 4) To provide for the distribution of Assets of Insolvent Debtors.—(Mr. Curran.) 1°, 29; 2°\*, 619 (vol. i); M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1280; agreed to, 1281 (vol. ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 5) Respecting the liability of Carriers by Land.—(Mr. Coughlin.) 1°\*, 29; 2° m., 102 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 6) To further amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.) 1°\*, 29; 2° m., 176; gonsdn. resmd., 180; Amt. (Mr. Tupper) 6 m. h., 182; neg. (Y. 55, N. 87) 187; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496; Amt (Mr. Amyot) to recom. neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504; 3°\*, 616 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 7) To amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 17, intitled: "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum of money to the Province of British Columbia for the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and for other purposes."—(Sir Leonard Tilley.) 1°, 32; 2°, 102 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1064 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 8) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Bergin.) 1°\* 40; 2°\*, 57; in Com. and 3°\*, 245 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.) 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 57; in Com., 245; 3°\*, 281 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 10) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Federal Bank of Canada, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Small.) 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 57; in Com. and 3°\*, 428 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 11) To extend the Jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Allen.) 1°\*, 40; 2° m., 127; 2°\*, 131; Order for Com. read, 215; in Com; 496; 3°\*, 616 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 12) For constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. McCarthy.) 1°, 40 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 13) Respecting Carriers by Land.—(Mr. McCarthy.) 1°\*, 40; 2° m., 254-282; Amt. (Mr. Curran) 6 m. h., 285; neg. (Y. 64, N. 74) and 2°\*, 289 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 14) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.) 1°, 41 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 15) To continue an Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. McDougald.) 1°\*, 46; 2°\*, 113; in Com. and 3°\*, 616 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 16) To amend the Law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.—(Mr. Smyth.) 1°\*, 46 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 17) Respecting International Ferries.—(Mr. Paterson, Essex.) 1°\*, 46; 2° m., 254; 2°\*, 256 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 18) Respecting Wharves, Docks and Piers constructed in navigable waters.—(Mr. Tupper.) 1°, 46; 2° m., 215; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 218 (vol. i).

- BILL (No. 19)** To provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, by prohibiting Sunday Excursions of certain kinds.—(Mr. Charlton.)  
1°\*, 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 20)** To modify the application of "The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)  
1°, 46; 2°, 126 (vol. i); in Com., 2430; Order for 3°, 2532; deb. adjd., 2533 (vol. iii); ref. back to Com., 2768; 3°, 2770 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 21)** To provide for the taking of a Census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.—(Mr. Pope.)  
1° of B. and Res. prop., 46; M. for Com. on Res., 74; in Com., 75; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 125; Res. agreed to and 2° of B., 126; in Com., 171; consdn. m. and Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to recom., 212; neg. on a div., 212; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to recom., 213; neg. (Y. 62 N. 120) 215; Amt. (Mr. Mills) to recom., 215; neg. on a div., 215; 3°\*, 215 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 22)** To amend the Criminal Law, to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the Ice on any navigable or frequented waters.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)  
1°\*, 57; 2°, 131; in Com., 150; Order dschg'd. and ref. to Sel. Com., 496 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 23)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)  
1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 113; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 24)** To incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)  
1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 113; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 25)** Further to amend "The Patent Act of 1872."—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)  
1°, 67; 2° m., 266; neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 26)** To provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
Res. prop., 67; Amt. (Mr. Blake) to refer to Sel. Com., 70; neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72; 1°\* of B., 74; 2°\* and in Com., 175; M. for 3° agreed to on a div. and 3°\*, 212 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 27)** To provide for the punishment of Seduction, and like offences.—(Mr. Charlton.)  
1°\*, 76; 2°, 619 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 28)** To incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.—(Mr. Haggart.)  
1°\*, 88; 2°\*, 113 (vol. i); M. for Com., 1007; deb. adjd., 1008; M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii); in Com. and 3°\*, 3053 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 29)** To amend the Act respecting Patents of Inventions.—(Mr. Smyth.)  
1°\*, 88 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 30)** To amend and consolidate "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879," and the Acts amending it.—(Mr. Wells.)  
18, 101 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 31)** To amend and consolidate the Canada Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884.—(Mr. Chapleau.)  
1°, 101; Res. prop., 210; Res. (letter carriers) in Com., 270; Res. (C. S. Examiners, &c.) in Com., 273, 281 (vol. i); conc. m., 889; conc. in, 892; 2° of B. m., 1095; 2° and in Com., 1097-1130, 1281; 3° m., 1282; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3 m. h., 1282; neg. (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286; Amt. (Mr. Casey) to recom., 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; Amt. (Mr. Blake) to recom., 1294; neg. (Y. 53, N. 104) 1296; Amt. (Mr. Davies) to recom., 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1301; Amt. (Mr. Lister) to recom., neg. on same div., 1303; Amt. (Mr. Mulock) to recom., 1303; neg. on same div., 1304; 3° on a div., 1304 (vol. ii); M. to conc. in Senate Amts., 1823, 2396 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 32)** Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. Billy.)  
1°, 101 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 33)** For the equitable distribution of Insolvents' Estates.—(Mr. Beaty.)  
1°\*, 113 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 34)** For the discharge of past Insolvents.—(Mr. Beaty.)  
1°\*, 113 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 35)** Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. Bergeron.)  
1°\*, 113 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 36)** To provide Banking and Loan facilities to those engaged in Agricultural pursuits.—(Mr. Orton.)  
Res. prop., 115; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 120 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 37)** Further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)  
1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 179; in Com. and 3°\*, 672 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 38)** To amend the Acts relating to The Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)  
1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 179; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 39)** To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mulock.)  
1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 180; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 40)** Further relating to The Central Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Temple.)  
1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 180 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 939 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 41)** To amend the Act respecting duties of Justices of the Peace in relation to Summary Convictions.—(Mr. Tupper.)  
1°, 125; 2°, 892 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 42)** To amend the Act respecting Offences against the person.—(Mr. Tupper.)  
1°\*, 125; 2° m., 218 deb. adjd., 219 (vol. i).

- BILL (No. 43)** To authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Curran.)  
1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 188 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°, 791 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 44)** Respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. Pope.)  
1°, 125 (vol. i); 2°, 892; in Com., 1064-1094; 3° m., 1321; Amt. (Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) to recom., 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; Amt. (Mr. Mulock) to recom., 1324; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327; Amt. (Mr. Catudal) to recom., 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328; Amt. (Mr. Casey) to recom., 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332; Amt. (Mr. Armstrong) to recom., 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; Amt. (Mr. Scriver) to recom., neg. on a div., 1334; Amt. (Mr. Davies) to recom., neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334; 3°, 1335 (vol. ii); Sen. Amts conc. in, 2397 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 45)** Respecting the representation of the Territories in the House of Commons.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)  
1°\*, 147; 2° m., 362, 490; deb. adjd., 495 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 46)** Further to amend the Law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.—(Mr. Gigault.)  
1°, 147 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 47)** For the more effectual prevention of Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. Charlton.)  
1°\*, 147 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 48)** Respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 49)** To incorporate the Pension Fund of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 50)** To incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Temple.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 289 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 873; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 51)** For granting certain powers to the International Coal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Desjardins.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 567 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 52)** Respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 53)** Respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Girouard.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 54)** To confirm the Union of the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, and the Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.—(Mr. Abbott.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 259; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 55)** To authorize the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association to insure against fire the property of the Patrons of Husbandry wheresoever situate in Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 246 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1210 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 56)** Respecting Disorderly Houses.—(Mr. Ouimet.)  
1°, 170 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 57)** To amend the Criminal Law of Canada.—(Mr. Ouimet.)  
1°, 170 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 58)** To amend the Liquor License Act of 1833.—(Mr. Foster.)  
1°, 170; 2° m., 620; deb. adjd., 622 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 59)** To incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)  
1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 281; in Com. and 3°\*, 567 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 60)** To incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)  
1°\*, 180; 2°\*, 246; in Com., 693; 3°\*, 791 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 61)** Further to amend the Act incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)  
1°\*, 188; 2°\*, 246 (vol. i); Notice of an Amt., 1210; in Com., 1347; 3°, 1352 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 62)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Watson.)  
1°\*, 210; 2°\*, 281 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 63)** To incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Watson.)  
1°\*, 210; 2°\*, 289 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 64)** Further to amend the Patent Act of 1872.—(Mr. McCarthy.)  
1°, 234; 2° m., 622; Order for 2° dschgd. 629 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 65)** To amend "The Canada Temperance Act of 1878."—(Mr. McCarthy.)  
1°, 235 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 66)** Further to amend an Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations.—(Mr. Edgar.)  
1°, 235 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 67)** Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)  
1°, 246 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 68)** To limit the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as respects matters of a purely local nature in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)  
1°, 270 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 69)** Respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 428 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

- BILL (No. 70)** To make further provision respecting the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.—(Mr. *Small*.)  
1° 270 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 71)** To amend the Criminal Law.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*.)  
1° 270 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 72)** Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin*.)  
1°\*, 213; 2°\*, 405 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 73)** To incorporate the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Williams*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (vol. i); in Com., 791; 3°\*, 816 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 74)** Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Royal*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405, (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1180 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 75)** To incorporate the Canadian Pacific Employés Relief Association.—(Mr. *Gault*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 490 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 76)** To amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°, 1723 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 77)** To incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kilvert*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 78)** To incorporate the Truro Bank.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 79)** To incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)  
1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 490 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1180 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 80)** To incorporate the Fort Macleod Ranch Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Ives*.)  
1°\*, 349; 2°\*, 428 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1723 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2357 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 81)** Respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited).—(Mr. *Curran*.)  
1°\*, 349; 2°\*, 428; in Com. and 3°\*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 82)** To incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*.)  
1°\*, 349; 2° m., 428; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 428 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 83)** To incorporate the Kootenay Railway Company, British Columbia.—(Mr. *Small*.)  
1°\*, 349; 2°\*, 545 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 84)** For the relief of Amanda Esther Davis.—(C) from the Senate.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell*.)  
1° on a div., 226; M. to fix day for 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 226; 2° on a div., 567; in Com. and 3°\*, 693. (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 85)** Respecting Factories.—(Mr. *Bergin*.)  
1°\*, 362 (vol. i); 2° m., 873; deb. adjd., 886; M. to resume adjd. deb., 940; Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) to substitute B. (No. 94) Canada Temperance Act, 940; Amt. agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 86)** To amend the Act respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)  
1°, 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 87)** To amend the Act 40 Victoria, Chapter 36, intituled: "An Act to provide for the employment, without the walls of Common Gaols, of Prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein."—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*.)  
1°\*, 362 (vol. i); 2°, in Com., and 3°\*, 1658 (vol. ii), (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 88)** Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. *Townshend*.)  
1°\*, 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 89)** Further to amend "The Patent Act of 1872."—(Mr. *Hay*.)  
1°\*, 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 90)** To amend "The Fisheries Act."—(Mr. *Mulock*.)  
1°, 426 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 91)** To incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*.)  
1°\*, 428; 2°, 567 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1180 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 92)** Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. *Jamieson*.)  
1°, 448; Ques. and M. to fix day for 2°, 713 (vol. i); 2° m., 949; Amt. (Mr. *Ives*) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; 2° agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; in Com., 954; 3° m., 1045; Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to recom., 1045; in Com., 1046; Amt. (Mr. *Bourbeau*) to recom., 1047; in Com., 1047; on M. to conc., Amt. (Mr. *Burpee*) 1047; neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Townshend*) to recom., 1050; in Com., 1050; Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) to recom., 1051; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 64) 1054; Amt. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) to recom., 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062; Amt. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) to recom., neg., 1062; Amt. (Mr. *Gigault*) to recom., neg., 1062; 3°, 1063 (vol. ii); M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to consdr. Sen. Amts., 2600; consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2644; (Amt) 2645; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; (Amt.) 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 103) 2651; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2552; Amts., 2653-2657; Amt. (Mr. *Small*) 2660; neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2670; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) 2674; neg., 2675 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 93)** To establish a Court of Claims for Canada. (Sir *Hector Langevin*.)  
1°, 449 (vol. i); prop. Res., 777 (vol. ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2439 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 94)** To incorporate the Western Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCallum*.)  
1°\*, 534; 2°\*, 616 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1288 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

- BILL (No. 95) Respecting Explosive Substances.—(K) from the Senate.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**  
1°\*, 545 (vol. i); 2°, 893; in Com., 1167; 3°, 1335 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 96) Statutes of Canada Consolidation.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**  
Not introduced. See B. 130.
- BILL (No. 97) For the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry.—(E) from the Senate.—(Mr. Taylor.)**  
1° on a div., 605; 2° on a div., 672 (vol. i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 98) To amend the Acts respecting Controverted Elections.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
1°, 605 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 99) To amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. Bourbeau.)**  
1°, 605 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 101) To amend the Law respecting Bridges, Booms and other works, constructed over or in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**  
1°, 605 (vol. i); 2° m., 893; 2°\* and in Com., 894; 3°\*, 895 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 102) To amend the Acts respecting the Department of the Secretary of State.—(Mr. Chapleau.)**  
1°, 629 (vol. i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°\*, 895 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**  
1°, 629 (vol. i); Order for 2° postponed, 1095; 2° m., 1133; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1137; neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) and deb. adjd., 1166; deb. rsmd., 1167; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; deb. adjd., 1204; deb. rsmd., 1226; 2° agreed to (Y. 111, N. 63) 1277; M. for Com., 1336; in Com., 1385, 1388, 1444, 1475, 1568, 1608, 1646, 1680, 1712, 1745, 1782, 1824, 1856, 1895, 1915, 1956, 1983, 2052, 2065, 2086, 2104, 2139, 2172, 2210, 2241, 2274, 2301, 2321, 2345, 2360, 2393 (vol. iii), 2757, 3052, 3062; on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Charlton) neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) 3053; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 3058; neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Watson) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mulock) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062; Amt. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; Amt. (Mr. Burpee) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063; Amt. (Mr. Trow) 3063; neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064; Amt. (Mr. Armstrong) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064; Amt. (Mr. Somerville, Brant) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. McCraney and Innes) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. Cameron [Middlesex] and Langelier) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066; Amts. (Messrs. Lister and Cameron, Huron) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3067; Amts. (Messrs. Weldon and Fairbank) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; Amts. (Messrs. Paterson [Brant] and Gilmor) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3069; Amts. (Messrs. Holton and Fisher) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3 m. h., 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072; 3° of B., 3072 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 104) To amend the sections of Acts therein mentioned relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)**  
1°, 630 (vol. i); 2°, in Com., and 3°\*, 1670 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 105) Respecting the Bank of British Columbia.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**  
1°, 631; 2° 894 (vol. ii); in Com. and 3°\*, 2396 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 106) For the relief of Alice Elvira Evans.—(G) from the Senate.—(Mr. Edgar.)**  
1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 107) For the relief of George Louis Emil Hatfeld.—(D) from the Senate.—(Mr. Kilvert.)**  
1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 108) To amend the Act to encourage the construction of Dry Docks, by granting assistance on certain conditions to Companies constructing them.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**  
1°, 693 (vol. i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°\*, 895 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 109) Respecting Real Property in the North-West Territories.—(A) from the Senate.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**  
1°\*, 742 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 110) To incorporate the Rock Lake and Souris and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. McDougald, Pictou.)**  
1°\*, 742 (vol. i); 2°\*, 873 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 111) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and amendments thereto.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
1°, 742 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 112) Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. Gigault.)**  
1°, 743 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 113) Respecting Proof of Entries in Books of Account kept by Officers of the Crown.—(M) from the Senate.—(Mr. Chapleau.)**  
1°\*, 964 (vol. ii); 2°, 2397; withdn., 2398; 2°, 2465; in Com., 2466; 3°\*, 2497 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 114) To comprise in one Act a limitation of the Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(J) from the Senate.—(Mr. Kilvert.)**  
1°\*, 783; 2°\*, 816; in Com. and 3°, 1352 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 115) To amend an Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(I) from the Senate.—(Mr. Desjardins.)**  
1°\*, 832; 2°\*, 873; in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 35.)

- BILL (No. 116)** To amend the Act respecting the Indemnity to the Members of both Houses of Parliament.—(Mr. *Farrow*.)  
1° 813 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 117)** Respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.—(Sir *Leonard Tilley*.)  
1°\*, 832; 2°, 1671; Order dschgd. and B. ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1677 (vol. ii); in Com. and 3°\*, 2396 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 118)** Further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)  
Res. prop., 832; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 837; 2° and in Com., 1672; 3°\*, 1680 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 119)** Further to amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)  
Res. prop., in Com. and 1° of B., 837 (vol. ii); 2°, 2419; in Com. and 3°\*, 2439 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 120)** To give effect to an Agreement made by the Department of Public Works for the Sale and transfer of the Dundas and Waterloo Road.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)  
Res. prop., 451 (vol. i); conc. in and 1°\* of B., 892 (vol. ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 2396 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 121)** To amend the Act 45 *Vic.*, chap. 41, respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*.)  
1°\*, 927 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 122)** Respecting Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*.)  
Res. prop., 936; in Com. and 1°\*, 939; M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1320 (vol. ii); 2°, 2476; in Com., 2478; 3°\*, 2497 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 123)** Further to amend an Act intituled: "An Act respecting offences against the person."—(S) *from the Senate*.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
1°\*, 1037 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2767; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767; 3°\*, 2768 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 124)** To restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)  
1°, 1037 (vol. ii); withdn., 3023 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 125)** For the Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors.—(Mr. *Beaty*.)  
Res. prop., 1040; 1°\* of B., 1063 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 126)** To provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886.—(Mr. *Fope*.)  
Res. prop., 451 (vol. i); in Com., 892; Res. conc. in and 1°\* of B., 1064 (vol. ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 2399 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 127)** Further to amend "An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations."—(N) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Edgar*.)  
1°, 1094 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 128)** To make further provision respecting summary proceedings before Justices and other Magistrates.—(L) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Small*.)  
1°\*, 1130 (vol. ii); Order for 2° transferred to Govt. Orders, 2420 vol. iii; 2° m., 2827; 2° and in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 129)** To amend an Act respecting "The Central Prison for the Province of Ontario."—(P) *from the Senate*.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
1°\*, 1226 (vol. ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 2402 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 130)** Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
1°, 1226 (vol. ii); Order for 2° dschgd., and B. withdn., 2402 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 131)** "For the better Preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works," and the Acts in amendment thereof.—(O) *from the Senate*.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
1°\*, 1278 (vol. ii); 2° m. and in Com., 2824; 3°\*, 2854 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 132)** To amend the Act 43 *Vic.*, chap. 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian Waters, and to enable the Governor in Council to suspend from time to time certain provisions of the said Act.—(Mr. *McLelan*.)  
Res. prop. and in Com., 1278; 1°\* of B., 1279 (vol. ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2899 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 133)** Further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882."—(Mr. *McLelan*.)  
Res. prop., 1279; in Com. and, 1°\* of B., 1280 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2399; 3°\*, 2421 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 134)** Respecting "The Liquor License Act, 1883."—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
1°, 1281 (vol. ii); 2° m., 2400; 2°\*, 2402 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768, 2894; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2958; 3°\*, 2961 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 135)** Further to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874."—(Mr. *Costigan*.)  
Res. (Chief Inspector) prop., 1306; in Com., 1307; conc. in and 1°\* of B., 1320 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2548; 3°, 2555 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 136)** To amend the Criminal Law of Canada.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*.)  
1°, 1335 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 137)** To make further provision respecting Pawnbrokers.—(R) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Small*.)  
1°\*, 1474 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 138)** For the relief of George Branford Cox.—(H) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron*.)  
1° on a div., 1473; 2° on a div., 1566; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1723 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 139)** To amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
Res. prop., 1658; in Com., 1666; 1°\* of B., 1670 (vol. ii); 2°, 2402 (vol. iii); in Com., 2759; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65) 2763; 3° on same div. reversed, 2763 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

- BILL** (No. 140) Respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(T) *from the Senate*.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1°\*, 1670 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2772; 3° m., 2832; 3°, 2833 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL** (No. 141) Respecting the Administration of Justice, and other matters, in the North-West Territories.—(V) *from the Senate*.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1°\*, 2345; Res. prop., 2531 (vol. iii); Res. in Com., 2926; 2° of B., 2934; M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; in Com. on B., 2961; M. for consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Mills) neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3000; deb. adjd., 3002; Order for rsmng. adjd. deb., 3427; Amt. neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL** (No. 142) Respecting Canned Goods.—(U) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Costigan.)  
1°\*, 2345; 2°, 2439; in Com., 2534 (vol. iii), 2767; 3°\*, 2767 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL** (No. 143) Respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs, and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(W) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Bowell.)  
1°\*, 2356; 2°, 2466; in Com., 2467, 2541; Res. (remuneration of Analysts) prop., 2497; in Com., 2541, 2542 (vol. iii), 2751; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751; 3° of B., 2751 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL** (No. 144) To authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
Res. prop., 994 (vol. ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2402; in Com., 2415; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2421; 1°\* of B., 2430 (vol. iii); 2° and in Com., 2770; 3° m., 2820; 3° on a div., 2822 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL** (No. 145) To authorize the raising, by way of Loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.—(Mr. Bowell.)  
Res. prop., 2391; M. for Com. on Res., 2461; in Com., 2463; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2523; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 2526 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL** (No. 146) To amend "The Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883."—(Mr. Costigan.)  
Res. prop., 2421; M. for Com. on Res., 2526; in Com., 2528; 1°\* of B., 2529; 2° m., 2935; 2°\*, 2536 (vol. iii); in Com., 2968; 3°, 3002; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3435 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL** (No. 147) To authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)  
Res. prop., 782 (vol. ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2440; in Com., 2461, 2483, 2497; M. to conc. in Res., 2533; 1°\* of B., 2534 (vol. iii); 2° m., 2770, 2854; in Com., 2855; Order for 3° read, Amts. (Mr. Blake) 2890; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; Amts. (Mr. Blake) neg. on same div., 2894; 3°\*, 2894 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL** (No. 148) To amend the Act respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.—(Mr. McLelan.)  
Res. prop., 2431; in Com., 2522; Res. conc. in and 1°\* of B., 2534 (vol. iii); 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 2772 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL** (No. 149) For granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,700,000 required for defraying certain Expenses now being incurred in connection with the Troubles in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Bowell.)  
Res. and 1°\*, 2559; 2° and in Com., 2855; 3°\*, 2894 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL** (No. 150) To authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of the Harbor of Three Rivers.—(Mr. Bowell.)  
Res. prop., 2497; Res. in Com., 2555 (vol. iii); 1°\* of B., 2751; 2° m., 2934; in Com., 2935; 3°\*, 2957 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL** (No. 151) Respecting the Ocean Mail Service.—(Mr. Carling.)  
Res. prop., 2440; Res. in Com., 2555 (vol. iii); M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2751; M. to conc. in Res., 2754; 1° of B., 2757; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (vol. iv).
- BILL** (No. 152) To amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883.—(Mr. Caron.)  
1°, 2853; 2° m., 3045; 2° and in Com., 3046; 3°\*, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL** (No. 153) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Candian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.—(Mr. Pope.)  
Res. prop., 2420 (vol. iii); M. for Com., 2559; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; in Com., 2724; M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2858; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2858; Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2859; in Com., 2859; on M. to conc. in Res. Amt. (Mr. Charlton) 2860; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861; Amt. (Mr. Vail) 2861; in Com., 2862; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Casey) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Davies) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 2863; neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Mills) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865; Amt. (Mr. Watson) 2865; neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868; 1° of B., 2868; 2° m., 3024; 2° and in Com., 3031; 3° m., 3293; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL** (No. 154) Further to amend the Act relating to the Culling and Measurement of Timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Costigan.)  
Res. prop., 2419; M. for Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii); 1°, 2° and in Com., 3043; 3°\*, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL** (No. 155) For increasing the yearly subsidy to the Province of Manitoba, and for other purposes therein mentioned.—(Mr. Bowell.)  
Res. prop., 2420 (vol. iii); M. for Com., 2775; in Com., 2789, 2823; further Res., 2889; in Com., 2924; 1°\* of B., 2926; 2° and in Com., 3047; 3°, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

- BILL (No. 156)** To restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)  
Res. (Chinese interpreter) prop., 2421 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3023; prop. Res. (poll tax, &c.) 2497; M. for Com. on Res., 3002; in Com., 3023; 1°\* of B., 3323; 2° and in Com., 3050; 3°, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 157)** To amend the several Acts relating to Duties of Customs and Excise.—(Mr. *Bowell*.)  
1°, 3250; 2°\*, 3434; in Com. and 3°\*, 3435 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 158)** To authorize the granting of further subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the Railways therein described.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)  
Res. prop., 2531 (vol. iii); M. for Com. on Res., 2971; in Com., 2974; M. to conc. in Res., 3250; 1°\* of B., 3293; 2° m., 3380; in Com., 3380-3399; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. *Kirk*) 3401; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79) 3404; 3°\*, 3404 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 159)** For facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. *McJelan*.)  
1°\*, 3293; Order for 2° read., 3436; 2° m., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6 m. h., neg., 3470; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 160)** Respecting a grant of land to the Militia on service in Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. *Caron*.)  
Res. prop., 3321; M. for Com., 3376; in Com., 3377; 1°\* of B., 3380; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 161)** To provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)  
Res. prop., 3293; M. for Com. on Res., 3375; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 3395; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3436 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 162)** To provide a Salary for an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)  
Res. prop., 3395; in Com. on Res., 3435; 1°\* of B., 3436; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 163)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1885, and the 30th June, 1886; and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Bowell*.)  
1°\*, 2°, 3°\*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 164)** To authorize the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned in aid of the construction of certain Railways.—(Mr. *Pope*.)  
Res. prop., 3457; M. for Com., 3470; in Com., 3472; 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3473 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 165)** To continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)  
1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3458 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 1516 (ii), 3475 (iv).
- Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Acts**  
Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Smyth*). 1°\*, 46 (i).
- Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Acts.**  
Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Gigault*). 1°. 147 (i).
- BILL, MR. S. J. R., AND SAWDUST LAW: M. for Ret.\*** (Mr. *Forbes*) 14 (i).
- BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, N.S., MANAGEMENT OF: M. for Ret.\*** (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- BINGHAM, LIEUT.-COL., DEPRIVATION OF COMMAND: M. for Ret.\*** (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
- BLACK ROD, GENTLEMAN USHER: Messages summoning Commons to Senate**, 1 (i), 1516 (ii), 3475 (iv).
- BOLDUC, CAPT. LUDGER, RESIGNATION OF: M. for Ret.** (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 29 (i).
- BOLTON, STAFF COMMANDER, AND DEPT. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES: M. for Rep. of Auditor-General, &c.** (Mr. *McMullen*) 135; **DISPUTE WITH MR. TILTON: M. for Ret.\*** 312 (i).
- BONDED MACHINERY IN USE: Ques.** (Mr. *McMullen*) 3320 (iv).
- BONDS GOVT., DISAPPEARANCE FROM DEPT.: Ques.** (Mr. *Blake*) 3371 (iv).
- BONUSES GRANTED TO RYS., MEMORIALS, &C., RESPECTING: M. for copies\*** (Mr. *Fleming*) 1443 (ii).
- BONUSES TO RYS. IN ONT., PETS. FOR RELIEF OF: M. for copies** (Mr. *Wilson*) 356 (i).
- Books of Account.** See "PROOF OF ENTRIES."
- BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO MILITIA CORPS: Ques.** (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).
- BORAX: in Com. on Ways and Means**, 808 (ii).
- BOUNDARIES:**  
ALASKA AND B. C.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 705 (i).  
BRITISH COLUMBIA'S EASTERN: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. *Mills*) 533 (i).  
ONTARIO'S NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 210.  
—— CLAIMS TO COUNTRY NORTH OF HEIGHT OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 51 (i).  
—— IMPERIAL LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 51, 115 (i), 2854, 2998, 3321; (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3437 (iv).  
—— NORTHERN, RES. OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1132 (ii).  
—— PROPOSALS TO PARLT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 567 (i).  
—— WESTERN BOUNDARY, ARGUMENT BEFORE P. C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Rykert*) 430 (i).
- BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURES OF IRON: M. for copies of O. C., &c.\*** (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, PAYMENT OF, IN GUYSBOROUGH, N.S.: Ques.** (Mr. *Kirk*) 2751 (iv).
- BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS: M. for Stmt.** (Mr. *Weldon*) 98 (i).
- BOURINOT'S, MR., WORK: Scarcity of copies in Library** (remarks) 40 (i).
- BRADLEY, W. INGLES, SERVICES OF: M. for Ret.** (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 479 (i).

- BRANCH LINES, C.P.R., EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnts.\* (Mr. Blake) 147; Ques., 694 (i).
- BRANDON, POSTMASTER AT, SALARY AND ALLOWANCES: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 2029 (iii).
- BRANDON TO MOOSE JAW, C.P.R.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).
- Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 59** (Mr. Paterson, Brant). 1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 281; in Com. and 3°\*, 567 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 20.)
- BRAS D'OR LAKES, FISH CAUGHT AND BOUNTY PAID: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McDougall, Cape Breton) 1443 (ii).
- BRAS ST. NICHOLAS, DEEPENING OF: M. for copies of Pet.\* (Mr. Langelier) 312 (i).
- BRAVERY, DISTINCTIVE, REWARDS FOR: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2359 (iii).
- BREAKWATERS. See "MARINE" and "PUBLIC WORKS."
- BREWERS AND DISTILLERS, COMPENSATION TO: prop. Res. (Mr. Kranz) 236; Deb. (Mr. Wells) 236; (Mr. Orton) 238; (Mr. Sproule) 241; (Mr. Fisher) 242; on Amt.: (Mr. Foster) 243, 247; (Mr. Jamieson) 252; (Mr. Fairbank) 253 (i).
- BRIDGES AND TRESTLES ON C.P.R.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Edgar) 100 (i).
- Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters Act Amt. B. No. 101** (Sir Hector Langevin). 1°, 605 (i); 2° m., 893; 2°\* and in Com., 894; 3°\*, 895 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 6.)
- Bridge, Fredericton.** See "ST. JOHN RIVER BRIDGE."
- BRITISH COLUMBIA:**
- AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (iv).
- ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Gordon) 705 (i).
- BARRACK HUTS, ERECTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 479 (i).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. See "GENERAL HEADING."
- CHINESE COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 29, 211 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION. See general heading and B. 156.
- CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYÉS IN B.U.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1442 (ii).
- DEEP-WATER FISHERIES OFF COAST: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 3073 (iv).
- DISCOVERY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 479 (i).
- EASTERN BOUNDARY, COR.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Mills) 535 (i).
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 743 (i); in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv). See B. 7.
- EXPENDITURE FOR RAILWAYS IN B.C.: M. for Stmnt.\* (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FISHERIES INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 694 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 189 (i).
- INDIAN RESERVE LANDS: M. for copies of Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES REP.: Remarks (Mr. Shakespeare) 594 (i).
- METLAKATLA INDIAN TROUBLES: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Shakespeare) 304 (i).
- PENITENTIARY, SUSPENSION OF RULES: M. for Cor. (Mr. Shakespeare) 823 (ii).
- PORT MOODY AND SAVONA'S FERRY: Ques. (Mr. Homer) 146 (i).
- PORT MOODY DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 816 (ii).
- PUBLIC RESERVES AND "FORE-SHORE" RIGHTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).
- SATUMA ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 479 (i).
- RY. BELT ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. Gordon) 290 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA—Continued.**
- RY. LANDS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 831 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 743 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).
- TELEGRAPH CABLE ACROSS JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- U.S. AND VICTORIA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (iv). [See also "DOMINION LANDS," "INDIANS," &c.]
- BRITISH MEDICAL ACT AND AMTS.:** M. for copies of Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Bergin) 33 (i); Rets. respecting (remarks) 939 (ii).
- BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457; in Com., 8472 (iv).
- BROKERAGE AND COMMISSION:** in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- BROOKLYN, N.S., BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 478 (i).
- BROSSEAU & LISABELLE, CUSTOMS BROKERS, FRAUDS, &c., BY:** Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1387 (ii).
- BUCKRAM;** in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).
- BUDGET, THE:** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 76, 149, 211; Remarks (Sir Leonard Tilley) 211; (Annual Stmnt.) 313. [For Deb. see "WAYS AND MEANS."]
- Building Societies.** See "INSOLVENT BANKS."
- BUOYS IN LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S.:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS:** Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 479 (i).
- BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE, ESTABLISHMENT OF A:** Ques. (Mr. Gigault) 76 (i).
- BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, SOUNDINGS, &c.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Robertson, Hastings) 533 (i).
- BURGESS, A. M.** See "DOMINION LANDS."
- BURGLARY, &c.** See Bs. 71 and 136.
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.** See "GOVT. BUSINESS."
- BYE-ELECTIONS SINCE 1878:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 210 (i).
- CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B.C.:** Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 235 (i).
- CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE:** Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- CALGARY AND ROCKY MOUNTAINS, COST OF C. P. R. BETWEEN:** M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR, COST OF C. P. R. BETWEEN:** M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT:** M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CAMERON, Mr. D. M.:** Election sustained on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE CO., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF LIQUIDATORS, &c.:** M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Amyot) 303 (i).
- CANADA AND ANTWERP STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION:** in Com. of Sup., 2943 (iv).
- CANADA AND GERMANY STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION:** in Com. of Sup., 2945 (iv).
- CANADA AND JAMAICA CONFEDERATION:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Burpee) 505 (i).

- CANADA ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458 (iv).
- CANADA CENTRAL RY., BONUSES TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lan-  
derkin) 86 (i).
- Canada Co-operative Supply Association B.  
No. 81 (Mr. Curran). 1°\*, 349; 2°\*, 428; in Com.  
and 3°\*, 693 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 31.)
- CANADA N.W. LAND CO., STOCK INVESTED IN BY C.P.R.: M.  
for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CANADA SHIPPING CO. AND I.C.R. FREIGHT RATES: M. for  
Ret. (Mr. Blake) 144 (i).
- Canada Southern Ry. Co. and Erie and Niagara  
Ry. Co.'s B. No. 9 (Mr. Bergin). 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 57; in  
Com. 245; 3°\*, 281 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 15.)
- CANADA SOUTHERN RY. MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr.  
Wigle) 120 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 65 (Mr. Mc-  
Carthy). 1°, 235 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 67 (Mr.  
Baker, Victoria). 1°, 246 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. Towns-  
hend), 1°\*, 362 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. Jamieson).  
1°, 448; Ques. and M. to fix a day for 2°, 713 (i); 2°  
m., 949; Amt. (Mr. Ives) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109)  
954; 2° agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; in Com., 954;  
3° m., 1045; Amt. (Mr. Weldon) to recom., 1045; in  
Com., 1046; Amt. (Mr. Bourbeau) to recom., 1047; in  
Com., 1047; on M. to conc., Amt. (Mr. Burpee) 1047;  
neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr.  
Townshend) to recom., 1050; in Com., 1050; Amt.  
(Mr. Hickey) to recom., 1051; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 64)  
1054; Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to recom., 1059;  
neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062; Amt. (Mr. Macdonald, King's)  
to recom., neg., 1062; Amt. (Mr. Gigault) to recom.,  
neg., 1062; 3°, 1063 (ii); M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to  
constr. Sen. Amts., 2600; consdn. of Sen. Amts.,  
2644; (Amt.) 2645; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; (Amt.)  
2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 75,  
N. 90) 2552; Amts., 2653-2657; Amt. (Mr. Small)  
2660; neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2670; Amt. (Mr. Cameron,  
Victoria) 2674; neg., 2675 (iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 99 (Mr.  
Bourbeau). 1°, 605 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr.  
Gigault). 1°, 743 (i).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT, 1878:
- CERTIFICATES OF LIQUOR SOLD UNDER IN N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr.  
Kirk) 147 (i).
- LIQUOR CERTIFICATES GRANTED UNDER IN HALTON: M. for Ret.\*  
(Mr. McCraney) 67; PROSECUTIONS UNDER AND DRUGGISTS'  
LICENSES: Ques., 1306 (ii), 3320 (iv).
- MEMORIALS, &c., RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. Kranz) 448 (i).
- PETITIONS RESPECTING: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 533 (i).
- QUEBEC ACT, WORKING OF UNDER: M. for Cor. (Mr. Bergeron) 307 (i).
- QUES. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 363 (i).
- REVENUE DERIVED FROM SALE OF LIQUOR: M. for Stmt. (Mr.  
Rykert) 313 (i).
- SUPREME COURT CASE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 45 (i).
- VOTINGS UNDER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fisher) 121 (i).
- CANADIAN AGENT AT PARIS, APPOINTMENT OF, &c.: M. for  
Papers (Mr. Bergeron) 928 (ii).  
[See "FABRE, MR."]
- CANADIAN CONTINGENT FOR THE SOUDAN: Ques. (Mr. Blake)  
563 (i).
- CANADIAN FISHERIES: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. Mu-  
lock) 55 (i).
- C. P. R. Co's. Acts Amt. B. No. 153 (Mr. Pope). Res.  
prop., 2420 (iii); M. for Com., 2559; Amt. (Mr. Cam-  
eron, Huron) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; in Com.,  
2724; M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2858; Amt. (Mr. Cam-  
eron, Huron) 2858; Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2859;  
in Com., 2859; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Charl-  
ton) 2860; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861; Amt. (Mr. Vail)  
2861; in Com., 2862; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt.  
(Mr. Casey) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863; Amt.  
(Mr. Davies) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 2863; neg.  
(Y. 55, N. 89) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Mills) 2864; Amt.  
(Mr. Weldon) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865; Amt.  
(Mr. Watson) 2865; neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868; 1° of  
B., 2868; 2° m., 3024; 2° and in Com., 3031; 3° m.,  
3293; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (iv). (48-49 Vic.,  
c. 57.)
- Canadian Pacific Employés Relief Association  
Incorp. B. No 75 (Mr. Gault). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*,  
490 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 23.)
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. LOAN B. 153 (Mr. Pope): prop.  
Res., 2420; M. for Com. (Annual Stmt.) 2559; Deb.  
(Mr. Chapleau) 2565; (Mr. Blake) 2586; (Mr. Ives)  
2622; (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2630; Amt. 2643; (Mr.  
Charlton) 2676; (Mr. McCarthy) 2688; (Mr. Davies)  
2692; (Mr. Foster) 2702; (Mr. McMullen) 2708; (Mr.  
Ross) 2712; (Mr. Dawson) 2719; (Mr. Paterson, Brant)  
2720; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) neg. (Y. 51, N. 100)  
2723; on M. for 2° of B. (Mr. Edgar) 2024 (iii).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:
- ADVANCES TO CO. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1305 (ii).
- AGREEMENT BY CO. TO TERMS OF RES.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii).
- ALLOWANCES TO CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS: M. for copies of Cor.,  
&c. (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
- AMENDED PLANS AND PROFILES, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 362 (i).
- AMOUNTS DUE TO CONTRACTORS AND NON-PAYMENT BY CO.: M. for  
Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 533.
- AVALANCHES IN THE SELKIRK RANGE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 394 (i).
- BRANCH LINES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 694 (1).
- BRANDON TO MOOSE JAW: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).
- B. C. SECTIONS, WORK ON: M. for Rep., &c. (Mr. Blake) 204 (i).
- CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR, COST AND EQUIPMENT: M. for Stmt.  
Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CASUALTIES ON MAIN LINE AND BRANCHES: M. for Stmt. (Mr.  
Mitchell) 228 (i).
- CHANGE IN ARRANGEMENTS, COR. BETWEEN CO. AND GOVT.: Ques.  
(Mr. Blake) 695 (i), 1744, 1913, 2029 (iii).
- COMPLETION OF LINE WEST OF WINNIPEG, DATES, &c.: M. for Ret.\*  
(Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).
- CONNECTION WITH ONTARIO SYSTEM, OFFERS TO CONSTRUCT LINES: M.  
for copies\* (Mr. Mulock) 532\* (i), 1444 (ii); Ques., 569 (i).
- CONNECTION WITH QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) (iii).
- CONSTRUCTION FROM WINNIPEG TO 615 MILES WEST, COST: M. for  
Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 226.
- CONSTRUCTION NEAR LYTTON, B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 225 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION ON THE FRASER: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 204 (i).

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

- CONSTRUCTION, PORT ARTHUR AND WINNIPEG: M. for Stmtt. of sums paid to Co. (Mr. Casey) 123 (i).
- CONTRACTORS, &C., NON-PAYMENT OF BY CO.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 533 (i).
- CURVES, GRADES AND TANGENTS: M. for Ret.\* 67; Ques. (Mr. Blake) 632, 694, 744 (i), 888 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- DEBT, FLOATING AND UNSCURED: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 219 (i), 1677 (ii).
- EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 816 (i).
- EARNINGS, GROSS AND NET, AND EXPENSES: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Blake) 61 (i).
- EASTERN SECTION, ESTIMATED COST: Ms. for copies of Estimate (Mr. Edgar) 299, 300, 302 (i).
- EASTERN SECTION, WESTERN DIVISION, ESTIMATES: M. for copies (Mr. Edgar) 299 (i).
- EMPLOYÉS, NAMES OF, SALARY, FEE, &C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 56 (i).
- EMPLOYÉS RELIEF ASSOCIATION. See B. 75.
- ENGINEERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3417 (iv).
- EXPENDITURE, COST OF EQUIPMENT, SUMS PAID FOR EXTENSION, &C.\*: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Blake) 147 (i).
- EXPENDITURE TO COMPLETE GOVT. CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1130 (ii).
- EXTENSION TO QUEBEC, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1677 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- FORTY-MILE BELT IN B.C.: Memo. read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1983 (iii).
- GAPS ON, NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: Explanation (Mr. Powell) 838 (ii).
- GOVT. MORTGAGE, CHANGES IN RELATION TO: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 36 (i).
- GOVT. SECTIONS IN B. O., WORKING OF, BY CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 632 (i).
- HOMESTEADS WITHIN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 567 (i).
- IMMIGRATION TO MAN. AND N.W., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND CO. M. for copies\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 147 (i).
- INTEREST PAID TO GOVT. BY CO. ON LOANS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 350 (i), 1677 (ii), 1955 (iii).
- INTEREST, PAYMENT OF BY CO.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1677 (ii).
- LABORERS' WAGES, PAYMENT OF, ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 290 (i).
- LAND AREA IN 48-MILE BELT ACCEPTED BY CO.: Stmtt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 782 (ii).
- LAND GRANT ACCEPTED BY CO., ACRES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 568, 744 (i); Stmtt. (Sir Hector Langevin) 862.
- LAND GRANT AND LAND GRANT BONDS: Ms. for Stmtt. (Mr. Blake) 92, 100 (i).
- LANDS EJECTED BY CO. OUTSIDE RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 927 (i).
- LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 57 (i).
- LOAN: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 29 (i); payment of interest on, 1131 (ii).
- LOAN \$30,000,000, PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1130 (ii).
- LOCATION AND LANDS SET APART, &C.: M. for Maps\* (Mr. Blake) 46 (i).
- LOCATION OF LINE IN B. O.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2239 (iii).
- NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING CO., POSITION OF: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- NORTH SHORE LINE SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
- PLANS AND PROFILES, AMENDED: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 362 (i).
- PORT MOODY AND SAVONA'S FERRY, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. Homer) 146 (i).
- PORT MOODY WHARF AND FREIGHT SHED: M. for plans, &c. (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).
- POSTAL AND TRANSPORT SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1744 (iii).
- PROGRESS ESTIMATES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 235; Ques. (Mr. Blake) 188; for Feb., 429 (i).
- RAILS FOR GOVT. SECTION, B. O.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1914 (iii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Stmtts.\* (Mr. Blake) 100 (i).
- RELIEF OF CO. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 350 (i).
- RESERVE OF \$960,000 FOR EXTENSION TO QUEBEC: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. Laurier) 533 (i).

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

- RETURNS RESPECTING, NUMBER AND COST: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Hesson) 481 (i); Remarks (Mr. Blake) 782, 1565 (ii), 3371 (iv).
- ROLLING STOCK ON WESTERN DIVISION, CHANGE IN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Edgar) 302 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, PAYMENT OF DUTIES ON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 888 (ii).
- ROUNDHOUSE ON PRIVATE PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2030 (iii).
- ROUTE, ROLLING STOCK, RECEIPTS: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
- SECTION B., AWARD OF \$34,179.17 CREDITS IN PUBLIC ACCTS.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 114 (i).
- SECTION B., AWARD TO CONTRACTORS: M. for copy of Case submitted to Arbitrators (Mr. Casey) 131 (i).
- SECTION B., AWARD TO CONTRACTORS: (Mr. Casey) Ques., 78; M. for copy of Rep. of Judge Clark, 132 (i).
- SECTION B., ARBITRATION, EVIDENCE TAKEN: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 112; M. for copies, 206 (i).
- SECTION B., CASE SUBMITTED TO ARBITRATION: M. for copy (Mr. Casey) 206 (i).
- SECTION B., COPY OF CLAIM PUT IN BY CONTRACTORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 134 (i).
- SECTION B., ENGINEERS' REPORT ON RE-MEASUREMENT, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 121 (i).
- SECTION B., OPINION OF COUNSEL AS TO BINDING CHARACTER OF AWARD: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 77 (i).
- SHAREHOLDERS AND STOCK: M. for Stmtt.\* (Mr. Blake) 503 (i).
- SHORT LINE ROUTE TO MARITIME PROVINCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 33 (i).
- ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION TO QUEBEC: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. Laurier) 533 (i).
- STOCK SOLD FORMERLY PLEDGED FOR A LOAN: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (iv).
- SUBSIDY TO THE NORTH SHORE LINE: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
- SUMS PAID OR ADVANCED TO CO. AS INTEREST OR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1677 (ii).
- TARIFF RATES FOR PASSENGERS, &C., WEST OF WINNIPEG: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Watson) 964 (i).
- TERMINUS ON ATLANTIC OCEAN, SURVEYS OF SEVERAL PROPOSED LINES: M. for Reps. of Engineers (Mr. Lesage) 38 (i).
- TIMBER DUES TO GOVT. BY CO.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 479 (i).
- TOWN SITES, SALES OF: M. for Stmtt.\* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- TRAIN SERVICE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- TRESTLES AND BRIDGES: M. for Stmtt. (Mr. Edgar) 100, 105 (i).
- VAN HORNE, MR., REPORT OF: M. for copy (Mr. Blake) 208 (i).
- VERNON SMITH'S REP. OF SURVEY: M. for copies (Mr. Lesage) 294 (i).
- WESTERN TERMINUS, PLAN OF PROPOSED ROUTE: M. for copy (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- WINNIPEG TO BRANDON, &C., COMPLETION OF MAIN LINE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Watson) 964 (i).
- CANADIAN VOYAGEURS, NAMES, &C.: M. for Stmtt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 210 (i).
- CANAL FROM GRAVENHURST BAY TO RIVER SEVERN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Cockburn) 202 (i).
- CANALS. See "SUPPLY," &c.
- Canned Goods B. No. 142 (Mr. Costigan). 1°\*, 2345; 2°, 2439; in Com., 2534 (iii), 2767; 3°\*, 2767 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 63.)
- CANNED GOODS, LAW RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Gault) 57 (i).
- CAPE BRETON:
- BOUNTY PAID ON FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES: M. for Stmtt.\* (Mr. McDougall) 1443 (ii).
- CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2239 (iii); in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).
- CLAIMS UNDER TERMS OF CONFEDERATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 607 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS: Ques. (Mr. Dodd) 289 (i).

**CAPE BRETON—Continued.**

- ROACH, M., AND PILOTAGE COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3427 (iv).  
 TELEGRAPH SYSTEM ON ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 78 (i).  
 VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION AND RET. OF MEMBER, 1 (i).
- CAPE ST. IGNACE, STATION AT:** Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 246 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE RAILWAY, CONNECTION WITH:** Ques. (Mr. Davies) 2997 (iv).
- CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH RY., PAYMENT TO CONTRACTORS FOR CONSTRUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 694 (i).
- CAPITAL ACCOUNT, EXPENDITURE ON:** M. for Stmt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 45 (i).
- CARLTON, EVACUATION OF, REP.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1567 (ii).
- Carriers by Land B. No. 5 (Mr. Coughlin).** 1°\*, 29; 2° m., 102 (i).
- Carriers by Land B. No. 13 (Mr. McCarthy).** 1°\*, 40; 2° m., 254, 282; Amt. (Mr. Curran) 6 m. h., 285; neg. (Y. 64, N. 74) and 2°\*, 289 (i).
- CARON, CLOVIS, SALARY AND EXPENSES AS FISHERY OVERSEER:** Ques. (Mr. Blondeau) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,\* 532 (i).
- CARPET MATS:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (ii).
- CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS:** Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 479 (i).
- CASUALTIES ON G. T. R. AND C. P. R. AND BRANCHES:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. Mitchell) 226; on I. C. R. (Mr. Weldon) 100 (i).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN AGENCY:** M. for copy of Rep. (Mr. Holton) 1443 (ii).
- CAVALRY SCHOOLS.** See "MILITIA."
- CENSUS IN MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST:** Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 149 (i).
- Census, Man., N.W.T., &c., B. No. 21 (Mr. Pope).** 1° of B. and Res. prop., 46; M. for Com. on Res., 74; in Com. 75; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 125; Res. agreed to and 2° of B., 126; in Com., 171; considn. m. and Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to recom., 212; neg. on a div., 212; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to recom., 213; neg. (Y. 62, N. 120) 215; Amt. (Mr. Mills) to recom., 215; neg. on a div., 215; 3°\*, 215 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 3.)
- Central Bank of N.B. B. No. 40 (Mr. Temple).** 1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 180 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 939 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 11.)
- CENTRAL ONT. RY. Co's. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458; in Com., 3473 (iv).
- Central Prison of Ont. Act Amt. B. No. 129 (Sir John A. Macdonald).** 1°\*, 1226 (ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°\* 2402 (iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 79.)
- CERTIFICATES OF LIQUOR GRANTED IN CO. OF HALTON:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McCraney) 67 (i).
- CHAINS, IRON OR STEEL:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- CHANGE OF NAMES IN N.W.T.:** Ques. (Mr. Tassé) 2359 (iii).
- CHAPLEAU, SHERIFF, COMMUNICATIONS FROM, re OUTBREAK:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- CHARLINCH POST OFFICE, APPOINTMENT OR REMOVAL OF POSTMASTER, &c.:** M. for Papers (Mr. Blake) 708 (i).
- CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 2359 (iii).
- CHENEVERT, J. A., EMPLOYMENT OF BY PUB. WORKS DEPT.:** Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 429 (i).
- CHEBRIER, GEO. E., INDIAN AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA, DISMISSAL OF:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Holton) 1443 (ii).
- CHINA AND PORCELAIN WARE:** in Com. on Ways and Means 847 (ii).
- CHINESE COMMISSIONERS' REP.:** Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 29, 211; presented (Mr. Chapleau) 234 (i).
- CHINESE COMMISSION, ROOMS RENTED AND PAYMENT OF SECRETARY:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 567 (i).
- CHINESE COMMISSION:** M. for copy of Commission, Names of Commissioners, salary, &c. (Mr. McMullen) 56 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 505, 632 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION:** Deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. Chapleau) 3002; (Mr. Shakespeare) 3011; (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 3013; (Mr. Gordon) 3022; (Mr. Homer) 3022 (iv).
- Chinese Immigration Restriction B. No. 124 (Mr. Chapleau).** 1°, 1037 (ii); withdn., 3023 (iv).
- Chinese Immigration Restriction B. No. 156 (Mr. Chapleau).** Res. (Chinese Interpreter) prop., 2421 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3023; prop. Res. (Poll Tax, &c.) 2497; M. for Com. on Res., 3002; in Com., 3023; 1°\* of B., 3323; 2° and in Com., 3050; 3°, 3075 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 71.)
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. No. 31 (Mr. Chapleau).** 1°, 101; Res. prop., 210; Res. (Letter Carriers) in Com., 270; Res. (C. S. Examiners, &c.) in Com., 273, 281 (i); conc. m., 889; conc. in, 892; 2° of B. m., 1095; 2° and in Com., 1097-1130, 1281; 3° m., 1282; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3 m. h., 1282; neg. (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286; Amt. (Mr. Casey) to recom., 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; Amt. (Mr. Blake) to recom., 1294; neg. (Y. 58, N. 104) 1296; Amt. (Mr. Davies) to recom., 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1301; Amt. (Mr. Lister) to recom., neg. on same div., 1303; Amt. (Mr. Mulock) to recom., 1303; neg. on same div., 1304; 3° on a div., 1304 (ii); M. to conc. in Senate Amts., 1823, 2396 (iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 46.)
- CIVIL SERVICE VOLUNTEERS:** Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 3053 (iv).
- CHOLERA, PRECAUTIONS AGAINST:** Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 568 (i).
- CHURCH POINT AND TROUT COVE PIERS, ENGINEERS REP.:** M. for copy (Mr. Vail) 54 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMT. B.:** Ques. (Mr. Casey) 28 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYÉS IN B.C., NAMES, &c.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1442 (ii).
- CLAIMS OF CONTRACTORS OF SEC. B.** See "C. P. R."
- CLAIMS, &c., OF HALF-BREEDS (Mr. Blake).** See "HALF-BREEDS."
- CLAIM OF STAFF COMMANDER BOLTON.** See "BOLTON"
- CLAIMS OF MAN.:** Mess. from His Ex., 202 (i). See B. 155.
- CLARK, G. M. K. (JUDGE) SUMS PAID TO FROM 1879 TO '84:** M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 697; Ques., 235 (i).
- CLARK, JUDGE, REP. re AWARD SEC. B.** See "C.P.R."
- CLARKE'S CROSSING, ARRIVAL OF TROOPS AT:** Telegrams read (Mr. Caron) 1205 (ii).

- CLEARING VESSELS WITHOUT HARBOR MASTER'S CERTIFICATE:** Ques. (Mr. *Paint*) 862 (ii).
- CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY:** Lists of Vacancies; Writs issued, and New Members returned, 1, 113 (i); 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).
- CLERKS OF WORKS.** See "PUBLIC WORKS."
- CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS:** in Com. of Sup., 2906 (iv).
- CLOVER POINT, B.C., TELEGRAPH CABLE:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii);
- COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE, FREE, OR FOR EXPORTATION:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 100 (i).
- COAL, SPRING HILL MINES:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 533 (i).
- COAL LANDS, SALES AND LEASES:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i). See "DOMINION LANDS."
- COAL, PURCHASE OF FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, QUANTITY AND VALUE:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 313 (i).
- COAL, TENDERS TO SUPPLY FOG-WHISTLES, &c., IN BAY OF FUNDY:** M. for copies (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- COFFIN'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, PROTECTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1915 (iii).
- COLLINS, J. E., SUMS PAID TO FOR SERVICES:** M. for Ret., (Mr. *McMullen*) 699 (i).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. No. 126** (Mr. *Pope*). Res. prop., 451 (i); in Com., 892; Res. conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1064 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2399 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- COLONIZATION Co.'s MODIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2241 (iii).
- COLORED LABELS FOR FRUIT:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor B. No. 117** (Sir *Leonard Tilley*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 832; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1671; Order dschgd. and B. ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1677 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2396 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH JAMAICA:** Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2854 (iv).
- COMMITTEES:**
- BANKRUPTCY:** M. for Sp. Com. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 47; Mess. from His Ex. referred to Com., 102 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.:** M. for Com. to supervise, 28 (i).
- LIBRARY:** M. for Joint Com. of both Houses, 36 (i).
- SELECT STANDING:** M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare lists, 27; Lists presented, 30; conc. in, 32; Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- COMMISSIONERS ON CHINESE DIFFICULTY IN B. C.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i). See "CHINESE."
- COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND.** See "HIGH COMMISSIONER."
- COMMISSION, I. C. R.** See "ROBERTSON, J. D."
- COMMISSION ON HALF-BREED CLAIMS.** See "HALF-BREEDS."
- COMMONS.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- COMMUNICATION WITH IMP. GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).
- COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. (Str. *Lansdowne*):** in Com. of Sup., 927.
- COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES:** Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 3321 (iv).
- COMPANIES:**
- AMHERST AND P. E. I. RY. Co.'s B.:** M. to introd. (Mr. *Townshend*) 349 (i).
- BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RY. Co.** See B. 59.
- CALGARY, EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING RY. Co.** See B. 73.
- COMPANIES—Continued.**
- CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE Co.'s LIQUIDATION:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
- CANADA Co-OPERATIVE SUPPLY ASSOCIATION.** See B. 81.
- CANADA SOUTHERN RY. Co., &c.** See B. 9.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC EMPLOYEES RELIEF ASSOCIATION.** See B. 75.
- COLONIZATION Co.'s AGREEMENTS, PETITIONS, &c.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i); Ques., 1678 (ii), 2241 (iii).
- DOMINION GRANGE MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION.** See B. 55.
- DOMINION DRAINAGE Co.** See B. 28.
- ERIE AND NIAGARA RY. Co.** See B. 9.
- FORT MACLEOD RANCHE TELEGRAPH Co.** See B. 80.
- FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE Co.** See B. 50.
- GREAT WESTERN AND LAKE ONT. SHORE JUNCTION RY. Co.** See B. 38.
- HALIFAX STEAM NAV. Co., MONEYS PAID TO:** M. for copies of Repts, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HAMILTON, GUELPH AND BUFFALO RY. Co.** See B. 77.
- HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.** See B. 114.
- HURON AND ONT. SHIP CANAL Co.** See B. 69.
- INSURANCE Co.'s, LOAN Co.'s AND BUILDING SOCIETIES.** See B. 66.
- INTERNATIONAL COAL Co.** See B. 51.
- INTERNATIONAL FERRIES.** See B. 17.
- KOOTENAY RY. Co. OF B.C.** See B. 83.
- LAKE ERIE, ESSEX AND DETROIT RIVER RY. Co.** See B. 24.
- LONDON LIFE INSURANCE Co.** See B. 76.
- MANITOBA CENTRAL RY. Co.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 863 (ii).
- MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. Co. OF CANADA.** See Bs. 74 and 147.
- ONT. PACIFIC RY. Co.** See B. 72.
- PORT CREDIT HARBOR Co., REPORTS MADE TO GOVT.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 124 (i).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND LAKE OF THE WOODS RY. AND NAV. Co.** See B. 63.
- QU'APPELLE AND LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND STMBT. Co.** See B. 147.
- RICHELIEU AND ONT. NAVIGATION Co.** See B. 61.
- RIVER ST. CLAIR RY., BRIDGE AND TUNNEL Co.** See B. 8.
- ROCK LAKE, SOURIS AND BRANDON RY. Co.** See B. 110.
- ROYAL CANADIAN INSURANCE Co.** See B. 43.
- RUSH LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND NAV. Co.** See B. 79.
- SAULT STE. MARIE BRIDGE Co.** See B. 52.
- SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY RY. Co.** See B. 37.
- WEST ONT. PACIFIC RY. Co.** See B. 94.
- WINNIPEG AND PRINCE ALBERT RY. Co.** See Bs. 82 and 91.
- WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. Co.** See B. 23.
- [See Bs. 147, 158 and 164.]
- CONALLY, CAPT.** See "DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE."
- CONCURRENCE.** See "SUPPLY."
- CONSOLIDATED FIVE PER CENT. LOAN:** M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE:** M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- Congregational Missionary Societies' Confirmation B. No. 54** (Mr. *Abbott*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 259; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 2421; M. for Com. on Res., 2526; in Com., 2528; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 2529; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2935; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2536 (iii); in Com., 2968; 3<sup>o</sup>, 3002; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3435 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- Consolid. Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 20** (Sir *Leonard Tilley*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 46; 2<sup>o</sup>, 126 (i); in Com., 2430; Order for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2532; deb. adjd., 2533 (iii); ref. back to Com., 2768; 3<sup>o</sup>, 2770 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- Consolid. Militia Act Amt. B. No. 152** (Mr. *Caron*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 2853; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3045; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 3046; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

- Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 30** (Mr. *Wells*). 1°, 101 (i).
- Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 35** (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°\*, 113 (i).
- Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 111** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 742, (i).
- CONSOLID. OF THE STATUTES, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
- CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CAN. TEMP. ACT. See "LUGHRIN."
- CONTRACTS FOR PRINTING SINCE 1867: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Ryhert*) 246 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.: in Com. of Sup., 914, 916, 921, 923, 925, 927 (ii).
- Controverted Elections Acts Amt. Bill No. 98** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 605 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS. See "ELECTIONS" and respective Districts; also "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- COPYRIGHT, LAW OF: prop. Res. respecting (Mr. *Edgar*) 708 (i).
- CORRESPONDENTS DISMISSED FROM CAMP. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W."
- CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
- CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2997 (iv).
- CORPUS CHRISTI, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2301 (iii).
- COSTE, LOUIS AND EUGÈNE, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1131 (ii)
- COTTON BED-QUILTS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- COTTON YARNS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 3075 (iv).
- County Court Judge, Man., Salary Provision B. No. 162** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 3395; in Com. on Res., 3435; 1°\* of B, 3436; 2°\* in Com. and 3°\*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- Court of Claims for Canada B. No. 93** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 449 (i); prop. Res., 777 (ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2439 (iii).
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. No. 12** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 40 (i).
- Cox, Geo. Branford, Relief B. No. 138** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1° on a div., 1473; 2° on a div., 1566; in Com. and 3°, on a div., 1723 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 57** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 170 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Assault and Battery) B. No. 42** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°\*, 125; 2°m., 218; deb. adjd., 219 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Burglary, &c.) B. No. 71** (Mr. *Robinson, Hastings*). 1°, 270 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Burglary, &c) B. No. 136** (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*). 1°, 1335 (ii).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Disorderly Houses) B. No. 56** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 170 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Law of Evidence) B. No. 6** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 29; 2° m., 176; consdn. resmd., 180; Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 6 m. h., 182; neg. (Y. 55, N. 87) 187; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496; Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) to recom., neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504; 3°\*, 616 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Seduction, &c.) B. No. 123** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1037 (ii); 2° and in Com., 2767; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767; 3°\*, 2768 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- Criminal Law Amt. (Seduction, &c.) B. No. 27** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 76; 2° m., 619 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Summary Convictions) B. No. 41** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 125; 2°, 892 (ii).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Summary Proceedings) B. No. 128** (Mr. *Small*). 1°\*, 1130 (ii); Order for 2° transferred to Govt. Orders, 2420 (iii); 2° m., 2827; 2° and in Com., 2829 (iv).
- Criminal Law Amt. (unguarded Holes in the Ice) B. No. 22** (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 57; 2°, 131; in Com., 150; Order dschgd. and ref. to Sel. Com., 496 (i).
- CRIMINAL LAWS OF CANADA, 1869-1871, PUBLICATION OF IN FRENCH: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 246 (i).
- CRIMINAL LIBEL. "See SAUNDERS AND WOOD."
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).
- CRITICISMS OF PRESS AS TO CAUSE OF DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTH-WEST, AND SLUR UPON FRENCH MEMBERS COMMANDING BATTALIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 887 (ii)
- CROZIER, SUPT., REP. OF *re* INDIAN SYMPATHY WITH HALF-BREEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. No. 47** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°\*, 147 (i).
- CULLERS, SUPERVISOR OF. See "SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS."
- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. No. 154** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 2419; M. for Com. on Res., 2475 (iii); 1°, 2° and in Com., 3043; 3°\*, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- CUMBERLAND: Vacancy in the Representation, Warrant issued and Return of Member to represent, 1 (i).
- Customs and Excise Duties Acts Amt. B. No. 157** (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 3250; 2°\*, 3434; in Com. and 3°\*, 3435 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c 61.)
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:
- ANIMAL CHARCOAL, IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Stairs*) 533 (i).
- APPRAISER AND INLAND REV. COLLECTOR AT SUMMERBIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- BERT-ROOT SUGAR, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 744 (i).
- BONDED MACHINERY IN USE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3320 (iv).
- BROUSSEAU & LISABELLE, FRAUDS BY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).
- COLLECTIONS IN ALGOMA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 39 (i).
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES. See B. 157.
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE RECEIPTS FOR JUNE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3073 (iv).
- DETECTIVES OR POLICE IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 889 (ii).
- DRAWBACKS ON MANUFACTURED EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
- DUTIES, COLLECTION OF UNAUTHORISED: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 427 (i).
- DUTIES, IMPOSITION OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).
- DUTY ON GRAIN, ABOLITION OF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).

**CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.**

EXCISE DUTIES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 3394; conc., 3470 (iv).  
 EXCISE REVENUE FOR 6 MONTHS, 1884-85: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 290 (i).  
 EXCISE REVENUE FOR MAY, 1884 AND 1885: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2531 (iii).  
 EXPORT DUTY ON OAK, PINE, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).  
 FINES EXACTED, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).  
 FLOUR AND CORNMEAL, INCREASED DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 148 (i).  
 FLOUR, CORN, &c., IMPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 56 (i).  
 FRENCH CANADIAN EMPLOYÉS IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1914; (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).  
 IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).  
 MACKENZIE, J. L., VIOLATION OF CUSTOMS LAWS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).  
 MACKINLEY, A. & W., SCHOOL BOOKS ENTERED UNDER VALUE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).  
 MONTREAL, SEIZURES AT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).  
 PORT MULGRAVE AS A SUB-PORT: M. for Papers (Mr. *Kirk*) 2750 (iv).  
 PRISON MANUFACTURES, IMPORTATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2169 (iii).  
 RAILS, IMPORTATION OF BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1566 (ii).  
 RICE, INCREASED DUTIES ON: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 695 (i).  
 RICHIBUCTO AND KINGSTON PORTS, CUSTOMS BUSINESS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1442 (ii).  
 RIDGETOWN AS A PORT OF ENTRY, PETS., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Casey*) 532 (ii).  
 SCHOOL BOOKS CONSIGNED BY NELSON & SON: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Wallace*) 1443 (ii).  
 SEIZURES AT N.S. PORTS OF ENTRY: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Stairs*) 532 (i).  
 SPIRITS TAKEN OUT OF BOND: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3371; Stmt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 3395 (iv).  
 ST. CROIX COTTON MILLS, PAYMENT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 632 (i).  
 TORONTO, SEIZURE OF SCHOOL BOOKS AT: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).  
 WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES, MEMORIALS: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).  
 WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 138 (i).  
 WHEAT, FLOUR, CORNMEAL AND CORN, DUTIES IN N.S.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).  
 WINES, SPIRITS, ALE, &c., IMPORTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 313 (i).  
 WINNIPEG, SEIZURES AT: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 293 (i); M. for Ret.\* 1443 (ii).  
 [See "WAYS AND MEANS."]  
 CUTLERY: in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (ii).  
 DAMASK OF COTTON: in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (ii);  
 DAMS AT LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1130 (ii).  
**Davis, Amanda Esther, Relief B. No. 84** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1° on a div., 226; M. to fix day for 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 226; 2° on a div., 567; in Com. and 3°\*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 37.*)  
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 28; First Rep. presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 32; M. to conc. in Second Rep., 40; Delay in distributing Daily Issue to Newspapers, 595; Delay in distributing French Translation, 746 (ii); Ms. to conc. in Third Rep., 2168 (iii), 3359; Omissions from, 3249, 3474; M. to conc. in Fourth Rep., 3458; in Com. of Sup., 2765, conc., 3372 (iv).  
 DEBT OF THE DOMINION. See "CAPITAL ACCOUNT."

DEBT OF CANADA, FLOATING AND UNFUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).  
 DEBT, FLOATING AND UNSECURED, OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 219 (i), 1677 (ii).  
 DEBT OF NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING CO. TO C.P.R.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145.  
 DE CHENE, CAPT. A. M., ENQUIRY RESPECTING: M. for copies of Complaint\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).  
 DEEPENING OF BRAS ST. NICHOLAS: M. for copies of Pets., (Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).  
 DEEP-WATER FISHERIES OFF COAST OF B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 3073 (iv).  
 DELANEY, GOWANLOCK AND OTHER PRISONERS, RESCUE OF: Telegram from Gen. Middleton (read) 2357 (iii).  
 DEPTL. CLERKS, DELAY IN PAYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).  
 DEPTL. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 914-927 (ii).  
 DEPOSITS, GOVT. See "BANKS AND BANKING."  
 DEPUTY SPEAKER: M. appointing Malachy Daly, Esq., (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 72 (i); SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3353 (iv). See B. 26.  
 DESAULNIERS, MR. A. L.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).  
 DESPATCHES, OFFICIAL, RESPECTING ENGAGEMENTS IN THE N.W., 2169, 2199 (iii).  
 DESPATCHES. See "MIDDLETON, GENL."  
 DETECTIVES, CUSTOMS, IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 889 (ii).  
 DEWDNEY, LIEUT.-GOV., COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).  
 DIGBY PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).  
 DINGMAN, M. A. See "INDIANS."  
 DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 52 (i).  
 DISCOVERY ISLAND, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE ON: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).  
**Disorderly Houses, B. No. 56** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°\*, 170 (i).  
 DISPUTE, BETWEEN MR. TILTON AND STAFF COMMANDER BOLTON: M. for Rep. of Auditor Genl. (Mr. *McMullen*) 135; M. for Ret.\* 312 (i).  
 DISPUTED BOUNDARIES OF ONT., IMPERIAL LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 51, 115 (i); 2854, 2998, 3321; on M. for Com. of Sup., 3437 (iv).  
 DISPUTED TER., INDIAN TITLE TO, INFORMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 594 (i).  
 DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.:  
 ANDRÉ FATHER, LETTER FROM, IN JAN., 1883: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).  
 ARMS, DESCRIPTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 814 (ii).  
 ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES OF MILITIAMEN: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 894 (ii).  
 ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 2854 (iv).  
 BATOCHÉ, CAPTURE OF, RUMORED INDIGNITIES COMMITTED BY VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Mr. *Desjardins*) 2998; Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 3425 (iv).  
 BATOCHÉ, ENGAGEMENT AT, DESPATCH RESPECTING: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1380 (ii).

## DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.—Continued.

- BATTLE OF BATOCHÉ, TELEGRAM FROM GENL. MIDDLETON, GIVING DETAILS: Read (Mr. Caron) 1822; second despatch, 1835 (iii).
- BIG BEAR, RELEASE OF PRISONERS BY: Tel. read (Mr. Caron) 2750 (iv).
- CARRIAGE OF WAR SUPPLIES BY AMERICAN RAILWAYS, 839 (ii).
- CHAPLEAU, SHERIFF, COMMUNICATIONS FROM, *re* OUTBREAK: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- CIVIL SERVICE VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Mr. Edgar) 3043 (iv).
- CLARKE'S CROSSING, ARRIVAL OF TROOPS AT: Telegrams read (Mr. Caron) 1205 (ii).
- COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. Ross) 3321 (iv).
- CORRESPONDENTS, DISMISSAL OF FROM CAMP: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1608 (ii).
- COST OF EXPEDITION: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1678 (ii).
- CROWFOOT, COMMUNICATION FROM: Read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1038 (ii).
- CROZIER, SUPT., REP. OF, *re* INDIAN SYMPATHY WITH HALF-BREEDS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DEWDNEY, GOV. COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DUMAS, MICHEL, APPOINTMENT OF AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DUMONT, GABRIEL: EXTRADITION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2358; FERRY LICENSE GRANTED TO: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DUCK LAKE, ENGAGEMENT AT: Telegram read and Despatch of Troops, 790 (ii).
- DUCK LAKE, REP. OF FIGHT AT: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 1743 (iii).
- EXPENSES. *See* B. 149.
- FORT PITT, DISASTER AT: Confirmation of News (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1281: Tel., 1301 (ii).
- FREE TRANSPORT OF BODIES OF VOLUNTEERS KILLED: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2029 (iii).
- FROG LAKE, MASSACRE AT: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 994 (ii).
- FUNERAL EXPENSES OF ACHILLE BLAIS: Ques. (Mr. Langlier) 2169 (iii).
- GATLING GUNS FOR USE OF TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Hastings) 813 (ii).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS IN THE N.W., COMMUNICATIONS WITH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- GRANDIN, BISHOP, COMMUNICATION FROM: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3321, 3423 (iv).
- HALF-BREED COMMISSION: Letter read from Mr. Street (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1607; work of (remarks) 1566 (ii).
- HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION IN 1884: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- IMP. GOVT., COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1744 (iii).
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS IN THE FIELD: Prop. M. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 812 (ii).
- INDIANS AT FT. QU'APPELLE, LOYALTY OF: Telegram read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1320 (ii).
- INDIANS AT TOUCHWOOD: Telegram read (Mr. Caron) 1566 (ii).
- INSURGENTS, DISPOSITION OF, BY GENL. MIDDLETON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2169 (iii).
- ISBSTER, JAMES, APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- LEDUC, FATHER, AND MR. MALONEY, COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- LUXURIES FOR THE VOLUNTEERS, FORWARDING OF: Remarks, 968 (ii).
- MEMORIALS, &C., RESPECTING GRIEVANCES, ANSWERS TO: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- MIDDLETON, GENL., INSTRUCTIONS ISSUED TO, RESPECTING INSURGENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2169 (iii). *See* "MIDDLETON" FOR DESPATCHES.
- MONTREAL GARRISON ARTILLERY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1566 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE OFFICERS, REPS. FROM OF ENGAGEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, RES. *re* HALF-BREED CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- OFFICIAL DESPATCHES RESPECTING ENGAGEMENTS, 2169 (iii), 2999 (iv).
- PRINCE ALBERT AND ST. LAURENT SETTLEMENTS, REPS. OF MESSRS. RUSSELL AND ALDOUS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- PRINCE ALBERT COLONIZATION CO.'S LAND, SETTLERS AND SQUATTERS IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).

## DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.—Continued.

- ORGANIZATION OF COMPANIES IN THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1474; Remarks (Mr. Watson) 816 (ii).
- OTTER'S, COL., MARCH TO BATTLEFORD: Remarks (Mr. Caron) 1386 (ii).
- QUIMET'S, COL., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Remarks (Mr. Caron) 1167, 1205 (ii).
- PILLAGE OF HOUSES OF HALF-BREEDS BY VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. Langlier) 2169 (iii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. Caron) 966; Remarks, 968 (ii).
- PETITIONS AND RES., &C., HALF-BREEDS AND SETTLERS CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- POUNDMAKER AND OTHER INDIANS, DESPATCH FROM GENL. MIDDLETON ANNOUNCING CAPTURE: Read (Mr. Caron) 2139 (iii).
- POUNDMAKER, SKIRMISH WITH: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1646; Telegram from Herchmer: Read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1649 (ii).
- PRISONERS, SURRENDER OF, BY POUNDMAKER: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2065 (iii).
- PRISONERS HELD FOR TRIAL: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3443 (iv).
- QU'APPELLE HALF-BREEDS, REP. OF MR. WALSH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- RAID ON HOUSES AT BATTLEFORD: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 889 (ii).
- RELIEF OF DESTITUTE FAMILIES (remarks) 3321.
- RELIGIOUS RITES REFUSED PRISONERS: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 2998 (iv).
- RESCUE OF MRS. DELANEY, GOWANLOCK AND OTHER PRISONERS: Telegram from Genl. Middleton read (Mr. Caron) 2357 (iii).
- REWARDS FOR BRAVERY: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2359 (iii).
- RIEL, CAPTURE OF, TELEGRAM FROM GENERAL MIDDLETON: Read (Mr. Caron) 1895 (vol. iii).
- RIEL'S PROPOSAL TO ACCEPT MONEY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- RIEL, TRIAL OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2358 (iii).
- RIVER LOT CLAIMS, SETTLEMENT OF, MR. PEARCE'S LETTER RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- ST. LAURENT, LAND AND SURVEYS OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- ST. LOUIS DE LANGEVIN, PRT. FROM SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- SCHMIDT, ANSWER TO LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- SCOTT'S, COL., BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 1064 (ii).
- STONE INDIAN RISING: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 863 (ii).
- SURVEYS OF RIVER LOTS AT ST. ALBERT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424; mode of (Ques.) 3424 (iv).
- TACHÉ, ARCHBISHOP, COMMUNICATION FROM *re* HALF-BREEDS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- TRIAL OF PRISONERS: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3440 (iv).
- TROOPS, MOVEMENTS OF, 838, 872, 887; Telegram from Col. AMYOT, 1328 (ii).
- VÉGREVILLE, FATHER, COB. WITH MR. DEVILLE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- VICTORIA RIFLES, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 1983 (iii).
- VOLUNTEERS, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2029, 2170 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3370 (iv).
- VOTE OF THANKS TO GENL. MIDDLETON AND VOLUNTEERS: (Mr. Caron) 3459; Res., 3463 (iv).
- WANT OF CONFIDENCE RES. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
- WAR SUPPLIES, CARRIAGE OF, BY AMERICAN RAILWAYS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 836 (ii).
- WILLIAMS, COL., DEATH OF: Remarks (Mr. Caron) and Tel. read from Genl. Middleton, 3073 (iv).

[*See* "HALF-BREEDS," "DOMINION LANDS," &C.]

## DIVISIONS:

- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE N.W.T. B. 141 (Sir John A. Macdonald): on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; on M. for consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Mills) neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3000; neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (iv).
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS, &C. B. 143 (Mr. Costigan): on M. to conc. in Amts. from Com. of W., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751 (iv).

DIVISIONS—Continued.

ANIMALS, INFECTIOUS, &c., DISEASES AFFECTING B. 44 (Mr. Pope): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amts. to recom. (Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; (Mr. Mulock) 1324; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327; (Mr. Catudal) 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328; (Mr. Casey) 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332; (Mr. Armstrong) 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; (Mr. Davies) neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334 (ii).

BREWERS AND DISTILLERS, COMPENSATION TO: Prop. Res. (Mr. Kranz) 236; Amt. (Mr. Fisher) agreed to (Y. 105, N. 74) 253 (i).

CANADA TEMP. ACT, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Jamieson): on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (Mr. Ives) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; on M. to conc. in Amts. from Com., Amt. (Mr. Burpee) 1047; neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amts. to recom. (Mr. Hickey) 1051; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 64) 1054; (Mr. White, Cardwell) 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062 (ii); on consdn. of Sen. Amts., Amt. (Mr. Jamieson) 2645; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; Amt., 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2552; Amt. (Mr. Small) 2660; neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2670 (iv).

O. P. R. CO.'S ACTS AMT. B. 153 (Mr. Pope): on M. for Com. on Res., Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 160) 2723; on M. to rec. Rep. of Com. on Res., Amts. (Mr. Charlton) 2860; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861 (Mr. Casey) 2862; neg. (Y. 55) N. 91) 2863; (Mr. Laurier) 2863; neg. Y. 55, N. 89) 2864; (Mr. Weldon) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865; (Mr. Watson) 2865; neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868; 3<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (iv).

O. P. R. TRESTLES AND BRIDGES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Edgar) 100; Amt. (Mr. McLellan) agreed to (Y. 101, N. 54) 112 (i).

CENSUS OF MAN., N.W.T., &c., B. 21 (Mr. Pope): on consdn. of B., Amt. to recom. (Sir Richard Cartwright), 213; neg. (Y. 62, N. 120) 215 (i).

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE'S RULING: Appeal (Mr. Edgar) from decision to House; Ruling sustained (Y. 76, N. 46) 1513 (ii); (Mr. Cameron, Huron) Ruling sustained (Y. 67, N. 41) 1924 (iii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMT. B. 31 (Mr. Chapleau): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. 3 m.h. (Mr. Mitchell) 1282; neg. (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286; Amts. to recom. (Mr. Casey) 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; (Mr. Blake) 1294; neg. (Y. 58, N. 104) 1296; (Mr. Davies) 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1301; (Messrs. Lister and Mulock) 1303; neg. on same div. (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (LAW OF EVIDENCE) B. 6 (Mr. Cameron, Huron): on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Tupper) 182; neg. (Y. 55, N. 87) 187; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. to recom. (Mr. Amyot) neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504 (i).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON) B. 123 (Sir John A. Macdonald): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (Mr. Charlton) raising age of consent in girls, neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767 (iv).

DAVIS, AMANDA ESTHER, RELIEF B. 84 (Mr. White, Cardwell): M. to fix day for 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 226 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REPS.: on M. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to conc. in Third Rep., Amt. (Mr. Tassé) 3685; neg. (Y. 18, N. 127) 3369; Amt. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 3361; neg. (Y. 63, N. 82) 3369; Amt. (Mr. Hickey) neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 3370 (iv).

EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. ADVANCES TO: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) censuring Govt., 363; neg. (Y. 59, N. 118) 394 (i).

FACTORIES REGULATION, &c., OF LABOR B. 85 (Mr. Bergin): on M. to same. adjd. deb., Amt. to substitute B. 92 (Can. Temp. Act) 940; agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (ii).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, Amt (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1137; neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) 1166; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 111, N. 63) 1277; on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Charlton) neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) 3053; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058; (Mr. Weldon) 3058; neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060; (Mr. Watson) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. Mulock) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062; Amts. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; (Mr. Burpee) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063; (Mr. Trow) 3063; neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064; (Mr. Armstrong) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064; (Mr. Somerville, Brant) neg.

DIVISIONS—Continued.

(Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; (Messrs. McCraney and Innes) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; (Messrs. Cameron [Middlesex] and Langelier) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; (Messrs. Lister and Cameron, Huron) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3067; (Messrs. Weldon and Fairbank) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; (Messrs. Paterson [Brant] and Gillmor) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3069; (Messrs. Holton and Fisher) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. 3 m. h. (Mr. Mills) 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072 (iv).

HALF-BREED GRIEVANCES: Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 756; (Y. 57, N. 122) 771 (i); Res. (Mr. Blake) censuring Govt., 3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213 (iv).

HATZFELD, GEO. LOUIS EMIL, DIVORCE B. 107 (Mr. Kilvert): 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO RYS. B. 147 (Sir Hector Langevin) on Order for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amts. (Mr. Blake) 2890; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; further Amts. (Mr. Blake) neg. on same div., 2894 (iv).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT B. 139 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (Mr. Laurier) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65) 2763; 3<sup>o</sup> on same div. reversed, 2763 (iv).

PATENT ACT, 1872, AMT. B. 25 (Mr. White, Renfrew) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 266; neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (i).

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2868; neg. (Y. 42, N. 79) 2889 (iv).

REPRESENTATION OF THE N. W. T. IN PARLT.: Res. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404; neg. (Y. 35, N. 77) 3408 (iv).

SHORT LINE RY., MONTREAL TO ATLANTIC: Prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) 189; M. to adjd. deb. agreed to (Y. 104, N. 49) 200 (i).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY, APPOINTMENT B. 26 (Sir John A. Macdonald): on Prop. Res., Amt. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. Blake) 70; neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72 (i).

SUBSIDIES, FURTHER, TO RYS. B. 158 (Sir Hector Langevin): on M. to conc. in Amts. from Com. of W., Amts. (Mr. Kirk) 3401; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403; (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79) 3404; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 3057; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. Langelier) 3266; neg. (Y. 39, N. 101) 3292; (Mr. Leage) 3292; neg. (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292; Amt. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 2292 (iv).

SUPREME COURT APPELLATE JURISDICTION LIMITATION B. 3 (Mr. Landry, Montmagny): 2<sup>o</sup> m., 151; neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (i).

WASHINGTON TREATY AND RECIPROCITY: Res. (Mr. Davies) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 995; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1023 (ii).

DIVORCE:

COURT, CREATION OF A: Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 77 (i).

COX, GEORGE BRANFORD. See B. No. 142.

DAVIS, AMANDA ESTHER. See B. No. 84.

EVANS, ALICE ELVIRA. See B. No. 106.

EVIDENCE IN CASES: Remarks (Mr. Jackson) 428 (i).

HATZFELD, GEORGE LOUIS EMIL. See B. No. 107.

TERRY, FAIRY EMILY JANE. See B. No. 97.

DODGE, BRENTON, OF KENTVILLE, N.S., DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Moffat) 1442 (ii).

DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL FRANCHISES, DESPATCH FROM MR. FIELDING: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2170 (iii).

"DOMINION ANNUAL REGISTER," PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. McCraney) 1443 (ii).

DOMINION BUILDINGS IN CHARLOTTETOWN, CONSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 1039 (ii).

DOMINION DAY, SITTING OF THE HOUSE ON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2773 (iv).

Dominion Drainage Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. Haggart). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 88; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 113 (i); M. for Com., 1007; deb. adjd., 1008; M. for Com., 1386 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3053 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 95.)

DOMINION EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (ii).

**Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association B. No. 55** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 246 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1210 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

#### DOMINION LANDS:

AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).

AGRICULTURAL, TIMBER, PASTURE AND MINERAL LANDS AND TOWN SITES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

BELL & KAVANAGH LAND CLAIMS: M. for copies of O. C. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 479 (i).

COAL LANDS, SALES AND LEASES: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

DUMONT'S LOT ON THE SASKATCHEWAN: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii).  
FORESTS, PROTECTION OF, J. H. MORGAN'S REP.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).

FRAUDS, &c., IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915, 2170 (iii).

FRAUDS AND IRREGULARITIES IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915, 2170 (iii).

GRAZING LAND LEASES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

HOMESTEADS WITHIN RT. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 479 (i).

INDIAN LANDS ACQUIRED BY GOVT. IN ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 632 (i).

INDIAN LANDS SOLD IN VIGOR AGENCY: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).

INDIAN LANDS UNSOLD IN CO. OF PEEL: M. for List (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).

INDIAN LANDS UNSOLD IN TP. OF TORONTO: M. for List\* (Mr. *Fleming*) 147 (i).

INDIAN LANDS UNSOLD IN TRAFALGAR: M. for List\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).

INDIAN RESERVES IN B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 703 (i);  
Purchase of by Govt.: M. for copies of Cor., &c.,\* 1443 (ii).

ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE, LEASE OF, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 147 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 92. See B. 147.

LANDS IN RY. BELT, B.C., AND HOMESTEAD ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 289 (i).

LAND SALES, RECEIPTS ON ACCOUNT OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2854 (iv).

LAND SALES, &c., SOUTH OF 24-MILE BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2530 (iii).

LANDS SOLD OR LEASED FOR TIMBER, LOGS, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 40 (i).

MINING AND TIMBER LANDS NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).

MORGAN, J. H., APPOINTMENT AS FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: M. for O.C., &c.\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).

PATENTS ISSUED TO SETTLERS IN PRINCE ALBERT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 964 (ii).

PLANS AND SURVEYS OF ST. LAURENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).

PRINCE ALBERT COLON. CO.'S TOWNSHIP SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).

PRINCE ALBERT, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii), 2358 (iv).

QU'APPELLE VALLEY FARMING CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).

RY. LANDS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443.

REVENUE FOR SEVEN MONTHS, 1894-95: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 290 (i).

RICHELIEU COUNTY, DOM. PROPERTIES: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Massue*) 147 (i).

RIVER LOT CLAIMS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).

SALES FOR 1884-85: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3072 (iv).

SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).

SIMPSON, G. A., GOVT. LAND AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 57 (i).

SQUATTERS IN QU'APPELLE VALLEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 205 (i).

SURVEYS AND PLANS, BATTLEFORD AND EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2357 (iii).

SURVEYS AND EXAMINATION OF RETURNS: in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv).

#### DOMINION LANDS—Continued.

ST. ALBERT RIVER LOTS, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).

ST. LAURENT, SURVEYS OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).

TIMBER DUES IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2240.

TIMBER LICENSES OR BERTHS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 210 (i).

TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 30, 121 (i), 863 (ii).

[See also "HALF-BREEDS" and "INDIANS."]

DOMINION LICENSE ACT, WORKING OF: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 307 (i).

DOMINION NOTES, ISSUE AND REDEMPTION: in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).

DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).

DOMINION PROPERTIES IN COUNTY OF RICHELIEU: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Massue*) 147.

DOMINION STEAMERS. See "MARINE," "SUPPLY," &c.

DOMINION SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVS.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Aymot*) 303 (i). See "SUBSIDIES."

DOUTRE, J., re HALIFAX COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).

DRAWBACKS ON MANUFACTURED EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).

DRAWBACK ON SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 100 (i).

DREDGES, TUGS, AND SCOWS, BUILDING OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 53 (i).

DREDGES, TUGS, BARGES, &c., ON RED RIVER: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).

DRILL PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2910 (iv).

DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).

DRUGGISTS' LICENSES UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1306 (ii).

**Dry Docks, Encouragement of Construction, B. No. 108** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 693 (i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°\*, 895 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 5). See B. 7.

DRUGS. See "ADULTERATION."

DUCK: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).

DUCK LAKE, ENGAGEMENT AT, REP. OF: Telegrams read (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 790; Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1567 (ii); (Mr. *Trow*) 1743 (iii).

DUMAS, MICHEL, APPOINTMENT OF AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).

DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE FOG-HORN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).

DUMONT, EXTRADITION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2358 (iii).

DUMONT, GABRIEL, FERRY LICENSE GRANTED TO: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD, SALE OF BY GOVT.: M. for copies of Papers, &c. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).

**Dundas and Waterloo Road Sale and Transfer B. No. 120** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 451 (i); conc. in and 1°\* of B., 892 (ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn, 2396 (iii).

DUNDAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 290 (i).

- DUTIES, COLLECTION OF UNAUTHORIZED:** Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 427 (i).
- DUTIES, IMPOSITION OF, IN OLD PROV. OF CANADA:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).
- DUTIES OF CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.** See "CUSTOMS."
- DUTY ON GRAIN, ABOLITION OF:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
- DUTIES ON FISH EXPORTED TO THE U.S.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (i).
- DUTIES ON HAY, COR. BETWEEN CANADA AND U.S.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Irvine*) 443 (i).
- DUTIES COLLECTED ON WHEAT, FLOUR, &C., IN N.S.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).
- DYNAMITE, LEGISLATION RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. *Farrow*) 57 (i).
- EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES, C.P.R.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).
- EARTHENWARE AND STONWARE:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (ii).
- EARNINGS, C.P.R., MAIN LINE AND LEASED LINES:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- EASTER, ADJMT. FOR:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 713 (i); M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 888 (ii).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY., EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES:** Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 148; M. FOR STMT.\* 313 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3384 (iv).
- EASTERN SECTION C.P.R., QUANTITIES, &C., ENGINEERS' ESTIMATES:** M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 299, 302 (i).
- EDGAR, MR. J. D.:** Certificate and Election and Return of, 1.
- EDUCATION OF INDIANS AND HALF-BREEDS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).
- EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S AGENT:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii); Tp. Surveys, 2171 (iii).
- EGYPT.** See "VOYAGEURS."
- ELECTION EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 3451 (iv).
- Election of Members Acts Amt. B. No. 14** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 41 (i).
- ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED:**
- LENNOX: Judge's Rep. and Certificate, 1.
  - LEVIS: Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i).
  - NORTHUMBERLAND: Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i).
  - SOULANGES: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1.
  - WEST MIDDLESEX: Judge's Rep. and Judgment, 1.
- ELECTIONS SINCE GENERAL ELECTION, 1878:** Date of certificates, date of receipt, issue of Speaker's warrants, receipt, &c., M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- Electoral Franchise.** See "FRANCHISE."
- ELGIN COUNTY JUDGE, CASE OF:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 98 (i).
- ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET, ERECTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 148 (i).
- ELGIN.** See "REFUND OF BONUSES."
- EMERSON, TOWN OF, GOVT. AID TO:** Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 148; M. for copies of Claims, &c.,\* 448 (i).
- Employment of Prisoners.** See "PRISON LABOR."
- Employment of Women and Children in Factories B. No. 2** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°, 29; Order for 2° dschgd, 362 (i). See B. 85.
- EQUIPMENT OF THE 90TH BATTALION:** Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 2854 (iv).
- Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.** See "CANADA SOUTHERN."
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, LENGTH OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 743; SUBSTITUTION OF GRANITE FOR SANDSTONE: Ques., 743 (i). See B. 7.
- ESSEX CENTRE TO KINGSVILLE HARBOR RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 (iv).
- ESTIMATES, THE, FOR 1885-86, PRESENTED:** (Mr. *Bowell*) 289 (i); Suppl., 3359; Further Suppl., 3423; Suppl. for 1884-85, 2820 (iv).
- ETCHEMIN RIVER LINE, SURVEY OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 350 (i).
- Evans, Alice Elvira Relief B. No. 106** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (ii). (48-49 *Vic., c.* 39).
- EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. ADVANCES:** Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) censuring Govt., 295, deb. rsmd., 363; (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 367, 391; (Mr. *Holton*) 368; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 369; (Mr. *Mulock*) 370; (Mr. *Ives*) 372; (Mr. *Blake*) 373; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 380; (Mr. *Davies*) 384; (Mr. *Macmaster*) 387; (Messrs. *Lister and Mc-Mullen*) 390; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 392; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*); 393 (i).
- EXCHANGE BANK OF CANADA, GOVT. CLAIM AGAINST:** Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 89 (i).
- EXCISE DUTIES:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3294; conc., 3470 (iv).
- EXCISE.** See "CUSTOMS."
- EXHIBITIONS.** See "ANTWERP," "COLONIAL" and "DOMINION."
- EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES:** Deb. on M. for 2° of B. 6 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 176; (Mr. *Tupper*) 180; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. *Woodworth*) 182; (Mr. *Lister*) 184; (Mr. *Beaty*) 185; (Mr. *Fleming*) 186 (i). See B. 6.
- EVIDENCE IN DIVORCE CASES:** Remarks (Mr. *Jackson*) 428 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., CANALS, &C., IN B. C., N. W. T. AND OTHER PROVINCES:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF C. P. R.:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 145 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON BRANCH LINES OF C. P. R., &C., COST OF EQUIPMENT, &C.:** M. for Stmts.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON MAIN LINE BETWEEN CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR AND SELKIRK AND KAMLOOPS:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- EXPENDITURE TO COMPLETE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION ON C. P. R.:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1130 (ii).
- EXTENSION OF C. P. R. TO CANADIAN PORTS ON ATLANTIC, VERNON SMITH'S REP.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Lesage*) 294 (i).
- EXTENSION OF C. P. R. TO QUEBEC, PAPERS, &C.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 1677 (ii). B. 2239 (iii).
- Expense B.** See "N. W. T."
- EXPENSES OF ELECTION UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT:** in Com. of Sup., 3388 (iv).

- EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF THE GOVT., &C., IN ENGLAND OR ELSEWHERE:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*), 124 (i).
- Expiring Laws continuation B. No. 165** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3458 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 52).
- Explosive Substances B. No. 95** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 545 (i); 2°, 893; in Com., 1167; 3°, 1335 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 7).
- EXPORT DUTY ON OAK, PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).
- EXTRACT OF FLUID BEEF:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- EXTRADITION ARRANGEMENT, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. OF CAN. AND AMBASSADOR AT WASHINGTON:** M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).
- EXTRADITION OF DUMONT:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2358 (iv).
- EXTRADITION, DEMANDS FOR, AND PROCEEDINGS TAKEN:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- EXTRA-MURAL EMPLOYMENT.** See "PRISON LABOR."
- FABRE, MR., AGENT IN PARIS, REP. OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 290 (i); SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
- Factories B. No. 85** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°\*, 362 (i); 2° m., 873; deb. adjd., 886; M. to same. adjd. deb., 940; Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) to substitute B. (No. 94) Can. Temp. Act, 940; Amt. agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (ii). See B. 2.
- FACTORY COMMISSION REP.** (Mr. *Blake*): Remarks, 455, 478 (i).
- FACTORY LABOR REGULATION:** Deb. on M. for 2° of B. 85 (Mr. *Bergin*) 873; (Mr. *Sproule*) 881; (Mr. *Mills*) 882; Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) to substitute Can. Temp. Act, 940; (Messrs. *Bergin* and *Ives*) 940; (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) 941; (Mr. *Scriver*) 943; (Mr. *Foster*) 944; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 946; (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 946; (Mr. *Fisher*) 947; (Mr. *McNeill*) 948 (ii).
- Factory Labor, Regulation of, B. No. 2** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°\*, 29; Order for 2° dschgd., 362 (i). See B. 85.
- FACTORY OPERATIVES, NUMBER EMPLOYED:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
- Federal Bank of Canada Capital Stock, B. No. 10** (Mr. *Small*). 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 57; in Com. and 3°\*, 428 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE, PROPOSALS FOR:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 51 (i).
- Fees from Settlers in the N. W. T.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- Ferries, International, B. No. 17** (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°\*, 46; 2° m., 254; 2°\*, 256 (i).
- FERTILIZERS.** See "AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS."
- FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD:** in Com. of Sup., 901, 915 (ii).
- FINANCE MINISTER, HEALTH OF:** Ques. (Mr. *McGreevy*) 2497 (iii).
- FINANCES OF THE COUNTRY, CONDUCT OF:** Remarks (Mr. *Blake* and others) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (iv).
- FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER IN ENG.:** in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- FINANCIAL INSPECTOR:** in Com. of Sup., 895 (ii).
- FINES, CUSTOMS, EXACTED AND DISPOSITION OF SAME, &C.:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 90** (Mr. *Mulock*) 1°, 426 (i).
- FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF:** in Com. of Sup., 910 (ii).
- FISHERIES:**
- ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2980 (iv).
- BOUNTIES, CLAIMS PAID: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Fortin*) 56 (i).
- BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Burpee*) 98 (i).
- BOUNTY DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- BOUNTY PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2751 (iv).
- BOUNTY PAID ON FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *McDougall*) 1443 (ii).
- CANADIAN FISHERIES, O.C., &C., RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 56 (i).
- CARON, C., FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,\* 532 (i).
- COMMISSION, INCREASED REMUNERATION TO COUNSEL: in Com. of Sup., 3391; conc., 3396 (iv).
- DEEP-WATER FISHERIES OFF COAST OF B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 3073 (iii).
- EXTENSION OF ACT TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 51 (i).
- FISH-BREEDING: in Com. of Sup., 2953 (iv).
- FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES, BOUNTY PAID: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *McDougall Cape Breton*) 1443 (ii).
- FISHERIES EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- FISH: in Com. on Ways and Means, 859 (ii).
- FISHING LICENSES IN LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 964 (ii).
- FISH INSPECTOR IN CITY OF ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 2997 (iv).
- FISH LADDERS IN LA HAVRE RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2239 (iii).
- FISH TAKEN IN THE MIRAMICHI: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).
- FISH WEIRS IN CO. OF CHARLOTTE, LICENSES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).
- FREE FISHING ALLOWED AMERICANS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3321 (iv).
- GAUVREAU, J., FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,\* 532 (i).
- GREGORY, J. U., REP. OF ENQUIRY: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- HALIFAX COMMISSION, INCREASED REMUNERATION TO COUNSEL: in Com. of Sup., 3390-3392; conc., 3396 (iv).
- INLAND FISHERIES OF ONT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
- INSPECTOR FOR B.C., APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 694 (i).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES: M. for Ret.,\* 1444 (ii); Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3073 (iv).
- LEASES AND LICENSES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 533 (i).
- LONG POINT FISHING GROUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 289 (i).
- MILLARD, COLLECTION OF FINES FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1211 (ii).
- NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Vail*) 3074 (iv).
- PROTECTION AFTER JULY: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 2359 (iii).
- PROTECTION IN THE N.W.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Hesson*) 700 (i).
- PROTECTION STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 2955 (iv).
- RIVERS AND STREAMS, RENTAL OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i); Ques., 2359 (iii).
- ROGERS' FISH LADDER, PURCHASE OR USE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3073 (iv).
- ROGERS, W. H., BREACH OF SAWDUST LAW: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
- SALMON FISHING IN BATHURST HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2359 (iii).
- STARR, J. E., REMOVAL OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- [See also "WASHINGTON TREATY."]
- FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U.S. AND SPAIN:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Vail*) 219; deb. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 220; (Mr. *Blake* and Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 221; (Messrs. *Cartwright, Weldon* and *Davies*) 222; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 223; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 224; (Mr. *Mills*) 225.

FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLID. LOANS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).

FLANNEL SHIRTS FOR THE MILITIA, CONTRACT FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1306 (ii).

FLOUR AND CORNMEAL, INCREASE OF DUTY ON: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 148 (i).

FLOUR, CORN AND CORNMEAL IMPORTED AND EXPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 56 (i).

FOG HORN ON DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).

FOG HORNS AND LETTER-BOX FRONTS, TENDERS FOR: M. for copies of advertisements, &c.\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 313 (i).

FOOT AND CARRIAGE BRIDGE ON THE ST. JOHN RIVER: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1443 (ii).

FOOT GREASE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).

FORESTRY COMMISSIONERS, APPOINTMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 187 (i).

FORESTS, PROTECTION OF, J. H. MORGAN'S REP.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).

FORT FRANCIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3385 (iv).

**Fort Macleod Rancho Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80** (Mr. *Ives*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 349; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 428 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1723 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2357 (iii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 92*.)

FORT WILLIAM, ONT., INDIAN RESERVE, ROAD ON: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).

FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, TIMBER LICENSES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (iii).

FORTY MILE BELT IN B.C.: Memo. read (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1983 (iii).

FRANCE AND CANADA, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 825 (ii).

FRANCE AND QUEBEC, STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (iv).

FRANCE AND QUEBEC, FORTNIGHTLY LINE, STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2936, 2942, 3041 (iv).

FRANCE, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS. See "HIGH COMMISSIONER."

FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS. See "PETITIONS."

**Franchise, Electoral B. No. 103** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 629 (i); Order for 2<sup>o</sup> postponed, 1095; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1133; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1137; neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) and deb. adjd., 1166; deb. rsmd., 1167; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; deb. adjd., 1204; deb. rsmd., 1226; 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 111, N. 63) 1277; M. for Com., 1336; in Com., 1385, 1388, 1444, 1475, 1568, 1608, 1646, 1680, 1712, 1745 (ii), 1782, 1824, 1856, 1895, 1915, 1956, 1983, 2052, 2065, 2086, 2104, 2139, 2172, 2210, 2241, 2274, 2301, 2321, 2345, 2360, 2393 (iii), 2757, 3052, 3062; on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053; Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 3053; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3058; neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060; (Mr. *Watson*) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062; Amt. (Mr. *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; Amts:

(Mr. *Burpee*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063; (Mr. *Trow*) 3063; neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064; (Mr. *Armstrong*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064; (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. *McCraney* and *Innes*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. *Cameron [Middlesex]* and *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066; Amts. (Messrs. *Lister* and *Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3067; Amts. (Messrs. *Weldon* and *Fairbank*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; Amts. (Messrs. *Paterson [Brant]* and *Gillmor*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3069; Amts. (Messrs. *Holton* and *Fisher*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 3 m. h., 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072; 3<sup>o</sup> of B., 3072 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 40*.)

#### FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL B., DEBATE:

*ABBOTT*, Mr.: in Com., "usufructuary," 1416 (ii); "revision of lists," 2345, 2350 (iii); "general provisions," 1448 (ii), 2352, 2355; "appeal," 2363 (iii).

*ALLEN*, Mr.: in Com., "person" (Indian) 1493 (ii); "qualifications," &c., 1853; "who shall not vote," 2166 (iii).

*ARMSTRONG*, Mr.: on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1272-1274; in Com., (woman suffrage) 1469; "tenant" (Amt.) 1481; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1506, 1542; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications, &c.," 1643 (ii), 1880-1882; (manhood suffrage) 1970; (Amt.) 2001; "registration," 2247, 2318; "revision of lists," 2433 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3064 (iv).

*AUGER*, Mr.: on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1238-1241; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452, 1456, 1458; "tenant" (Amt.) 1482; "person" (Indian) 1543; "actual value," 1597, 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1937, 1995, 2068; "registration," 2296 (iii).

*BAIN*, Mr. (*Wentworth*): in Com., "person" (Indian) 1535; "qualifications, &c.," 1709-1712 (ii), 1776-1779; (manhood suffrage) 1952-1954; (Amt.) 1993, 2052, 2062 (iii), 2758 (iv); "registration," 2252, 2280, 2289; "officers and duties," 2356 (iii).

*BAKER*, Mr. (*Victoria*): in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1587 (ii).

*BEATY*, Mr., jun.: in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1874-1880 (iii).

*BERGIN*, Mr.: in Com. (remarks) 2203; "qualifications," &c., 2085 (iii).

*BLAKE*, Mr.: on 1<sup>o</sup>, 629 (i); on Order for 2<sup>o</sup> being called (remarks) 1095; on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1177-1192; in Com., "usufructuary," 1448, 1450, 1452, 1456, 1457; "person" (Indian) 1497, 1565; "farm," 1591 (ii); on disqualifying revising barrister, 2086; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104-2111, 2161, 2163; "registration," 2173, 2177, 2180, 2231, 2312; "revision of lists," 2346; "qualifications, &c.," 2395; "appeal," 2395 (iii); "preamble," 2759; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3059 (iv).

*BOWELL*, Mr.: in Com., "actual value," 1596-1607; "occupant," 1483; "tenant," 1478-1480 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1995, 2061; "revision of lists," 2343; "appeal," 2361; "general provisions," 2344 (iii).

*BURNS*, Mr.: in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1809 (iii).

*BURPEE*, Mr.: in Com., "person" (Indian) 1522 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1810, 1987, 1991, 2001, (manhood suffrage) 1959, 2004, 2058, (Amt.) 2060, 2073, 2079; "who shall not vote" (Indians) (Amt.) 2120; "registration," 2251 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3058; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3063 (iv).

*CAMERON*, Mr. (*Middlesex*): on M. for Com., 1373-1379 (ii); in Com., (woman suffrage) 1440; "person" (Indian) 1493; "qualifications, &c.," 1699-1707, 1890, 1895-1900, 1994, (Amt.) 1999, 2002, (manhood suffrage) 1973, 2061, (Amt.) 2071, 2073, 2077, 2084, 2085, 2395; "registration," 2193-2197, 2263; "who shall not vote," 2152, (Indians) 2149-2152, (Amt.) 2274, (Amt.) 2285, 2289, 2291; "appeal," 2395 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3066 (iv).

## FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- CAMERON, Mr. (Victoria):** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1393; "tenant," 1477; "registration," 2180, 2230, 2233 (iii).
- CAMERON, Mr. (Inverness):** in Com. (woman suffrage) (correction *re* Indians) 1419; "qualifications, &c.," 1629-1632, 1836 (ii), 2395; "registration," 2278, 2283 (iii).
- CAMERON, Mr. (Huron):** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1138-1143; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1394, 1438; "owner," 1472; "tenant" (Amt.) 1475, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indian) 1502, 1527, 1580; "farm," 1591, 1592; "farmers' sons" (Amt.) 1594; "qualifications, &c.," 1692-1699 (ii), 1924-1931, 2074; "registration," 2216-2220, (Amt.) 2227, 2241, 2274-2277, 2281-2284, (Amt.) 2286, 2300, 2302-2305, 2313, 2317, 2319; "revision of lists," 2321, 2326-2329, 2332, 2345-2348; "general provisions," 2314, 2345, 2351-2354; "officers and duties," 2356, 2389; "appeal," 2360-2366; "offences," 2390 (iii).
- CARTWRIGHT, Sir Richard:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1134; (Amt.) 1137, neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) 1166; on M. for Com. (remarks) 1385; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1459; "tenant," 1479; "person" (Indian) 1573 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1817, 1915-1918, 1988, 1992, 1995, 2068, 2071, 2073, 2079, 2082, (Amt.) 2085; "registration," 2220-2223, 2232, 2279, 2281, 2285, 2288, 2297, 2299, 2300; "revision of lists," 2326, 2338, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2344, 2355; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2382 (ii).
- CASEY, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1263-1266; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1401-1408, 1459; "usufructuary," 1452, 1458; "owner," 1470; "tenant," 1477; "person" (Indian) 1496, 1528-1530, 1578, (Chinese) 1582, 1590; "farm," 1592; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "qualifications, &c.," 1739-1743 (ii), 1828; (Indians) 1837, (Amt.) 1845; (manhood suffrage) 1956-1959, 1988, 2052, 2061; (Amts.) 2064, 2070, 2079, 2080, 2394; on disqualifying barristers, 2086; "who shall not vote," 2086, 2093; "registration," 2254-2258, 2270, 2272, 2282, 2283, (Amt.) 2288, 2290, 2308-2310; "revision of lists," 2321, 2323, 2325, 2333, 2343; "general provisions," 2344, 2347, 2350; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2383-2385 (iii).
- CASGRAIN, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1384; (woman suffrage) 1395; "usufructuary," 1447; "person" (Indian) 1516, 1519, 1536, (Chinese) 1588; "farm," 1591; "qualifications, &c.," 1690-1692 (ii), (Amt.) 1791; "who shall not vote," 2099 (iii).
- CHAPLEAU, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1171-1177; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590 (ii).
- CHARLTON, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1158-1160; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1390, 1439; "person" (Indian) 1503, 1523, (Chinese) 1587; "qualifications, &c.," 1608, (Amt.) 1623 (ii), 1770-1773, (Indians) 1850, 1864-1871, (manhood suffrage) 1947-1952; "registration," 2279, 2282, 2286, 2287, (Amt.) 2288, 2289, 2306-2308, (Amt.) 2317; "revision of lists," 2340, 2350; "general provisions," 2344, (Amt.) 2344; "appeal," 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2377; "offences," 2390 (iii); on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 3053 (iv).
- COCKBURN, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1268; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1438 (ii).
- COOK, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590 (ii); "registration," 2213-2216 (iii).
- COSTIGAN, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1990; "revision of lists," 2343 (iii).
- COURSOL, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1248; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1389 (ii).
- CURRAN, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1408; "qualifications, &c.," 1623-1626 (ii).
- DAVIES, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1153-1158; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1418, 1458; "tenant," 1476, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1576, (Chinese) 1583; "farm," 1592; "farmers' sons," 1594;

## FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- "qualifications, &c.," 1638-1643 (ii), 1824-1828, 1939-1945; (manhood suffrage) 1987, 1991, 1992, 1996, 2054, 2058, 2066-2069, 2071, (Amt.) 2072-2074, 2077; "who shall not vote," 2090, 2096, (Indians) 2157-2160, (Amt.) 2160; "registration," 2210, (Amt.) 2211, 2229, 2230, (Amt.) 2234, 2269, 2271-2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2281, 2286, 2287, 2289, 2291, (Amt.) 2292, 2301, 2313, 2316, (Amt.) 2318; "revision of lists," 2326, 2329, 2331, 2347; "general provisions," 2353; "appeal," 2361; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2378, 2389 (iii).
- DAWSON, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1160; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1408; "owner," 1473; "person" (Indian) 1486, 1491, 1492, 1521, 1569, (explanation) 1503 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1775, (manhood suffrage) 1979, (Indians) 2006-2008, 2012, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2123, 2149; "registration," 2248-2268, 2298; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2369, 2387 (iii); "preamble," 2758 (iv).
- DE ST. GEORGES, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1533 (ii).
- DESJARDINS, Mr.:** in Com., "usufructuary," 1451, 1455 (ii).
- DUPONT, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1234 (ii).
- EDGAR, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1197-1200; in Com., (woman suffrage) 1399; "owner," 1473; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1553, (Chinese) 1582, 1584 (ii); "farm," 2393; "qualifications, &c." (manhood suffrage) 1968-1970, 1993, 2001, (Amt.) 2003, (Indian) 2012, 2053, 2066, 2080, 2394; "registration," 2282, 2289, 2305, 2312, 2316-2319; "revision of lists," 2330, 2331, 2334, 2337 (iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3057 (iv).
- FAIRBANK, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1226; (woman suffrage) 1415; "person" (Indian) 1519, 1531; "actual value," 1605; (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1779, 1784; (manhood suffrage) 1971-1973, 1993, 1997, 2082; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2152; "revision of lists," 2338, 2342, 2348 (iii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068 (iv).
- FARROW, Mr.:** in Com., "tenant," 1482 (ii).
- FISHER, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1254-1258; "usufructuary," 1455; "tenant," 1479, 1482; "person" (Indian) 1504, 1538; "actual value," 1595, 1599, 1602, 1604, (Amt.) 1595; "qualifications, &c.," 1647-1654 (ii), 1804, 1994, 1996, 2080, (manhood suffrage) 1967; "who shall not vote," 2098, (Indians) 2116-2119; "registration," 2211, 2294 (iii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3070, (iv).
- FLEMING, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1146-1149; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1410; "usufructuary," 1457; "owner," 1473; "tenant" (Amt.) 1476, 1477, 1479; "person" (Indian) 1545 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1994, (Amt.) 1997, 2062, 2080; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2164; "registration," 2197-2199, 2298; "revision of lists," 2341 (iii).
- FOSTER, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1156-1158; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1558 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1819, 1822, 2001, 2055, 2057; "who shall not vote," 2089, 2098 (iii).
- GAULT, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1582; "qualifications, &c.," 1638 (ii).
- GIGAULT, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1245-1248 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1789 (iii).
- GILLMOR, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1226, 1269; "person" (Indians) 1534, (Chinese) 1585; "qualifications," 1707-1709 (ii), 1807, 1984, 1990, 1997, 2054, 2060, 2072, 2074; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2114-2116; "registration," 2258 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 3059; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3069 (iv).
- GIROUARD, Mr.:** in Com., "usufructuary," 1446; "tenant," 1480 (ii).
- HACKETT, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1654-1657 (ii); "who shall not vote," 2095 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3054-3056 (iv).

## FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- HESSON, Mr.:** in Com., "farmers' sons," 1595; actual value," 1599, 1605 (ii), (explanation) 1752; "qualifications, &c.," 1987, 2059, 2081, 2082, 2084, 2085; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2133; "registration," 2246, 2283, 2295, 2305 (iii).
- HICKEY, Mr.:** "actual value," 1600 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1887-1890, 1989; "revision of lists," 2330; "registration" (Amt.) 2279 (iii).
- HOLTON, Mr.:** on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3070 (iv).
- HOMER, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1582 (ii).
- INNES, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1736-1739 (ii); "registration" (Amt.) 2279 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3065 (iv).
- IRVINE, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1544 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1814-1817; "who shall not vote," 2097 (iii).
- IVES, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1986-1988 (iii).
- JACKSON, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1342; "person" (Indian) 1638; "qualifications, &c.," 1712-1715 (ii).
- JENKINS, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1344 (ii); in Com. (manhood suffrage) 1981 (iii); on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (Amt.) 3053 (iv).
- KING, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1261-1263; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1524 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1806; "who shall not vote" (Indian) 2164; "registration" 2266, 2285, (Amt.) 2285 (iii).
- KIRK, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1259-1261 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1834, 2067, 2072, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (ii).
- LANDERKIN, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1353-1360; "tenant," 1482; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1539; "actual value," 1602 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Indians) 1845-1849, 1985, 1997, (Amt.) 2000, 2021, 2074; "registration of voters," 2267, 2301; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2385.
- LANDRY, Mr. (Kent):** in Com., "usufructuary," 1449; "person" (Indians) 1554; (Chinese) 1584, 1588 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1812, 2057 "who shall not vote," 2100; "registration," 2230, 2232, 2260 (iii); on (Amt.) (Mr. Weldon) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 3058 (iv).
- LANDRY, Mr. (Montmagny):** in Com., "qualifications, &c." 1635, 1637 (ii).
- LANGELIER, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1364-1373; in Com., (woman suffrage) 1388; "usufructuary," 1444, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1452, 1454, 1455, 1457; "tenant," 1475, (Amt.) 1476, 1480; "qualifications," 1832-1838 (ii), 1903-1908, 1984, 1996, 2084, 2087, 2070, 2394; "registration," 2185-2190, (Amt.) 2228; "revision of lists," 2331, 2333, 2342; "appeal," 2365; "officers and duties," 2388; "offences," 2390 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (Amt.) 3062; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amts.) 3063, 3066 (iv).
- LANGEVIN, Sir Hector:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1137; in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 2085; "registration of voters," 2299 (iii).
- LAURIER, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1167, (Amt.) 1171; in Com., "usufructuary," 1415, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1454, 1455, 1456; "tenant," 1480; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "parish," 1593; "qualifications, &c.," 1626-1629 (ii), 1984 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 3057; on Amt. (Mr. Fisher) to M. for consdn. of B., 3070 (iv).
- LISTER, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1150-1153; on M. for Com., 1344-1347, 1352; "qualifications, &c.," 1732-1736 (ii), 1860-1864, (Indians) 2009-2012, 2066, 2070, 2075; "who shall not vote," 2088, (Indians) 2153-2155; "registration," 2264, 2283, 2286, 2316; "revision of lists," 2324, 2338, 2343; general provisions," 2344; appeal," 2364; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2371 (ii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3066 (iv).
- MACDONALD, Sir John A.:** 2<sup>d</sup> m., 1133; in Com., 1385; (woman suffrage), 1388, 1458; "owner," 1444, 1445, 1449, 1452, 1453, 1457; "tenant," 1475, 1481; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1484, 1486, 1487, 1489, 1563, 1574 (ii), 2023 (iii); (Chinese) 1582, 1558; "farm," 1591; "parish,"

## FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1596, 1600 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1937, 1983-1988, 1992-2003, 2053, 2060, 2062, 2064, 2065, 2079, 2080, 2394 (iii), 2757-2759 (iv); "disqualifying revising barrister," 2086; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104, (Amt.) 2139; "registration," 2172, 2177-2180, 2228, 2231, 2241, 2244, 2269, 2273, 2279-2294, 2300, 2310-2319; "revision of lists," 2321, 2326-2335, 2339-2345; "general provisions," 2344, 2351, 2353-2356; "appeal," 2360-2365, 2395; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2370, 2373, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "farm," 2393 (iii); "preamble," 2758; M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052; on Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 3058 (iv).
- MACKINTOSH, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1241-1245 (ii).
- MACMASTER, Mr.:** in Com., "revision of lists," 2324, 2343; "general provisions," 2352; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2380-2382, 2386 (iii).
- MCCALLUM, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1871, 1994-1996; "registration," 2258, 2272, 2283, 2284; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2373, 2383 (iii).
- MCCRANEY, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1410; "person" (Indian) 1541 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1773-1775 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3065 (iv).
- MCINTYRE, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1790 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (Amt.) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058 (iv).
- McMULLEN, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1200-1204; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1395; "tenant," 1476, 1477, 1479; "qualifications, &c.," 1685-1690 (ii), 1853, 1856, 1866, (manhood suffrage) 1961-1964, 1992, 1995, 2000, (Amt.) 2052, 2059, 2063, 2067, 2070, 2075, 2080, 2082; "who shall not vote," 2100, (Indians) 2135-2137; "registration," 2190-2193; "revision of lists," 2396; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2386; "farm," 2393 (iii).
- McNEILL, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1412 (ii); "qualifications, &c." 2073 (iii).
- MILLS, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1161-1166; in Com., 1388, (woman suffrage) 1391, 1458; "usufructuary," 1449, 1453, 1454, 1455; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1477; "occupant," 1483; "farm," 1591 (ii), 2393 (iii); "person" (Indians) 1484, (Amt.) 1485, 1507, 1568, (Chinese) 1583, 1589; "city," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1599, 1605 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1747, 1761, (Indians) 1849, 1910-1913, 1934-1937; (manhood suffrage) 1964-1967, (Indians) 1976, 1988, 1991-2003, 2004-2006, 2053, 2056, 2060, 2063, 2065-2069, 2072, 2075, 2078-2083, 2085, 2394 (iii), 2758 (iv); "disqualifying revising barrister," 2086; "who shall not vote" (Amt.) 2087, (Indians) 2149, 2180; "registration," 2181-2185, 2229, 2233; (Amt.) 2227, 2243, 2266, 2270, 2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2282, 2285, 2287, 2288, 2293, 2300, 2315, 2316, 2318; "revision of lists," 2322, 2325, 2332, 2336, 2340-2343, 2345-2349; "general provisions," 2353, 2354; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indians) 2373-2376, 2387, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "appeal," 2361, 2364, 2366, 2396; "preamble," 2759 (iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052, 3062; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (Amt.) 3052; on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) 3054; on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 3059; on M. for consdn. of B., on Amt. (Mr. Holton) 3070; (Amt.) 3 m. h., 3071 (iv).
- MITCHELL, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1145, (explanation) 1149; in Com., "person" (Indians) 1577, (Chinese) 1582 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1807, (Amt.) 1938; (manhood suffrage) 1959, 1980, (Amt.) 1987, 1991, 2069, 2072 (iii).
- MULOCK, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1379, 1384, (woman suffrage) 1421, 1426-1430; "owner," 1473; "tenant," 1482; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1538; "actual value," 1607; "qualifications, &c.," 1715-1723 (ii), 1882, 1987; (manhood suffrage) 1978, (Amt.) 1985, 1992, 2000, 2053, (Amt.) 2054, 2059, 2064, 2070, (Amt.) 2072, 2073, 2076; "who shall

## FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- not vote" (Indians) 2137; "registration," 2223-2227, 2248, 2272, 2286, 2287, 2291, 2300, 2302, 2317; "revision of lists," 2322, 2327, 2329, 2331, 2335, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2354; "appeal," 2360, 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2372 (iii); "preamble," 2758; on Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 3061; on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; in Com., 3052; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 3052 (iv).
- PAINT, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1991, 2072, 2077, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (iii).
- PLATT, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1336-1341, (woman suffrage) 1439; "person" (Indian) 1525; "actual value," 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1784-1789; (manhood suffrage and Indians) 1977; "revision of lists," 2343; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2127-2129 (iii).
- PATERSON, Mr. (Brant):** on M. for Com., 1360-1364; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1489, 1492, 1571, 1574 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1793-1798, 1800-1804, 1931, (manhood suffrage) 1981, 2004, (Indian) 2013-2019, 2056, 2059, 2074, 2079, 2084; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2123-2127, 2162; "registration," 2269-2263, 2199-2205, 2269, 2273, 2279, 2283, 2285, 2291, 2298, 2300, 2315, 2318; "revision of lists," 2337; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indian) 2367-2369, 2376, 2387; "appeal," 2367; "offences, 2391 (iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068; on M. to conc. in Amts., 3071 (iv).
- PATTERSON, Mr. (Essex):** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1986 (iii).
- RINFRET, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1506, 1538; "qualifications, &c.," 1630-1633 (ii).
- ROYAL, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1330 (ii).
- RYKERT, Mr.:** in Com., "usufructuary," 1450; "tenant," 1477 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1761-1770, 2002, 2058; "revision of list," 2342 (iii).
- SHAKESPEARE, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1391; "person" (Chinese) 1583, 1591 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Indians and Chinese) 1974 (iii).
- SOMERVILLE, Mr. (Brant):** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1269-1272; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1441; "person" (Indian) 1549 (ii); "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2129-2133; "registration," 2276, 2291, 2296 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3065 (iv).
- SPROULE, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492, 1551; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications, &c." (Indians) 1850, 2012, 2073; "registration," 2248; "appeal," 2361, 2366; "officers and duties," 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390 (iii).
- STAIRS, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. *McIntyre*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3057 (iv).
- TASCHEREAU, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1236; in Com., "usufructuary," 1447 (ii).
- TASSE, Mr.:** in Com., "who shall not vote," 2093, 2097 (iii).
- TAYLOR, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 2061 (iii).
- TEMPLE, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 2054, 2058, 2084; "revision of lists," 2341 (iii).
- TROW, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage), 1460; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1598 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1908, 2056, 2073, 2076; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2133, (Amt.) 2163; "registration," 2240, 2280; "revision of lists," 2343 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3063 (iv).
- TOWNSHEND, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1249-1254; in Com. (Amt.) (woman suffrage) 1388; agreed to, 1442 (vol. ii).
- TUPPER, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1643, 1832, 2250 (iii).
- VAIL, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1274-1277; in Com., "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Amt.) 1829-1832, 1930, 1994, 1999-2002, 2084, 2085, 2394; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2165; "registration," 2190, 2249, 2278, (Amt.) 2280, 2288, 2294, 2316 (iii).
- WALLACE, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1341; in Com., "tenant," 1477, 1478; "person" (Indian) 1491; "actual value," 1602, 1604 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 2002, 2066, 2083 (iii).

## FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- WATSON, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1274; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1468; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1522, 1542; "occupant," 1484; "actual value," 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Indians) 1853, (Amts.) 1933, 1990, 1992, 2008, (Indian) 2058; "registration," 2268, 2295; "revision of lists," 2344 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 3061 (iv).
- WELDON, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1149; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1478; "person" (Indian) 1493, (Chinese) "farm," 1592; "parish," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1595; "actual value" (Amt.) 1596, 1600; "qualifications, &c.," 1727-1731 (ii), (Amt.) 1805; "registration," 2253, 2277, (Amts.) 2278, 2282, 2283, 2286, 2288, 2289, 2291, 2297, 2310, 2316; "revision of lists," 2323, 2328, 2339, 2341, 2343, 2349 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 3058; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068 (iv).
- WHITE, Mr. (Cardwell):** on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1192-1197 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," (manhood suffrage) 1945, 1996, (Indian) 2019; "registration," 2245, 2283 (iii).
- WHITE, Mr. (Hastings):** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (manhood suffrage and Indians) 1983, 2008, 2087; "who shall not vote," 2088, 2092, (Indians) 2155-2157 (iii).
- WHITE, Mr. (Renfrew):** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1996 (iii).
- WILSON, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1417; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1515, 1536; "qualifications, &c.," 1723-1727 (ii), 1901, (manhood suffrage) 1960, 1986, 1989, 2060, 2068, 2073, 2077; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2120-2122; "registration," 2205-2207, 2265, 2287; "appeal," 2362, 2367 (iii).
- WOOD, Mr. (Westmoreland):** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1731 (i).
- WOODWORTH, Mr.:** on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1228-1234; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1584 (ii).
- WRIGHT, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1143 (ii).
- YEO, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1647 (ii).
- [For QUES. OF ORDER, &c., &c., See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," and "PROCEDURE."]
- FRASER, D. M., AND DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, CCR. BETWEEN: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Robertson Shelburne*) 533 (i).**
- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. *Temple*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 289 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 873; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 26.)**
- FREE FISHING ALLOWED AMERICAN FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 3321 (iv).**
- FREEMAN, J. N., AND SAWDUST LAW IN N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).**
- FREE TRANSPORT OF BODIES OF VOLUNTEERS KILLED: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii).**
- FRENCH CANADIANS IN CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1914; (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).**
- FRENCH CANADIANS, REPATRIATION OF, SCHEME: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).**
- FUEL FOR SETTLERS IN THE N.W.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).**
- FUNERAL EXPENSES OF ACHILLE BLAIS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2169 (iii).**
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. No. 119 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 837 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, 2419; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2439 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 69.)**

- GAS COKE:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (ii).
- GATINEAU RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 (iv).
- GATLING GUNS FOR USE OF TROOPS IN N.W.:** Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 813 (ii).
- GAUDET, MR. A.:** Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- GAUVREAU, JULES, SALARY AND EXPENSES AS FISHERY OVERSEER:** Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,\* 532 (i).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. (Chief Inspector) prop., 1306; in Com., 1307; conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1320 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 2548; 3<sup>o</sup>, 2555 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- GENEVA GIN AND BRANDY:** in Com on Ways and Means, 3224, 3229 (iv).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY:** in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE DOM., MANAGEMENT OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Hall*) 114 (i).
- GLAMIS POST OFFICE, ENQUIRY RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1131 (ii).
- GLUCOSE SYRUP:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- GOLD RESERVE, GOVT.:** M. for copies of Cor. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 351; Stmt. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 361 (i).
- GOODS IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- GOODWIN, GEORGE:** See "TRENT VALLEY CANAL."
- GOSSELIN, EUGÈNE, RECORD IN THE MATTER OF:** M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 703, 704 (i).
- GOVT. AGENTS IN THE N.W.T., FEES FROM SETTLERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- GOVT. BONDS, DISAPPEARANCE OF, FROM VAULTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3371 (iv).
- GOVT. BUSINESS:** Remarks, 211, 595 (i), 1744 (ii), 2996, 3293, 3427, 3444 (vi).
- GOVT. DEPOSITS IN BANKS:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 29 (i).
- GOVT. EMPLOYÉS ALONG LINE OF C.P.R.:** M. for names, &c.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i).
- GOVT. EMPLOYÉS IN B. C.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
- GOVT. LOANS:** Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- GOVT. MEASURES, PRECEDENCE:** on Thursdays after Ques. by Members, 451; on Wednesdays after Routine, 965; on Mondays after Ques. by Members, 1336; Ms. to take in Saturdays, 1824 (iii), 3246, 3459 (iv).
- GOVT. MORTGAGE ON C.P.R., CHANGES IN RELATION TO:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 36 (i).
- GOVT. NOTES IN CIRCULATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS IN THE N.W., COMMUNICATIONS WITH:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- GOVT. OF THE N.W.T.:** in Com. of Sup., 3243 (iv).
- GOVT. PROPERTIES IN CO. OF RICHELIEU:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Massue*) 147 (i).
- GOVT. PRINTING AND ADVERTISING:** Remarks (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3033-3039 (iv).
- GOVT. RYS., RETURN TICKETS ON:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 706 (i).
- GOVT. RIGHTS TO WATER LOTS ON RIVERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 2238 (iii).
- GOVT. SECTIONS OF C. P. R. IN B. C., WORKING OF, BY CONTRACTORS:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 632 (i).
- GOVT. STEAMERS.** See "MARINE" and "SUPPLY."
- GOVT. YARDS IN MONTREAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 57 (i).
- GOVERNOR GENERAL:**
- COMMONS, SUMMONING OF, TO SENATE, 2 (i), 3475 (iv).
- SPEECH FROM THRONE ON OPENING OF PARLT., 2; Reply to Address, 113 (i).
- SPEECH FROM THRONE PROROGUING PARLT., 3475 (iv).
- GOV. GENL.'S SECRETARY, LETTER FROM, re Royal Assent to Bills, 1514 (ii); from Deputy, re Prorogation, 3473 (iv).**
- GOV. GENL.'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 898 (ii).
- GRADES AND CURVES ON C. P. R. AS FAR AS CONSTRUCTED, EXCLUSIVE OF LINE FROM FOOT OF ROCKY MTS. TO KAMLOOPS:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).
- GRADES AND CURVES ON LINE FROM FOOT OF ROCKY MTS., &c.:** M. for Stmt. and Plan\* (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- GRADES, CURVES AND TANGENTS ON C. P. R.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 632, 694, 744 (i), 888 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- GRANDIN, BISHOP, COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3423 (iv).
- GRANT, ALPIN, POSITION OF, UNDER GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 429 (i).
- GRANT, G. (MILITIA DEPT.) SUPERANNUATION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2531 (iii).
- GRANT OF \$1,700,000 FOR N. W. EXPENSES:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 2532, 2559 (iii).
- GRAND PILES TO LAKE ST. JOHN RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 (iv).
- GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY:**
- ACCIDENTS AND CASUALTIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 226 (i).
- DOUBLE TRACK BETWEEN MONTREAL AND TORONTO, ASSURANCE, &c., GIVEN TO GOVT.: M. for copy, &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 143 (i).
- IMPORTATION OF RAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1566 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE, TORONTO AND OTTAWA: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 816 (ii).
- RETURN, IMPERFECT, PRESENTED BY MR. HICKSON: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 860, 862; Ques. 1278 (ii).
- RETURNS REQUIRED UNDER ACT OF 1879, &c., MILES OF MAIN LINE, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 229 (i).
- RETURNS, ENQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Mitchell*) 566, 662 (i), 860, 964, 1278 (ii), 2393 (iii), 3000, 3395 (iv).
- STOCKHOLDERS LIST, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 28, 101, 350; Remarks, 113 (i), 2210 (iii).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 234.
- ANSWER OF MR. HICKSON: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 927 (ii).
- ACTION OF MR. HICKSON: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).
- ENFORCEMENT OF ORDER OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3426 (iv).
- GRADUATES OF ROYAL MIL. COL.:** M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 313 (i).
- GRAIN, &c, ABOLITION OF DUTY ON:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
- GRANTS OF DOMINION LANDS.** See "LAND GRANTS," &c.
- GRAVENHURST BAY AND RIVER SEVERN CANAL:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 56, 202 (i).
- GRAVING DOCK, ESQUIMALT, B.C.** See "ADVANCES TO PROVINCES."
- GRAZING LAND LEASES, GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION, &c.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

- GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paint*) 78 (i).
- GREAT VILLAGE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, COLCHESTER, N. S.: M. for Stmt. in detail\*(Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 67 (i).
- Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 179; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- GREGORY, J. U., REP. OF ENQUIRY MADE BY, re FISHERIES: M. for copios\* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).
- GRENVILLE, SOUTH, ELECTION: Ret. of Member, 3072 (iv).
- GREY. See "REFUND OF RY. BONUSES."
- GUAY, MR.: Returned as Member elect for Lewis, 1385 (ii).
- GUERIN, LISTER, REP. OF SURVEY OF IMPROVEMENTS ON THE OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1040 (ii).
- GUNS USED IN THE FIGHT WITH POUNDMAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- GUILLET, MR.: unseated on judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i); Returned and took seat 1192 (ii).
- HALF-BREEDS:
- CLAIMS OF FRENCH AT ST. LAURENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2353 (iii).
- CLAIMS OF UNENUMERATED (MAN.): Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1743, 3428 (iv).
- CLAIMS RECOGNIZED AND REJECTED BY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169 (iii).
- CLAIMS, &c., IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1474 (ii).
- COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1566; sittings of: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567; claims recognized and rejected by: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169 (iii).
- DUMAS, M., APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- DUMONT, G., AND FERRY LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- GRIEVANCES, DUTY OF GOVT.: M. for adjmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 2030 (iii); Memorials, Answers to: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv) See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- INDIAN SYMPATHY WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- ISBESTER, APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- MINORS (MAN.) CLAIMS PREFERRED AND REJECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169; temporarily absent: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1743; unenumerated, 1743 (iii), 3126, 3428 (iv).
- NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, RES. re CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- PETITIONS, &c., ON HALF-BREEDS AND SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
- PLOTS ON THE SASKATCHEWAN: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- QU'APPELLE, REP. OF MR. WALSH: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
- RESERVES AND HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- RESUMÉ OF EVENTS SINCE 1878: Res. in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Blake*) 3075 (iv).
- SCHMIDT, L., ANSWER TO LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv); Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915 (iii).
- SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567, 1914 (iii).
- SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND UNDISTURBED OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- [See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W."]
- HALIFAX STEAM NAVIGATION CO., MONEYS PAID BY GOVT. TO: M. for copies of Reps., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HALTON. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," "INDIANS, &c."
- Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- Hamilton Provident and Loan Society B. No. 114 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1°\*, 783; 2°\*, 816; in Com. and 3°, 1352 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- HARBORS IN GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY, RE-SURVEY OF: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 51 (i).
- Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers, Advance to, authorization B. No. 150 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 2497; Res. in Com., 2555 (iii); 1°\* of B., 2751; 2° m., 2934; in Com., 2935; 3°\*, 2957 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- Harbor Master, Halifax, Appointment of, Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Mr. *McLelan*). Res. prop., 2421; in Com., 2522; Res. conc. in and 1°\* of B., 2534 (iii); 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 2772 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- HARBORS. See "MARINE" and "PUBLIC WORKS."
- HARDWARE AND SUPPLIES FURNISHED DEPT. MARINE AND FISHERIES AT HALIFAX: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i); Ques., 1914 (iii).
- HARDWARE AND RY. SUPPLIES, PURCHASE OF BY DEPT. OF RYS. AND CANALS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1442 (ii); Ques., 1915 (iii).
- Hatzfeld, Geo. L. E., Relief B. No. 107 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- HAY DUTIES. See "DUTIES."
- HEALTH OFFICERS. See "INSTRUCTIONS."
- HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2766 (iv).
- HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).
- HENEY, JOHN, GOVT. PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 3426 (iv).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER:
- AMOUNTS PAID ON ACCOUNT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 210 (i).
- COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN FRANCE AND CANADA: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 825 (ii).
- COR. re ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
- IMPERIAL FEDERATION, COR. BETWEEN AND GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 51 (i).
- IN COM. OF SUP.: 3386 (iv).
- INSTRUCTIONS TO, RESPECTING IMMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 290 (i).
- OFFICE OF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 44 (i).
- PAYMENTS, CLAIMS, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 44 (i).
- REP. AND DESPATCHES TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- SALARY AND POSITION: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HOLLAND, GEO. AND ANDREW, SERVICES AS REPORTERS AND SHORT-HAND WRITERS: M. for Stmt.\*(Mr. *Auger*) 147 (i).
- HOMESTEADS WITHIN THE RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 479, 567 (i).
- HOOP IRON: in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).
- HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION TO N. W. IN 1884: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- HORSES FOR TROOPS IN N. W., PURCHASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 1306 (ii).
- HOUSE FURNISHING HARDWARE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 848 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS:
- ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 49 (i).
- ANNUAL REGISTER, MORGAN'S: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).
- BLACK ROD: Mess. from Gov. Genl., 2 (i), 1516 (ii), 2475 (iii).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

COMMISSIONERS, REP. *re* STAFF: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2497: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 2750; increased expenditure under: in Com. of Sup., 3449; conc., 3470 (iv).

COMMITTEES, EXTRA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2795 (iv).

CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 2796 (iv).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Com. to supervise, 28 (i). See general heading.

ELECTION EXPENSES, RETURNING OFFICERS, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (iv).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL. See "FRANCHISE."

GRENVILLE, SOUTH, ELECTION: Ret. of Member elect, 3072 (iv).

HACHÉ, JACQUES, GRATITUDE TO: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (iv).

INCREASED INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (iv).

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS ABSENT THROUGH SICKNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3473 (iv). See B. 116.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE: prop. M. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 812 (ii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from. His Ex., 40 (i).

LENNOX ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

LÉVIS ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 593 (i).

LIBRARY: M. for Joint Com., 36; Mr. *Bourinot's* work: scarcity of copies, 40; Office of Librarian: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 41 (i).

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY ACT AMT. See B. 116.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 133 (i), 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).

NEW MEMBERS, RETURN OF, 1, 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).

NORTHUMBERLAND ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 593 (i).

OFFICIAL REP. See "DEBATES."

OPENING: Communication from Gov. Gen. by Black Rod, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2 (i).

PRINTING COM.'S SECOND REP.: M. to conc. in (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 149 (i); SEVENTH REP., 1822 (iii); NINTH REP., 3293; TENTH REP., 3393 (iv).

PRINTING, PAPER AND BOOKBINDING: in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii), 2798 (iv).

PROROGATION: Communication from Deputy of Gov. Genl.'s Sec., 3473; Speech from the Throne, 3475 (iv).

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1516 (ii), 2475 (iv).

SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).

SELECT STANDING COMS.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 27; Lists presented, 30; conc. in, 32; Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).

SENATE, COMMONS SUMMONED TO BY MESS., 1 (i), 3475 (iv).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, EXTRA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2795 (iv).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: Irregularity in meeting: Remarks, 2996 (iv); M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1744 (iii); M. for two sittings each day, 3459 (iv).

SOLANGLÉS ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).

STAFF, COMMISSION ON REORGANISATION: Rep. presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2497 (iii); Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 2750; increased expenditure under: in Com. of Sup., 3449; conc., 3470 (iv).

STATIONERY, &c., USED: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 290 (i).

VACANCIES, NOTIFICATION OF (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2676 (iv).

WEST MIDDLESEX ELECTION: Judge's certificate and Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

WRITS OF ELECTION: Warrants issued for, 1, 599 (i).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, SUPPLIES FURNISHED TO: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 783 (ii); in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).

HUGHES, D. J. CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 77; M. for copies of Papers and Cor., 98 (i).

HURON AND ONT. SHIP CANAL Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 428 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

HURON AND SUPERIOR, LAKES, SURVEYS OF: in Com. of Sup., 3244 (iv).

Ice, Unguarded Openings, &c. See B. 22.

## IMMIGRATION:

ALLAN LINE, PAYMENTS FOR ASSISTED PASSAGES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 567 (i); M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).

BUILDINGS AT LEVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 89 (i).

CHINESE, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: presented (Mr. *Chapleau*).

MAN. AND N. W., COR. BETWEEN C.P.R. CO. AND GOVT.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).

OFFICE AT QUÉBEC, EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*).

PAUPER IMMIGRANTS, TURKISH: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3475 (iv).

PRINTING AND ADVERTISING: M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 202 (i).

REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS, SCHEME: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).

SETTLERS IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 189 (i).

— DOM. DURING 1884: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).

— MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).

— MAR. PROVS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 148 (i).

— N. W.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).

SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 350 (i).

IMMIGRANT PATIENTS IN QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3358 (iv).

IMITATION PRECIOUS STONES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (ii).

IMPERIAL GOVT., COMMUNICATION WITH, *re* DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).

IMPERIAL FEDERATION, COR. BETWEEN HIGH COMMISSIONER AND GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 51 (i).

IMPORTATION OF PRISON MANUFACTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2169 (iii).

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, DISTINGUISHING PRODUCTS OF CANADA: M. for Rep.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).

IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).

IMPROVED RIFLED ORDNANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).

INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPT OF., REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i); in Com. of Sup., 901 (ii), 3410 (iv).

INCREASED DUTY ON FLOUR: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 744 (i).

INDIANTOWN AND BOYSTOWN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3453 (iv).

Indemnity to Members Act. Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Farrow*). 1°, 813 (ii).

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

INDIANS:

ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1884, APPLICATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 77 (i).

B. C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. OF CAN. AND B. C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mills*) 863 (ii).

CHEBRIER, G. E., AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).

EDUCATION OF, IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).

FORT WILLIAM RESERVE: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP. See "SUPPLY."

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AT QU'APPELLE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2922 (iii).

LANDS IN TP. OF TORONTO: M. for List\* (Mr. *Fleming*) 147 (i).

LANDS IN VIGER AGENCY: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).

LEBEL, A., AGENT ACTING WITHOUT SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1211 (ii).

## INDIANS—Continued.

- MANITOBA AGENCY, MANAGEMENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Charlton*) 61 (i).
- METLAKATLA, TROUBLES AT: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).
- RESERVE LANDS IN B. C., PURCHASE OF, BY GOVT.: M. for copies of Cor., &c.\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- RESERVES AND HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- RESERVE, VICTORIA ARM, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1211 (ii).
- RISING OF THE STONIES: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 863 (ii).
- SCHOOLS IN B. C., ESTABLISHMENT OF: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- SCHOOLS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 568 (i).
- SUPERINTENDENTS, OFFICE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 88 (i).
- SUPPLIES IN THE N.W., TENDERS: M. for Rets.\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
- SYMPATHY WITH HALF-BREEDS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- TITLES IN ONT. ACQUIRED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 632 (i).
- TITLE TO DISPUTED TERRITORY: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 594 (i).
- TRAFALGAR, LANDS UNSOLD: M. for List\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).  
(See "DOM. LANDS," "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.," &c.)
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AT QU'APPELLE AND HIGH RIVER: conc., 2922.
- INDUSTRIES OF CANADA, COMMISSION RESPECTING: M. for copy of Com., O. C., Cor., &c., and also Rep., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- Infectious or Contagious Diseases.** See "ANIMALS."
- INLAND FISHERIES OF THE DOM., QUEEN vs. ROBINSON: M. for copy of Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *O'Brien*) 229 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE, DEPT. OF: Rep. presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 28; in Com. of Sup., 901, 916 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR AT SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- Inland Revenue.** See "CONSOLIDATED."
- INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Sel. Com., 47; Mess. from His Ex., 101; M. to ref. Pets. to Sel. Com., 125 (i).
- Insolvency B. No. 32** (Mr. *Billy*). 1°, 101 (i).
- Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c., B. No. 66** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 235 (i).
- Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c., B. No. 127** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 1094 (ii).
- Insolvent Debtors, Distribution of Assets B. No. 4** (Mr. *Curran*). 1°, 29; 2°\*, 619 (i); M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1280; agreed to, 1231 (ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (iii).
- Insolvents, Discharge of past, B. No. 34** (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°\*, 113 (i).
- Insolvents' Estates Equitable Distribution B. No. 33** (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°\*, 113 (i).
- Inspection Act.** See "GENERAL."
- INSPECTION OF BANKS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 51 (i); prop. Res., 81 (i).
- INSPECTION OF FACTORIES, RES. RESPECTING, ON ORDER FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergin*) 606 (i).
- INSPECTORS OF PUBLIC WORKS, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 606 (i).
- INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS, PERSONS EMPLOYED AS: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 139 (i).

- INSTRUCTIONS TO GENL. MIDDLETON RESPECTING INSURGENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169 (iii).
- INSTRUCTIONS TO HEALTH OFFICERS IN N.B., AND QUARANTINE REGS.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1443 (ii).
- INSURANCE:**
- CANADA AGRICULTURAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED INSURANCE ACT, 1877. See B. 20.
- DOMINION GRANGE MUTUAL FIRE. See B. 55.
- INSOLVENT CO'S. See Bs. 66 and 127.
- LONDON LIFE INSURANCE CO. See B. 76.
- ROYAL CANADIAN INSURANCE CO. See B. 43.
- SUPERINTENDENCE OF: in Com. of Sup., 2957; conc. 2958 (iv).
- INSURRECTION. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W." &c.
- INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:**
- CASUALTIES TO TRAINS FROM COLLISIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).
- COAL CARRIED FROM SPRING HILL MINES\*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 533 (i).
- COMMISSION RESPECTING CLAIMS AGAINST: M. for copies of O. C., &c.\* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).
- COMMISSION, SECRETARY TO, APPOINTMENT: M. for copy of O. C.\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 187 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION TO INDIANTOWN: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 744 (i), 816 (ii).
- COST OF EQUIPMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).
- COST OF WORKING: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 202 (i).
- EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3073 (iv).
- EQUIPMENT, VALUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 888 (ii).
- FREE PASSES AND REDUCED FARE TICKETS: Ms. for Ret. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 234; (Mr. *McMullen*) 505 (i).
- FREIGHT AND PASSENGER EARNINGS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davies*) 1442 (ii).
- FREIGHT RATE ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN CAN. SHIPPING CO. AND THE BEAVER LINE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
- PLANTE, J. B., CLAIM OF, FOR HORSES KILLED: M. for copies (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 147 (i).
- PULLMAN CARS, COR. RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Weldon*).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 1744 (iii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1744, 1914 (ii).
- REVENUE AND WORKING EXPENSES: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 101 (i).
- ROBERTSON, J. D., CLAIM OF, re EXPROPRIATION OF FACTORY, &c.: M. for Papers, &c.\* (Mr. *Mills*) 1443 (ii).
- ROLLING STOCK, PURCHASE, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 101 (i).
- RY. CROSSING ON MILL ST.: MEMORIALS, &c.\* M. for copies (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- RY. SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1442 (ii).
- SALE OF TICKETS ON CHATHAM BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2238 (iii).
- SIMARD, M. J., REP. RECOMMENDING PAYMENT TO G. LAVOIE FOR LAND DAMAGES: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).
- WIRE FENCES, CONTRACTS MADE BY GOVT.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 532 (i).
- INTEREST PAID TO GOVT. BY C.P.R. CO. ON LOANS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 350 (i), 1677 (ii), 1955 (iii).
- INTERIOR DEPTL. REP.: Appeal to Members to speak louder (Mr. *Mitchell*) 49 (i).
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF, REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i); in Com. of Sup., 915, 968 (ii), 2764, 3408; conc., 3433 (iv).
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF, RECEIPTS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 54 (i).
- INTERIOR, ALLEGED FRAUDS AND IRREGULARITIES IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915, 2170 (iii).

- INTERIOR, MINISTER OF, ABSENCE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1131 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 40 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL COAL CO.'S B. NO. 51 (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 567 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 29.*)
- INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION. See "ANTWERP."
- INTERNATIONAL FERRIES B. NO. 17 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°\*, 46; 2° m., 254; 2°\*, 256 (i).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS, TRAFFIC IN, B. NO. 70 (Mr. *Small*). 1°, 270 (i).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," and "LIQUOR LICENSE ACT."
- IRON, BOUNTIES ON MANUFACTURES OF: M. for copies of O.C., &c.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- ISBESTER, J., APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- ISLANDS IN RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, LEASE OF, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 147 (i).
- ISSUE AND REDEMPTION OF DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- JACKSON. See "HALF-BREEDS."
- JENKINS, MR.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- JOINT COMMISSION, SURVEYS BETWEEN B.C. AND ALASKA: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Gordon*) 705 (i).
- JONES, L. K., APPOINTMENT AS SEC. TO I. C. R. COMMISSION: M. for copies of O.C. (Mr. *Rykert*) 187 (i).
- JONES, W. H. (SEC. OF STATE'S DEPT.) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2530 (iii).
- JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, CABLE ACROSS, COST: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- JUDGE CLARK, REP. OF, *re* CLAIMS SECTION B.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 78; M. for copy, 132 (i).
- JUDGE HUGHES, OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 77; M. for Ret., 98 (i).
- JUDGE MEREDITH, RESIGNATION OF: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 43 (i).
- JUDGES IN N. B., APPOINTMENT FOR YEAR'S CIRCUIT: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 563 (i).
- JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS. See B. 161.
- JUDICIAL REFORM IN THE N. W. T., PETITIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1306 (ii).
- JUDICIARY OF MAN. See B. 162.
- JUDICIARY OF QUEBEC. See "SUPERIOR COURT."
- JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY SUPREME COURT: M. for copies, &c. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).
- JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 985 (ii).
- JUSTICES OF THE PEACE. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1211 (ii). See B. 128.
- JUTE CLOTH: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- JUSTICE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 898, 914 (ii).
- KAVANAGH, J. C. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- KEEWATIN DISTRICT: EXPENSES OF GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 3244 (iv).
- KENTVILLE, N.S., DISMISSAL OF COLLECTOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Moffatt*) 1442 (ii).
- KIMBER, R. E. See "BLACK ROD."
- KINGSTON HARBOR PREVENTIVE OFFICERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1442 (ii).
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 985 (ii).
- KINGSTON. See "MARKET BATTERY and "TÊTE DU PONT."
- KITS SERVED OUT TO THE MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1568 (ii).
- KOOTENAY RY. CO., B. C., INCORP. B. NO. 83 (Mr. *Small*). 1°\*, 349; 2°\*, 545 (i).
- La Banque du Peuple B. NO. 53 (Mr. *Girouard*). 1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 8.*)
- LABORERS' WAGES, PAYMENT OF, ON C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 290 (i).
- Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit Riv. Ry. Co.'s B. NO. 24 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 113; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 21.*)
- LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT DAMS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1130 (ii).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES, PERMITS GRANTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1444 (ii); legislation respecting (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
- LAKE TÉMISCAMINGUE, MESSRS. PERLEY & GUERIN'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1040 (ii).
- LAND AND SURVEYS OF ST. LAURENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
- LAND AREA IN THE 48-MILE BELT ACCEPTED BY C.P.R. CO.: Stmt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 782; Stmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 862 (ii).
- LAND BOARD AT WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 3345 (iv).
- LAND CLAIMS IN N.W.T., DUTIES OF MR. RUSSELL: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
- LAND COMPANY AGENT. See "EDMONTON."
- LAND GRANT ACCEPTED BY C.P.R. CO., NUMBER OF ACRES: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 568, 744 (i).
- LAND GRANT AND LAND GRANT BONDS C.P.R., PRESENT POSITION OF: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- LAND GRANTS AND LAND GRANT BONDS TO RAILWAYS IN MAN. AND N. W.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W.T. B. NO. 147 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 782 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2440; in Com., 2461, 2483, 2497; M. to conc. in Res., 2533; 1°\* of B., 2534 (iii); 2° m., 2770, 2854; in Com., 2855; Order for 3° read, Amts. (Mr. *Blake*) 2890; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; Amts. (Mr. *Blake*) neg. on same div., 2894; 3°\*, 2894 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 60.*)
- LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1039 (ii).
- LAND RESERVES OF B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 703 (i).
- LAND SALES OR SETTLEMENT IN N.W., SOUTH OF 24-MILE BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2530 (iii).
- LANDS IN RY. BELT IN B.C. AND HOMESTEAD ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 289 (i).

- LANDS NORTH AND WEST OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mills) 66 (i).
- LANDS. See "DOMINION."
- LANDS REJECTED BY C.P.R. CO. IN RY. BELT: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 965; outside Ry. Belt, Queb. (Mr. Blake) 927 (ii).
- "LANSDOWNE," STEAMER, ENGINES AND BOILER: Ques. (Mr. Vail) 189 (i); COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Jenkins) 927 (ii).
- LANGELIER, MR. F.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- LAURIE, MAJ. GENL., MISSION OF, TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 2997 (iv).
- LAVIS'S PATENT POLE AND MILITIA TENTS: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 2029 (iii).
- LAVOIE, GEO. See "I.C.R."
- Law of Evidence.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- LAW REPORTS, ONT.: in Com of Sup., 3351 (iv).
- LEDUC, FATHER, AND MR. MALONEY, COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- LE FONDS POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 816 (ii).
- LEBEL, ANTOINE, INDIAN AGENT ACTING WITHOUT SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. De St. Georges) 1211 (ii).
- LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgos Rep., warrant issued and return of Member, 1.
- LETTER CARRIERS. See "CIVIL SERVICE" B. 31.
- LETTER POSTAGE REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 33; M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Charlton) 291 (i).
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION OF: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Charlton) 291 (i).
- LEVELS, GRADES, TANGENTS, &C., FROM SUMMIT OF ROCKIES TO MOODY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 888 (ii).
- LEVIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i); Return of Member elect, 1385 (ii).
- Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. 139** (Sir John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 1658; in Com., 1666; 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 1670 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, 2402 (iii); in Com., 2759; 3<sup>o</sup> m., Amt. (Mr. Laurier) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65) 2763; 3<sup>o</sup> on same div. reversed, 2763 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 45.)
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. for Joint Com., 36; Mr. Bourinot's Work: scarcity of copies, 40; Office of Librarian: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 41 (i); in Com. of Sup., 2796 (iv).
- LICENSE ACT, 1883, DECISION OF SUPREME COURT *re*: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 533 (i).
- LICENSE ACT, DOM., COMMISSIONERS UNDER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Bergin) 307 (i).
- LICENSE ACT, QUEBEC, WORKING OF: M. for Cor. (Mr. Bergeron) 307 (i).
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS IN ESSEX: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 606 (i).
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS, BOARD OF, UNDER ACT OF 1883: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 46 (i).
- LICENSE INSPECTORS, PAY OF, UNDER ACT OF 1883: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 1568 (ii).
- LICENSES, LAKE ERIE, FISHING, NAMES OF PERSONS GRANTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 964 (ii).
- LICENSES OR PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER, &C., APPLICATIONS FOR AND NOT GRANTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 209 (i).
- LICENSES. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- LIEUT.-GOV. OF N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 362 (i).
- LIEUT.-GOV. OF QUEBEC, OATH OF OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 479 (i).
- LIFE BOATS AND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2947 (iv).
- LIFE SAVING APPARATUS IN C.B.: Ques. (Mr. Dodd) 289 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Jackson) 142 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSES, &C. See "MARINE" and "PUBLIC WORKS."
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2951, 3250 (iv).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND FOG-ALARMS, CONSTRUCTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).
- LIGHTHOUSE AT QUACO, MEMORIALS OR COR: M. for copies\* (Mr. Weldon) 1442 (ii).
- LIGHTSHIP AT LOWER TRAVERSE, WOOD SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 30 (i).
- LINDSAY, D., DEPUTY COLLECTOR OF INLAND REVENUE, SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2531 (iii).
- LINGAN MINES, C.B., AIDING CIVIL POWER AT: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (iv).
- "LION," SEIZURE OF SCHOONER, IN N.S.: M. for copies of Rep., &c.\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).
- LIQUOR CERTIFICATES IN CO. OF HALTON: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McCraney) 67 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, APPLICATION FOR AND LICENSES GRANTED, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 46 (i).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 58** (Mr. Foster). 1<sup>o</sup>, 170; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 620; deb. adjd., 622 (i).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, B. No. 134** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1281 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2400; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2402 (iii); in Com., 2768, 2894; 3<sup>o</sup> m., Amt. (Mr. Mulock) 2958; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2961 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 74.)
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, BOARDS OF COMMISSIONERS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 77 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, CONSTITUTIONALITY OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 429 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, REGULATIONS DIRECTING LICENSE FUND UNDER: Ques. (Mr. Auger) 76 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, PUTTING IN FORCE OF: in Com. of Sup., 3244 (iv).
- LIQUOR. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," &C.
- LIQUORS, REVENUE DERIVED FROM IMPORTATION, &C.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Rykert) 313 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 29 (i).
- LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S., AUTOMATIC BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- LIVERPOOL OR LONDON, AND ST. JOHN, N.B., OR HALIFAX STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
- LOANS:
- ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVTS.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- ADVANCES TO PROVINCES. See B. 7.
- BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 113, 743 (i).
- CONTRACTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1744, 1914 (iii).

## LOANS—Continued.

- C. P. R. : \$30,000,000, PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1130; payment of interest on; Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1131 (ii). See B. 153.
- DRY DOCKS, ENCOURAGEMENT. See B. 108.
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK. See B. 7.
- FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLID., RETIREMENT : M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
- FIVE PER CENT. LOAN SINKING FUND : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2465 (iii).
- GOVT. LOANS : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- HARBOR MASTER OF HALIFAX. See B. 48.
- LOAN, RECENT, PROSPECTUS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c. : M. for copies (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS. : APPLICATIONS FOR ADVANCES : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- MONEY BORROWED BY GOVT. IN CANADA : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 743 (i); (Mr. *Charlton*) 1305 (ii).
- PUBLIC SERVICE. See B. 145.
- QUEBEC, ADVANCES ON ACCOUNT OF SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 235 (i).
- TEMPORARY LOANS TO GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 350 (i), 2530 (iii).
- THREE RIVERS HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See B. 150.
- £4,000,000 RECENTLY EFFECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2998 (iv).
- Loans for the Public Service authorization B. No. 145** (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 2391; M. for Com. on Res., 2461; in Com., 2463; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2523; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 2526 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- LOBSTER TRAPS AND SEA LOTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS. IN N. W. T. : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 292 (i).
- LOCATION, &c., C. P. R., LAND SET APART, GRANTED, &c. : M. for Map (Mr. *Blake*) 46 (i).
- LOCATION OF C. P. R. IN B. C. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2239 (iii).
- London Life Insurance Co.'s Amt. B. No. 76** (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1723 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- LONGLEY, G. C., COLLECTOR OF INLAND REV., SUPERANNUATION OF : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2530 (iii).
- LONG SAULT AND LAKE TÉMISCAMINGUE RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458.
- LONG POINT FISHING GROUNDS : Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 259 (i).
- LONGUEUIL AND LÉVIS RY., SURVEY OF : Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 429 (i).
- Lord's Day Observance.** See "SUNDAY EXCURSIONS."
- LOSSES AND EXPENSES THROUGH TROUBLES IN THE N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
- LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, SUPPLY OF WOOD TO : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
- LUGHRIN, CHARLES H., AND SEC. OF STATE, COR. BETWEEN, re CANADA TEMP. ACT : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Burpee*) 1443 (ii).
- Lutheran Church.** See "SYNOD."
- LYNCH'S TREATISE ON BUTTER : in Com. of Sup., 3456 (iv).
- LYTTON, B. C., WORK ON C. P. R., NEAR : M. for information (Mr. *Blake*).
- MADUXNAKIK RIVER OBSTRUCTIONS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Irvine*) 443 (i).
- MACKINLEY, A. & W., OF HALIFAX, ENTRY OF SCHOOL BOOKS AT UNDERVALUATION : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).

- MAIL BAGS, FURNISHING OF : Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 964 (ii).
- MAIL ROBBERIES IN MAN. AND N. W. T. : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE. See "POST OFFICE."
- MAIL SUBSIDIES. See "SUPPLY."
- MAIL TRAINS ON G. T. R., BROCKVILLE, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 816 (ii).
- MANILA HATS ; in Com. on Ways and Means, 817 (ii).
- MANITOBA :**
- BRANDON, POSTMASTER AT, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2029 (iii).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. See general heading.
- CENSUS : Ques. (Mr. *Farrow*) 149 (i). See B. 21.
- CLAIMS FOR A SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 188 (i).
- CLAIMS SETTLEMENT. See B. 155.
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES : prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 3395 (iv).
- CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT WINNIPEG : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 293 (i); M. for Ret.,\* 1443 (ii).
- EMERSON, TOWN OF, GOVT. AID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 148; M. for copies of Claims, &c.,\* 449 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c. : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
- INDIAN AGENCY, MANAGEMENT OF : M. for copy of Rep. of Commission (Mr. *Charlton*) 61; missing Ret. produced (Mr. *Speaker*) 67 (i).
- LAND BOARD AT WINNIPEG : in Com. of Sup., 3315 (iv).
- MAIL ROBBERIES : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).
- MAN, AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. See B. 147.
- MAN. CENTRAL RY. CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862 (i).
- MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO. See B. 147.
- PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 3351 (iv).
- ROUNDHOUSE AT SELKIRK : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2171 (iii).
- SESSION OF LEGISLATURE, 1884 : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862 (ii).
- SETTLERS : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).
- TUG-BARGES, DREDGES, &c., ON RED RIVER : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).
- [See also "DOMINION LANDS," "HALF-BREEDS," "INDIANS," &c.]
- Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 74** (Mr. *Royal*). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1180 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT : Deb. on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 2775; (Mr. *Watson*) 2776; (Mr. *Ross*) 2777; (Mr. *Blake*) 2778; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2780; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2783; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 2783; (Mr. *Mills*) 2784; (Mr. *White, Hastings*) 2786; (Messrs. *Trow and Woodworth*) 2787; (Mr. *Fairbank*) 2789 (iv). See B. 155.
- Manitoba, Subsidy to, increased, B. No. 155** (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 2420 (iii); M. for Com., 2775; in Com., 2789, 2823; further Res., 2889; in Com., 2924; 1°\* of B., 2926; 2° and in Com., 3047; 3°, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- MANUFACTURED EXPORTS, DRAWBACKS ON : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
- MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES REP. : Information respecting B. C. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 594.
- MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 113 (i); in Com. of Sup., 906, 922 (ii).
- MARINE :**
- ALLAN STEAMSHIP CO. AND CLAIM OF GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 148 (i).
- AUTOMATIC BUOYS IN LIVERPOOL HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).

## MARINE—Continued.

- BAYFIELD BREAKWATER, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 77 (i).  
 BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, MANAGEMENT : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).  
 BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 478 (i).  
 BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS : Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).  
 BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, SOUNDINGS : M. for copy of Rep. (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 1533 (ii).  
 CAPE RACE LIGHT ; in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).  
 CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 479 (i).  
 COFFIN'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, PROTECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1915 (iii).  
 DIGBY PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).  
 DISCOVERY ISLAND, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).  
 DREDGES, TUGS AND SCOWS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 53 ; remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 56 (i).  
 DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE FOG-HORN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).  
 FOG-WHISTLES IN BAY OF FUNDY, TENDERS FOR COAL : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).  
 GREAT VILLAGE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 67 (i).  
 HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).  
 HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, SUPPLIES : Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 783 ; in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).  
 "LANSDOWNE," STEAMER, ENGINE AND BOILER : Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 189 (i) ; COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. : Ques. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 927 (ii).  
 LIFE-BOATS AND STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2947 (iv).  
 LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS IN C.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Dodd*) 289 (i).  
 LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).  
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2950-2952, 3250 (iv).  
 "LION," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF : M. for copies of Rep.\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).  
 LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, WOOD SUPPLIES : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).  
 MASTERS AND MATES' EXAMINATION : in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).  
 MCLISAAC'S POND AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 36 ; ENGINEERS' REPS. : M. for copies, 60 (i).  
 METAGHAN RIVER PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).  
 NARROWS, ST. LAWRENCE, LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 112 (i).  
 NAVIGATION OF CANADIAN WATERS. See B. 132.  
 "NEPTUNE," STEAMER, SUPPLIES : M. for copies of Accts. (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).  
 NEW HARBOR AND INDIAN HARBOR BREAKWATERS : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).  
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).  
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2945 (iv).  
 PARSBOROUGH BREAKWATER, TENDERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 66 (i).  
 PORT ARTHUR HARBOR : in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).  
 PORT MOODY DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 816 (ii).  
 PORT ROWAN AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 297 (i).  
 PORTS STANLEY AND BURWELL, HARBORS OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 63 (i).  
 "QUEEN OF THE ISLES," STEAMER, EMPLOYMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1131 (ii).  
 RED POINT HARBOR BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1039 (ii).  
 RIVER ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION. See B. 159.  
 SALMON POINT BREAKWATER : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).  
 SATUMA ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).

## MARINE—Continued.

- SAWDUST IN LA HAVRE RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2239 (iii).  
 SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSBY RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1039 (ii).  
 SHIPPING, REGISTRATION : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).  
 "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 831 (ii).  
 SOMERVILLE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 57 (i).  
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMT. See B. 133.  
 STORES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i) ; Ques., 1914 (iii).  
 TRACADIE BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).  
 TUG-BARGES, DREDGE, &c., ON RED RIVER : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).  
 WATER AND RIVER POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).  
 WELLER'S BAY "RANGE LIGHTS" : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).  
 WHITE POINT BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).  
 WHITE POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).  
 WRECKS AND CASUALTIES : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).  
**Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. No. 11** (Mr. *Allen*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 40 ; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 127 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 131 ; Order for Com. read, 215 ; in Com., 496 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 616 (i).  
 MARKET BATTERY, KINGSTON, LEASE OF PROPERTY : M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).  
 MARTIN, JOHN, CONTINUATION OF PENSION TO WIDOW OF : M. for copies of Pets.\* (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).  
 MASKINONGÉ, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION : Warrant issued and Ret. of member, 1 (i).  
 MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 2946 (iv).  
 MATTAWA, MOUNTAIN RAPIDS, AND LONG SAULT, IMPROVEMENTS AT : Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1040 (ii).  
 MEDALS FOR VOLUNTEERS WHO SERVED IN THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 2274 (iii).  
 MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 351 (i).  
 MEETING OF THE HOUSE, IRREGULAR TIME : Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2996 (iv).  
 MEGANTIC : Return of Member to represent, 1 (i).  
 MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION FOR : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 49 (i).  
 MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, PAYMENT TO THOSE ABSENT THROUGH SICKNESS : Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3473 (iv).  
 MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 133 (i), 1192, 1385 (ii), 3450 (iv).  
 MEMORIALS, &c., RESPECTING GRIEVANCES, ANSWERS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).  
 MEREDITH, CHIEF JUSTICE, RESIGNATION OF : M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 43 (i).  
 MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :  
 ADDRESS, ANS. TO, 113 (i).  
 CLAIMS OF MANITOBA, 202 (i).  
 CHINESE COMMISSIONERS' REP., 234 (i).  
 ESTIMATES, THE, 289 (i) ; Suppl. for 1884-85, 2820 ; Suppl. for 1885-86, 3359 ; Further Suppl. for 1895-86, 3423 (iv).  
 BANKRUPTCY PETS., RES., &c., 101 (i).  
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 40 (i).  
 ALBANY, DECK OF, DEATH OF, THANKS OF QUEEN, 32 (i).  
 GRANT OF \$700,000 FOR N.W. TROUBLES, 1064 (ii).  
 GRANT OF \$1,000,000 FOR EXPENDITURE IN N.W., 2234 (iii).  
 MIDDLETON, GENL., VOTE TO, 3470 (iv).  
 PARLIAMENT : OPENING, 1 ; PROROGATION, 3475.  
 WASHINGTON TREATY, COR. AND PAPERS, 3232 (iv).  
 METAGHAN RIVER PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).

**METLAKATLA INDIAN TROUBLES:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).

**METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORIES:** in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

**MIDDLETON, GENL., DESPATCHES FROM:** 1822, 1835, 1895, 2139, 2357 (iii), 2750, 3073 (iv); Instructions to: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1306 (ii), 2169 (iii); Thanks of Parlt., 3457; Vote of \$20,000, 3470 (iv).

### MILITIA :

A, B AND C BATTERIES : in Com. of Sup., 2914 (iv).  
 ACTIVE MEMBERS, NUMBER : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Mulock*) 533 (i).  
 AMMUNITION : in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).  
 ARMS, DESCRIPTION OF : Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 814.  
 ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS, PAYMENT OF ARREARS : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 883; M. for Ret.,\* 1444 (ii).  
 BARRACKS AT LONDON : in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).  
 BARRACK HUTS, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).  
 BATTERIES, TRANSFER OF : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 235 (i).  
 BERGIN, SURGEON-GENL., SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1914 (iii).  
 BLAIS, ACHILLE, FUNERAL EXPENSES : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2169 (iii).  
 BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO CORPS : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (ii).  
 BRIGADE MAJORS' SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).  
 CANADIAN CONTINGENT FOR THE SOUDAN : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 568 (i).  
 CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS : in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).  
 DOM. ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION : in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).  
 DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION : in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).  
 DRILL PAY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2910 (iv).  
 EQUIPMENT OF THE 90TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 2851 (iv).  
 EXPEDITION TO THE N.W., COST OF : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1678 (ii).  
 FLANNEL SHIRTS, CONTRACT FOR : Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1306 (ii).  
 GATLING GUNS FOR USE OF TROOPS : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 813 (ii).  
 GRANT, G., SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2531 (iii).  
 GUNS IN ACTION IN THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).  
 HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION TO THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).  
 IMPROVED RIFLED ORDNANCE : in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).  
 KITS SERVED OUT : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1568 (ii).  
 LAURIE, MAJOR GENL., MISSION TO THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2997 (ii).  
 LAVIS' PATENT POLE AND MILITIA TENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2029 (iii).  
 MARTIN, J., PENSION TO WIDOW OF : M. for copies of Pet.\* (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).  
 MEDALS FOR VOLUNTEERS : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 2274 (iii).  
 MIDDLETON, GENL., DESPATCHES FROM, 1822, 1835, 1895, 2139, 2357 (iii), 2750, 3073 (iv).  
 MIDDLETON, GENL., INSTRUCTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1306 (ii), 2169 (iii).  
 MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES, NUMBER, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 313 (i).  
 MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES IN THE MILITIA : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1040 (ii).  
 MILITARY BRANCH, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2889, 2893, 2903 (iv).  
 MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 2913; conc., 2932 (iv).  
 MILITARY MAGAZINE AT ST. JOHN : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 603 (i).  
 MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS IN MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862, 1474 (ii).  
 MILITARY PROPERTIES, CARE OF : in Com. Sup., 2916 (iv).  
 MILITARY STOREHOUSE, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1039 (ii).  
 MONTREAL GARRISON ARTILLERY : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1566 (ii).  
 MOUNTED INFANTRY, WINNIPEG : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (iv).  
 OFFICERS AND MEN, PAY, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 313 (i).  
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST : M. for copy of Rep. of Major-Genl. (Mr. *Casey*) 45 (i).  
 OTTEB'S, COL., MARCH TO BATTLEFORD : Remarks, 1386 (ii).  
 QUINET'S, COL., ABSENCE FROM DUTY : Remarks, 1167, 1205 (ii).  
 PENSIONS TO MILITIAMEN OF 1812 : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 101 (i).  
 PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).  
 POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE : Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 246 (ii).

### MILITIA—Continued.

PROTESTANT VOLUNTEERS IN 65TH BATTALION ; Remarks, 2998 ; Tel., 3094 (iv).  
 REBELLION. See general heading "DISTURBANCE."  
 REWARDS FOR BRAVERY : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2359.  
 SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC : M. for Papers (Mr. *Langelier*) 88 (i).  
 SCOTT'S, COL., BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1064 (ii).  
 TROOPS AT CLARKE'S CROSSING : Telegram, 1205 (ii).  
 TROOPS, MOVEMENTS OF : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 238, 872 ; Tel., 1328 (ii).  
 VETERANS OF WAR 1812 : in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).  
 ——— EXTENSION OF PENSIONS TO WIDOWS : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 36 (i).  
 VICTORIA RIFLES, MONTREAL : Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1983 (iii).  
 VOLUNTEERS OF MIL. DIST. No. 9 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).  
 ——— TREATMENT OF HALF-BREEDS BY : Remarks, 2169 (iii).  
 ——— KILLED, TRANSPORT OF BODIES : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii).  
 ——— IN THE N.W. AND INTOXICATING LIQUOR : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1131 (ii).  
 ——— CORPS IN THE N.W. IN 1879 : Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 816 ; Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1474 (ii).  
 ——— OF 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES : Res. (Mr. *Hickey*) 37 (i).  
 ——— RECOGNITION OF SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 1563 (ii).  
 VOTE OF THANKS, GEN. MIDDLETON AND VOLUNTEERS, 3459 ; Res., 3463 (iv).  
 WAR SUPPLIES, CARRIAGE BY AMERICAN RYS. : Remarks, 839 (ii).  
 WATERPROOF BLANKETS, PURCHASE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).  
 WILLIAMS, COL., DEATH OF : Remarks and Telegram, 3073 (iv).  
 [See also general heading "DISTURBANCE."]  
**Militia Acts.** See "CONSOLIDATED."  
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE, ANNUAL REP. : presented (Mr. *Caron*) 49 (i).  
 MILITIA, DEPT. OF : in Com. of Sup., 898, 914 (ii), 2913 (iv).  
**Militia, Recognition of Services in the N.W. B.**  
 160 (Mr. *Caron*). Res. prop., 3321 ; M. for Com., 3376 ; in Com., 3377 ; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 3380 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 73)  
 MILLARD, MR., FINES IMPOSED, COLLECTION OF : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1211 (ii).  
 MILL ST., ST. JOHN, RY. CROSSING ON, MEMORIAL AND COR. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).  
 MINERAL WATERS : in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).  
 MINING AND TIMBER LANDS, NORTH OF LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON, OWNERSHIP OF : M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).  
 MINISTER OF RYS., OFFICE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 41 (i).  
 MINISTER OF INT., ABSENCE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 964 (ii).  
 MIRAMICHI RIVER, FISH CAUGHT IN : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).  
 MISSION OF HON. MR. ROYAL : Attention of Govt. called to newspaper paragraph (Mr. *Blake*) 889 (ii).  
 MISSION OF MAJOR GENL. LAURIE TO THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2 97 (iv).  
 MODEL FARM, ESTABLISHMENT : in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).  
 MONEY BORROWED BY GOVT. IN CANADA : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 743 (i).  
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 ; in Com., 3472 (iv).  
 MONTREAL AND SOREL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457 (iv).  
 MONTREAL GARRISON ARTILLERY. See "MILITIA."

- MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 567 (i).
- MOODY, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 148 (i).
- MOODY. See "PORT MOODY."
- "MORAVIAN." See "ALLAN LINE."
- MORGAN, H. J., PAYMENTS TO: M. for Stmt. (Mr. McCraney) 1443 (ii). See "DOMINION ANNUAL REGISTER."
- MORGAN, J. H., SERVICES AS FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Cockburn) 77; APPOINTMENT: M. for O. C. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 147 (i).
- MOULDINGS AND PICTURE FRAMES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (ii).
- MORTON DAIRYING AND FARMING Co. See "SQUATTERS."
- MOUNTED INFANTRY. See "MILITIA."
- Mounted Police Augmentation B. No. 144** (Sir John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 994 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2402; in Com., 2415; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2421; 1°\* of B., 2430 (iii); 2° and in Com., 2770; 3° m., 2820; 3° on a div., 2822 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 53.)
- MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, TENDERS FOR: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2359 (iii).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 505 (i).
- Mounted Police Force B. No. 140** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°\*, 1670 (ii); 2° and in Com., 2772; 3° m., 2832; 3°, 2833 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 54.)
- MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3392, 3421 (iv).
- MOUNTED POLICE, INCREASE OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2169 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE OFFICERS, REPS. FROM, re ENGAGEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3435 (iv).
- MOUNTED POLICE RECRUITS: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1566 (ii).
- MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3303, 3307 (iv).
- MURRAY CANAL ROUTE, COR. AND PETS.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Cockburn) 1442 (ii).
- MUSK: in Com on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- MUSKOKA LAKES AND RIVER SEVERN CANAL SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 289 (i).
- MCCARTHY, C. (PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530 (iii).
- MCDUGALL, MR. H. F.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- McISAAC'S POND, INVERNESS, N.S., AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE, (Ques.) 36; ENGINEERS' REPS. RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 60 (i).
- McLEOD, N., (INDIAN AFFAIRS) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530 (iii).
- MOHANUS, GRATUITY TO WIDOW OF: in Com. of Sup., 3350; conc., 3374 (iv).
- NAPANEE, CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (Mr. Pruyt) 77 (i).
- NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458.
- NARROWS, ERECTION OF A LIGHTHOUSE AT: Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 112 (i).
- "NATIONAL POLICY" PAMPHLET: M. for copy\* (Mr. Charlton) 124 (i).
- Navigation of Canadian Waters Act Amt. B. No. 132** (Mr. McLelan). Res. prop. and in Com., 1278; 1°\* of B., 1279 (ii): Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2899 (iv). See B. 159.
- NELSON & SON'S SCHOOL BOOKS. See "CUSTOMS."
- "NEWFIELD." See "ALLAN LINE."
- NEW HARBOR AND INDIAN HARBOR, N.S., BREAKWATERS, ENGINEERS' REPS.: M. for copies, &c.\* (Mr. Kirk) 147 (i).
- NEW MEMBERS, RET. OF (ANNOUNCEMENT) 1, 113 (i), 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).
- NEW MILITIA PENSIONS: conc., 2765 (iv).
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- CARLTON BRANCH RY., PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (iv).
- DODGE, BRENTON, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Moffat) 1442 (ii).
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 989 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FISH INSPECTOR IN CITY OF ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 2997 (iv).
- FISH TAKEN IN THE MIRAMICHI: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mitchell) 295 (i).
- FOOT AND CARRIAGE BRIDGE AT ST. JOHN: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1443 (ii).
- INTERCOLONIAL RY. See general heading.
- JUDGES, APPOINTMENT FOR YEAR'S CIRCUIT: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 568 (i).
- LIEUT.-GOVERNOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 362 (i).
- MILITARY PROPERTIES AT ST. JOHN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 606 (i).
- MILL ST., ST. JOHN, RY. CROSSING, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Weldon) 1442 (ii).
- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. Co.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Temple) 533 (i).
- POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 246 (i).
- RICHIBUCTO AND KINGSTON PORTS, CUSTOMS BUSINESS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1442 (ii).
- SALMON FISHING IN BATHURST HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2359 (iii).
- ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RY. EXTENSION Co.: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 569 (i).
- ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTY, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 3427 (iv).
- ST. STEPHEN'S POST OFFICE, RECEIPTS, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Burpee) 1100 (ii).
- ST. STEPHEN'S PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 1148 (ii).
- SUPREME COURT, CAUSES ENTERED: M. for number (Mr. Foster) 294 (i).
- WOODSTOCK PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Irvine) 606 (i).
- "NEPTUNE," See "HUDSON BAY."
- NEW BRUNSWICK AND P.E.I. RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE DOM., TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 3042 (iv).
- NICOLET: Return of Member to represent, 1.
- NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING Co., POSITION OF DEBT OF \$600,000: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF ONT., PROCEEDINGS, MONEYS PAID, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 210 (i).
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. AND THE C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 57 (i).
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. LEASE: M. for copy (Mr. Mulock) 56 (i).

- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY., COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND LOCAL GOVT. OF N.B.:** M. for copies (Mr. Temple) 533 (i).
- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457 (iv).
- NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS:** M. for copy of Repts., &c. (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).
- NORTH SHORE LINE, SUBSIDY TO:** M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
- NORTH SHORE RY., PURCHASE OF, BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 189 (i).
- NORTH SHORE RY., USE OF BY C.P.R.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii).
- NORTHUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i); Return of Member, 1192 (ii).
- NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAV. Co.** See B. 147.
- NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY.:** Remarks (Mr. Watson) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3380 (iv).
- N.W. COUNCIL, RES. re HALF-BREED CLAIMS:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- N.W. COUNCIL, SALARIES:** in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).
- N.W.T. Expenses B. No. 149** (Mr. Bowell). Res., 2532, 1°\* of B., 2559; 2° and in Com., 2855; 3°\*, 2894 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 42.)
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:**
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. See B. 141.
- BELL AND KAVANAGH LAND CLAIMS: M. for copies of O. C. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 479 (i).
- CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. See general heading.
- CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 149 (i). See B. 21.
- CHANGE OF NAMES OF LOCALITIES: Ques. (Mr. Tassé) 2359 (iii).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt. \* (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FEES FROM SETTLERS BY GOVT. AGENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2170 (iii).
- FISHERIES ACT EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 51 (i).
- FISHERIES PROTECTION: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Hesson) 700 (i).
- FORT MACLEOD BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iv).
- FORT MACLEOD RANCH TEL. Co. See B. 80.
- FUEL FOR SETTLERS: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Blake) 61 (i).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 66 (i).
- GRANDIN, BISHOP, COMMUNICATIONS FROM: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3423 (iv).
- HALF-BREED GRIEVANCES: Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt to Oom. on Ways and Means, 761; neg. (Y. 57, N. 122) 771 (i); Speech, 2030; Resumé of Events: Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 3075; deb. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 3110; (Mr. Laurier) 3119; (Mr. Girouard) 3128; (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 3154, 3163; (Mr. Mackintosh) 3175; (Mr. Mills) 3190; (Mr. Royal) 3199.
- HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION IN 1884: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- IMMIGRANT SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 350 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- INDIANS. See general heading.
- INDIAN SUPPLIES, TENDERS FOR: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 532 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AT QU'APPELLE, &c.: conc., 2922 (iv).
- JUDICIAL REFORM, PETITIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1306 (ii).
- LAND GRANTS TO RYS. See B. 147.
- LANDS. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- LAURIE, MAJOR GENL., MISSION TO N.W.: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 2997 (iv).
- LOSSES AND EXPENSES THROUGH TROUBLES: in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
- MAIL ROBBERIES: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Blake) 91 (i).
- MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 862 (ii).
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—Continued.**
- MORGAN, J. H., APPOINTMENT AS FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: M. for O. C., &c.\* (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 147 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- N.W. COUNCIL, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).
- OFFICIALS, COMMUNICATIONS WITH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- REAL PROPERTY IN THE N.W.T. See B. 109.
- REBELLION. See general heading "DISTURBANCE."
- REPRESENTATION IN PARLT.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 292 (i); Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404.
- ROYAL, HON. MR., VISIT TO N.W.: attention of Govt. called to (Mr. Blake) 889 (ii).
- RUSSELL, MR., DUTIES OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2358 (iv).
- SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).
- SAUNDERS AND WOOD, TRIAL FOR LIBEL: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- SETTLERS DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1884: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 113 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN QU'APPELLE VALLEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN TP. 3, RANGES 23 AND 24 WEST: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 231 (i).
- ST. CLAIR RANCH Co.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2240 (iii).
- SURVEYS AND EXPLORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2029 (iii).
- SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF QU'APPELLE. See B. 39.
- VOLUNTEER CORPS, ORGANIZATION: Remarks (Mr. Watson) 816; Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1474 (ii).
- VOTE FOR RELIEF OF SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 1744 (iii). [See also "DISTURBANCE," "DOMINION LANDS," "HALF-BREEDS, &c."]
- NOVA SCOTIA:**
- ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 568 (i).
- AUTOMATIC BUOYS IN LIVERPOOL HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- BAYFIELD HARBOR BREAKWATER, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 77 (i).
- BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, MANAGEMENT: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Campbell, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 478 (i).
- CLAIMS FOR A SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 189 (i).
- COFFIN'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 1915 (iii).
- CUMBERLAND, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1 (i).
- CUSTOMS DETECTIVES OR POLICE IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 889 (ii).
- DIGBY PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Vail) 532 (i).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY., EARNINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 148; M. for Stmt.\* 313 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3384 (iv).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FISHERMEN, PAYMENT OF BOUNTY, IN GUYSBOROUGH Co.: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 2751 (iv).
- FISH LADDERS IN LA HAVE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 2239 (iii).
- GREAT VILLAGE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 67 (i).
- HARBORS IN GUYSBOROUGH Co., RE-SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 51 (i).
- "LION," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF: M. for copies of Rep.\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).
- MCISAAC'S POND AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 36; Engineers' Repts.: M. for copies, 60 (i).
- METAGHAN RIVER PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Vail) 532 (i).
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., PROJECTED LINE: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3413 (iv).
- PARSBOROUGH BREAKWATER, TENDERS: M. for copies (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 66 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND GUYSBOROUGH, &c., COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 114 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AS A SUB-PORT: M. for papers (Mr. Kirk) 445 (i).

**NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.**

- RYs., CONSOLIDATION AND COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 2530 (iv).
- SAWDUST LAW, BREACH OF : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147; Ques., 1039, 1211 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSEY RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1039 (ii).
- SOMERVILLE BREAKWATER REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 57 (i).
- STARR, J. E., FISHERY OVERSEER, REMOVAL OF : M. for Ret\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX : Ms. for Rets.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i), 1442; Ques., 1914, 1915 (iii).
- TRACADIE BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).
- VACANCY IN A JUDICIAL DISTRICT : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2750 (iv).
- WATER LOTS, APPLICATIONS FOR : Ques. (Mr. *Tupper*) 429 (i).
- WHITE POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).
- WINDSOR BRANCH RY., O.C., AGREEMENTS, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Kinney*) 533 (i).

**Oaths of Office.** See "ADMINISTRATION."

- OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
- OAK, PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS, EXPORT DUTY : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).
- OBSTRUCTIONS IN RIVERS, COR. BETWEEN CANADA AND U.S. : M. for copies (Mr. *Irvine*) 443; withdn., 415 (i).
- OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE. See "MARINE" and "SUPPLY."
- OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, ANNUAL COST, &c. : M. for Stmt., (Mr. *Blake*) 204 (i).
- Ocean Mail Service, Renewal of Contract B. No. 151** (Mr. *Carling*). Res. prop., 2440; Res. in Com., 2555 (iii); M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2751; M. to conc. in Res., 2754; 1° of B., 2757; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (iv).
- O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, SUMS PAID TO, re ONT. BOUNDARY : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Lister*) 210 (i).

**Offences Against the Person.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."

- OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 88 (i).
- OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES UNDER BANKRUPT ACT, 1869 : M. for Ret. of Estates, &c.\* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 303, 533 (i).
- OFFICIAL DESPATCHES RESPECTING ENGAGEMENTS IN N.W. : Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2999 (iv); Ques., 2169 (iii).
- OFFICIALS, GOVT., IN THE N.W., NAMES, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 66 (i).
- OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES, EMPLOYMENT OF, DURING RECESS : Ques. (Mr. *Auger*) 76 (i).
- O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST : M. for copy of Rep. of Maj.-Genl. (Mr. *Casey*) 45 (i).
- O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST AND SUSPENSION OF : M. for copy (Mr. *Wilson*) 101; (i).
- ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO'S BONDS : M. for copy of Prospectus, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i); Stockholders : M. for Stmt.\* 1443 (ii).
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°\*, 213; 2°\*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1007 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

**ONTARIO :**

- BOUNDARIES. See general heading.
- CHARLINGH, POSTMASTER AT : M. for Papers (Mr. *Blake*) 708 (i).

**ONTARIO—Continued.**

- CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
- CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2997 (iv).
- DAMS AT LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT : Ques. (Mr. *Dummy*) 293 (i).
- DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE FOG-HORN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD, SALE OF : M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 147; prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 451 (i). See B. 120.
- DUNDAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 290 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c. : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
- FORT FRANCIS CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 3385 (iv).
- GLAMMIS POST OFFICE, ENQUIRY : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1131 (ii).
- GRENVILLE, SOUTH, RETURN OF MEMBER, 3072 (iv).
- HENEY, J., GOVT. PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY : Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 3426 (iv).
- HUGHES, D. J., CHARGES AGAINST : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 98; Ques, 77 (i).
- INDIAN TITLES ACQUIRED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 632 (i).
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 985 (i), 3350 (iv).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES : M. for Ret\* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1444 (ii); Ques., 3073 (iv).
- LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND SETTLEMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1039 (ii).
- LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE, &c., 1 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).
- LONG POINT FISHING GROUNDS : Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 289 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE ON CAN. SOUTHERN RY. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
- MAITLAND, POSTMASTER AT : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1743 (iii).
- MARITIME COURT, EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION. See B. 11.
- MIDDLESEX, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S REP., 1 (i).
- MILITIA BARRACKS AT LONDON : in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- MINING AND TIMBER LANDS NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR : M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).
- MURRAY CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 3303 (iv).
- MURRAY CANAL ROUTE : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1442 (ii).
- MUSKOKA LAKES AND RIVER SEVERN CANAL SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 289 (i).
- NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Pruyn*) 77 (i).
- NORTHUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S REP., 593 (i); Ret. of Member, 1192 (ii).
- O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST : M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 45; (Mr. *Wilson*) 101 (i).
- ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO'S BONDS : M. for copy of Prospectus (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i); Stockholders : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- ONTARIO, WEST, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1 (i).
- OTTAWA, ALLOWANCE TO ASSISTANT POSTMASTER : in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (iv).
- OTTAWA RIVER SHIP CANAL : prop. Res. (Mr. *White*, *Renfrew*) 1211 (ii).
- OTTAWA RIVER SURVEY AND EXPLORATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *White*, *Renfrew*) 131 (i), 1040 (ii).
- PORT ARTHUR HARBOR : in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
- PORT CREDIT HARBOR CO., REPS. MADE TO GOVT. : M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 124 (i).
- PORT ROWAN AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 297 (i).
- PORTS STANLEY AND BURWELL, HARBORS OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 62 (i).
- REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO MUNICIPALITIES, MEMORIALS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Cook*) 569 (i).
- RIDEAU CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 3312, 3418 (iv).
- RIDGETOWN AS A PORT OF ENTRY, PETS., &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Casey*) 532 (i).
- RYS. CENTREING IN OTTAWA, BONUSES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86 (i).
- RYS. IN CO. OF GREY, REFUND OF BONUSES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
- SALMON POINT BREAKWATER : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).

## ONTARIO—Continued.

- SHILOH AND FERGUS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Innes) 1211 (ii).  
 ST. THOMAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).  
 TRENT RIVER NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 3311 (iv).  
 TIMBER PERMITS GRANTED IN TERRITORY AWARDED ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 114, 115; M. for Ret., 115; M. for copies,\* 124, 210 (i).  
 WELLAND AND WILLIAMSBURG CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 3301, 3418 (iv).  
 WELLER'S BAY "RANGE LIGHTS:" M. for Cor. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).  
 WILKINSON, J. A., SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 51 (i).  
 WOOD AND WILKINSON, SUMS PAID: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).  
 WOOD SUPPLY TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1387 (ii).

OPERATIVES IN FACTORIES: M. for Rets., Stmnts. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 37 (i).

ORDER PAPER, OMISSION FROM, OF A QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 2774; explanation, 2854 (iv).

## ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

## ORDER:

- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE N.W. B. 141: Interruption by Members not in Order (Mr. Speaker) 3430 (iv).  
 CENSUS OF THE N.W., &c., B. 21: Member called to Order for imputing motives (Mr. Speaker) 213 (i).  
 CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 31. On Amt. to 3<sup>o</sup>: full discussion of principles of B. objected to by Mr. Bowell; Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) competent for members to enter largely into discussion of B, but should confine their remarks to Resolution in Amt., 1300 (ii).  
 DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W. Remarks (Mr. Girouard) on newspaper paragraph: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) Ques. of Privilege should conclude with a motion, and member cannot correct a speaker until conclusion of speech, 3161 (iv).  
 FRANCHISE B. 103. Calling across floor not in Order (Mr. Chairman) 1432 (ii), 1733.  
 — Irrelevancy of deb., 1431, 1494, 1503, 1619, 1793, 2242, 1733 1800, 1923, 1964, 2146 (iii).  
 — Member called to Order for drawing a comparison: Ruled in Order (Mr. Chairman) 1867 (iii).  
 — Member called to Order for reading extracts: Ruling (Mr. Chairman) reading extracts continuously an abuse of Privilege, 1461, 1465, 1467, 1496 (ii); Remarks (Mr. Orton) 3161 (iv).  
 — Members wearying House with repetitions: Authorities quoted (Mr. Chairman) 1804 (iii).  
 — Objection (Mr. Davies) to member imputing statements, 1974; (Mr. Foster) 1825 (iii).  
 — Objection (Sir Richard Cartwright) to Member calling "Order" from his seat: Ruled (Mr. Chairman) in Order; but if a Member wants to raise a point of Order he must rise and state it, 1975 (iii).  
 — On discussion of financial condition of the country: objection (Mr. McCallum) 1919; Ruling (Mr. Chairman) an elaboration of financial condition of the country not in Order, 1922; appeal from decision of Chair to House (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 1923; Ruling sustained (Y. 67, N. 41) 1924 (iii).  
 — On enfranchisement of Indians: objection (Mr. Dawson) taken to discussing proprietary rights of Indians: Ruling (Mr. Chairman) objection sustained, 2144 (iii).  
 — On Member keeping floor and not speaking, and disorderly interruptions: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald and others) 1969 (iii).  
 — On M. to adjn.: Member called to order for irrelevancy of remarks, 1509: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Chairman) 1510; appeal from decision of Chair to House (Mr. Edgar) 1510; authorities quoted, 1510, 1511; ruling sustained (Y. 76, N. 46) 1513 (ii).  
 — Ruling (Mr. Chairman) deb. must be confined to clause before Com., 1800 (iii).

## ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

## ORDER—Continued.

- FRANCHISE B. 103. Unparliamentary language, withdrawal requested (Mr. Chairman) 1424; (Mr. Casey) 1435, 1436, 1466, 1680 (ii), 1825 (iii).  
 FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS: Genuineness of Signatures questioned by Mr. Woodworth, and "May" quoted, 2034; Remarks (Mr. Speaker) as to duties of Clerk and officers, 2027 (iii).  
 INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS B. 44: Full discussion of B. not in Order on an Amt. (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 1330 (ii).  
 LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN THE N. W. B. 147: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) on article in Toronto Mail re frosts in Manitoba, 2459; discussion on C. P. R. Contract declared not in Order (Mr. Speaker) 2460 (iv).  
 MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT: on Res, Member called to Order (Mr. Speaker) for referring to what took place in Com., 2783; reference to what took place in Com. of W. not in Order, 2786 (iv).  
 TORONTO "NEWS," ARTICLE ON FRENCH AGGRESSION: Objection taken by Mr. Charlton to an hon. Member naming another by some other name than his own or constituency; objection sustained by Mr. Speaker and expression withdrawn, 1680 (ii).  
 VOLUNTEERS, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES B. 160: On alteration of Res. without consent of the Crown; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3380 (iv).  
 WASHINGTON TREATY, TERMINATION OF FISHERY CLAUSES: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) allusion to previous deb. not in Order, 2899 (iv).  
 WAYS AND MEANS: Objection taken by Mr. Bowell to Member entering into full discussion of sugar duties, simply on a change; Ruling (Mr. Chairman) 852 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE:
- BONUSES TO RYS. BY ONT. GOVT.: Personal explanation (Mr. Blake) 3445 (iv).  
 CANADA TEMP. ACT: Explanation (Mr. Orton) on article in News Record, re vote, 3,000; explanation (Mr. Kaulbach) 3073 (iv).  
 C.P.R. BETWEEN EMERSON AND WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Lister) on Stmnt. of Minister of Marine, 693 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) re charge of being the defender of the Co., 2460 (iv).  
 — RESOLUTIONS: PUBLICATION IN NEWSPAPERS BEFORE PRESENTATION TO HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1712 (ii).  
 CORRESPONDENCE IN FORT ARTHUR "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. Dawson) and repudiation (Mr. Macmaster) 3162 (iv).  
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP: Interpolation of remarks in Speech; remarks and repudiation (Mr. Blake) 2541; correction (Mr. Macmaster) 2619 (iv).  
 DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.: Article in the Electeur; personal explanation (Mr. Caron) 967 (ii).  
 — Denial of Stmnt. in Montreal Post (Mr. Girouard) 3161 (iv).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Cook) on newspaper paragraph re Col. Amyot's Battalion, 1336 (ii).  
 — Repudiation of charge contained in article in Hamilton Spectator (Mr. Blake) 813 (ii).  
 DOMINION AND ONTARIO POLITICS: Personal explanation (Mr. Blake) 1837 (iii).  
 FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS AND THE CLERGY: Explanation (Mr. Sproule) re paragraph in Canada Presbyterian and Meaford Monitor 2772 (iv).  
 FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS, GENUINENESS OF SIGNATURES: Remarks (Mr. Edgar) on article in Ottawa Citizen, 1955, 2103; (Mr. Allen) 2209 (iii).  
 FRANCHISE B.: Report of speech in Globe newspaper: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 1824 (iii).  
 FRENCH AGGRESSION: Article in Toronto News, Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1678 (ii).  
 GOVERNMENT PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Somerville, Brant) on paragraph in Ottawa Citizen, 3162, 3213; personal allusions (Mr. Mackintosh) 3247 (iv).  
 GRAND TRUNK RY. AND CONDUCT OF MR. HICKSON: Remarks (Mr. McMullen) on paragraph in Montreal Herald, 1131 (ii).

## ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

## PRIVILEGE—Continued.

- HALF-BREED GRIEVANCES IN THE N.W. : Explanation (Mr. *Blake*) re J. E. BROWN's correspondence, 3246 (iv).
- HYDRAULIC POWER ON CORNWALL CANAL : Explanation (Mr. *Gault*) of paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, 49 (i).
- INTERPOLATION OF WORDS IN A DESPATCH : Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 3247 (iv).
- LABORERS ON C.P.R. : Explanation (Mr. *Dawson*) of paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, 247 (i).
- LAND GRANTS AND LAND GRANT BONDS, &C., RETURN : Personal explanation (Mr. *Mitchell*) 94 (i).
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EX., MEMBERS RISING AND UNCOVERING ON DELIVERY : Contradiction of Stmt. in *Ottawa Free Press* (Messrs. *Royal* and *Girouard*) 170 (i).
- NOVA SCOTIA VOLUNTEERS : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 1094 (i).
- PRINCE ALBERT COLONIZATION CO. : Explanation (Mr. *White, Hastings*) re paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 3162 (iv).
- TIMBER LIMITS IN THE N.W. : Denial (Mr. *Sproule*) of Statements published in *Ottawa Free Press*, 566 (i).
- TIMBER REGULATIONS IN B. C. : Remarks (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 2240 (iii).
- VERACITY QUESTIONED : Remarks (Mr. *Curran*) 725 (i).
- WATER POWER ON WILLIAMSBURG CANAL : Explanation (Mr. *Benson*) of paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, 48 (i).
- WAYS AND MEANS : Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) re workmen of Montreal, 521 (i).

## PROCEDURE :

- CAN. TEMP. ACT AMT. B. 92 : On Amt. (Mr. *White, Cirwell*) to M. for 2° : objection taken by Mr. *Blake* that a motion in amendment to 2° should be made as a substantive motion : Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) Amt. in Order, as it contradicts the principle of the B., and "May" quoted in support of same, 952 (ii).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT : On M. to place B. Second Order on Pub. Bills and Orders : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) Order of proceedings regulated by the Rules ; items standing on Order Paper taken up according to precedence ; Order cannot be changed without notice, 714 (i).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT : On Mr. Hickey's Amt. to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., relevancy of Amt. questioned : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) that Amt. is consequential to or relevant upon the Amt. adopted by the Senate, and Speaker Brand quoted, 2556 (iv).
- DIVISIONS IN COMMITTEE, OBJECTION TO CHAIRMAN'S RULING : Practice stated (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1470 (ii).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD : On M. for Com. on Res. legalising sale ; object of Rule stated to be that full time should be given for consideration of all Bills, Motions or Resolutions which may result in a charge on the Treasury, &c. (Mr. *Speaker*) 451 (i).
- FACTORIES, REGULATION OF LABOR B. 85 : On M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2° ; Objection taken by Mr. *Bergin* to Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) substituting Can. Temp. Act, 944 ; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) that the House may proceed to other Orders of the Day in discussing an Order, or a particular Order may be superseded by the House agreeing to an Amt. and "May" quoted to sustain same, 944 (ii).
- INSOLVENT DEBTORS' ASSETS B. 4 : On M. to transfer to Govt. Orders : Votes and Proceeding quoted (Mr. *Speaker*) 1281 (ii).
- INSPECTION OF FACTORIES RES : Suggestion (Mr. *Speaker*) that same stand first on Pub. Bills and Orders, 607 (i).
- MILITIA ACT, 1883, AMT. B. 152 : On Res. increasing number of men : Exception taken by Mr. *Blake* as to whether B. ought not to have been initiated by preliminary Res., 3045 ; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) not necessary that Amt. should be founded on a Res., and Journals of 1883 quoted, 3046 (iv).
- PETITIONS, PRESENTATION : Signatures signed by proxy : Reception objected to by Mr. *Woodworth* and "May" quoted, 2024 ; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) and practice stated, 2027, 2029 ; Names

## ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

## PROCEDURE—Continued.

- obtained by fraud : discussion to take place on M. to read and receive same (Mr. *Speaker*) 2274 ; Petition having no signatures not in Order and cannot be received (Mr. *Speaker*) 2319 (iii).
- PETITIONS, READING AND RECEIVING : Objection taken by Mr. *Edgar* : Cushing's practice quoted in support of same, 2319, 2320 (iii).
- PETITIONS, READING : Irregular for Member to read a Petition on presentation, but if required it may be read by the Clerk at the Table : Rule read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1891, and authorities quoted, 1893 (ii).
- PROHIBITION OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) in Order to move the Previous Question, &c., 1045 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) should conclude with a motion, 3161 (iv).
- SCOTT ACT PETITIONS AND FORGED SIGNATURES : On M. (Mr. *Foster*) to erase name : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) no practice to warrant such a motion ; English practice stated, 2320 (iv).
- SPEAKER, DEPUTY, APPOINTMENT OF MALACHY DALY, Esq. : On Res., objection on consent of Crown not having been signified (Mr. *Blake*) and B.N.A. Act quoted, 73 (i).
- SUPREME COURT APPELLATE JURISDICTION B. 68 : On M. to introduce : Right to introduce questioned, because Bill of same nature is before the House (Mr. *Casgrain*), and remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 240 ; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) in Order to introduce Bill, 270 (i).
- WAYS AND MEANS : Objection taken by Mr. *Blake* to Res. before Com., a Res. on same subject having been already passed upon : Ruled (Mr. *Chairman*) in Order, and authorities quoted to sustain same, 3285 (iv).
- WINNIPEG AND PRINCE ALBERT RY. B. 82 : On m. for 2° : suggestion (Mr. *Speaker*) that Order be discharged, 428 (i).
- OSSLER, MR. JUSTICE : Rep. on West Middlesex Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- OTTER'S, COL., MARCH TO BATTLEFORD : Remarks, 1386 (ii).
- OTTAWA, RY. CONNECTION WITH : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER SURVEY AND EXPLORATION : Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 131 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER SHIP CANAL : Res. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1211 ; Deb. (Mr. *Bryson*) 1215 ; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1217 ; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1218 ; (Messrs. *Cameron* [Victoria] and *Tassé*) 1219 ; (Mr. *Hilliard*) 1224 ; (Sir *Hector Langevin* and Messrs. *Blake* and *White, Renfrew*) 1225 (ii).
- OTTAWA, WADDINGTON AND NEW YORK RY. AND BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457 ; in Com., 3472 (iv).
- OUMET'S, COL., ABSENCE FROM DUTY : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1167, 1205 (ii).
- OUTBREAK. See "DISTURBANCE."
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., N.S., PROJECTED LINE : M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i) ; in Com. of Sup., 3414 (iv).
- PACIFIC RY. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC."
- PAPERS IN RESPECT OF THE N. W. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
- PARLIAMENT, 5TH, THIRD SESSION, 1885, 48 VICTORIA : Opening, 1 ; Speech from the Throne, 2 (i) ; Bills assented to, 1516 (ii), 3475 ; Prorogation, 3475 (iv). See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- PARSBOROUGH BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION OF : M. for copies of Tenders (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 66 (i).

- PARTRIDGE, PRAIRIE FOWLS, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (ii).
- PASSENGER, FREIGHT AND MIXED TRAINS, C. P. R., RUNNING OF: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. White, *Renfrew*). 1°, 67; 2° m., 266; neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (i).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. No. 64 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 234; 2° m., 622; Order for 2° dschgd., 629 (i).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. No. 89 (Mr. Hay). 1°, 362 (i).
- PATENTS ISSUED TO SETTLERS IN PRINCE ALBERT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 964 (ii).
- Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. Smyth). 1°, 88 (i).
- PAUPER TURKISH IMMIGRANTS: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 3475 (iv).
- Pawnbrokers' further Provision B. No. 137 (Mr. Small). 1°, 1474 (ii).
- PAYNE AND APPELGARTH, MURDER OF, BY INDIANS IN N.W., 859 (ii).
- PEACHY, J. W., SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 1743 (iii).
- PENITENTIARIES, REP.: presented (Sir Hector Langevin) 28 (i).
- PENITENTIARY RULES, SUSPENSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Shakespeare) 823 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES. See "SUPPLY."
- PENSION, CONTINUATION OF, TO WIDOW OF JOHN MARTIN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Curran) 201 (i).
- Pension Fund of Bank of Montreal B. No. 49 (Mr. White, *Cardwell*). 1°, 170; 2°, 245; in Com. and 3°, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).
- PETITIONS, FRANCHISE B.: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) on reception, 1856; on genuineness of Signatures (Mr. Woodworth and others) 2023; (Mr. McNeill) 2171; (Mr. Allen) 2209; (Mr. Rykert) 2274; (Mr. Edgar) 2319; (Mr. Sproule) 2392 (iii), 2772 (iv); (Mr. McNeill) 2495 (iii).
- PETITIONS, SCOTT ACT: M. (Mr. Foster) to erase name, 2320 (iii).
- PETITIONS, ON PRESENTATION OF: Remarks, 1891 (iii).
- PETITIONS, RESOLUTIONS, &c., ON BANKRUPTCY: presented (Sir John A. Macdonald) 101 (i).
- PETITIONS, RESOLUTIONS, &c., ON HALF-BREEDS' AND SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- PICKLES AND SAUCES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (ii).
- PICTURE FRAMES, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (ii).
- PIERS AND WHARVES IN P. E. I., EXPENDITURE ON MAINTENANCE, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Davies) 533 (i).
- PIERS. See "MARINE."
- PILLAGE OF HOUSES AND HALF BREEDS BY VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 2169 (iii), 2990 (iv).
- PITCH PINE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).
- PLANS AND SURVEYS OF ST. LAURENT SETTLEMENT, RECEIPT OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2358 (iii).
- PLATE GLASS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (ii).
- PLANTE, J. B., OF ST. CHARLES, CLAIM OF: M. for copies\* (Mr. Landry, *Montmagny*) 147 (i).
- POINTE AUX TREMBLES, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. De St. Georges) 234 (i).
- POLARISCOPIC TEST FOR SUGAR: Ques. (Mr. Vail) 479 (i).
- POPOISE FISHING, REP. OF J. U. GREGORY: M. for copy (Mr. Blondeau) 532 (i).
- Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 63 (Mr. Watson). 1°, 210; 2°, 289 (i).
- PORT ARTHUR AND WINNIPEG, CONSTRUCTION OF C. P. R. BETWEEN, SUMS PAID: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Casey) 123 (i).
- PORT CREDIT HARBOR CO., REPORTS MADE TO GOVT., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Platt) 124; REPAIRS to: Ques. (Mr. Fleming) 188 (i).
- PORT MOODY AND SAVONA FERRY, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. Homer) 146 (i).
- PORT MOODY, B.C., DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR OF: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 816 (ii).
- PORT MOODY WHARF AND FREIGHT SHED: M. for copies of Reps., Plans, &c. (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND EAST BAY C.B., STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND GUYSBOROUGH, CANOE AND ARCHAT, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 114 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE, N.S., AS A SUB-PORT: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Kirk) 445 (i).
- PORT ROWAN AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. Jackson) 297 (i).
- PORT STANLEY AND BURWELL HARBORS OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 62 (i).
- PORT WILLIAMS FISHERY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS., COMPUTING INTEREST: in Com. of Sup., 927 (ii).
- POST OFFICE:
- ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 568 (i).
- ASSISTANT POSTMASTER AT OTTAWA, ALLOWANCE TO: in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (iv).
- BRANDON, POSTMASTER AT, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 2029 (iii).
- CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- CHARLNOE, POSTMASTER AT: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Blake) 703 (i).
- DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. Carling) 76; in Com. of Sup., 902 (ii); conc., 2764 (iv).
- DEPOSITS IN P.O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 2359, 2465, 2559 (iii).
- DEPOSITORS IN P.O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ms. for Ret.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533; (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (i).
- GLAMMIS POST OFFICE ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1131 (ii).
- LETTER POSTAGE REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 33; M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Charlton) 291 (i).
- LE FONDS POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 816 (ii).
- MAIL TRAINS BETWEEN BROCKVILLE AND TORONTO: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, *Middlesex*) 816 (ii).
- MAIL BAGS, FURNISHING OF: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 964 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE ON CAN. SOUTHERN RY.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wigle) 120 (i).
- MAIL ROBBERIES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Blake) 91 (i).

## POST OFFICE—Continued.

- MAIL SUBSIDIES. See "SUPPLY."  
 MAITLAND, POSTMASTER AT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1743 (iii).  
 MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 351 (i).  
 OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, ANNUAL COST, &C.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 204 (i). See B. 151.  
 POST OFFICE AT MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).  
 POSTAL PRIVILEGES, EXTENSION TO LOCAL GOVTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 289 (i).  
 POSTAL AND TRANSPORT SERVICE ON C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).  
 POSTAL REVENUE AT VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).  
 SAVINGS BANKS IN THE MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 148 (i).  
 SHILOH AND FERGUS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1211 (ii).  
 SMALL SAVINGS, ENCOURAGEMENT OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).  
 SUPERINTENDENTS OF LETTER CARRIERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 218 (i).  
 U. S. AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (iv).  
 POUNDMAKER. See "DISTURBANCE."  
 POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE, ST. JOHN, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 246 (i).  
 PRESQU'ISLE AND WELLER'S BAY HARBORS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1442 (ii).  
 PRINCE ALBERT AND ST. LAURENT SETTLEMENTS; REPS. OF MESSRS. RUSSEL AND ALDOUS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).  
 PRINCE ALBERT COLON. CO.'S LAND, SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).  
 PRINCE ALBERT COLON. CO.'S TOWNSHIP SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).  
 PRINCE LEOPOLD. See "ALBANY, DUKE OF."  
 PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:  
 CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2917 (iv).  
 CAPE TORMENTINE RY. CONNECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 2997 (iv).  
 CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS AND CONTRACTORS: M. for copies of Pets., &C. (Mr. *Hackett*) 142; Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 694 (i).  
 CASUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 479 (i).  
 CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1039 (ii); (Mr. *Burpee*) 2359 (iii).  
 CUSTOMS APPRAISER AT SUMMERSIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).  
 EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &C.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).  
 FREIGHT AND PASSENGER EARNINGS ON P.E.I. RY.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davies*) 1442 (ii).  
 INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR AT SUMMERSIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).  
 "LANDSDOWNE," STEAMER, COMMUNICATION WITH ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 927 (ii).  
 PIERS AND WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davies*) 533 (i).  
 QUEEN'S CO., VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1 (i).  
 RED POINT HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1039 (ii).  
 REFUND TO MERCHANTS AND OTHERS, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (ii).  
 SEA LOTS, DEPTL. INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).  
 WHARVES ON P.E.I., GRANT FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 351 (i).  
 WINTER CROSSING: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 62 (i).  
 PRINGLE, H. H., OF COBOURG, EMPLOYMENT OF, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 743 (i).  
 PRINTING AND ADVERTISING, GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Somer-ville, Brant*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3033 (iv).

- PRINTING AND ADVERTISING, IMMIGRATION: M. to refer charges to Public Accounts Com. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 202 (i).  
 PRINTING AND ADVERTISING, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 28 (i).  
 PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.'S, SUMS PAID TO AND SERVICES RENDERED: M. for Rets.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).  
 PRINTING COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).  
 PRINTING DOMINION NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 898 (ii).  
 PRINTING DONE OUTSIDE OF CONTRACT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 860 (ii).  
 PRINTING OF PARLT.: M. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) to conc. in Second Rep., 149 (i); Seventh Rep., 1882 (iii); Ninth Rep., 3293; Tenth Rep., 3393 (iv).  
 PRINTING, PUBLIC, CHANGES IN CONTRACT: M. for copies of O.C. (Mr. *Rykert*) 246 (i).  
 PRISONERS. See "DISTURBANCE IN N.W."  
 PRISON LABOR WITHOUT THE WALLS OF GAOLS ACT AMT. B. NO. 87 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*). 1°\*, 362 (i); 2°, in Com., and 3°\*, 1658 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 81.)  
 PRIVATE BANKS AND BROKERS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 51 (i).  
 PRIVATE BILLS, RECEPTION OF: Ms. to extend time (Mr. *Kranz*) 88; (Mr. *Abbott*) 505, 782 (i); (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1094 (ii).  
 PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS FOR: M. to extend time for receiving (Mr. *Beaty*) 40 (i).  
 PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 899, 914 (ii).  
 PROGRESS ESTIMATES. See "C.P.R."  
 Prohibition. See "SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS."  
 PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW OF THE N.W.T., RELAXATION OF PROVISIONS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 101 (i). See "CAN. TEMP. ACT."  
 Proof of Entries in Books of Account B. No. 113 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°\*, 964 (ii); 2°, 2397; withdn., 2398; 2°, 2465; in Com., 2466; 3°\*, 2497 (iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 48.)  
 PROROGATION, LETTER FROM ACTING GOV. GEN.'S SEC., 3473; Mess. from His Ex., 3475 (iv).  
 PROSECUTIONS UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1306 (ii), 3320 (iv).  
 PROSSER, MR., FISHERY WARDEN, LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Lister*) 964 (ii).  
 PROVINCES, ADVANCES TO. See B. 7.  
 PROVINCIAL ACTS, DISALLOWANCE OF: M. for copies of O. C., &C. (Mr. *Blake*) 52 (i).  
 Provincial Courts Judges, Salaries, &C., B. No. 161 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 3293; M. for Com. on Res., 3375; in Com and 1°\* of B., 3395; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3436 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 56.)  
 PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION, COMPILATION OF COR., &C.: conc., 3434 (iv).  
 PROVINCIAL RYS. TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 188 (i).  
 PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES. See "SUBSIDIES."

PRODUCE, EXPORTS OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 606 (i).

PRUSSIAN POTASH: in Com. on Ways and Means 846 (ii).

PRUYN, MR. M. W.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28; M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to refer to Public Accounts Com., 76 (i).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS. See "PUBLIC WORKS."

PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 29, 76 (i), 927 (ii), 2465 (iv).

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2869; (Mr. *McLellan*) 2878; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2883; neg. (Y. 42, N. 79) 2889 (iv).

PUBLIC RESERVES IN B.C. AND "FORE-SHORE" RIGHTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 703 (i).

PUBLIC SERVICE, ROOMS, &c., RENTED FOR, IN OTTAWA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 533 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 28 (i).

Public Works, preservation of Peace in vicinity, Acts Amt. B. No. 131 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1278 (ii); 2° m. and in Com., 2824; 5°\*, 2854 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 80*.)

#### PUBLIC WORKS:

AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (iv).

BARRACK HUTS IN B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).

BARRACKS AT FORT MACLEOD: in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iv).

BAYFIELD HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 77 (i).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2916-2919, 3385, 3452 (iv).

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2917 (iv).

CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 479 (i).

CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1039 (ii); (Mr. *Burpee*) 2359 (iii).

CHURCH POINT AND TROUT COVE PIERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Vail*) 54 (i).

COAL, PURCHASE OF, FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 313 (i).

CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2997 (iv).

DREDGES, TUGS AND SCOWS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 53 (i).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2921; conc., 2923 (iv).

DRY DOCKS, ENCOURAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION. See B. 108.

DUNDAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 290 (i).

ESQUIMAULT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 743 (i); in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv). See B. 7.

FOG-HORNS AND LETTER-BOX FRONTS, TENDERS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 313 (i).

GOVT. YARDS IN MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 57 (i).

HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2920-2923, 3385, 3386, 3409, 3419, 3420, 3433 (iv).

HARBORS IN GUYSBOROUGH CO., RE-SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 51 (i).

HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).

HIGH COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 3386 (iv).

IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS AT LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 89 (i).

IMMIGRANT SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 350 (i).

INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 139; Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 606 (i).

INSPECTORS, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 606 (i).

MATTAWA, MOUNTAIN RAPIDS, &c., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1040 (ii).

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Pruyn*) 77 (i).

NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCallum*) 615, 695 (i).

OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).

OTTAWA RIVER SHIP CANAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1211 (ii).

#### PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

OTTAWA RIVER SURVEYS AND IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 131 (i), 1040 (ii).

PORT ARTHUR HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).

PORT CREDIT HARBOR, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Fleming*) 188 (i).

PORT MOODY DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 816 (ii).

ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3420.

SABLE ISLAND TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 57 (i).

SALMON POINT BREAKWATER: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).

SOMERVILLE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 57 (i).

STOREHOUSES IN QUÉBEC, LEASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1039 (ii).

ST. STEPHEN'S PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1148 (ii).

ST. THOMAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 79 (i).

TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 743 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WEST OF WINNIPEG: Remarks, 839 (ii).

TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 2922, 3307, 3386, 3420 (iv).

TELEGRAPH SYSTEM IN CAPE BRETON: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 78 (i).

THREE RIVERS HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See B. 150.

TRACADIE BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).

TUG-BARGES, DREDGE, &c., ON RED RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).

VENTILATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks, 2676 (iv).

WATER LOTS, APPLICATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Tupper*) 429 (i).

WATER LOTS ON RIVERS, GOVT. RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 2238 (iii).

WHARVES ON P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 351 (i).

WHITE POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).

WOODSTOCK, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Irvine*) 606 (i).

WOOD SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 429 (i); (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1387 (ii).

[See different PROVINCES; also "MARINE."]

PULLMAN PALACE CAR CO. See "I.C.R."

PUMICE AND PUMICE STONE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).

PURCELL & RYAN, PAYMENT TO, FOR SUPPLIES FURNISHED LORD LORNE AND PARTY: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (iv).

QU'APPELLE HALF-BREEDS, REP. OF MR. WALSH: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILROAD AND STMBT. CO. See B. 147.

QU'APPELLE VALLEY FARMING CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).

QUACO LIGHTHOUSE, MEMORIALS, &c., RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).

QUARANTINE, APPOINTMENT OF PHYSICIANS TO ACCOMPANY STEAMSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Taschereau*) 2169 (iii).

QUARANTINE. See "INSTRUCTIONS" and "SUPPLY."

QUÉBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).

#### QUÉBEC:

BEAUCE: Vacancy in the representation, 1 (i).

BOLDUC, CAPT., RESIGNATION OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 29 (i).

BRAS ST. NICHOLAS, DEEPENING OF: M. for copies of Pets.\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).

BROUSSEAU & LISABELLE, FRAUDS BY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).

CAPE ST. IGNACE STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).

CARON AND GAUVREAU, FISHERY OVERSEERS, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.\* 532 (i).

CATHOLIC POPULATION OF PROVINCE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 363 (i).

CHEVRIER, G. E., DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).

CHIEF JUSTICE MEREDITH, RESIGNATION OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 43 (i).

## QUEBEC—Continued.

- CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).  
 DECHENE, CAPT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).  
 DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC, TENDERS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).  
 ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 148 (i).  
 ETCHERMIN RIVER LINE SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 350 (i).  
 EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).  
 GOSSELIN, E., RECORD IN THE MATTER OF: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 703 (i).  
 GREGORY, J. N., REP. OF ENQUIRY: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).  
 GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).  
 IMMIGRATION OFFICE, EMPLOYÉS: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 30 (i).  
 LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).  
 LE FONDS POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 816 (ii).  
 LÉVIS, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 89 (i).  
 LÉVIS, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 633 (i).  
 LIEUT. GOV.'S OATH OF OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 479 (i).  
 LONGUEUIL AND LÉVIS RY. SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 429 (i).  
 LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE WOOD SUPPLIES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).  
 MASKINONGÉ: Vacancy in the Representation, 1 (i).  
 MEDICINE HAT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 350 (i).  
 MEGANTIC: Ret. of Member, 1 (i).  
 MONTMAGNY VILLAGE POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).  
 MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 567 (i).  
 NICOLET: Ret. of Member, 1 (i).  
 NORTH SHORE RY., SUBSIDY TO: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 41; Purchase of: Ques., 189 (i).  
 PLANTE, J. B., CLAIM OF: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Amyot*) 147 (i).  
 POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 231 (i).  
 REBELLION IN THE N.W. See general heading "DISTURBANCE."  
 RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS, MEMORIALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 666 (i).  
 SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC: M. for Papers, (Mr. *Langelier*) 88 (i).  
 SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 743 (i).  
 SHORT LINE RY. See general heading; also "SUBSIDIES."  
 SIMARD, J., REP. OF: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).  
 SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. 1; Ret. of Member, 113 (i).  
 ST. ROMUALD D'ETCHERMIN STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1567 (ii).  
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3350 (iv).  
 SUPERIOR COURT, CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 429 (i).  
 SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES. See B. 161.  
 SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, ACCOUNTS DUE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).  
 THREE RIVERS, HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF. See B. 150.  
 VICTORIA RIFLES, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1983 (iii).  
 "QUEEN OF THE ISLES," STEAMER, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1131 (ii).  
 QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2030 (iii).  
 QUEEN'S COUNTY, P. E. I., VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION: Warrant issued and return of Member, 1 (i).  
 QUEEN vs. ROBINSON. See "INLAND FISHERIES."  
 QUERCITRON OR OAK BARK: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).  
 RAILS FOR GOVT. SECTION IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1914 (iii).  
 RY. ACCIDENTS. See "CASUALTIES."  
 RY. Act. See "CONSOLIDATED."  
 RYS. AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 76 (i); in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii); Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3436 (iv).  
 RY. BONUSES. See "REFUND."  
 RY. BELT ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 290 (i).  
 RY. COMMISSIONERS. See "COURT."  
 RY. COMMISSIONERS AND DOMINION ARBITRATORS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 114 (i).  
 RYS. CENTREING IN OTTAWA, BONUSES GRANTED TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86 (i).  
 RY. FROM MONTREAL TO THE SEA BOARD: Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 189 (i).  
 RYS., REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO COUNTY COUNCIL OF GREY: M. for copy of Memorial (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).  
 RY. LANDS IN B. C., CLAIMS OF CANADA UPON: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).  
 RYS. OUTSIDE OF MAN. AND N.W.T., AID TO: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i).  
 RAILWAYS. See respective headings.  
 RY. SUPPLIES, PURCHASE OF, IN HALIFAX: M. for Ret. Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1915 (iii).  
 RY. TICKETS. See "SALE."  
 RANGE LIGHTS. See "WELLER'S BAY."  
 RAND'S MICMAC INDIAN DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).  
 Real Property in the N.W.T. B. 109 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 742 (i).  
 REBELLION. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W."  
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1677 (ii).  
 RECEIPTS OF DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 54 (i).  
 RECIPROCITY WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 78; with JAMAICA: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 429 (i); (Mr. *Laurier*) 2854 (iv); with MEXICO: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 632 (i); with the U. S.: Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Davies*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 995; (Mr. *Hackett*) 1001; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1004; (Mr. *Burpee*) 1004, 1008; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 1010; (Mr. *Kirk*) 1011; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1015; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1016; (Mr. *Jenkins*) 1019; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1021; Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1387; M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 1444 (ii); Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3163 (iv). See "TREATIES."  
 RUBBER, RE-COVERED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).  
 RED LIQUOR: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).  
 RED POINT HARBOR, P. E. I., BREAKWATER AT: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1039 (ii).  
 REFUND OF BANK IMPOSTS: in Com. of Sup., 3387; conc., 3396 (iv).  
 REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO Co. COUNCIL OF GREY, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58; Co. of Elgin (Mr. *Wilson*) 356 (i).  
 REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO ONT. MUNICIPALITIES: M. for copies of Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Cook*) 569; Deb. (Messrs. *McCallum* and *Mills*) 570; Messrs. O'Brien and *Fleming*) 571; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 573; (Mr. *Casey*) 576 (Messrs. *Wallace* and *McMullen*) 578; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 581, 588; (Mr. *Sproule*) 583; (Mr. *Lister*) 585; (Messrs. *Dawson* and *Desjardins*) 587; (Mr.

- Armstrong*) 588; (Mr. *Wilson*) 589; (Mr. *Allen*) 590; (Mr. *Fairbank*) 591; (Messrs. *Trow and Cook*) 592; (Mr. *Pope*) 593 (i).
- REFUND OF DUTIES TO MERCHANTS AND FISHERMEN IN P.E.I., COMMISSIONERS' REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (ii); in Com. of Sup., 3455; conc., 3470 (iv).
- RELIEF OF DISTRESSED IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 3321; in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
- REMOVAL OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3411 (iv).
- RENTAL OF OFFICES FOR USE OF GOVT. IN OTTAWA: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 533 (i).
- REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS, COR., REPS., O.C., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- REPORTS PRESENTED:
- AUDITOR GENERAL (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28 (i).
  - CHINESE COMMISSION (by Mess. from His Ex.) 234 (i).
  - INDIAN AFFAIRS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i).
  - INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 28 (i).
  - INTERIOR (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i).
  - MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. *McLellan*) 113 (i).
  - MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Caron*) 40 (i).
  - PENITENTIARIES (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 28 (i).
  - POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Carling*) 76 (i).
  - PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28 (i).
  - PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 28 (i).
  - RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Pope*) 76 (i).
  - SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 127 (i).
  - STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION, COMMISSIONERS' REP. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
  - TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 28 (i).
- REPRESENTATION OF N.W.T. IN PARLT.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 292 (i); Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404; neg. (Y. 35, N. 77) 3408 (iv).
- Representation of the N.W.T. in Parliament B. No. 45 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*; 147; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 362, 490; debt. adjd., 495 (i).
- RETURNS, ENQUIRIES FOR: 183, 211, 239, 363, 427, 455, 490, 501, 534, 566, 662, 715, 746 (i), 782, 895, 966, 1038, 1063, 1132, 1167, 1206 (ii), 1608, 1913, 2392 (iii), 2854, 2936, 3000, 3395 (iv).
- RETURNS, INCOMPLETE: Remarks, 67, 101, 534 (i), 860, 1064, 1209, 1278 (ii).
- RETURNS, C.P.R., ORDERED BY HOUSE SINCE DATE OF CONTRACT: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Hesson*) 431 (i).
- RETURNS, PREPARATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
- RETURN TICKETS ON GOVT. RYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 706 (i).
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:
- A, B AND C BATTERIES, Officers, &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 313 (i).
  - ABOLITION OF DUTY ON GRAIN, &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
  - ACTIVE MILITIA, Number and Annual Drill, &c.\* (Mr. *Mulock*) 533 (i).
  - ADVANCES TO GOVERNMENT BY BANKS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
  - ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
  - ADVERTISEMENTS FOR LOAN (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
  - AID TO RYS. OUTSIDE MAN. AND N.W. (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i).
  - ALASKA AND B.C. BOUNDARY LINE (Mr. *Gordon*) 705 (i).
  - ALGOMA, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS IN (Mr. *Dawson*) 39 (i).
  - ALLAN STEAMSHIP CO., Claim of Govt. against\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 312 (i). See "ASSISTED PASSAGES."
  - ANIMAL CHARCOAL Imported and Duties collected\* (Mr. *Stairs*) 533 (i).
  - "ANNUAL REGISTER." See "DOMINION."
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.
- ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
  - ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS, Payment of Arrears due\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
  - ASSISTED PASSAGES, &c., Sums paid Allan Line\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
  - "A TRIP TO THE DOM. OF CAN." Pamphlet\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
  - AUDITOR GENERAL and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries re Rental of Rivers and Streams\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i).
  - AUSTRALIAN COLONIES, Trade with (Mr. *Mitchell*) 36 (i).
  - BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
  - BANKRUPT ESTATES and Official Assignees\* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 303, 533 (i).
  - BAY OF FUNDY FOG-WHISTLES, Coal Supply, Tenders\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
  - BEAVER LINE OF STEAMERS, Intercol. Ry. Freight Rates (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
  - BELL & KAVANAGH, Land Claims of (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 479 (i).
  - BILL, S.J.R., and Breach of Sawdust Law in N.S.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
  - BINGHAM, LT. COL., deprivation of Command while on Duty\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
  - BIRD ISLAND LIGHT, N. S., Management of\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
  - BOLDUC, CAPT., Resignation (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 29 (i).
  - BOLTON, STAFF COMMANDER, Dept. of Marine and Fisheries in account with (Mr. *McMullen*) 135 (i).
  - BOLTON, STAFF COMMANDER, vs. Mr. Tilton\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 312 (i).
  - BONUSES GRANTED TO RYS., Memorials, &c.\* (Mr. *Fleming*) 1443 (ii).
  - BONUSES, RY., REFUND to County Council of Grey (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
  - BONUSES TO RYS. in Ont., Refund (Mr. *Wilson*) 356, 616 (i); (Mr. *Cooke*) 569.
  - BOUNDARIES. See general heading.
  - BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN, Sums paid under (Mr. *Fortin*) 56 (i).
  - BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 98 (i).
  - BOUNTIES TO MANUFACTURERS OF IRON (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
  - BRADLEY, W. INGLES, Clerk, Ry. Dept. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 479 (i).
  - BRAS D'OR LAKES, Bounty paid on Fish caught\* (Mr. *McDougall, Caps Breton*) 1443 (ii).
  - BRAS ST. NICHOLAS, Deepening of\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).
  - BRITISH MEDICAL ACT and Amt.\* (Mr. *Bergin*) 33 (i).
  - BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, Soundings, &c. (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 533 (i).
  - BYE-ELECTIONS SINCE 1878 (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
  - CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE CO. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
  - CANADA AND JAMAICA, Confederation (Mr. *Burpee*) 505 (i).
  - CANADA CENTRAL RY., Bonuses to (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86, 89 (i).
  - CANADA SHIPPING CO. and Intercol. Ry. Freight Rates (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
  - CANADA SOUTHERN RY. Mail Service (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
  - CANADA TEMP. ACT, Constitutionality of. See "LUGRIN, O. H."
  - CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, Memorials, &c., respecting\* (Mr. *Kranz*) 448 (i).
  - CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878, Voting on (Mr. *Fisher*) 121 (i).
  - CANADIAN AGENT AT PARIS (Mr. *Bergeron*) 928 (ii).
  - CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. See general heading.
  - CANADIAN VOYAGEURS, Names, &c.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 210 (i).
  - CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH, P.E.I. Ry., Payment of laborers (Mr. *Hackett*) 142 (i).
  - CAPITAL ACCOUNT, Expenditure on (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 45 (i).
  - CARON, CLOVIS, Fishery Overseer, Rep. of, &c.\* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
  - CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN AGENCY INVESTIGATION\* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).
  - CAVALRY AND INFANTRY SCHOOLS\* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 313 (i).
  - CAVALRY, SCHOOL OF, at Quebec\* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 88 (i).
  - CERTIFICATES TO SELL LIQUOR granted in County of Halton\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67; (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
  - CHARCOAL, ANIMAL, imported and Duties collected\* (Mr. *Stairs*) 533 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- CHARLTON POST OFFICE CHANGES (Mr. Blake) 708 (i).  
 CHERRIER, G. E., INDIAN AGENT at Caughnawaga, Dismissal of (Mr. Holton) 1443 (ii).  
 CHINESE COMMISSION, Date of Appointment, &c.\* (Mr. McMullen) 56 (i).  
 CHURCH POINT and Trout Cove Piers, N.S. (Mr. Vail) 54 (i).  
 CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYÉS IN B.O.\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1442 (ii).  
 CLAIMS OF CANADA TO RY. LANDS IN B.C.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
 CLARK, G. M. K., Sums paid to (Sir Richard Cartwright) 697 (i).  
 CLERKS OF WORKS or INSPECTORS (Sir Richard Cartwright) 139 (i).  
 COAL, CARRIAGE by I.C.R. from Spring Hill Mines\* (Mr. McMullen) 533 (i).  
 COAL ENTERED Ex-warehouse, &c. (Mr. Burpee) 100 (i).  
 COAL LANDS, Sales and Leases\* (Mr. Charlton) 209 (i).  
 COAL, PURCHASE OF, for Public Buildings, Ottawa\* (Mr. Kirk) 213 (i).  
 COAL SUPPLY to Fog-whistles, &c., Tenders\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).  
 COLLINS, J. E., Employment of (Mr. McMullen) 699 (i).  
 COLONIZATION COMPANIES and modified Agreements (Mr. Blake) 92 (i).  
 COMPTON, MR., Evidence taken re J. D. Robertson's claim\* (Mr. Mills) 1443 (ii).  
 CONSOLIDATED FIVE PER CENT. LOAN (Sir Richard Cartwright) 484 (i).  
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, Receipts and Expenditure\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 30 (i).  
 CONTRACTS FOR PRINTING since 1867\* (Mr. Rykert) 246 (i).  
 CULLERS, SUPERVISOR OF, Amounts due\* (Mr. De St. Georges) 1443 (ii).  
 CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS in Algoma (Mr. Dawson) 39 (i).  
 CUSTOMS LAWS, Violation of by John Leander McKenzie\* (Mr. Moffat) 1442 (ii).  
 CUSTOMS SEIZURE OF SCHOOL-BOOKS AT TORONTO\* (Mr. Rykert) 1443 (ii).  
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT WINNIPEG\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 1443 (ii).  
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES IN N.S.\* (Mr. Stairs) 532 (i).  
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES made at different Ports\* (Mr. Blake) 56 (i).  
 DE CHENE, CAPT. A. M., Enquiry respecting\* (Mr. Casgrain) 30 (i).  
 DEPOSITS, GOVERNMENT, in Banks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 29 (i).  
 DIGBY PIER, Wharfage Collections at\* (Mr. Vail) 532 (i).  
 DISALLOWANCE of Provincial Acts (Mr. Blake) 52 (i).  
 DODGE, B., Dismissal from office of Collector\* (Mr. Moffat) 1442 (ii).  
 DOMINION "Annual Register," Payments on account of\* (Mr. McCraney) 1443 (ii).  
 DOMINION LANDS. See general heading.  
 DOMINION LICENSE COMMISSIONERS (Mr. Bergeron) 307 (i).  
 DOMINION SUBSIDIES to Provinces (Mr. Amyot) 303 (i).  
 "DOM. OF CAN., A TRIP TO THE," Pamphlet\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).  
 DRAWBACKS on Manufactured Exports (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 139 (i).  
 DRAWBACKS on Shipbuilding Materials (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 100 (i).  
 DREDGES, TUGS and SCOWS Built (Mr. Jackson) 53 (i).  
 DREDGING ON RED RIVER\* (Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).  
 DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC, Tenderers and Securities\* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 533 (i).  
 DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE Fog Horn (Mr. Jackson) 293 (i).  
 DUNDAS AND WATERLOO Macadamized Road, Sale of\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 147 (i).  
 DUTIES imposed under Old Prov. of Can., &c.\* (Mr. Watson) 1443 (ii).  
 DUTIES ON HAY exported to the U.S. (Mr. Irvine) 443 (i).  
 DUTIES ON FISH exported to the U.S. (Mr. Davies) 831 (ii).  
 DUTIES ON WHEAT AND FLOUR, Memorials, &c.\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 532 (i).  
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY., Earnings\* (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 313 (i).  
 EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN Land Co.'s Agent\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
 EDUCATION OF INDIANS and Half-breeds in Man. and N.W.T.\* (Mr. Kirk) 1443 (ii).  
 ELECTIONS, BYE, since 1878\* (Mr. Blake) 210 (i).  
 EGIN, County Judge, Case of (Mr. Wilson) 98 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- EMERSON, Claim of Town on Govt.\* (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 448 (i).  
 EXHIBITION AT ANTWERP (Mr. Bergeron) 305 (i).  
 EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT (Sir Richard Cartwright) 45 (i).  
 EXPENDITURE ON PUB. WORKS in the different Provs.\* (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).  
 EXPENSES OF GOVT. OFFICIALS in England\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 124 (i).  
 EXPORT DUTY ON OAK, PINE, &c., Receipts\* (Mr. Edgar) 1442 (ii).  
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, distinguishing Products of Canada from other countries\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 30 (i).  
 EXTRADITION, Demands for, &c.\* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).  
 EXTRADITION\* (Mr. Blake) 147 (i).  
 FABRE, MR., Appointment as Canadian Agent at Paris (Mr. Bergeron) 928 (ii).  
 FACTORY OPERATIVES, number employed (Sir Richard Cartwright) 37 (i).  
 FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES, Bounty paid\* (Mr. McDougall, Cape Breton) 1443 (ii).  
 FISH, EXPORT OF, FROM P.E.I., Refund of Duties (Mr. Davies) 831 (ii).  
 FISH TAKEN in the Miramichi (Mr. Mitchell) 295 (i).  
 FISH WEIRS IN CO. OF CHARLOTTE, Licenses, &c.\* (Mr. Gillmor) 1444 (ii).  
 FISHERIES OF ONT., Inland (Mr. Vail) 229 (i).  
 FISHERIES, CANADIAN (Mr. Mulock) 55 (i).  
 FISHERY BOUNTIES, Sums paid (Mr. Fortin) 56 (i).  
 FISHERY PROTECTION in the N. W. (Mr. Hesson) 700 (i).  
 FISHERY OVERSEERS in N.S. and breach of Sawdust Law\* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).  
 FISHING LEASES, &c., in non-tidal Waters in N.B.\* (Mr. Weldon) 533 (i).  
 FISHING LICENSES granted for Lake Erie\* (Mr. Lister) 964 (ii).  
 FISHING VESSELS, Bounty to (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 98 (i).  
 FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLIDATED LOAN (Sir Richard Cartwright) 484 (i).  
 FLAG TREATY between U. S. and Spain (Mr. Vail) 219.  
 FLOUR AND WHEAT DUTIES, Memorials, &c.\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 532 (i).  
 FLOUR, CORN AND CORNMEAL, Imports and Exports from Provinces\* (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 56 (i).  
 FOG-HORN on Dummy Lighthouse (Mr. Jackson) 293 (i).  
 FOG-HORNS and Letter-Box Fronts\* (Mr. Langelier) 312 (i).  
 FOOT AND CARRIAGE BRIDGE on St. John River\* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1443 (ii).  
 FORESTRY COMMISSIONER, Appointment of (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 147; (Mr. Rykert) 187 (i).  
 FORESTS, PROTECTION OF, Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. Cockburn) 202 (i).  
 FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, Road on\* (Mr. Blake) 533 (i).  
 FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, Timber Licenses\* (Mr. Blake) 1442 (ii).  
 FRANCE AND CANADA, Commercial Relations (Mr. Amyot) 825 (ii).  
 FRASER, D. M. AND HUGH, payments to\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).  
 FREEMAN, J. N., and breach of Sawdust Law in N.S.\* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).  
 FRENCH CANADIANS, Repatriation of, Scheme of Immigration\* (Mr. Blake) 533 (i).  
 FUEL OF NORTH-WEST SETTLERS (Mr. Blake) 61 (i).  
 GAUVREAU, J., Fishery Overseer, Rep. of\* (Mr. Blondeau) 532 (i).  
 GOLD RESERVE, GOVT. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 351 (i).  
 GOODS IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION (Sir Richard Cartwright) 30 (i).  
 GOODWIN, GEO., Contract, Trent Valley Canal (Mr. Blake) 823 (i).  
 GOSSELIN, EUGÈNE, vs. THE QUEEN, RECORD OF (Mr. Amyot) 703 (i).  
 GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN BANKS (Sir Richard Cartwright) 29 (i).  
 GOVERNMENT EXPENSES OF VISITS TO ENGLAND\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 124 (i).  
 GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN THE N. W. (Mr. McMullen) 66 (i).  
 GOVERNMENT EMPLOYÉS IN B. O. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1442 (ii).  
 GOVERNMENT RYS., Return Tickets on (Mr. Weldon) 706 (i).  
 GRADUATES OF ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 313 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- GRAND TRUNK RY. See general heading.
- GRAIN, &c., Abolition of Duty on (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
- GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY. (Mr. *Paint*) 78 (i).
- GREAT VILLAGE RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 67 (i).
- GREGORY, J. U., Rep. of Enquiry, &c.\* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- GREY, COUNTY OF, Rys. in, Refund of Bonuses (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
- HALIFAX STEAM NAVIGATION Co., Moneys paid to by Govt.\* (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HALTON, COUNTY OF, Liquor Certificates granted\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67; (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
- HARBORS OF REFUGE, Ports Burwell and Stanley (Mr. *Wilson*) 62 (i).
- HARDWARE AND RY. Supplies purchased in Halifax\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1442 (ii).
- HARDWARE SUPPLIES purchased by Marine Dept. at Halifax\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i).
- HEALTH OFFICERS IN N. B., Instructions to\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1443 (ii).
- HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Cost (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER. See general heading.
- HOLLAND, G. & A., Payments to for Short-hand work\* (Mr. *Auger*) 147 (i).
- HUDSON BAY STEAMER *Neptune*, Supplies for (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
- HUGHES, D. J. (County Judge of Elgin) Case of (Mr. *Wilson*) 98 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS into the N. W. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- IMMIGRATION OFFICE, Quebec, Employés\* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 30 (i).
- IMMIGRATION, SCHEME FOR, mentioned by Sir Hector Langevin in a speech at Montreal\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, distinguishing products of Canada from other Countries\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS of Wheat, Flour, &c. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 138 (i).
- IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- IMPORTS OF SUGAR at Halifax from Jamaica\* (Mr. *Vail*) 40 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS OF NAVIGATION in the North Saskatchewan (Mr. *McCallum*) 615, 695 (i).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS IN B. C. (Mr. *Mills*) 863 (ii).
- INDIAN AGENCY, Man. (Mr. *Charlton*) 61 (i).
- INDIAN HARBOR, N. S., Rep. of Engineer\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
- INDIAN LANDS in Township of Toronto unsold (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).
- INDIAN LANDS sold in the Viger Agency\* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
- INDIAN LANDS unsold in Tp. of Trafalgar\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).
- INDIAN RESERVE, Fort William, Road on\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- INDIAN RESERVE LANDS in B. C., Purchase of\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- INDIAN SCHOOLS IN B. C., Establishment\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- INDIANS of Fort William Reserve\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).
- INDIAN SUPPLIES for the N. W.\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
- INDIAN TROUBLES at Metlakatla (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS for Indians and Half-breeds in Man. and N. W. T.\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).
- INDUSTRIES OF CANADA, Commission respecting\* (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- INLAND FISHERIES of Ont. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 229 (i).
- INTERCOLONIAL RY. See general heading.
- INTERIOR DEPT., Receipts, &c., (Mr. *Blake*) 55 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION at Antwerp (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
- INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 139 (i).
- IRON, BOUNTIES to Manufacturers\* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- ISLANDS LEASED in River St. Lawrence\* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 147 (i).
- JONES, L. K., Appointment of, as Secretary to Intercolonial Ry. Commission\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 187 (i).
- JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, Tel. Cable across, Cost\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- KAVANAGH & BELL, Land Claims by (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 479 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- KENTVILLE, N. S., Dismissal of Collector\* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
- KINGSTON HARBOR Preventive Officers Claims\* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1442 (ii).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES, Applications and Permits granted\* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1444 (ii).
- LAND RESERVES OF B. C. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 703 (i).
- LANDS NORTH AND WEST of Lake Superior (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).
- LEASES OR LICENSES to Fish in non-tidal Waters of N. B. (Mr. *Weldon*) 533 (i).
- LETTER POSTAGE, Reduction on (Mr. *Charlton*) 291 (i).
- LICENSE ACT and decision of Supreme Court\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- LICENSE ACT, DOM., Commissioners under (Mr. *Bergin*) 307 (i).
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS, Board of, under Act of 1883\* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 46 (i).
- LICENSES OR PERMITS to cut Timber (Mr. *Charlton*) 30 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING SERVICE at Port Rowan (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).
- LINGAN, Cape Breton, Services of Argyle Highlanders\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
- "LION" SCHOONER, Seizure of, at Barrington, N.S. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- LIQUOR CERTIFICATES in County of Halton granted under Canada Temperance Act, 1878\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, Factum, Arguments and Short-hand Writers' Notes (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 45 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, Licenses granted under\* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 46 (i).
- LIQUORS, REVENUE derived from Importation and Manufacture\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 313 (i).
- LOAN, FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLIDATED (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
- LOAN ISSUED IN LONDON (1884) Amounts subscribed and Advertisements for same (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS., Advances to (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS. in N. W. T. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 292 (i).
- LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTSHIP, Supplying of Wood to\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
- LUGRIN, C. H., and Sec. of State, Cor. re Can. Temp. Act\* (Mr. *Burpee*) 1443 (ii).
- MACKINLEY, A. & W., Entry by of School Books at undervaluation\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).
- MCISAAC'S POND, Inverness, N.S., Improvements (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 60 (i).
- McKENZIE, J. L., Violation of Customs Laws\* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
- MAIL ROBBERIES in Man. and N. W. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE on the Canada Southern Ry. (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
- MANUFACTURED EXPORTS, Drawbacks (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
- MARINE AND FISHERIES and Quaco Lighthouse Site\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- MARINE STORES, Purchase of, at Halifax\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i).
- MARINE. See general heading.
- MARKET BATTERY, Kingston, Lease of\* (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
- MARTIN, JOHN, Widow of, continuation of Pension to (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).
- MEREDITH, CHIEF JUSTICE, Resignation of (Mr. *Laurier*) 43 (i).
- METAGHAN PIER, Wharfage Collections\* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).
- METLAKATLA INDIAN TROUBLES (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).
- MILITIAMEN, Names and Places of Residence\* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 101 (i).
- MILITIA RESERVE, Enrolments in Military Dis. No. 9\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- MILITIA. See general heading.
- MILLARD, JOHN, and breach of Sawdust Laws in N. S.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
- MILL ST. RY. CROSSING, St. John\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- MIRAMICHI RIVER, Fish taken in (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).
- MORGAN, H. J., Payments to (Mr. *McCraney*) 120 (i).
- MORGAN, J. H., Forestry Commissioner\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147; (Mr. *Rykert*) 187; Report of (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, Amounts paid for Injuries\* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 505 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

MURRAY CANAL, Moneys paid for Valuation\* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).  
 MURRAY CANAL, Selection of Route, &c.\* (Mr. Cockburn) 1442 (ii).  
 NATIONAL POLICY PAMPHLET\* (Mr. Charlton) 124 (i).  
 NELSON & SON'S, Consignments of School Books\* (Mr. Wallace, York) 1443 (ii).  
 "NEPTUNE," STEAMER, Supplies for (Mr. Vail) 229 (i).  
 NEW HARBOR, Rep. of Engineer (Mr. Kirk) 147 (i).  
 NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co., Lease of\* (Mr. Mulock) 56 (i).  
 NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY., N.B.\* (Mr. Temple) 533 (i).  
 NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER Navigation, Improvements (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).  
 NORTH SHORE LINE, SUBSIDY (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).  
 OAK, PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS, Export Duty\* (Mr. Edgar) 1442 (ii).  
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN RIVERS IN N.B. (Mr. Irvine) 443 (i).  
 OCEAN MAIL SERVICE (Mr. Blake) 204 (i).  
 O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, Sums paid to, in connection with Ontario Boundary\* (Mr. Lister) 210 (i).  
 OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES under Bankrupt Act\* (Mr. Mitchell) 533 (i).  
 OFFICIALS IN THE N.W. (Mr. McMullen) 66 (i).  
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., Charges against (Mr. Casey) 45; (Mr. Wilson) 101 (i).  
 ONT. AND QUE. RY., Original Stockholders\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
 ONTARIO BOUNDARIES. See general heading.  
 OPERATIVES IN FACTORIES, Number employed (Sir Richard Cartwright) 37 (i).  
 OTTAWA, Premises leased or rented for the Public Service\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 503 (i).  
 OTTAWA, RY. COMMUNICATION WITH (Mr. Landerkin) 86, 89 (i).  
 OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., N.S. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).  
 PARRSBORO' BREAKWATER (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 65 (i).  
 PAYMENTS, CLAIMS, &c., to High Commissioner (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).  
 PENITENTIARY RULES, Suspension of, in B. C. (Mr. Shakespeare) 823 (ii).  
 PENSION, Continuation of, to widow of John Martin (Mr. Curran) 201 (i).  
 PIERES AND WHARVES IN P.E.I., Construction and Maintenance\* (Mr. Davies) 533 (i).  
 PLANTE, J. B., CLAIM OF\* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 147 (i).  
 POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF\* (Mr. De St. Georges) 231 (i).  
 PORPOISE FISHERY of St. Anne la Pocatière\* (Mr. Blondeau) 532 (i).  
 PORT CREDIT HARBOR COMPANY\* (Mr. Platt) 124 (i).  
 PORT MOODY Wharf and Freight Shed (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).  
 PORT MULGRAVE, N.S., as a Sub-port (Mr. Kirk) 445 (i).  
 PORT ROWAN Harbor of Refuge (Mr. Jackson) 297 (i).  
 PORT ROWAN LIFE-SAVING STATION (Mr. Jackson) 142 (i).  
 PORT STANLEY and Port Burwell Harbors of Refuge (Mr. Wilson) 62 (i).  
 PORT WILLIAMS, N.S., Fishery Overseer\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
 POSTAGE ON LETTERS, Reduction of (Mr. Charlton) 291 (i).  
 POSTAL REVENUE AT VIC., B.C., for eight months\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1442 (ii).  
 POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS and small Savings (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).  
 ——— Receipts at Stephen's, N.B. (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 100 (i).  
 ——— SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITORS\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).  
 ——— SAVINGS BANKS (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (ii).  
 PRESQU' ISLE and Weller's Bay Harbors\* (Mr. Cockburn) 1442 (ii).  
 PRINTING AND PUBLISHING Co.'s, Sums paid to\* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).  
 PRINTING CONTRACTS since 1867\* (Mr. Rykert) 246 (i).  
 PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW of the N.W.T.\* (Mr. Foster) 101 (i).  
 PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW, Petitions praying for\* (Mr. Foster) 533 (i).  
 PROSSEK, Mr., Fishery Warden, Lake Erie\* (Mr. Lister) 964 (ii).  
 PROTECTION to the Fisheries in the N.W. (Mr. Hesson) 700 (i).  
 PROVINCIAL ACTS, Disallowance of (Mr. Blake) 52 (i).  
 PUBLIC BUILDINGS at St. Thomas (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).  
 ——— Cost of heating (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).  
 PUBLIC RESERVES OF B.C. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

PUBLIC WORKS in different Provs., Expenditure on (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).  
 PUBLIC WORKS. See general heading.  
 QUACO LIGHTHOUSE SITE, Purchase, &c.\* (Mr. Weldon) 1442 (ii).  
 QU'APPELLE VALLEY, Squatters in (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).  
 QUARANTINE REGULATIONS issued to Ports in N.B.\* (Mr. Weldon) 1443 (ii).  
 QUEBEC DRILL SHED, Tenderers and Securities\* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 533 (ii).  
 "RANGE LIGHTS" at Weller's Bay\* (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).  
 RECEIPTS, &c., of Interior Department (Mr. Blake) 55 (i).  
 RECIPROCAL TRADE RELATIONS with the U. S.\* (Mr. Charlton) 1444 (ii).  
 REFUND OF DUTIES to P. E. I. Fishermen (Mr. Davies) 831 (ii).  
 REFUND OF HAY DUTIES (Mr. Irvine) 443 (i).  
 RENTAL OR LEASE OF ROOMS, &c., in Ottawa for the Public Service\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 503 (i).  
 REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS, Scheme of Immigration\* (Mr. Blake) 533 (ii).  
 REPRESENTATION OF N.W.T. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 292 (i).  
 RESERVES, PUBLIC, OF B.C. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).  
 RESIGNATION of Capt. Bolduc (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 29 (i).  
 RESIGNATION of Chief Justice Meredith (Mr. Laurier) 43 (i).  
 RETURN TICKETS on Govt. Rys. (Mr. Weldon) 706 (i).  
 REVENUE from Imported and Manufactured Liquors\* (Mr. Rykert) 313 (i).  
 RICHELIEU COUNTY, Dom. Lands in\* (Mr. Massue) 147 (i).  
 RICHIBUCTO HARBOR, Customs business\* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1442 (ii).  
 RIDGETOWN as a Port of Entry\* (Mr. Casey) 532 (ii).  
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, Number, Annual Grant and Names of Members\* (Mr. Bergin) 46 (i).  
 RIVERS AND STREAMS, Rental of\* (Mr. McMullen) 448 (i).  
 ROBBERY MAILS in Man. and N.W. (Mr. Blake) 91 (i).  
 ROBERTSON, J. D., Claim re Intercol. Ry.\* (Mr. Mills) 1443 (ii).  
 ROGERS' FISH-LADDER (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 870 (ii).  
 ROGERS, W. H., and Sawdust Law in N. S.\* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).  
 ROOTS, WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF\* (Mr. McDonald, King's) 20 (i).  
 ROYAL MILITARY COL. GRADUATES\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 313 (i).  
 RY. BONUSES IN ONT., Refund (Mr. Wilson) 356, 616; (Mr. Cook) 569; (Mr. Landerkin) 58 (i); (Mr. Fleming) 1443 (ii).  
 RY. COMMUNICATION with Ottawa (Mr. Landerkin) 86, 89 (i).  
 RY. COMPANIES OF CANADA\* (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 312 (i).  
 RY. LANDS IN B.C., Claims of Can.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
 RYS., Aid to, outside Man. and N.W. (Mr. Blake) 92 (i).  
 RY. SUBSIDIES in N. S. and Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) 140 (i).  
 RY. SUPPLIES purchased in Halifax\* (Mr. Forbes) 1442 (ii).  
 ST. JOHN, N.B., Military Properties (Mr. Weldon) 606 (i).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, Islands leased in\* (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 147 (i).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RY., Bonuses to (Mr. Landerkin) 86, 89 (i).  
 ST. ROCH DES AULNETS, ENQUIRY RESPECTING CAPT. A. M. DECHAMPS\* (Mr. Casgrain) 30 (i).  
 ST. STEPHENS, N. B., Post Office Receipts\* (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 100 (i).  
 ST. THOMAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).  
 SALMON POINT (Ont.) Breakwater at\* (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).  
 SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITORS\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).  
 SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (ii).  
 SAUNDERS & WOOD, Criminal Libel against\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
 SAWDUST LAW, Breach of, in N.S.\* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).  
 SCHOOL BOOKS, Consignment by Nelson & Sons\* (Mr. Wallace, York) 1443 (ii).  
 SCHOOL BOOKS, Seizure of, at Toronto\* (Mr. Rykert) 1443 (ii).  
 SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC\* (Mr. Landerkin) 88 (i).  
 SEA LOTS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (Mr. Blake) 62 (i).  
 SECTION B. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."  
 SEIZURE OF SCHOONER Lion\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).  
 SEIZURES AT DIFFERENT PORTS\* (Mr. Blake) 56 (i).  
 SEIZURES, CUSTOMS, at Winnipeg (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 293 (i); 1443 (ii).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- SEIZURES, CUSTOMS, in N.S.\* (Mr. *Stairs*) 532. (i)  
 SELDON, MR., and breach of Sawdust Law in N. S.\* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).  
 SETTLERS, FUEL FOR, in the N.W. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).  
 SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, Drawbacks on (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).  
 SHORTHAND WRITING, payment to G. and A. Holland\* (Mr. *Auger*) 147 (i).  
 SHORT LINE ROUTE TO MARITIME PROVINCES (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 33 (i).  
 SIMARD, M. J., Rep. recommending payment to G. Lavoie\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).  
 "SIR HECTOR," TUG, Depth of water drawn\* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).  
 "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," Repairs, &c., to Steamer (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 831 (ii).  
 SMALL SAVINGS AND P.O. Savings Banks (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).  
 SQUATTERS in the Qu'Appelle Valley (Mr. *Lister*) 205 (i).  
 SQUATTERS in TOWNSHIP 3, Ranges 23 and 24 west (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 231 (i).  
 STARR, J. E., Removal of, as Fishery Overseer\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).  
 SOUNDINGS, &c., Burlington Bay Canal\* (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 533 (i).  
 SUBSIDIES, DOMINION, TO PROVINCES (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).  
 SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS AND PAYMENTS\* (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).  
 SUBSIDIES TO RYS. in N.S. and Cape Breton (Mr. *McDougall*) 140 (i).  
 SUBSIDY TO THE NORTH SHORE LINE (Mr. *Laurier*) 41 (i).  
 SUGARS IMPORTED AT HALIFAX FROM JAMAICA\* (Mr. *Vail*) 40 (i).  
 SUPERANNUATION FUND\* (Mr. *Blake*) 56; (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i).  
 SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, Amounts due\* (Mr. *De St. George*) 1443 (ii).  
 SUPREME COURT, Contested Cases, &c.\* (Mr. *Curran*) 210 (i).  
 SUPREME COURT Decision *re* License Act\* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).  
 SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS and Queen's Bench, Quebec\* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).  
 SUPREME COURT OF NEW BRUNSWICK (Mr. *Foster*) 294 (i).  
 TARIFF under Old Prov. of Can., &c.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).  
 TELEGRAPH CABLE across Juan de Fuca Straits, Cost\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).  
 TEMP. ACT, 1878, PETITIONS, Number presented\* (Mr. *Foster*) 533 (i).  
 TENDERS FOR COAL SUPPLY TO Fog-whistles, &c.\* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).  
 TENDERS FOR INDIAN SUPPLIES for the N. W.\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).  
 TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, Lease of\* (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).  
 TILTON, MR., *vs.* Staff Commander Bolton\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 312 (i).  
 TIMBER LANDS sold or leased in Ont.\* (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 40 (i).  
 TIMBER LICENSES, Fort William Reserve\* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).  
 TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED in disputed Territory and applications not granted\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).  
 TIMBER LICENSES in B. C., Applications for\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 210 (i).  
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS in N.W. (Mr. *Charlton*) 121 (i).  
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS (Mr. *Charlton*) 30 (i).  
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS to cut in new Territory of Ont.\* (Mr. *Mills*) 124 (i).  
 TIMBER PERMITS to cut in disputed Territory\* (Mr. *Mills*) 210 (i).  
 TOLLS ON CERTAIN RAILWAY COMPANIES (Mr. *Mulock*) 54 (i).  
 TRACADIE BREAKWATER, Expenditure for Repairs\* (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).  
 TRADE WITH THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES (Mr. *Mitchell*) 36.  
 TRAFALGAR, TOWNSHIP, Indian Lands in\* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).  
 TREATY BETWEEN U. S. AND SPAIN (Mr. *Vail*) 219 (i).  
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, Goodwin's Contract (Mr. *Blake*) 823 (ii).  
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).  
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, Rent, &c., of building occupied by Engineer\* (Mr. *Cockburn*) 56 (i).  
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, Reps. to Council, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).  
 TUG-BARGES, Dredge, &c., on Red River\* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).  
 U.S. AND CAN., Reciprocal Trade Relations\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 1444 (ii).  
 VERNON SMITH'S REP. OF SURVEY (Mr. *Lesage*) 294 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- VICTORIA, B.C., Postal Revenue for eight months\* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).  
 VIGER INDIAN AGENCY, Lands sold\* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).  
 VOLUNTEER COMPANIES DISBANDED in Mil. Dist. No. 9\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).  
 VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38 (Mr. *Hickey*) 37 (i).  
 VOYAGEURS TO EGYPT, Names, &c.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 210 (i).  
 WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF ROOTS (Mr. *McDonald, King's*) 201 (i).  
 WEIRS IN THE CO. OF CHARLOTTE\* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).  
 WELLER'S BAY, Ont., "Range Lights"\* (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).  
 WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES, Memorials, &c.\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).  
 WHEAT AND FLOUR, Imports and Exports (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 138 (i).  
 WHEAT, FLOUR, CORNMEAL AND CORN, Duties collected\* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).  
 WHITE HAVEN BOAT CANAL, Rep. of Engineer\* (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).  
 WILKINSON, J. A., Moneys paid to\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).  
 WINDSOR BRANCH RY., Pleadings and Verdicts\* (Mr. *Kinney*) 532 (i).  
 WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT\* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1443 (ii).  
 WINTER CROSSING FROM P.E. I. (Mr. *McDonald, King's*) 62 (i).  
 WIRE FENCES, I. C. R., Contracts made by Govt.\* (Mr. *Weldon*) 532 (i).  
 WOOD, A. F., Moneys paid to\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).  
 WOOD, SUPPLYING OF, to Lower Traverse Lightship\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).  
 RICE, INCREASED DUTY ON : QUES. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 695 (i).  
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1°\*, 188; 2°\*, 246 (i); Notice of an Amt., 1210; in Com., 1347; 3°, 1352 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 91.)  
 RICHELIEU CO. LANDS. See "DOMINION LANDS."  
 RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS, MEMORIAL FROM RIPARIAN OWNERS : QUES. (Mr. *Bechard*) 606 (i).  
 RICHIBUCTO AND KINGSTON PORTS, CUSTOMS BUSINESS : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1442 (ii).  
 RICHIBUCTO HARBOR. See "CUSTOMS."  
 RIDEAU CANAL, INCREASE OF WATER SUPPLY : in Com. of Sup., 3313 (iv).  
 RIDGETOWN AS A PORT OF ENTRY, PETS., &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Casey*) 532 (i).  
 RIEL, CAPTURE OF, TEL. FROM GENL. MIDDLETON, 1895 (iii).  
 RIEL, EMPLOYMENT OF, BY GOVT. : QUES. (Mr. *Casey*) 743 (i).  
 RIEL'S PROPOSAL TO ACCEPT MONEY : QUES. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).  
 RIEL, TREATMENT OF IN PRISON : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2357 (iii).  
 RIEL, TRIAL OF : QUES. (Mr. *Lister*) 2358 (ii).  
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, HEADQUARTERS, ANNUAL GRANT, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bergin*) 46 (i).  
 "RIMOUSKI" STEAMER, SUBSIDY TO : QUES. (Mr. *Kirk*) 114 (i).  
 RITES OF RELIGION REFUSED PRISONERS IN THE N.W. : Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2998 (iv).  
 RIVER LOTS, N.W., SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS, MR. PEARCE'S LETTER RESPECTING : QUES. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).  
 RIVERS AND STREAMS, RENTAL OF, SUMS RECEIVED BY DEPT. OF FISHERIES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i); QUES., 2359 (iii).  
 RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH, SALE OF : QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1039 (ii).

- River St. Clair Ry.** See "ST. CLAIR."  
**ROACHE, MATTHEW, AND PILOTAGE COMMISSION:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3427 (iv).  
**ROBERTSON, JOHN D., COMPENSATION TO, FOR PREMISES AND LAND TAKEN FOR I.C.R.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Mills) 1443 (ii).  
**ROBINSON AND QUEEN.** See "INLAND FISHERIES."  
**Rock Lake, Brandon and Souris Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100** (Mr. McDougald, Pictou). 1°\*, 742 (i); 2°\*, 873 (ii).  
**ROGERS, W. H., FISHERY INSPECTOR FOR N.S., BREACH OF SAWDUST LAW:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).  
**ROGERS' FISH LADDERS, PURCHASE AND USE OF:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 3073 (iv).  
**ROGERS' PATENT FISH LADDER, COR. AND REPS.:** M. for copies (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 870 (ii).  
**ROLLING STOCK ON EASTERN SECTION, C.P.R.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Edgar) 302 (i).  
**ROLLING STOCK ON C.P.R., PAYMENT OF DUTIES ON, BY CO.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 888 (ii).  
**ROSS, N. N., OF QUEBEC, NAME AND SALARY OF SUCCESSOR TO:** Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 862 (ii).  
**ROUNDHOUSE AND BUILDINGS IN MAN. ON PRIVATE PROPERTY:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2030, 2171 (iii).  
**ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1516 (ii), 3475 (iv).**  
**Royal Canadian Insurance Co's B. No. 43** (Mr. Curran). 1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 188 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 791 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 28.)  
**ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.** See "MILITIA."  
**Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79** (Mr. Tupper). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 490 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1180 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 90.)  
**RUSSELL, A. (DEPT. OF INTERIOR) SUPERANNUATION OF:** Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530; RUSSELL, L., 2531 (iii).  
**SABLE ISLAND, TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH:** Ques. (Mr. Daly) 57 (i).  
**ST. ANNE LA POCATIÈRE PORPOISE FISHERY.** See "PORPOISE."  
**ST. CROIX COTTON MILLS, PAYMENT OF DUTIES:** Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 632 (i).  
**ST. CLAIR RANCHE CO., RENT PAID, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2240 (iii).  
**St. Clair Riv. Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 8** (Mr. Bergin). 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 57; in Com. and 3°\*, 245 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 25.)  
**ST. GEORGE'S DAY, ADJT. FOR:** M. (Mr. Shakespeare) 1305 (ii).  
**ST. JOHN AND PORTLAND, MILL ST. RY. CROSSING.** See "I. C. R."  
**ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RY. EXTENSION CO.:** Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 569 (i).  
**ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY AND COUNTY, ISSUE OF WRIT FOR ELECTION:** Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 3427 (iv).  
**ST. JOHN, N. B., MILITARY PROPERTIES:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 606 (i).  
**ST. LAURENT, LAND AND SURVEYS OF:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).  
**ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.** See "SUPPLY," &c.  
**St. Lawrence River Nav. B. No. 159** (Mr. McLelan). 1°\*, 3293; Order for 2° read, 3436; 2° m., Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6 m. h., neg., 3470; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 77.)  
**ST. LAWRENCE RY., BONUSES TO:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 86 (i).  
**ST. LOUIS DE LANGEVIN, PETITION FROM SETTLERS:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).  
**ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, ISLANDS LEASED IN:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 147 (i).  
**ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION TO QUEBEC:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 533 (i).  
**ST. PATRICK'S DAY:** M. for adjmt. (Mr. Curran) 593 (i).  
**ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL:** M. for adjmt. (Sir Hector Langevin) 2889 (iv).  
**ST. ROCH DES AULNETS, ENQUIRY re CAPT. DE CHENE:** M. for copy (Mr. Casgrain) 30 (i).  
**ST. ROMUALD D'ETCHEMIN, STATION AT:** Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1567 (ii).  
**ST. STEPHEN'S, N. B., POST OFFICE, RECEIPTS, &c.:** M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Burpee) 100 (i).  
**ST. STEPHEN'S, N. B., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 148 (i).  
**ST. THOMAS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT, AMOUNT EXPENDED ON:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).  
**ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY:** in Com. of Sup., 986 (ii).  
**SALARIES OF MINISTERS:** Ques. (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 3073 (iv).  
**Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets Act Amt. B. No. 86** (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 362 (i).  
**Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets. Acts Amt. B. No. 121** (Mr. Patterson, Essex). 1°\*, 927 (ii).  
**SALES AND RECEIPTS ON ACCOUNT OF DOMINION LANDS:** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2854; Sales for 1884-85, 2997 (iv).  
**SALMON FISHING IN BATHURST HARBOR, REGULATIONS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2359 (iii).  
**SALMON POINT BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION OF:** M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).  
**SALT CAKE:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).  
**SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.** See "N.W.T."  
**SATUMA ISLAND, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE:** Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 479 (i).  
**Sault St. Marie Bridge Co.'s B. No. 52** (Mr. Dawson). 1°\*, 170; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 24.)  
**SAUNDERS AND WOOD, TRIAL OF, FOR CRIMINAL LIBEL IN N. W.T.:** M. for copies\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).  
**SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE, IN THE MAR. PROVS.:** Ques. (Mr. Stairs) 148 (i); in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).  
**SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE, DEPOSITORS IN:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Fairbank) 819, 823 (ii).

- SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE, DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2359, 2465, 2559 (iii).
- SAVINGS BANKS (POST OFFICE OR OTHERWISE) DEPOSITORS IN: M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 533 (i).
- SAWDUST IN LA HAVÉ RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2239 (iii).
- SCHMIDT, LOUIS, AND OTHERS, OF PRINCE ALBERT DISTRICT, EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915 (iii); ANSWER TO LETTER OF, 3424 (iv).
- SCHOOL BOOKS, CONSIGNMENT OF BY NELSON & SONS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Wallace, York*) 1443 (ii). See "CUSTOMS."
- SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC: M. for copies of papers, &c. (Mr. *Langelier*) 88 (i).
- SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 743 (i).
- SCOTT ACT PETS.: M. to Erase name (Mr. *Foster*) 2320 (iii).
- SCOTT ACT, PROSECUTIONS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Tupper*) 41 (i).
- SEA LOTS OF P.E.I., DEPTL. INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- Secretary of State, Dept. of, Acts Amt. B. No. 102** (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 629 (i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°, 895 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- SEC. OF STATE'S REPORT: presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 127 (i).
- SECTION B. See "C. P. R."
- Seduction, &c., Punishment B. No. 27** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 76; 2°, 619 (i). See B. 123.
- SEIZURES. See "CUSTOMS."
- SEIZURES BY CUSTOMS DEPT. AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 2796, 3448 (iv).
- SETTLEMENT OF SETTLERS' CLAIMS AT PRINCE ALBERT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
- SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF MAN. HALF-BREED MINORS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1743 (iii). See "HALF BREEDS."
- SETTLERS' CLAIMS, PRINCE ALBERT DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).
- SETTLERS IN THE DOM. DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1884: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).
- SETTLERS IN THE MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 148 (i).
- SHAREHOLDERS. See "C. P. R." and "G. T. R."
- SHEET IRON HOLLOWWARE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSEY RIV.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1039 (ii).
- SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, DRAWBACK ON: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Burpee*) 100 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY.: Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 189; (Sir *Hector Langevin* and Mr. *Langelier*) 193; (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 195; (Messrs. *Casgrain* and *Blake*) 198; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 199; (Mr. *Mills*) 200 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY.: prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2531; M. for Com., 2971; in Com., 2975; Deb. on 2nd Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald* and Messrs. *Dodd, Vail* and *Blake*) 2977; (Messrs. *Gillmor* and *Landry*) 2978; (Mr. *Hall*) 2979; (Mr. *Langelier*) 2982; (Mr. *Colby*) 2982, 2987; (Mr. *Burpee*) 2986; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2987; (Mr. *Blake*) 2988; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2989, 3250; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2990; (Mr. *Lesage*) 2992; (Mr. *Desautniers, Maskinongé*) 2995; on M. to conc. in Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3250; Amt., 3257; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 3257; (Mr. *Langelier*) 3259; Amt. to Amt., 3265; (Mr. *Shanly*) 3266; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3266; (Mr. *Girouard*) 3267; (Mr. *Taschereau*) 3268; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 3269; (Mr. *Temple*) 3271; (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 3273; (Messrs. *Hall* and *Foster*) 3274; (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 3276; (Mr. *Colby*) 3277; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 3281; (Mr. *Bossé*) 3282; (Mr. *Fisher*) 3284; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3287; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 39, N. 107) 3289; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Lesage*) 3289; neg. (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292; Amt. neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 3292 (iv).
- SHORT LINE RY.: M. for copies of O. C., instructions given, Reports, &c., of Engineers (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 33 (i); SURVEY FROM ST. CHARLES: Ques, 350; SECOND REP. OF MR. LIGHT: Ques., 1744 (iii).
- SHORT LINE RY. FROM MONTREAL TO THE ATLANTIC: M. for copies of Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c. (Mr. *Lesage*) 38 (i); REPORT OF MR. WICKSTEED: Ques., 1744 (iii).
- SHORT LINE RY., PLANS AND REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 567 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY. TO THE MAR. PROVS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2239 (iii).
- SILVER AND GERMAN SILVER: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
- SIMARD, JOSEPH, REP. RECOMMENDING PAYMENT TO GEORGE LAVOIE: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).
- SIMPSON, G. A., GOVT. LAND AGENT: Ques (Mr. *Blake*) 57 (i).
- SINKING FUND, FIVE PER CENT. LOAN: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2465 (iii).
- "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER, REPAIRS TO, &c.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 831 (ii).
- Sisters of Charity of the N.W. incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 115** (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1°, 832; 2°, 873; in Com. and 3°, 1007 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- SKIRMISH WITH POUNDMAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1646 (ii).
- SMALL SAVINGS. See "POST OFFICE."
- SMITH, VERNON. See "SHORT LINE RY."
- SOMERVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REPAIR OF: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 57 (i).
- SOULANGES ELECTION, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT, 1 (i).
- SOUNDINGS TAKEN IN BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, REP. OF SUPT.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 533 (i).
- SOUTH GRENVILLE ELECTION: Return of Mr. *Shanly*, 3072 (iv).
- South Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 37** (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°, 125; 2°, 179; in Com. and 3°, 672 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- Speaker, Deputy, and Chairman of Committees B. No. 26** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 67; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to refer to Sel. Com., 70; neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72; 1° of B., 74; 2° and in Com., 175; M. for 3° agreed to on a div. and 3°, 212 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

- SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE:** Opening of Parlt., 2 (i); Prorogation, 3476 (iv).
- SPIRITS AND TOBACCO:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3212 (iv).
- SPIRITS TAKEN OUT OF BOND:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3371; Stmt. (Mr. Costigan) 3395 (iv).
- Spiruous Liquors Prohibition B. No. 125** (Mr. Beaty). Res. prop., 1040; 1°\* of B., 1063 (ii).
- SPRING HILL MINES.** See "COAL."
- SQUATTERS OR OCCUPANTS, &c.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 231 (i).
- SQUATTERS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY, ARBITRATION:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).
- STAFF OF THE HOUSE, RES. AND SCHEDULES ADOPTED BY COMMISSIONERS,** 2497 (iii).
- STAMP DUTY, COMMUTATION OF:** in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- STANDING COMMITTEES, NON-MEETING OF, FOR ORGANIZATION:** Remarks (Mr. Blake) 57, 67 (i).
- STANDING COM. ON COLONIZATION AND IMMIGRATION:** M. to add Messrs. Baker, Vic., and Jackson, to Com. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 299 (i).
- STANDING COM. ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES:** M. to add name of Mr. Bain (Sir Hector Langevin) 125 (i).
- STARR, J. E., FISHERY OVERSEER OF PORT WILLIAMS, N.S., REMOVAL OF:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- STATIONERY USED IN H. OF C., EXPENSE OF:** Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 290 (i).
- STATISTICS RELATING TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. Tassé) 2531 (iii), 2854 (iv).
- STATUTES, DISTRIBUTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. Trow) 568 (i).
- Statutes of Canada Consolidation B. No. 96** (Sir John A. Macdonald). Not introduced. See B. 130.
- Statutes of Canada, Revised, B. No. 130** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°, 1226 (ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2402 (iii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. No. 133** (Mr. McLelan). Res. prop., 1279; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1280 (ii); 2° and in Com., 2399; 3°\*, 2421 (iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 75.)
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH FRANCE:** Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 567 (i).
- STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS:**
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
  - CANADA AND ANTWERP: in Com. of Sup., 2942; conc., 2596 (iv).
  - CANADA AND GERMANY: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (iv).
  - FRANCE AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2936, 3041 (iv).
  - LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN, N.B., OR HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
  - N.B. AND P.E.I. TO GREAT BRITAIN: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).
  - P.E.I. AND GREAT BRITAIN: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
  - PORT MULGRAVE AND EAST BAY, C.B.: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
  - U. S. AND VICTORIA, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 2958 (iv).
- STEEL:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 805 (ii).
- STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE IN N.W.T.:** in Com. of Sup., 3448 (iv).
- STONEY INDIAN RISING, FURTHER INFORMATION ASKED, 863;** Stmt. (Sir Hector Langevin) 886 (ii).
- Subsidies, Further, to Rys. B. 158** (Sir Hector L. Langevin). Res. prop., 2531 (iii); M. for Com. on Res., 2971; in Com., 2974; M. to conc. in Res., 3250; 1°\* of B., 3293; 2° m., 3380; in Com., 3380; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. Kirk) 3401; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403; Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79) 3404; 3°\*, 3404; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 3057; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. Langevin) 3266; neg. (Y. 39, N. 101) 3292; (Mr. Lesage) 3292; neg. (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292; Amt. (Mr. Langevin) neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 3292 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 58.)
- Subsidies to Rys. B. No. 164** (Mr. Pope). Res. prop., 3457; M. for Com., 3470; in Com., 3472; 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 3473 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 59.)
- Subsidies to Rys.** See "LAND GRANTS."
- SUBSIDIES:**
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1677 (ii); in Com. of Sup 3295.
  - FURTHER, TO RYS. See B. 158.
  - LAND GRANTS TO RYS. See B. 147.
  - MANITOBA: prop. Res. (Mr. Bowell) 2889 (iv).
  - NEW BRUNSWICK AND P.E.I. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).
  - NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
  - N.S. INCREASED: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 189, 567 (i).
  - PROVINCIAL: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Amyot) 303 (i).
  - QUEBEC, ADVANCES TO, ON ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. Langevin) 235 (i).
  - RYS.: Remarks (Mr. Blake) and others, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (iv). See Bs. 147, 158 and 164.
  - Rimouski, STEAMER: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 114 (i).
  - RYS. IN N.S. AND CAPE BRETON: M. for Stmt. (Mr. McDougall) 140 (i).
  - RY. CO.'S, NAMES OF OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 312 (i).
- SUGARS, IMPORTATION OF, AT HALIFAX, FROM JAMAICA:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Vail) 40 (i).
- SUGAR:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3219 (iv).
- SUGAR: POLARISCOPE TEST:** Ques. (Mr. Vail) 479 (i).
- Summary Convictions.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SUMS PAID OR ADVANCED TO C. P. R. AS INTEREST OR SUBSIDY:** Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1677 (ii).
- Sunday Excursions Prohibition B. No. 19** (Mr. Charlton). 1°\*, 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE:** Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 429 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC:** prop. Res. (Sir Hector Langevin) 3293 (iv).
- SUPERANNUATION FUND, NUMBER ON LIST, &c.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 56 (i).
- SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, AMOUNTS DUE TO:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. De St. Georges) 1443 (ii).
- SUPPLIES FOR THE HUDSON'S BAY STR. "NEPTUNE":** M. for copies of Accts., &c. (Mr. Vail) 229 (i).
- Supply B. No. 163** (Mr. Bowell). 1°\*, 2°, 3°\*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 41.)
- SUPPLY:**
- [Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]
- Amts. to Ms. for Com.: Washington Treaty and Reciprocity (Mr. Davies) 995; Public Expenditure (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2868; Representation of the N. W. Territories (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 3404.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Estimates for 1885-86, 289; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1884-85, 2820; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1885-86, 3359; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting further Suppl. Estimates for 1885-86, 3415.

Res. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 27; in Com., 895, 968, 1023, 1304, 2795, 2830, 2889, 2903, 2936, 3041, 3232, 3295, 3339, 3383, 3408.

## COMMITTEE:

*Administration of Justice:*

General Vote, 985.

N. W. T. (*re* Trials in connection with Rebellion) 3411; conc., 3433; (Fourth Stipendiary Magistrate) 3448.

*Adulteration of Food.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:*

Archives, Care of, 1023.

Antwerp and Colonial Exhibition, 1032; conc., 2766.

Agricultural, Industrial, and other Statistics in Man. and N. W. T., 1035.

Criminal Statistics, Preparation of, 1026.

Dominion Exhibition, 1026.

Health Statistics: conc., 2766.

Indian and Colonial Exhibition, 3452.

Mortuary Statistics, 2027.

*Canals.* See "Railways and Canals."

*Charges of Management:*

Assistant Receivers General's Offices, Montreal, St. John, Winnipeg, 895.

Brokerage, Commission, &c., on Loans, 1874 to 1879, inclusive, 896.

Brokerage, Commission, &c., on Loan of 1884, 896.

County Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., and B.C., 896.

Country Savings Banks: printing, &c., 897.

Dominion Notes: issue and redemption, 897.

Dominion Notes, printing, &c., 897.

Financial Inspector, 895.

Financial Commissioner in England, 896; conc., 2763.

*Civil Government:*

Agriculture, Dept. of, 904; contingencies, 921.

Auditor General's Office, 901.

Civil Service Board of Examiners, 973.

Contingencies, Departmental:

High Commissioner, 925.

Post Office and Finance Depts., 927.

Travelling Expenses, 923.

Customs, Dept. of, 901; contingencies, 916.

Finance, Dept. of, and Treasury Board, 891; suppl., 3411; contingencies, 915.

Fisheries, Dept. of, 910.

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832, 898.

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 901; suppl. (increase and arrears of salaries) 3410, 3411.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Civil Government—Continued.*

Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 901; contingencies, 916.

Interior, Dept. of, 968, contingencies, 915; suppl. (Geological Survey Branch) 3408; conc., 2764, 3433 (iv).

Justice, Dept. of, 898.

Penitentiaries Branch, 914.

Marine, Dept. of, 906; contingencies, 922; suppl. 3411.

Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 898; contingencies, 914.

Postmaster-General's Dept., 902; suppl., 3411; conc., 2764.

Privy Council Office, 899; contingencies, 914.

Public Works, Dept. of, 911; suppl., 3448; contingencies, 921.

Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 973; contingencies, 923.

Secretary of State, Dept. of, 900; suppl., 3350, 3411.

Stationery Office: contingencies, 914.

*Collection of Revenues:*

Adulteration of Food, 3242.

Culling Timber, 3241.

Customs, 3232; suppl. (Extra for miscellaneous Services), 3393.

Excise, 3241.

Inspection of Staples, 3241.

Liquor License Act, conc., 3398; suppl., 3421.

Post Office, 3308; suppl. (Assistant Postmaster, Ottawa) 3393; conc., 3397.

Public Works—Repairs and Working Expenses:

Agent and Contingencies, B.C., 3308.

Harbors and Slides, Repairs, 3307.

Telegraph and Signal Service generally, 3307.

Telegraph Lines, P.E.I., and Mainland, 3307.

Railways—Repairs and Working Expenses:

Eastern Extension Railway, 3300.

Intercolonial, 3299.

Prince Edward Island Railway, 3301.

Windsor Branch Railway, 3301.

Weights and Measures and Gas, 3241.

Kinnee, Daniel (increase of Salary) 3457.

*Culling Timber.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Customs.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Dominion Lands—Capital:*

Surveys, Examination of Survey Returns, &c., 3344.

*Dominion Lands—Income:*

Agencies, 3346.

Land Board at Winnipeg, 3344.

*Dominion Police:*

General Vote, 985; suppl., 3350.

*Dominion Steamers.* See "Ocean and River Service."

*Excise.* See "Collection of Revenues."

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Fisheries :*

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit, 2956.

Fishing Bounty, expenses in connection with distribution, 2956; suppl., 3387.

Protection Steamers and Vessels, maintenance and repairs, 2955; conc., 2958.

*Geological Survey :*

General Vote, 3346; suppl., 3408; conc., 3433.

*Government Steamers.* See "Ocean and River Service."

*Immigration :*

General Vote, 2809, 2830.

*Indians :*

Assistance to Institutions, 3392.

Grant to supplement Indian Fund, 3242.

—— British Columbia generally, 3313.

—— Manitoba and N. W. T., 3314, 3339; suppl., 3393; conc., 3373.

—— New Brunswick, 3243.

—— Nova Scotia generally, 3243.

Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River : conc., 2922.

Oka Indians, Removal of, 3457.

*Inspection of Staples.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Insurance, Superintendence of :*

Expenses in connection with service, 2957; conc., 2958.

*Justice, Administration of,* 985.

*Legislation :*

## House of Commons :

Contingencies, 2796.

Debates, publishing of, 991; conc., 2765, 3371.

Expenses of Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c., 2795.

Haché, Jacques, Gratuity to, 3450.

Internal Economy, Commissioners' Report, increased expenditure under, 3449; conc., 3470.

Printing, paper and bookbinding, 992, 2798.

Salaries, &c., 991.

## Miscellaneous :

Deputy Speaker's Salary, 3351.

Election expenses, Returning Officers, Montreal, 3451.

Library—Salaries, &c., 2796.

Morgan's "Annual Register," 3351.

Sessional Indemnity, Increased, 3450.

## Senate :

Extra Expenses, including *Debates* and *Shorthand Writers*, 3448.

Salaries and Contingent Expenses, 990; conc., 2765.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

Agencies, rents and contingencies, 2951.

Cape Race Light, 2952.

Fog-Whistles, Buoys and Beacons, maintenance and repairs, 2951.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service—Continued.*

Lighthouse and Fog-Alarms, 2952.

Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., 2950.

*Liquor License Act.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*

Campbellton and Gaspé, 2942.

Canada and Antwerp, 2942; conc., 2958.

Canada and Germany, 2945.

France and Quebec, 2936, 3041.

Liverpool or London and St. John, N. B., or Halifax, N.S., 2942.

N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain and continental ports, 3457.

Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B., 2942.

Prince Edward Island and Great Britain, 2942.

United States and Victoria, B.C., 2936; conc., 2958.

*Marine Hospitals :*

General Vote, 2957.

*Militia :*

A, B and C Batteries, Pay and maintenance, 2914.

Ammunition, 2903.

Barrack Huts, B.C., 3412.

Barracks at London, 3412.

Brigade Majors' Salaries, transport, &c., 2903.

Cavalry and Infantry Schools, Pay and maintenance, 2915.

Clothing and Great Coats, 2906.

Contingencies, 2913.

Dominion Artillery Association, 2913.

Dominion Rifle Association, 2913.

Drill Pay, &c., 2910.

Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, 2915.

Middleton, General, Grant to, 3470.

Military Branch and District Staff, Salaries, 2889, 2903.

Military Properties, Care and maintenance, 2916.

Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg, 3411.

New Militia Pensions, conc., 2765.

Ordnance, Improved Rifled, 2915.

Pay and transport, &c., of Force aiding civil power at Langan Mines, C.B., 3452.

Public Armories, Care of Arms, &c., 2910.

Royal Military College, 2913; conc., 2922.

Veterans of War of 1812, Pensions, conc., 2765.

*Miscellaneous :*

American Institute of Mining Engineers' visit to N.S., 3456.

Bank Imposts, Refund of, 3387; conc., 3396.

Canada Temperance Act, Expenses of Elections under, 3387.

Chinese Commission, Expenses, &c., 3387; conc., 3396.

Chinese Commissioners' Report, Printing, &c., 3421.

Commercial Agencies, 3245.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Miscellaneous—Continued.*

- District of Keewatin, Expenses of Govt., 3244.  
 Doutre, J., Settlement of Claim against Govt. re Fishery Commission, 3392.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies of office, 4244.  
 Halifax Fishery Commission, Settlement of Legal Claims, 3388, 3392; conc., 3396.  
 "Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises," 3455.  
 Hudson Bay Expedition Expenses, 3245.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Putting in force Act respecting, 3244.  
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, 3456.  
 Middleton, General, Grant to, 3470.  
 Model Farm, Establishment of, 3453.  
 Mounted Police Barracks, Erection of, 3244; suppl. 3387.  
 North-West Council, Salaries of Members for 1881 and 1883, 3392; conc., 3397.  
 North-West Disturbance, Expenses and losses, arising out of, 3454.  
 North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt., &c., 3243.  
 Printing Commission, Expenses, 3392.  
 Provincial Legislation, Compilation, &c., correspondence, petitions, reports and O.C.'s respecting, 3421; conc., 3434.  
 Purcell & Ryan, claim for transportation of supplies, &c., furnished Marquis of Lorne, 3452.  
 Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary, 3420.  
 Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I., 3455; conc., 3470.  
 Returns, Preparation of, Payment of Extra Clerks, 3245; suppl., 3388.  
 Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron, 3244.
- North-West Mounted Police:*  
 Equipment, pay and maintenance of additional men, 3421  
 General Vote, 3243; suppl., 3392.
- Ocean and River Service:*  
 Canadian Registration of Shipping, 2950.  
 Government Steamers, maintenance, &c., 2945; conc., 3396.  
 Life-boats, Stations and Life-preservers, &c., 2946.  
 Obstruction in Navigable Waters, Removal of 2950.  
 Water and River Police, Montreal and Quebec, 2950.  
 Wrecks and Casualties, investigation of, &c., 2950.
- Penitentiaries:*  
 British Columbia, 990.  
 Dorchester, 989.  
 Kingston, 985; suppl. (McManus' gratuity) 3350; conc., 3374.  
 Manitoba, 989; suppl. (Sutherland, services) 3350.  
 Removal of Prisoners, 3411.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Penitentiaries—Continued.*

St. Vincent de Paul, 986; suppl. (Baillaigé, services) 3350.

*Pensions:*

New Militia, conc., 2765.

Veterans of War of 1812, 992; conc., 2765.

*Post Office.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Public Works\*—Capital:**Public Buildings:*

Additional Public Buildings, Ottawa, 2916.

*Public Works:*

Cape Tormentine Harbor, 2917.

Esquimalt Graving Dock, 2916.

Port Arthur and Kaministiquia River, 2916.

*Public Works—Consolidated Fund:**Harbors and Rivers:*

Manitoba (River Saskatchewan) 3420.

Nova Scotia, 3419.

Ontario, 3386.

Quebec (River Yamaska) 3419.

*Miscellaneous:*

House and Furniture for High Commissioner, balance, 3386.

Roads and Bridges (iron bridge across Rideau River) 3420.

*Public Buildings:*

Armories, Montreal, 3385; suppl., 3419.

British Columbia, 3386.

Examining Warehouse, Toronto, 3385.

Newcastle, N.B., Post Office, 3385.

*Telegraphs:*

Amherst Island and Mainland, 3420.

Sub-marine Cable between B.C. and Washington Territory, 3386.

*Public Works—Income:*

Dredging, 2921; conc., 2923.

*Harbors and Rivers:*

Manitoba, 2921.

Maritime Provinces—Repairs and Improvements generally, 2920; conc., 2922.

New Brunswick, 2920.

Ontario, 2920.

Prince Edward Island, 2919.

*Public Buildings:*

Manitoba, 2919.

New Brunswick, 2918.

North-West Territories, 2919.

N. W. T. (Prince Albert Court House and Gaol) 3452.

Ontario, 2918.

Prince Edward Island, 2918.

Quebec, 2918.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 2919.

Telegraphs, 2922.

\*For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

## Quarantine :

- General Vote, 2853.
- Immigrant Patients, Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 3358.
- Sheep Scab in Quebec, extirpating disease, 3358 ; suppl., 3411.

## Railways\* and Canals—Capital :

## Canals :

- Cornwall, 3301.
- Fort Francis, Hugh Sutherland's Claim, 3385.
- Lachine, 3301.
- Murray 3303.
- St. Peter's, 3312.
- Trent River Nav. and Looks, 3311.
- Welland, 3301, 3311.
- Williamsburg, 3301.

## Railways :

- Canadian Pacific Railway—
  - Inspecting Engineers' Expenses, 3417.
  - Pembina Branch (Award of Arbitrators) 3417.
  - Section B., 3383.
  - Subsidy, 3295 :
- Carleton Branch Railway :
  - To purchase, with harbor frontage, town lots, &c., 3415.
- Eastern Extension Railway :
  - Steamer *Norwegian*, Repairs, 3384.
- Intercolonial Railway :
  - Air Brakes to 100 engines, 3299.
  - Miscellaneous Works, 3296 ; suppl., 3383 ; conc., 3395.
  - Sleeping Cars, Purchase of, 3417.
- Short Line Railway, N.S. :
  - Settling unpaid Claims, &c., 3413.

## Railways and Canals—Income :

## Canals :

- Grenville (J. Simard, for services) 3418.
- Miscellaneous (Repairs to Road Dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3418.
- Rideau, 3312 ; (Land Damages, Township of Pittsburg) 3418.
- Welland (Land and Damages, Grand River, &c.) 3418 ; conc., 3433.

## Railways :

- Surveys and Inspections, 3313.
- Surveys of Cape Breton and other Railways, 3418.

## Scientific Institutions :

- Meteorological Observations, instruments &c., 2956.

## Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."

## Weights and Measures and Gas. See "Collection of Revenues."

## CONCURRENCE :

- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. (Trials in connection with Rebellion) 3433.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## CONCURRENCE—Continued.

- Antwerp and Colonial Exhibition, Expenses, 2766.
- Assistant Postmaster, Ottawa, Allowance to, 3397.
- Bank Imposts, Refund of, 3396.
- Canada and Antwerp, Steam communication, 2958.
- Charges of Management, 2763.
- Chinese Commission, Expenses, 3396.
- Debates, House of Commons, 2765, 3371.
- Dominion Steamers, 3396.
- Dredging, 2923.
- Fishery Protection Steamers and Vessels, 2953.
- Halifax Fishery Commission, Legal Claims, 3396.
- Harbors and Rivers, Maritime Provinces, Repairs, &c., 2922.
- Health Statistics, Expenses in connection with, 2766.
- Indian Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River, 2922.
- Indians of Manitoba and the N. W. T., 3373.
- Insurance, Superintendence of, 2958.
- Intercolonial Railway (Capital) 3395.
- Interior, Dept. of, 2764.
- Internal Economy Commissioners' Report, Increased Expenditure under, 3470.
- Liquor License Act, Commissioners, Inspectors, &c., 3398.
- McManus, C., Gratuity to Widow of, 3374.
- Mining Geologists, 3433.
- North-West Council, Salaries of Members, &c., 3396.
- Pensions, New Militia, 2765.
- Postmaster General's Office, 2764.
- Provincial Legislation, Compilation, &c., of Documents respecting, 3434.
- Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 3470.
- Royal Military College of Canada, 2922.
- Senate, Salaries and Contingencies, 2765.
- U.S. and Victoria, B.C., Steam communication, 2958.
- Veterans of War of 1812, Pensions, 2765.
- Welland Canal (Land Damages, &c.) 3433.

**Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction Limitation B. No. 3** (Mr. Landry, *Montmagny*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 28 ; Order for 2<sup>o</sup> read, 102 ; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 151 ; Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 165 ; neg., 167 ; 2<sup>o</sup> neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (i). See B. 68.

**Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction Limitation B. No. 68** (Mr. Landry, *Montmagny*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 270 (i). See B. 3.

SUPREME COURT, CONTESTED CASES BEFORE, AND JUDGMENTS :  
M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 210 (i).

SUPREME COURT : Deb. on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> of B. 3 (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 151, 167 ; (Mr. *Tupper*) 156 ; (Messrs. *Girouard, Beaty and Blake*) 157 ; (Mr. *Macmaster*) 160 ; (Mr. *Curran*) 161 ; (Mr. *Davies*) 162 ; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 163 ; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 164 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 165 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 166 ; (Mr. *Laurier*) 167 ; (Messrs. *Royal and Belleau*) 168 ; (Mr. *Coursol*) 169 (i).

\*For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

- SUPREME COURT: Judgments on Controverted Elections, 1, 593 (i).
- SUPREME COURT, JUDGMENTS RENDERED SINCE ESTABLISHMENT: M. for copies\* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 533 (i).
- SUPREME COURT OF N.B., CAUSES ENTERED FOR ARGUMENT: M. for Number, &c. (Mr. Foster) 294 (i).
- SURVEYS AND EXAMINATIONS OF SURVEY RETS.: in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv).
- SURVEYS AND PLANS OF BATTLEFORD AND EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2357 (iii).
- SURVEYS OF RIVER LOTS AT ST. ALBERT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424; Mode of: Ques., 3424 (iv).
- SUTHERLAND, DR., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).
- SMALL SAVINGS, ENCOURAGEMENT OF: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN THE QU'APPELLE VALLEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN TOWNSHIP 3, RANGES 23 AND 24, WEST: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 231 (i).
- Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. Mulock). 1°\*, 125; 2°\*, 180; in Com. and 3°\*, 490 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 33.)
- Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°\*, 180; 2°\*, 246; in Com., 693 (i); 3°\*, 791 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 32.)
- TRACADIE BREAKWATER, N.S., EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. McIsaac) 147 (i).
- TACHÉ, ARCHBISHOP, COMMUNICATION FROM, *re* HALF-BREEDS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- TAGGING METAL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- TANGENTS AND CURVES ON C.P.R., NUMBER AND AGGREGATE LENGTH: Ques.: (Mr. Blake) 744 (i). See "C.P.R."
- TARIFF, NOTICE OF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 714 (i).
- TARIFF, THE. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- TAR, PINE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).
- TASCHEREAU, MR. T. L.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 743 (i).
- TELEGRAPH CABLE ACROSS JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, COST OF: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WEST OF WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 839 (ii).
- TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).
- TELEGRAPH SYSTEM IN CAPE BRETON, EXTENSION OF: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 78 (i).
- TEMPORARY LOANS TO GOVERNMENT BY BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 350 (i), 2530 (iii).
- TERRY, CHARLES HUNTER, GRATUITY TO: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 632 (i).
- Terry, Fairy Emily Jane, Relief of, B. No. 97 (Mr. Taylor). 1° on a div., 605; 2° on a div., 672 (i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 36.)
- TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, LEASE OF: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
- THANKS OF QUEEN FOR CONDOLENCE ON DEATH OF DUKE OF ALBANY: Mess. from His Ex. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 32 (i).
- THANKS OF PARLT. TO VOLUNTEERS. See "VOTE."
- Three Rivers. See "HARBOR COMMISSIONERS."
- THUNDER BAY COLONISATION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458; in Com., 3473 (iv).
- TILTON, MR., AND STAFF COMMANDER BOLTON, DISPUTE BETWEEN: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 312 (i).
- TIMBER DUES TO GOVT. BY C.P.R. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 479 (i).
- TIMBER LICENSES AND PERMITS GRANTED ON LANDS OUTSIDE OF DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Rets.\* (Mr. Charlton) 209 (i).
- TIMBER LICENSES AND PERMITS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 121 (i).
- TIMBER LICENSES ISSUED SINCE JAN., 1882, IN N.W.T., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 863 (ii).
- TIMBER LICENSES OR BERTHS IN B.C., TOTAL APPLICATIONS, DATE, NAMES AND ADDRESSES, &c., &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 210 (i).
- TIMBER ON INDIAN LANDS, NON-PRINTING OF RETS., AS ORDERED BY HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 56 (i).
- TIMBER PERMITS GRANTED IN TERRITORY AWARDED ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 114, 115; M. for Ret., 115; M. for copies, &c.,\* 124, 210 (i).
- TISSUE PAPER: in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- TOLLS ON CERTAIN RAILWAY COMPANIES: M. for Stmt., &c. (Mr. Mulock) 54 (i).
- BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO MILITIA CORPS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 1744 (iii).
- TOWELS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- TOWNSHEND, MR. C. J.: Certificate of Election and Ret. of, 1.
- C. P. R. TOWN SITES, SALES OF, TRANSACTION ON JOINT ACCOUNT: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS: presented (Mr. Bowell) 28 (i).
- TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 1387 (ii); (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3163 (iv).
- TRADE RELATIONS WITH AUSTRALIAN COLONIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mitchell) 36; WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Burpee) 78; WITH JAMAICA, 429; WITH MEXICO: Ques. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 632 (i).
- Trading Corporations. See "INSOLVENT BANKS."
- TRANSFER OF BATTERIES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 235 (i).
- TRANSLATION OF *Hansard* AND VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS: Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 594 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION CHARGES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (iv).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, Act Amt B. No. 104 (Sir Leonard Tilley). 1°, 630 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1670 (ii). (48-49 Vic. c. 47.)

TREATIES:

FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U. S. AND SPAIN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Vail*) 219 (i).

NEGOTIATIONS BY SIR AMBROSE SHEA: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1387 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH JAMAICA: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2854 (iv).

WASHINGTON TREATY, TERMINATION OF FISHERY CLAUSES: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2559, 2773, 2890; on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davies*) 2897; Remarks (Mr. *Vail*) 3074; Cor. and Papers: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3232; Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3249; Transport Regulations: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3249; Deb. on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3322; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3330; (Mr. *Mills*) 3333; (Messrs. *McLelan* and *Mitchell*) 3336; (Mr. *Vail*) 3338 (iv).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, PLANS AND ESTIMATES OF COST, &c.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i); CONTRACTS: M. for copies, 823 (ii).

TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 3311 (iv).

TRESTLES AND BRIDGES, C.P.R., NUMBER OF: M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 100 (i).

TROOPS, TRANSPORT OF: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) 887 (ii).

TROUBLES AT PRINCE ALBERT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 693 (i).

Truro Bank incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°\*, 313; 2°\*, 405 (i).

TRUTCH, J. W., EMPLOYMENT OF, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 744 (i).

TUG-BARGES, DREDGE AND MACHINERY ON RED RIVER: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).

TURKISH PAUPER IMMIGRANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 3475 (iv).

UMBRELLA OR PARASOL RIBS, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (ii).

U. S. AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (iv).

VACANCIES IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1, 593 (i).

VACANCY IN A JUDICIAL DISTRICT, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2750 (iv).

VEGREVILLE, FATHER, COB. WITH MR. DEVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).

VETERANS OF 1812, WIDOWS OF, EXTENSION OF PENSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 36 (i).

VETERANS OF WAR OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).

VICTORIA RIFLES. See "MILITIA."

VIOLATION OF CUSTOMS LAW IN N.S., BY JOHN LEANDER MACKENZIE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).

VOLUNTEER CORPS ORGANIZED IN THE N.W. IN 1879: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 816; Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1474 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS DISBANDED IN MILITARY DISTRICT No. 9: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS IN THE N.W., AND INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1131 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS IN THE N.W., RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 1566 (ii); (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii); prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3321; in Com. on Res., 3370. See B. 160.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38: Res. recognising services (Mr. *Hickey*) 37 (i).

VOLUNTEERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE, INCREASE OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).

VOTE FOR RELIEF OF SETTLERS IN THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1744 (iii).

VOTE OF \$1,000,000 FOR THE N.W. TROUBLES: in Com. of Sup., 2234 (iii).

VOTE OF THANKS OF PARLT. TO GENL. MIDDLETON AND VOLUNTEERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Caron*) 3459; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3463; (Mr. *Tassé*) 3465; (Mr. *Wright*) 3466; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 3467; (Mr. *Macmillan*) 3468 (iv).

VOTE TO GENL. MIDDLETON: notice (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3457; Mess. from His Ex., 3470 (iv).

VOYAGEURS TO EGYPT, NUMBER, NAMES, RESIDENCE, &c., OF OFFICERS AND MEN: M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 210 (i).

WARRANTS ISSUED FOR NEW ELECTIONS, 1, 593 (i).

WAR SUPPLIES, CARRIAGE OF, BY AMERICAN RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 838 (ii).

WASHINGTON TREATY. See "TREATIES."

WATER AND RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).

WATER LOTS IN N.S., APPLICATION FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Tupper*) 429 (i).

WATER LOTS ON RIVERS, GOVT. RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 2238 (iii).

WATERPROOF BLANKETS FOR VOLUNTEERS, PURCHASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).

WATSON, EBENEZER, OF SARNIA, OFFICE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 188 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 27; on M. for Com., the Budget Speech, 313; reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 333; Deb. adjd., 348; resmd. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 394; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 412; (Mr. *Tupper*) 455; (Mr. *Charlton*) 463; (Mr. *McLelan*) 505; (Mr. *Mills*) 512; (Mr. *Curran*) 521; (Mr. *Rinfret*) 527; (Mr. *Foster*) 535; (Mr. *Davies*) 545; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 555; (Mr. *King*) 561; (Mr. *Burns*) 595; (Mr. *Casey*) 599, 633; (Mr. *Stairs*) 641; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 648; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 656; (Mr. *Jackson*) 662; (Mr. *Vail*) 666; (Mr. *Allison*) 676; (Mr. *Tassé*) 677; (Mr. *Hackett*) 687; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 715; (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 719; (Mr. *McMullen*) 722; (Mr. *Dickinson*) 729; (Mr. *Sproule*) 733; (Mr. *Bécharde*) 739; (Mr. *Hesson*) 747; Res. (Mr. *Blake*) re Disturbance in the N.W., 756; neg. (Y. 57, N. 129), and in Com., 771 (i); in Com., 783, 791, 840 (ii); Res. (Mr. *Blake*) re Disturbance in the N. W. (*Resumé* of Events) 3075; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213; in Com., 3214, 3294; Res. conc. in, 3322 (iv).

WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF ROOTS: M. for copies of Cor.\* (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 201 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 832; in Com. and 1°\* of B. 837; 2° and in Com., 1672; 3°\*, 1680 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

WEIRS IN THE COUNTY OF CHARLOTTE, N. B., LICENSES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).

WELLER'S BAY, "RANGE LIGHTS" AT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).

Western Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *McCallum*). 1°\*, 534; 2°\*, 616 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 1288 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

- WESTERN TERMINUS C. P. R., ROUTE OR ROUTES FROM PORT MOODY TO ENGLISH BAY: M. for Plan, &c. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- WEST MIDDLESEX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- WEST ONTARIO ELECTION: Return of Member to represent, 1 (i).
- WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS. See "MARINE."
- Wharves, Docks and Piers in Nav. Waters B. No. 18** (Mr. Tupper). 1<sup>o</sup>, 46; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 215; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 218 (i).
- WHARVES ON P. E. I., GRANT FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 351 (i).
- WHEAT, FLOUR, CORNMEAL AND CORN, DUTY COLLECTED ON, IN N. S.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Vail) 533 (i).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES, ALTERATION OF: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 148 (i).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR, DUTIES ON, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 532 (i).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 138 (i).
- WHISKEY: in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225 (iv).
- WHITE POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER, REPAIR OF: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 52 (i).
- WHITE SHELLAC: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- WILKINSON, J. A., SUMS PAID TO, AND FOR WHAT SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 51 (i).
- WINDSOR BRANCH RY, O.C., AGREEMENTS, &c., RESPECTING: M. for copies\* (Mr. Kinney) 533 (i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82** (Mr. Cameron, Victoria). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 349; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 428; Order d'schgd and B. withdn, 428 (i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 91** (Mr. Cameron, Victoria). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 428; 2<sup>o</sup>, 567 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1180 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 89.)
- WINTER CROSSING FROM P. E. I.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 62 (i).
- WOOD AND WILKINSON, SUMS PAID TO, AND SERVICES RENDERED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).
- Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 23** (Mr. Williams). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 67; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 113; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 490 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 16.)
- WOODSTOCK, N. B., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, INSPECTOR OF: Ques. (Mr. Irvine) 606 (i).
- WOOD SUPPLIES FOR GOVT BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 429 (i); (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1387 (ii).
- WOOLLEN FABRICS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 800, 840 (ii).
- WOOLLEN RAGS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 783; legislation respecting: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1567 (ii).
- WRIT FOR LÉVIS COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 633; Remarks 661 (i).